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ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the commodification of domestic labour in a particular type of domestic labour firm, housekeeping services franchises, in southern Ontario. Specifically, I investigate the labour-related experiences of the women employed in these franchises. There are two goals: (1) to draw out, describe, and analyse the relations and processes within which women engage while employed as workers in housekeeping services franchises and (2) to devise conceptual tools that can be used to refine and enhance explanations of waged domestic labour processes.

I designed the project in three phases. I was employed at a housekeeping services franchise in Hamilton for three and a half months in the Spring of 1990. During the Fall of 1990 and Winter and Spring of 1991 I carried out multiple-depth conversations with 14 women employed as franchise housekeepers and ten interviews with managers/owners of franchises in southern Ontario and head office personnel. The analysis and write-up began in May 1991 and was completed in February 1993.

The thesis as a report of this research can be divided into three areas, methodology, theory, and topic. Methodologically, I implement a set of feminist principles drawn from a feminist marxist framework. Theoretically, I offer a set of abstractions which together conceptualise waged domestic labour processes in a post-1973 organisation of production relations: 'total labour', production regime, class formation, and gender formation. These concepts in part explain and in part interpret workers' experiences of waged domestic labour processes. Topically, I extend domestic labour studies to include waged domestic labour processes that generate surplus value. I focus on the transformation of the traditional relation of "mistress and maid" to that of "mistress and manager" and "manager and maid".
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CHAPTER 1
A DAY IN THE LIFE OF A FRANCHISE HOUSEKEEPER

(1.1) BACKGROUND AND OUTLINE

When I thought about pursuing a doctoral degree in geography I wanted to find out how working women define themselves, as women and as workers. Such an investigation, while seemingly a cumbersome undertaking, could still be managed by focusing on the interface between production and reproduction, that is, on paid reproductive labour. What sparked the idea of carrying out the investigation in a waged domestic labour process was that a close friend of mine went to work in a paramedical services franchise. I was intrigued with the notion of franchising a service relation rather than a tangible product. In order to gain first-hand knowledge of a particular form of waged domestic labour that franchises a service, I decided to completely submerge myself in the labour process through employment. Because I had cleaned houses privately in the past, I sought employment in a housekeeping services franchise.

In the following section I recount an ordinary day for me in the housekeeping services franchise where I was employed. The depiction brings together the wide variety of activities in which I engaged in the workplace as well as the

---

1. Rather than presenting the labour process of the housekeeping services franchises industry in detail, I chose to present the material in two formats. First is the narrative in the following section; the second, in a series of appendices. For more information about the structure of the housekeeping services franchising firm see Appendix A. For information on the organisation of the franchises themselves see Appendix B. For a detailed account of individual labour tasks and the services offered in housekeeping services franchises see Appendix C.
assortment of commitments I had outside the job. Throughout the narrative I note specific topics, issues, or queries that I follow up on in the discussions in subsequent chapters. I conclude this chapter by noting the connections between my experiences and the specific research questions I pursued in subsequent phases of the research.

(1.2) A DAY

I started working for Clare’s Cleaning Services at the beginning of the month. I didn’t do much cleaning. Most of the time I was in training. I learned a bit about the firm and the franchises and I learned a lot about how to clean a house quickly. There are three principles: left-right-up-down, inside-out, and helping-out. If I could keep these principles straight, then I could remember everything I was supposed to do, no matter my position on the team.

The left-right-up-down principle directs the clean. In cleaning a room, I begin in one place and work around the room toward the right cleaning everything from the ceiling to the floor until I get back to where I began. By sticking to this principle, I don’t waste time going all over the room, dusting this, wiping that. Rather, I clean in a spatially systematic manner. The second principle, inside-out, organises the approach to the clean. It’s like reaching into a sock and pulling it ‘inside out’. In vacuuming the living room, for example, I would start in the furthest corner of the room and back out the entrance. Likewise, we begin at the furthest end of the house, usually the largest bedroom, and make our way through the house backing out the front door. If there is an upstairs, we begin ‘up’ and work our way ‘down’. The

2. All names have been changed to preserve anonymity. I used two strategies to choose names. First, I used the names of friends and relatives of whom the people in the study reminded me. Second, I tried to choose a name which reflected the person’s real name. For example, if a woman’s name were Pamela, I chose Samantha. If, however, she went by Panimie, I chose Sammie Jo.
helping-out principle literally means teamwork. As members of a team we each have our own set of cleaning tasks. They have been assigned so that we finish them about the same time. However, this seldom happens. Someone usually finishes before the others. The one who's done first helps the others with their tasks. Sometimes, one team helps out another if the day is longer than usual or a house is dirtier than expected.

I was hired with the expectation that I would only clean when Judith, the manager and owner, needed an extra housekeeper. The rest of the time I would deliver flyers. Usually there are only two women per team; so I was supposed to be always the third hand. For the first three weeks I cleaned Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays, the heaviest days of the week. This week I cleaned everyday. Today's Friday and I'm exhausted. We squeezed in several apartments between the three or four houses we cleaned each day. Every afternoon I took a hot bath as soon as I got home. Judith assured me that all weeks weren't as heavy, and that next week would be lighter. I'm not so sure. I think it's heavier because it's Spring cleaning time.

Cassie picked me up this morning at 7:30. Vivian was already in the car. I was disappointed when I saw Vivian. I knew Cassie was picking me up and that Vivian was her cleaning partner, but I failed to put the two together. It's not that I dislike either one of them, I just prefer working with Roxanne. Roxanne trained me and when she and I are together we "go about our business" in the house and then in the car we listen to the radio and talk about, well, nothing in particular, we just talk.

Yesterday I worked with Vivian and Fiona. It was horrendous. At the first house, I was responsible for the kitchen. I took my time and did what I thought was a pretty good job. Vivian was acting as "interim supervisor" for the day because all three of us were maids, not supervising maids. So, Vivian came around to check my
work. I saw her wipe the sink. Then, I saw her squirt some VIM. I started fluffing the light fixtures in the foyer to ward off my anger. When I looked again she had her gloves on, scrubbing. I stood at the doorway and said (curtly, I admit), "Vivian, you could have told me to do it over". She snapped back, "You've been trained". Whew, was it a long day! She reprimanded me at the next house for thumping the beater bar on the stairs, at the next one for not buffing the chrome, and the next one for not getting all the cat hair off a corduroy pillow. Why couldn't we get along? Problems like this occurred regularly when the manager switched supervising maids from team to team and used the employee to check the maids' quality. Vivian wanted to show Judith that she could be a supervising maid.

With this in mind, I crawled into the back seat and off we went. I took the clipboard and saw we had three scheduled cleans: two on the mountain and one in Linden. I thought "this was going to be a light day - we'll pick up our cheques and be done by 2:30 at the latest!" On the way to the first house, Cassie told Vivian to remind her to phone Judith to check up on the Owen clean after lunch. This changed everything. This meant a long day plus traffic. And it was going to be hot!

Our first clean, the Robinsons, was a multi-level with a back split. These houses are "monsters" with two and a half baths. Yet they are easy to clean because there are very few knickknacks on the shelves. Mr. and Mrs. Robinson were getting ready to go on vacation so they were home. I kind of like it when the customers are home because when they talk to you, the time passes more quickly. Cleaning houses where there is no background noise is boring.

I started upstairs in the small bathroom while Cassie started cleaning the kitchen. Vivian began dusting with me upstairs. Even though it looked clean, the bathroom was pretty scummy. Wiping down the baseboards was like scraping dried
black mud. This bathroom hadn’t been cleaned thoroughly in weeks. What should have taken me twenty minutes took me half an hour. I got all my stuff together and went to the second bathroom. It was a lot cleaner, but it still took me thirty minutes. I hadn’t realised I was so slow.

When I ran into Vivian on the stairs, I asked her (in a whisper, because the Robinsons were there) if this were a monthly clean. She at first ignored me (a holdover from yesterday), then mumbled something about a "mess". I thought, well, that’s for sure. I’m not so slow, it just takes longer because the house is in such a mess.

The downstairs bath was next to the kitchen. While I was cleaning I heard Cassie chatting with Mrs. Robinson. They were going to their cottage near Haliburton. I interrupted and said that I had been there in the Fall and thought it was beautiful. There was a slight pause in the conversation. Mrs. Robinson looked in my direction, then resumed talking to Cassie. As I turned to go into the bathroom, I remembered that only the supervising maid was allowed to talk with the customers. It was a firm rule.

This half bath, too, took longer than I anticipated, a full twenty five minutes. Once I finished, I got the water ready for mopping and put all the cleaning products in the car. I checked with Cassie to see what I could do. She first asked if I had buffed the chrome. I told her that I had, but she took a look anyway. Then she asked that I do the utility room because she wouldn’t be able to get to it. When I finished, I gave the chrome an extra wipe and met Cassie in the foyer. I grabbed the mop, she dumped the bucket, and we were out the door.

I didn’t understand why the clean took so long. So, I asked. Cassie said that this clean wasn’t on her regular route. Judith sent them out to "clean up someone
else’s mess". Apparently, Vivian was out the week before last with Barb and "squealed" to Judith about the quality of the clean. Judith knew that Cassie would clean up the mess without complaining too much. Cassie may not have complained to Judith, but she sure complained when we got into the car. I never heard such language, and I swear quite a bit. She was incensed over Judith’s tactic to get her to clean up someone else’s mess. I asked why she didn’t refuse the clean. Cassie said that if she didn’t clean it up, then Judith would lose the clean. And if she lost the clean, then she would pull a clean off her route and give it to Barb. Since wages were based on the percentage of gross revenue from the cleans, it was in Cassie’s economic interests to clean it without complaining.

The second clean was right around the corner from the Robinsons. Like many of the houses in this neighborhood (and on this route), these two had the same layout, only with different décor. Mr. and Mrs. Collins were already out. We traded tasks so this time Vivian started in the kitchen, Cassie in the bathroom, and I began the dusting. Before we went upstairs, Vivian yelled for us to come in the kitchen. Mrs. Collins had left Coke in the fridge and two loonies on the counter. Almost immediately Cassie said that she and Vivian should take the tips because this clean was a regular. She said that we could have some Coke when we were finished. Although seniority was not significant in determining wages or choosing cleans, it was very important in distinguishing who was eligible for "perks". As supervisory maid, Cassie set the rules and made all the decisions concerning customer relations.

I kind of liked dusting because I got to pick up nearly everything in the house. I started upstairs in the largest bedroom. I turned to my left to start dusting - the dresser, the chest, and the curio cabinet. Mrs. Collins had a delicate crystal figurine collection in the cabinet. I wasn’t sure how to clean it. I called for Cassie
who told me to skip the curio cabinets, one in the bedroom and two downstairs in the living room. Judith had written into the contract that Clare's would not be responsible for cleaning such expensive items. Cassie said that some of those pieces cost up to $1,500. Further, if anything else looks expensive, don’t touch it. If a Clare’s maid were to break something so expensive, it would take years to pay back the customer (in monthly installments) at such low wages. Breakage insurance covered 100% up to $200 for the first incident and 50% up to $100 for the second incident. There was full coverage for a third break, but the worker was fired. Skipping the expensive "stuff" made my job easier, at least for now, in this house.

I started dusting again from left to right, up and down. In one hand I carried a wet cloth for the baseboards and sills. In the other, I carried a dusting cloth dampened with vinegar and water. Most of the furniture in the house was lacquer with several glass top tables. Vinegar was the only thing that removed the really fine dust that settles on glossy surfaces. Anyway, I circled the rooms upstairs, dusting and wiping, dusting and wiping. As I was finishing up and preparing to vacuum, Cassie was just starting on the second bathroom. She told me to finish dusting downstairs first, then vacuum the whole house.

I made my way down the stairs wiping the bannister and the edges of the steps. I proceeded throughout the downstairs in the same manner. Once I finished, I packed some of the equipment and placed it by the front door. Just as I reached for the vacuum, Vivian went to the door and pulled out the fluffy. She said that I shouldn’t pack things up so soon. I grabbed the vacuum and went upstairs. I passed Cassie on the steps. She said to let her know when I was done. Coordination of the clean was important for the timing. The supervising maid had to be able to gauge the tasks and
the time so that we were mostly busy and didn't have to stand around and wait. Since there was less dusting here, I was more likely to finish before anyone else.

To vacuum, I started in the furthest corner and backed out of each room. I did the same for the landing. The stairs were difficult to manoeuvre. The carpet was thick and I had to lean forward and press down on the beater bar. I lost my balance a couple of times, knocked my shin on the edge of the step, got rug burns on my knees, and jammed my thumb. Small injuries I could handle. I didn't want to fall down the steps backwards and hurt my neck or head.

I vacuumed the rest of the downstairs without injury. Cassie and I finished at the same time. Vivian wasn't quite done. It was up to Cassie to decide how we would spend the next twenty minutes. She decided that Vivian would wipe down the utility room and prepare for mopping; Cassie would vacuum the floor and mop; and I would deliver flyers.

I hated delivering flyers. The cleaning was alienating enough with no talking, no music, no eating, just cleaning. But flyer distribution was worse. No radios, no friends, no cutting through lawns, and no breaks. I had to place each flyer in the mail slot which usually meant I had to open the front screen door. I felt as if I were invading someone else's private domain. The dogs I came across felt that way, too! A couple of times their bark startled me so badly I burst into tears and swore I never would do it again. Yet here I was today doing it again. The uniform was an added disappointment. I usually wore my own clothes, but today I had on my uniform, a dark polyester jumper, white blouse with puffy sleeves, and an apron with ruffles. It was humiliating. A few people stared at me while I was walking from house to house. Since it was Spring Break, there were many kids riding their bikes up and down the street. I had to dodge them, and they, me.
I was across the street when Cassie and Vivian appeared at the doorway. I went over to wait at the car. As I was standing there, a little girl about ten asked if I were a real cleaning lady. I told her yes and that I also had to advertise which was why I was handing out flyers. She said she liked the car and that I was a "pretty cleaning lady". By this time Cassie was in the car and Vivian was holding the door open for me. I quickly said thank you and got in the back. Even though it was such a little compliment, it made me feel a whole lot better.

The drive to the next house was forty-five minutes. It was 11:15 and getting warmer. I asked Vivian to roll down her window. She obliged but said nothing. I said thanks, leaned my head back, and closed my eyes. How was I going to make sense of all this? The fragmentation of the labour was clear. We all had our tasks and carried them out as efficiently as possible. A worker supervised the labour whenever the manager wasn’t around. And there were several different workplaces - the office, the car, and the customers' houses. Since we had to follow strict rules when carrying out the labour, there were very few places and times we could actually interact. Yet here we were in the car, practically unsupervised, and we weren’t talking. We were tired and hot. To make matters worse, country music was on the radio. Would I ever be able to establish a rapport? Was it because I was new? Did they not trust me? Was Vivian still mad at me?

After about fifteen minutes we stopped at a variety store. Vivian got out and held the door open. I was trying to avoid putting my feet in the middle of a puddle. Vivian said, "The puddle's for me." I didn't know what to make of her comment. As soon as I was on my two feet, she walked off. I shut the door, stretched, and thought about what I was going to eat.
I ended up with a cheese sandwich, muffin, and coffee. Cassie told me the salami subs were good here. I told her that I was a vegetarian, and quickly added, for health reasons. This started a short conversation while we were waiting to pay. She asked what I could eat and if grocery shopping were cheaper when you don’t buy meat.

I was last to pay (which was part of the seniority process), and subsequently last outside. We stood by the car eating. I drank my coffee while they each had a cigarette. They talked a bit about Janet who had sprained her ankle yesterday and had to go to the hospital. Cassie laughed, kind of meanly, and said that she bet Judith guilted Janet into working today. Vivian agreed and asked how Darla’s worker compensation claim was going. (Darla was Cassie’s previous cleaning partner who had hurt her back while moving a couch.) It had been six months and still nothing. Cassie went back into the store to pick up a few groceries. Vivian went to make a phone call. I sipped my coffee and thought about theorising waged domestic labour processes.

Back in the car, I decided I would start up a conversation. I asked Vivian which soaps she watched. I had seen her pick up a soap opera magazine in the store. After a long, awkward pause, Cassie said that she liked "General Hospital" and "Days of Our Lives". Vivian said she preferred the "Young and the Restless" because "GH" and "Days" were too boring. This launched a conversation between them for the next half hour. No one talked to me. No one asked me which soaps I watched. I sat back and listened. After a little while, I began to recall what had happened during the day. Then I decided that I would memorise what everyone had said during the cleans for my research journal.

The O’Brien clean was a three bedroom ranch with a full basement. Cassie gave me the kitchen, Vivian the bathrooms, and she took the dusting and vacuuming. I began the kitchen by washing up the breakfast dishes and taking apart the stove top. I
put the rings and drip pans into the sink to soak and sprayed degreaser on top of the stove. I started around the kitchen, wiping down the cupboards, countertops, and appliances. Left, right, up, down. I had made it halfway around the kitchen when I heard Vivian scream. Cassie poked her head around the corner and said she’d go see what was wrong. Then I heard Cassie laughing. Someone didn’t flush this morning. Apparently this happens regularly. Vivian just forgot.

I continued wiping and cleaning. It went fairly quickly because the kitchen was small even though I was responsible for the breakfast nook and sliding glass doors, too. After I put the stove back together, I remembered to clean the kitchen window and wipe the top of the garbage pail. I did the floor by hand since only the kitchen part had linoleum; the rest was carpeted. I told Cassie when I finished. She was ready to vacuum and Vivian had only to do the shower downstairs. Cassie sent me to deliver more flyers. I must have looked tormented because she gave me a long-winded explanation as to why I had to do it. What it boiled down to was that Judith needed to get more customers out here to make the business pay. Forty-five minutes was a long drive.

While Cassie was talking, the doorbell rang. It was a floral delivery. She took them and laid them on the table. I started to go. We looked at each other and promptly returned to the box for a peek. They were red long-stemmed roses. She said Mr. O’Brien was probably in trouble again. We both knew we weren’t supposed to be looking into a customer’s things, or to be speculating about what they do in their lives. All I could think about was that Mr. O’Brien must have been in a lot of trouble to warrant roses.

I went out to deliver flyers. Cassie yelled to me when I was in the driveway next door. They would pick me up at the end of the next street in about
twenty minutes, after she and Vivian finished. I waved and started passing out the flyers. I thought about the roses and Cassie. Breaking the rules brought us a little closer together. Twenty minutes later, at the appointed place they picked me up and off we went.

The ride back to town was a bit more lively. Vivian was complaining about the toilet. All Cassie could do was laugh. I didn’t want Vivian to like me any less so I only smiled a couple of times. It was hot by now and I was getting sleepy. I might have been dozing off because at one point Cassie said something and I jerked awake. We were almost in Dundas. We stopped. Vivian got out and said she’d see Cassie Monday. I instinctively got out to sit in the front. Cassie turned to me and said Vivian picked up her cheque this morning and we were doing the Owen clean by ourselves. She had phoned Judith at the O’Brien’s and picked up this "add-on". She could have said "no", but she wanted the money. To save Cassie some travel time, Judith decided to have us clean the Owen’s two bedroom apartment and drop Vivian off in Dundas. I asked if Vivian lived in Dundas. Cassie said she didn’t but her boyfriend did.

Once we dropped Vivian off, Cassie was bubbling over and talking a mile a minute. She told me all about Ms. Owen. She was in med school and had "interesting" pictures on the walls, especially in the bathroom. Most of the pictures were of leather and chains. Cassie had even found magazines and other paraphernalia behind the couch. She said she would show me the stuff next time. For now, we would have to hurry so she wouldn’t be able to move the couch today.

Since Ms. Owen didn’t know we were going to clean today, she didn’t leave the air-conditioning on. When we walked in, was it hot! We both went straight to the windows to open them. Cassie decided to give me the bathrooms and kitchen
since they were easier than the dusting and vacuuming. This way we would finish as quickly as possible. We finished nearly at the same time, packed up and were ready to go. Cassie took one more look around, picked up the cheque, and went into the kitchen. I saw her buffing the chrome. I told her that I did try. She smiled and said, "You're getting there." When we got to the car, I realised I had left the glass cleaner in the bathroom. Cassie grumbled. I told her I would go get it and she could have a smoke. Of course, the elevators were busy which made the day ten minutes longer.

During the drive back to town we talked about a lot of different things - Garth Brooks and country music, Lujack and "Guiding Light", and movies with Mel Gibson. She asked me how much Judith was paying me. She said she made 28% of gross sales. Then she asked me was I on unemployment or social assistance. I was a bit puzzled, but answered her anyway. I told her I was on a student scholarship and I got some money from my ex-husband. Something clicked because then she said she couldn't figure out how I could afford to live by myself, especially in the apartment building that I lived in, without having more money. She knew I couldn't live there on part-time wages from Clare's. I told her a bit about school and my finances. She told me about her husband breaking his foot at work and her plans to have a baby.

We pulled into the franchise parking lot. Whew, I was so tired. I was glad the day was over. Then I remembered it wasn't over. I thought about all the work I had to do once I got home. I had to write up today in my journal, which would take about two and a half hours. I had to finish marking mid-terms and then arrange to trade the exams with the other teaching assistant. (Luckily she lives only two blocks away.) I had to do a load of laundry before I packed to go to Kitchener for the weekend. I plan to sleep a lot at a friend's house. And I had to eat, too. I decided not to think about it and just to do it.
Cassie and I walked into a room full of laughter. Barb had been accused of stealing someone's pillows. Barb said she wouldn't want pea green velvet pillows anyway. And, if she were going to steal, it would be something worthwhile. Judith cut in and told me and Cassie to get some coffee and cookies in the other room. Everyone would have to wait while she wrote out next week's schedules. Since Barb was going on holidays, the regular routes shifted.

Judith asked me for the cheques. I didn't have them. Cassie pulled them out of her pocket and said Vivian had given them to her. Fiona turned to me and told me not to worry, Vivian was always that way. What a relief. Then Barb said that Vivian should quit and go to school. It wasn't me, Vivian wasn't happy. Cassie's friendship was genuine. In order to keep the seniority power positions intact, Cassie couldn't talk with me when Vivian was around, nor could anyone else. Roxanne is the exception. She is the only worker that doesn't have a history with Vivian.

The talking went on. Judith said she would never put three maids together without a real supervising maid again, ever. I told her that I learned a lot from that experience. She laughed. Cassie told everyone about Vivian's misfortune with the O'Brien's toilet. Roxanne asked Janet about her ankle. Janet said it wasn't that bad. Judith said she couldn't afford to let Janet off work even for a day. So, she didn't.

Judith finally handed out the schedules and the cheques. Barb had a question about a deduction. It turned out to be a repair cost of the air shock for the hatch door. Barb objected. Judith said it was in the contract. Barb argued that it was maintenance. Judith insisted that if Barb hadn't been so hard on the door, then she wouldn't have had to replace it. No one said anything else after that. Then we began to filter out. First Roxanne and Fiona, then Barb and Janet. Next Janine and Roberta, and finally me and Cassie.
When we got in the car I asked Cassie why Barb had to pay for the repair. I was under the impression that all repairs were paid for by the firm. Cassie said that she didn’t think it was right that Barb had to pay. The shocks on the hatch were always going out. She figured that it was a bad shock. Judith made Barb pay because Barb was a bad driver. I asked why didn’t she say anything in support of Barb in the office. "I don’t want to get involved."

Cassie changed the topic quickly. We went by a bank and she asked if I minded stopping. She wanted to deposit her cheque to get money for bingo. Cassie was going to the early game and wanted to know if I wanted to go. I told her I would like to go sometime, but not today because I was going to Kitchener to visit a friend. While Cassie was in the bank, I went into the store next door and picked up supper - macaroni and cheese and a tomato. When she dropped me off she told me to have a good weekend. I wished her luck in her gambling adventure.

I waved as she drove away. When I turned to go inside, I saw Dagmar weeding the garden. I smiled and said hello. She didn’t recognise me. I crossed the lobby to get my mail. I found a place to lean against the wall near the elevator. Mrs. Baar, who lived next door, stood beside me and Mrs. Weininger, from the tenth floor, passed me to get her mail. Reverend Applebaum, who lives on the other side of me greeted all the other people in the lobby except me. All these people say hello to me when I’m dressed to go to school. With my uniform, none of them even looked me in the eye.

The elevator opened. Maggie, from fourteen, stepped out and said, "Pam, how are you?" The people who knew me went on into the elevator without turning around. I stayed and chatted for a few minutes. She asked me when I had taken up cleaning. Just recently, for school, and not for long. I asked her about her plans for
the weekend. She was off to her daughter’s in St. Catharine’s. I waved good-by and pressed the “up” button.

I thought about Maggie while I was waiting. I knew a little bit about her. She had been a nurse’s aid years ago when the hospital first opened. I thought about the type of work she did - the caring, the nurturing, and the supporting of both the patients and the nurses. She used to live by herself when she was my age. She told me stories of men following her home from work. They weren’t strangers; they were men she knew - doctors, orderlies, custodians. She said she didn’t know about sexual harassment in the workplace back then. If she had, she said things would have been different. She raised a child on her own and endured the social stigma of being an unwed mother. She eventually changed jobs and joined the hospital’s clerical staff. She had never trained to be a registered nurse.

I got into the elevator. I was so tired. I moved to the corner and leaned up against the railing. I thought about the differences between Maggie’s work and mine. Cleaning houses and going to university were different from assisting nurses or admitting patients. Then I thought about the similarities. She lived alone and so did I. I did women’s work and so did she. When I first met Maggie in the laundry room downstairs, I remember thinking how organised she must be because her clothes were so neatly folded and stacked. And I remember wishing that I were that organised. My thoughts were getting cluttered. Then I realised the clutter wasn’t messiness, the clutter was too many things to do. Then I thought about how at some level labour must be labour no matter what task you are performing, how much money you are making, or whom you are working for. The differences must somehow lie in the organisation of the labour, what you do, and who controls it. What matters most I thought, was how women workers, like Maggie and me, defined ourselves and forged identities on
our own and with other working women. It matters most because it was Maggie who said hello in the lobby, not my neighbours.

This was what I was contemplating going up in the elevator. But it was cut short when I reached my front door. The phone was ringing. It was Antonio. Another fight and an emotional drain. "Breaking up" is more like "tearing apart". I was lucky it only lasted an hour and not the whole evening. With tears rolling down my cheeks, I drew the bath. I went to the fridge to get something cold to drink. Then I remembered that I didn’t get any Coke this morning. Oh well, I’d drink some lemonade, take a hot bath, cry to get over my hurt, and then get on with what I had to do.

I got through that evening, and many others like it. I was relieved when my last day at Clare’s rolled around. Balancing such demanding fieldwork while pursuing professional goals at university was more difficult than I had anticipated. I was ready to focus on reflection and analysis. Once I left Clare’s, I thought I would never look back. I knew I wouldn’t miss being busy all the time. I was looking forward to sleep, too. And lots of it. I also knew I wouldn’t miss Vivian all that much, though I came to understand her a lot better than when I first met her. And I certainly was glad that the cleaning itself was over. Tending sore muscles and achey joints isn’t my idea of leisure. Mind you, I clean my house the same way, that is, when I do get around to cleaning. What I miss most, I think, is the riding around in the car. Even though it was hot wearing polyester, and even though the car had "Clare’s Cleaning" written on the doors, and even though it was boring most of the time, it was in the car that I felt the most independence. It was in the car that I felt the most solidarity.
(1.3) IMPLICATIONS

These experiences set the framework for the remaining part of the investigation (discussed in more detail in Chapter 3). In sorting through my notes I was able to identify three themes around which the topics, issues, and queries coalesced. Through my experiences as well as talking with women who worked in some of the franchises in Hamilton, I came to realise that there was much more to domestic labour than just the tasks and relations. If I were actually to grasp the intricacies of waged domestic labour as a set of relations, then I would have to think through the constitutive processes of productive and reproductive labour. By distinguishing between a set of tasks and the regulation of the labour that goes into carrying out those tasks, I could conceive of a labour process that could both encourage alienation and permit the challenging of its organisation and regulation. Yet constitution does not end there. Within the fragmented world of the franchise housekeeper were processes shaping both gender and class. That is, gender and class were negotiated in particular places and mediated by each individual's personal material history.  

What follows is a study of (re)production in a waged domestic labour process. The content of this thesis draws on my own experiences in addition to those of fourteen women employed in housekeeping services franchises in southern Ontario. In the following chapters I develop a framework for investigating waged domestic

3. Personal material history is defined in Chapter 7, Section 7.4, p. 198.
4. I use the term "(re)production" in one of two ways: in reference either to include both production and reproduction relations or to an argument being applicable to both production and reproduction relations. I make this distinction now because although I focus primarily on the production process in waged domestic labour processes, I would argue that a parallel, thought not identical, set of arguments can be made for reproduction (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4, pp. 73-76 and Footnote 6, p. 75, and Chapter 6, Section 6.3, p. 135). The use of the term becomes clearer with the arguments I make in Chapter 5, Section 5.3, pp. 94-99.
labour. I also develop concepts that are useful in explaining: the kinds of labour in which women workers engage; women workers' experiences of the organisation of a specific kind of labour as well as its regulation; and the concrete processes through which women workers forge individual and collective class and gender identities. Within this context, I outline the objectives of the thesis in Chapter Two.
CHAPTER 2

ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES

(2.1) ISSUES

Two key issues emerged in my attempts to understand and explain my own employment experience at the housekeeping services franchise that shaped my subsequent analysis presented in this thesis. First, it seemed that distinct sets of labour relations comprised the same set of tasks for basically the same purpose. Yet the generation of surplus value, though characteristic, was not the only difference between waged and unwaged domestic labour. I wanted to know what relations and processes distinguished this particular waged domestic labour process from others.

Second, it seemed like how we acted depended on whom we were with and where we were working. Differences appeared to emanate not only from our interaction with the manager, customers, and co-workers in the various workplaces, but also from our own past, our own personal experiences. As many times we were at variance, we also came to support each other. Clearly our social identities diverged, but how did we forge our own specific class and gender identities in this particular form of commodified domestic labour?

(2.2) DEFINITIONS

Domestic labour is a continuous series of tasks organised around the primary goal of maintaining a household (Luxton 1980, p. 18). The tasks themselves can be loosely grouped into five sets of activities: meal preparation, child
bearing/child rearing, emotional support, housekeeping, and the daily reproduction of labour power.¹ These tasks do not exist independent of each other (Luxton 1980, p. 19). Existing domestic labour relations organised around these tasks shift when any aspect of the activities change. For example, money management sets the financial context of the household and many of the activities are restricted or enabled through handling monetary resources like cash and credit.

*Commodification of domestic labour*, which can involve both goods and services, refers to the processes by which (a) those end products of labour usually carried out in a household by family members are purchased as goods from private firms and (b) those domestic labour tasks as labour relations which have been transferred to the market and transformed into production relations (drawn from Kollantai 1977; Briskin 1980; Vogel 1983; Armstrong and Armstrong 1990). For example, in the former case, the increased availability of canned foods in the mid- to late-nineteenth century involved the production of cooked goods as commodities, viz. canned meat, vegetables, fruit, and bread (Matthews 1987). In the latter case, domestic labour tasks as relations are commodified as in, for example, the labour relations in housekeeping services franchises.

With the emergence of housekeeping services franchises in the late 1970s and early 1980s, waged housekeeping activities were no longer restricted to private employment as live-in or live-out housekeepers. Domestic labourers were now for hire on a regular basis through *domestic labour firms*, that is, a firm set up to provide domestic labour services.² Private housekeepers, too, are waged domestic labourers.

---

¹ The 'reproduction of labour power' embraces both the specific tasks of maintaining a household as well as the organisation of those tasks.
² Another type of domestic labour firm is a long-standing type of firm, like a brokerage firm, where brokers introduce domestic labourers to prospective employers.
The point of distinction is that in domestic labour firms the waged domestic labour relation generates surplus value; that is, the labour is productive in a marxist sense.  

(2.3) REVIEW  

Domestic labour studies have centred on either unwaged or waged domestic labour relations. Analyses of unwaged domestic labour have concentrated on one of three areas. Firstly, there are studies of the tasks in unwaged domestic labour, whether it be remunerated or unremunerated (Luxton 1980; Kaluzynska 1980; Strasser 1982; Cowan 1983). Secondly, there are studies that examine the distribution of domestic labour tasks, as in who does what for whom and why (Meissner et al. 1975; Berk and Fenstemaker Berk 1979; Vanek 1983; Hartmann 1981/1987). Thirdly, there is a more recent focus on the 'double ghetto' or 'second shift' where women are employed full- or part-time outside the home and remain responsible for most or all of the domestic labour inside the home (Shaevitz 1984; Armstrong and Armstrong 1984a; Braiker 1986; Hochschild 1989; Treuille and Stautberg 1988; Canape 1990).

Of those analyses of waged domestic labour, the primary focus has been on privately employed domestic labourers (see Leslie 1974; McBride 1976; Katzman 1978; Sutherland 1981; Dudden 1983; Rollins 1985; Romero 1987, 1988a, 1988b, 1992; Lasser 1987; Arat-Koç 1989; Chaney and Castro 1989; Silvera 1983/1989; Cohen 1991). Some analysts have thematically bridged the gap between waged and

3. In the 'domestic labour debate' in the 1970s and early 1980s, marxist and feminist analysts deliberated extensively over the materiality of domestic labour and its contributions to maintaining capitalism as the dominant mode of production. The only decisive conclusion was that though integral to capitalism, domestic labour does not generate surplus value and therefore is not productive labour. Malos (1980) pulled together into one volume key contributions in the debate. See also Fox (1980) for an additional set of articles. I challenge this view specifically and only in light of this recent reorganisation of commodified domestic labour. I should also note that the question as to whether service workers generate surplus value remains controversial (see Walker 1985).
unwaged domestic labour by investigating links between gender and domesticity (Matthews 1987; Palmer 1989). In the context of housekeepers and housekeeping, no researchers have examined waged domestic labour processes that generate surplus value.

Geographic analyses of domestic labour tend to highlight the same areas. Travel and commuting studies demonstrate the importance of women’s unwaged labour in the home (Hanson and Hanson 1980; Pickup 1988; Preston 1991). Locality studies have shown that economic restructuring processes impact employment and domestic labour through reorganising class and gender relations both inside and outside the home (Massey 1983, 1984; Lancaster Regionalism Group 1985; Cooke 1986a). Studies of coping strategies, homework, working women, and the provision of state services have elucidated the entwinement of reproduction and production relations (Mackenzie 1988a; Tivers 1988; Dyck 1989; Fincher 1989, 1991; Rose 1990). Specific spatial analyses of domestic labour tasks, for example shopping, have shed light on the construction of urban space (Bowlby 1988; Mackenzie 1988b, 1989a). Recent studies in Britain on nannies and live-ins have begun to challenge the boundaries of the spatial designation between home and the workplace (Lowe and Gregson 1989).

These works have focused feminist and political economy studies toward investigations of women’s daily lives, labour, and struggles. This shift is crucial if the spatial aspects of production and reproduction relations are to be clearly elaborated.

(2.4) SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

Because the tasks in housekeeping as part of reproduction are not mobile, as for example are laundry (which can be sent out) and cooking (where meals can be brought in), the home becomes a site of production where surplus value is generated
through hiring the services of housekeepers through a franchise. As an interface between production and reproduction, housekeeping services franchises provide ample terrain upon which to examine waged domestic labour processes and women's daily lives, labour, and struggles. By having engaged fully in a housekeeping services franchise via employment, I can begin to understand, interpret, and analyse relations and processes that reciprocally shape and organise waged domestic labourers' lives and labour. My experiences of being pushed and pulled by the manager, the customers, and co-workers co-existing with feelings of solidarity with them as women forced me to re-think arguments of labour control and worker resistance. By being engaged simultaneously in relations and processes that fragment the labour process spatially and consolidate workers' opposition to or acceptance of the regulation of labour, I gained insight into the ways in which women forge both individual and collective class and gender identities in the workplace.

This study contributes to the emergence and ongoing construction of a geography of domestic labour. By focusing on waged domestic labour, this study (1) widens the base of domestic labour studies in geography to include commodified forms of domestic labour; (2) emphasises the social relations of domestic labour; and (3) places women's concerns and struggles in their daily lives front and center. This study extends spatial analyses of labour by casting experience vis-à-vis processes of fragmentation and consolidation in the workplace(s) and by introducing spatially-specific conceptualisations which are both materially and historically grounded. This study directly addresses the spatial aspect of the processes involved in constructing and reconstructing the daily labour relations women engage and the struggles they undertake. This study develops conceptual tools to both encompass and disentangle reproduction and production relations as well as address some of the social divisions of
labour within these relations. This study documents women’s experiences of a waged domestic labour process, situates their daily struggles within the context of their own lives as women workers, and focuses on women’s experiences, responses, and mediations of the relations comprising their waged domestic labour.

(2.5) OBJECTIVES OF THESIS

This thesis has two goals: (1) to draw out, describe, and analyse the relations and processes in which women engage while employed as workers in housekeeping services franchises and (2) to devise conceptual tools that can be used to refine and enhance explanations of waged domestic labour processes. The specific research questions addressed in the thesis are: (1) in what ways do women employed in a commodified form of domestic labour accomplish those daily labour tasks associated with the home and the workplace?; (2) how does the organisation of production relations in a waged domestic labour process enable both managers to control the waged domestic labourers and workers to develop resistance strategies to a manager’s authority?; and (3) how do women workers employed in a specific waged domestic labour process forge individual and collective class and gender identities?

I use a feminist methodology to investigate (re)production relations in a waged domestic labour process in southern Ontario. I present my orientation to the research in Chapter Three. In Chapter Four, I provide an overview of the theory of waged domestic labour I elaborate in the subsequent three chapters. In Chapters Five, Six, and Seven, I introduce conceptual tools, then demonstrate them empirically. In Chapter Five I introduce ’total labour’, a concept which encompasses reproduction and production as the same set of relations from distinct vantage points. In Chapter Six I recast Burawoy’s (1985) ’factory regime’ in the form of ’production regime’ so that
labour and its regulation outside commodity production can be addressed. In Chapter Seven, I argue that class and gender form through a set of concrete processes implicated in (re)production relations. Each of the empirical demonstrations brings into focus particular aspects and strengths of the conceptualisation introduced and are not representative of all working class women. In Chapter Eight, I conclude the thesis by noting the specific contributions of this investigation and possible research directions for future studies.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN, METHODS, AND METHODOLOGY

(3.1) OUTLINE

In this chapter I first provide an overview of the design of the research project and the methods I used for data collection and analysis. Next, I identify and discuss three key issues in refining a feminist methodology. I then present my feminist methodology and point out the links between my research design and choice of methods with regard to the issues I identified in Section 3.3. I also highlight the advantages of this approach. I conclude by drawing out the links between this study and my principles and politics.

(3.2) RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

I used several methods to gather and analyse the information for this project: participant observation, interviews, document survey, and abstraction. I designed the project in three phases. Phase One consisted of a three month full participant observation (following Burgess 1984) as an employee in a local housekeeping services franchise (see Chapter 1). Phase Two comprised two sets of interviews: with some of the women I worked with as well as women employed in other franchises in the area and with franchise managers/owners and head office personnel. Phase Three consisted of interpreting my own experiences, surveying documents and various literatures, and analysing the information I had collected throughout the project. I now turn to a description of my use of each method in the various phases of the project.
(3.2.1) **Participant observation**

Participant observation is a standard qualitative method in the social sciences (Burgess 1984; Eyles 1988). The types of participant observation range complete full participant to complete observer. Burgess (1986) identifies four types: Complete participant, where the researcher does not make known the purposes of the research; Participant-as-observer[,] where the investigator takes on a specific role but makes it clear that this stems from the research; Observer[-][as][-]participant[,] where the purpose of the observation is made clear from the start of the research and finally the complete observer role which involves eavesdropping as the researcher is removed from sustained interaction (pp. 56-57).

I chose complete participant for three reasons. First, I would be able to acquire hands-on experience which would help fill in the class gap between myself and the women employed as domestic labourers in housekeeping services franchises. The *class gap* is the difference in the outcomes of the material and historical processes of constitution and marginalisation between the researcher and the ‘researched’. Class is implicated in several sets of relations and processes involved in the formation of each person’s identity - making this gap multifaceted. Being a franchise housekeeper would enable me to experience marginalisation in a different setting as well as help me overcome my own class biases.¹ (See Table 3.1 for my work schedule and Table 3.2 for wages earned during this period.)

Second, complete immersion would sensitize me to the concerns and interests of the women at the workplace. If I were to base some of the topics to be covered in the interviews on the issues the women brought up in conversations we had in the workplace, the project would have a better chance of being relevant not only to myself, but also to the women who participated.

---

¹ I discuss this topic in more detail in a working paper entitled "The gap as part of the politics of research design" (Moss 1992a).
Table 3.1. Work schedule for employment period, February 27 to May 23, 1990, with work in August, 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates and Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27  7:15-14:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   7:45-14:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   8:00-14:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   8:00-14:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   7:30-16:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   8:00-14:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6   8:00-14:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7   7:45-13:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8   8:00-13:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9   9:30-16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10  7:45-13:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   laid off from injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   laid off from injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   laid off from injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   laid off from injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6   laid off from injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7   8:00-16:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8   12:00-13:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9   13:00-15:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10  7:45-13:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   13:00-15:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   8:45-14:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   7:45-14:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   7:45-15:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   11:45-12:45, 18:30-20:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6   17:30-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7   8:45-13:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9   7:30-15:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10  7:30-15:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2. Wages earned for employment period, February 27 to May 23, 1990, with work in August, 1990.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For week ending</th>
<th>Gross pay (dollars)</th>
<th>Pay after deductions b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>no deductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>no deductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16</td>
<td>75.25</td>
<td>no deductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23</td>
<td>69.50</td>
<td>no deductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30</td>
<td>66.50</td>
<td>no deductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>laid off c</td>
<td>no pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>no deductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20</td>
<td>62.25</td>
<td>no deductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>no deductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>143.25</td>
<td>134.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11</td>
<td>169.75</td>
<td>152.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>82.25</td>
<td>81.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>169.75</td>
<td>152.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>99.25</td>
<td>98.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1282.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>1237.81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wages varied according to tasks assigned. For cleaning I received $7.00 per hour; for flyer distribution, $5.00 per hour.

b Deductions include unemployment insurance, Canada Pension Plan, and T4 Tax. Wages earned were used to offset research costs.

c I twisted my ankle while delivering flyers.
Third, the experience in the first phase of the research would prepare me for the interpretation and analysis of the information gathered in other phases of the research. By engaging in a waged domestic labour process, I would have a sound basis upon which to elaborate and refine a theory of waged domestic labour, from both the women workers' perspectives and the academy's. I would know for example what it would be like to clean eight bathrooms on a Friday before a long weekend when it was 30°C and why I wouldn't just leave work and go home. My empathy would increase and the chances of me misrepresenting the women's lives would decrease.

I wrote about these experiences in a daily journal. I recorded my thoughts on the labour process, co-worker relations, managerial techniques of control of the labour process and the labour, methodology, theory, methods, research ethics, class, gender, class formation processes, gender formation processes, and empowerment. I also recorded my feelings, my emotions, my homelife, my worklife, my leisure activities, my activities, and my relationships. I described the housework, what people said, how people worked, training processes, the tasks, the rules, how people got along, the fights, the fun, and so on.

(3.2.2) Interviews

Like participant observation, interviews are also a standard qualitative method used in the social sciences. Humanists and feminists have been challenging the ways in which researchers can and should approach an interview relationship (Wolff 1971; Vaughter 1976; Oakley 1981). Unequal distributions of power in the interview relationship can lead to unexpected and undesirable results, like class bias in the interpretation or exploitation by the researcher of the women participating in the project (Finch 1984; Christiansen-Ruffman 1985; Riessman 1987; Currie 1988). With sensitivity to this unequal distribution of power, I chose two different types of
interviews for two sets of interviewees (Phase Two of the research.) For the first set of
interviewees, the women workers, I chose multiple-depth conversations. *Multiple-
derth conversations* are semi-structured interviews conducted over a period of time
(with breaks between a few days or a few months) wherein:

the researcher uses the assumption that meaning is being constructed rather than
information simply given, time and context have to be provided in a flexible
way for meaning to be clarified (Reinharz 1983, p. 182).

The process of constructing meaning within the interview setting yielded a more even
distribution of power, especially at subsequent meetings, because each of us was
contributing to the conversation and sharing our experiences. The time between the
conversations served two purposes. First, the time allowed the women workers to
think about the project, their participation, and their relationship with me as a student
and as a researcher. Second, the time gave me a chance to reflect on the research
process and the relationship between myself and the women workers. Because of the
flexible structure and the multiple settings of the conversations, I was able to guide the
discussion around my choice of topics without predetermining either the direction or
the specific content of the conversation. This ensured consistency in the topics we
covered in individual conversations. The flexible structure also permitted part of the
control of the interview to shift from me to the women workers. This ensured
relevancy in the topics we covered from the women workers' perspectives. For the
second set of interviewees, managers/owners and head office personnel, I chose
structured interviews. *Structured interviews* elicit information from a person by
another person, usually in a face to face encounter (Babbie 1979, p. 580). Because I
wanted information that they had, the distribution of power was skewed in favour of
the managers/owners and the head office personnel. I succinctly requested specific
information through a series of open-ended questions. The distribution of power did not change.

After reviewing my journal, I drew up a list of topics that I wanted to discuss with the women.\(^2\) Topics included: employment history; formal and informal training processes; choice of maid services as employment; advantages and disadvantages of working with teams and working alone; women’s self-image and self-esteem; and external views of domestic labour and domestic labourers. From this list I designed three sets of questions that would serve as the base-line information guidelines for the multiple-depth conversations (formatted in the style of Mackenzie 1989a). See Appendix D for the complete set of interview guidelines.\(^3\) From the managers/owners and head office personnel, I was primarily interested in the tasks involved in the labour process and in employer/employee relations. See Appendix E for the interview structure and questions.

The multiple-depth conversations consisted of a series of three in-depth, semi-structured discussions with breaks of between a few days and a few months. My research contact with these women consisted of three meetings which averaged 100 minutes each. The shortest conversation was 35 minutes; the longest, 270 minutes. The second set of conversations tended to be shorter than the average; the third set tended to be longer. All were recorded on tape and then transcribed (see Appendix F for the format of the transcription notes). Comparability of the information in the conversations was ensured by my coverage of the base-line information guidelines.

---

\(^2\) This list was not entirely empirically driven. I carried out Phases Two and Three of the research project concomitantly. I drew up the list of topics in conjunction with the information I gathered from the document surveys (see Section 3.2.3).

\(^3\) Because of the very low number of women workers, managers/owners, and head office personnel, I did not pre-test the sets of questions with anyone that was
Table 3.3. Location of interviews and multiple-depth conversations.

**WORKERS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple-depth Conversation #1</th>
<th>Multiple-depth Conversation #2</th>
<th>Multiple-depth Conversation #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>coffee shop</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(re-taping)</td>
<td>coffee shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francie</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>my place</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>(unfinished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>sub shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>my place</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrice</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
<td>her place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
<td>donut shop</td>
<td>her place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANAGERS AND HEAD OFFICE PERSONNEL INTERVIEWS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franchise manager</td>
<td>Clare’s</td>
<td>coffee shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head office personnel</td>
<td>Clare’s</td>
<td>head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head office personnel</td>
<td>Clare’s</td>
<td>head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise manager</td>
<td>Clare’s</td>
<td>manager’s home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(re-taping)</td>
<td></td>
<td>franchise office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise manager</td>
<td>Hannah’s</td>
<td>franchise office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head office personnel</td>
<td>Hannah’s</td>
<td>head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise manager</td>
<td>Lavares</td>
<td>franchise office and the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head office personnel</td>
<td>Lavares</td>
<td>head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head office personnel</td>
<td>Mobile Maids</td>
<td>head office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
described above. By far the most common place for the multiple-depth conversations was the worker’s home (see Table 3.3). All the women participating in the project signed a letter of consent (see Appendix G). The women participated on the condition that I preserve their anonymity by keeping their identities confidential.

Each structured interview with the managers/owners and head office personnel lasted on average ninety minutes and was usually carried out in an office (see Table 3.3). One of the interviews was not recorded as requested by the executive. The rest were. All managers/owners and head office personnel participating in the project signed letters of consent (see Appendix H). They agreed to provide me with information as long as I kept their identities confidential and gave them a report at the end of the study. In lieu of answering some questions, the manager or head office person directed me to specific documents, like magazine articles, annual reports, or flyers. Although all the interviews were structured, the interviews with franchise managers/owners were less structured than those with head office personnel. Managers/owners were more willing to give details about their own work and their relations with their employees.

Gaining access to the women workers was a long, and at times disappointing, process. Three of the women with whom I worked agreed to participate in the study. At another firm, I gained access to the workers through the manager. Of the ten women I met, eight participated in the study. Of these eight, one woman dropped out after the first recorded conversation because of the pressures of childcare. I contacted the manager of a third franchise, who granted me access to the workers by giving me their telephone numbers only after the women workers consented to be contacted. Three of the four women chose to participate.

4. This woman consented to allow me to use this information.
Recruiting participants from the managers/owners and head office personnel was much easier. I phoned and set up appointments. None refused. I talked with four franchise managers/owners and five head office personnel. Though the number of women workers participating in the project is small, in comparison to the population of franchise housekeepers in Hamilton, the number is substantial. Of the twenty two women employed in the three franchises at the beginning of the investigation, thirteen of fourteen women completed the study. Taking into account the transiency of the occupation and the scaling down of the franchise operations, these women still account for about half of the franchise housekeepers in the area. As a sample to illustrate the arguments I make in the second half of the thesis, the small number of women actually strengthens rather than weakens the study. The depth of the conversations and wide coverage of topics offset the disadvantage of working with a small number of interviewees, especially with regard to the generalisability of the results. The empirical demonstrations are not, nor are they intended to be, generalisable to all waged domestic labourers or even to all franchise housekeepers. Rather, the women’s experiences illustrate the concepts that are developed as part of a theory of waged domestic labour processes.

(3.2.3) Document survey

I used document surveys of both published and unpublished materials to set women workers’ experiences and personal histories in a material and historical context and to document processes of change in specific places in southern Ontario’s housekeeping services franchise industry, (Phase Three of the research project). The most promising primary document source was head office and franchise files.

5. Two of the three franchises have lost business during this recession. The manager of one of the franchises cut the number of employees by half, from eight to four. I could not obtain information about the third franchise. One woman who left Clare’s went back after leaving a nanny position.
However, after being initially granted access to files in one head office, the privilege was revoked. Other primary sources included records of solicitation in newspaper articles, advertisements, and telephone directories and in sporadic diaries the women kept (at my request). Information recorded in my own journal and transcriptions of the conversations and interviews were also part of the analysis.

Secondary sources were also vital, substantively and theoretically. Contextualising the material and historical conditions giving rise to both the commodification and regulation of a particular waged domestic labour process as well as how it is experienced by women workers are crucial in constructing explanations of waged domestic labour processes. Recognition of subjective elements of labour relations vis-à-vis objective conditions of exploitation in the labour process can provide insights into historically- and spatially-specific manifestations of the abstract relations of labour.

The analysis in this thesis has been influenced by the histories, investigations, and geographies of women’s labour in Western Europe and North America, especially those works focusing on domestic labour and domestic labourers. Histories of domestic labourers shed light on the spatially specific material and historical contexts within which women sought service employment (e.g. Salmon 1897/1972; Leslie 1974; McBride 1974, 1976; Oakley 1976; Katzman 1978; Sutherland 1981; Cowan 1983; Dudden 1983; Maza 1983; Fairchilds 1984; Matthews 1987; Palmer 1989; Parr 1990; Arat-Koç 1990). Accounts of women’s experiences as domestic labourers were also useful in that they assisted me in the interpretation of the franchise housekeepers’ experiences (e.g. Silvera 1983/1989; Rollins 1985; Glenn

6. Only in one case was I allowed to peruse a limited number of files without supervision. The door remained open, and I recorded the information by talking into a tape recorder.
The works that focused on the links between employment outside the home and responsibilities for the maintenance of the household showed how women were facing the challenges of waged and unwaged labour (e.g. Mackenzie and Rose 1983; Armstrong and Armstrong 1984a; Andrew and Moore Milroy 1988; Mackenzie 1986b, 1989a; Hochschild 1989). Studies of women’s labour outside the home in specific labour processes dominated by women informed my reading of the labour relations within the housekeeping services franchise (e.g. Westwood 1985; Gannagé 1986; Glucksman 1990a). Theoretical treatises on domestic labour helped me challenge other and refine my own conceptions of labour, housework, household, and women’s work, which benefitted me in constructing a theory of waged domestic labour (e.g. Fox 1980, 1988; Barrett 1980; Luxton 1980; Folbre 1982, 1987; Delphy 1984b; Armstrong and Armstrong 1984b; Fraad, Resnick and Wolff 1989; Armstrong and Armstrong 1990).

(3.2.4) Abstraction

Abstraction is a method of analysis that, when used by marxists, tries to capture dialectical change by conceptualising polarities within relations, interaction, and processes (McCarney 1990; Cox and Mair 1989). In contradistinction to the realist method of abstraction used in political economy in geography (q.v. Bhaskar 1979, 1986; Sayer 1981, 1984; and e.g. Chouinard, Fincher and Webber 1983; Foord and Gregson 1986), I chose Ollman’s (1990) scheme of abstraction. I chose this scheme for two reasons. First, Ollman draws attention to the characteristic way in which Marx used abstraction: as descriptive of the process from the real concrete to the thought concrete; as the results of this process; and as ill-fitting mental constructs (1990, p. 7).

7. Briefly, the real concrete refers to our everyday world in its complexity and the thought concrete refers to the mental constructs we develop in order to be able to understand our everyday world (Ollman 1990, p. 27).
29; cf. Sayer 1984, pp. 126-128). Being aware of these distinctions can assist an analyst in developing mental constructs or concepts that either explain or enhance the understanding of a specific set of relations or processes of social change. In this way, analysts can avoid confusion in developing very specific analyses of various sets of social relations and processes of social change within the same theoretical framework.

Second, Ollman's scheme places dialectical interaction and change at the center of the process of abstraction. Instead of attempting to distinguish between necessary and contingent sets of relations in the search for cause and effect (as realists do), analysts using Ollman's scheme emphasise the reciprocal interactive social processes of change. This does not negate the existence of internal and external relations or necessary and contingent relationships. Rather, it focuses on specific sets of relations and processes and their relation to other sets of relations and processes. This focus does not make the analysis relative (in that there is no epistemological basis for explanation or understanding); it makes the analysis limited in specified ways. Explaining and understanding specific relations and processes in particular contexts emerge as the goals of analysis.

Ollman wishes to "put dialectics to work" (Ollman 1990, pp. 26 and 71) by:

[r]esponding to a mixture of influences that include the material world and our experiences in it as well as to personal wishes and social constraints, it is the process of abstraction that establishes the specificity of the objects with which we interact [my emphasis] (Ollman 1990, p. 28).

This process of abstraction sets the conceptual boundaries of each concept. Mode refers to the three simultaneously occurring conceptual boundaries: extension, level of generality, and vantage point. Extension refers to the spatial and temporal limits of a concept. Level of generality of a concept refers to the focus on a specific attribute of a
concept. *Level of generality* of a concept refers to the focus on a specific attribute of a set of relations with the whole network of specific attributes of other sets of relations. The *vantage point* of a concept refers to the same relation or process being viewed from different sides of that relation or from different moments in the configuration of social relations at a specific time in a particular place. The mode links the concept to the system from which the abstraction is made (Ollman 1990, p. 41). (See Figure 3.1 for a visual representation of Ollman’s scheme of abstraction.)

My choice of this particular combination of methods arises out of my feminist methodological approach to research. In order to be able to set my choice into a feminist context, I need to review contributions made by feminist scholars to the continuing critique of positivist methodological approaches in social scientific research (see Bowles and Duelli Klein 1983). I link my choice of methods to my feminist methodology in the subsequent section (Section 3.4).

(3.3) A REFINED FEMINIST METHODOLOGY

Politics was very much a part of the feminist agenda in the 1970s (e.g. Firestone 1970; Millett 1970; Mitchell 1975; Brownmiller 1975; Foreman 1977) and into the next decade (e.g. Daly 1978/1984; O’Brien 1981; Walker 1983; Valverde 1985; MacKinnon 1987). By the 1980s, women had already been identified as being ‘invisible’ not only for example as historians, geographers, and economists, but also in

---

9. Ollman (1990, pp. 52-53) identifies seven levels of abstraction in Marx’s works. They are: (I) unique about an individual or a situation; (II) general about individuals, activities, or products; (III) peculiar to people, activities, or products because of their appearance and form; (IV) peculiar to societies divided on the basis of labour; (V) general to people, activities, and products that are common to the human condition; (VI) characteristics shared by all animals; and (VII) characteristics of the material part of nature.

10. This abstraction scheme is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, Section 4.3, pp. 69-73.
Figure 3.1. A visual representation of Ollman's scheme of abstraction.

**Level of Generality:** the focus on a specific attribute of a set of relations with the whole network of specific attributes of other sets of relations.

**Extension:** the spatial and temporal limits of a concept.

**Vantage point:** the same relation or process being viewed from different sides or from different moments.

See pp. 38-39 for extended definitions of extension, level of generality, and vantage point.
the histories, economies, and geographies constructed by the academy (e.g. Rowbotham 1973; Zelinsky 1973a, 1973b; Hayford 1974; McDowell 1979; Zelinsky, Hanson and Monk 1982; Hanson and Monk 1982). Social scientists as well as activists and other professionals shaped and elaborated women’s participation in the social sciences, both as constructors and ‘objects’ of construction, by introducing innovations in approaches to research, often 'discovered' by trial and error in their own investigations and/or projects (see the introduction in Mies 1982/1991). This incorporation of feminist politics into the academy forced feminist scientists to rework their scientific frameworks at all levels, from ontological assumptions, epistemological arguments, and analytical frameworks to choice of research topic, project design, and methods of data collection. Feminist scholars and academics translated their politics into research questions and changed the way they approached those questions.

Much feminist scholarly attention focused on the construction of a feminist methodology, demonstrated by the number of books and edited volumes appearing in the early 1980s (e.g. Roberts 1981; Langland and Gove 1983; Bowles and Duelli Klein 1983; Harding and Hintikka 1983; Stanley and Wise 1983). Central to all these feminist methodologies was a concern to capture significant differences in life experiences between women and men and amongst women who are divided by class, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation (Mies 1982/1991; Davis 1982; Stanley and Wise 1983; Maguire 1985; Segura 1989). The life experiences to be addressed were not only those of the ‘researched’, but also of the researcher (Mies 1983). A difference in preference over the type of method to be used in feminist research sparked a debate over qualitative versus quantitative techniques (Rowbotham, Segal and Wainwright 1979; Hartmann 1981/1987; Jayaratne 1983; Currie 1988; Jayaratne and Stewart 1991). From this milieu, critical arguments for a specifically feminist methodology
developed which elaborated upon early arguments: research 'for' rather than 'on' women (Duelli Klein 1983); the legitimation of subjugated knowledges, that is, the affirmation of women's experiences as a source of knowledge (Belenky et al. 1986; Ginzberg 1989); and non-hierarchical power relations between the researcher and the 'researched' (Oakley 1981; Reinharz 1983).

Feminists designated key attributes which were to distinguish what was feminist about their works, ranging from embracing a "passionate scholarship" (DuBois 1983) to making institutional structures accessible to working-class women (Acker, Barry and Esseveeld 1983; Ferree 1985). Some advocated constructing a completely different paradigm (Duelli Klein 1983; Mies 1983; Reinharz 1983) while others were intent on revising existing methodologies (Briskin 1980; Hartsock 1983; Fraser 1987). Feminist geographers, too, were and still are in the midst of coming to grips with these issues (Tivers 1979; Bowlby, Foord and Mackenzie 1982; WSGS/IBG 1984; Mackenzie 1986a, 1988a; Bowlby, Foord and McDowell 1986; Domosh 1991; Moss et al. 1993).

Exemplary of feminist reconstructions of approaches to research in the social sciences is Vickers' (1982/1989) five methodological rebellions: against decontextualisation; to restore agency; against reversal (attributing blame to the disempowered); against "objectivity"; and against linearity, inevitability, and laws (1982/1989, pp. 34-43). Making her way through 'male-stream' thought via the process of validating her own experience as a woman, she critiques and rebels against the dominant methodologies employed in social scientific research. She maintains that the "starting place for understanding" the inadequacies of traditional methodologies for women and feminist research is the power structures in the discipline itself (1982/1989, p. 32).
Clearly, on the one hand, these rebellions are not exclusively feminist. For example, critical theory calls for a rebellion against objectivity as well as displacement of positivist science with a critical science (e.g. Horkheimer and Adorno 1944/1972; Habermas 1971, 1984; Kellner 1989). Hermeneuticists and ethnographers emphasise contextualising experience, as do historical materialists and structuralists (e.g. Geertz 1973; Gottliener 1983; Thompson 1963/1968; McCarney 1990; Anderson 1980; Ryan 1983; Gerstein 1989). Postmodernists clamour for voices to be heard and agency to be part of the social construction of reality as do most other critical social scientists (Barthes 1982, 1985; Baudrillard 1981; Laclau and Mouffe 1987; Clifford 1988). Just as clearly, on the other hand, these rebellions are part of a feminist methodology. Feminists root agency in historical and material conditions; take issue with attributing victims agency through language as a total context-stripping technique; value subjectivity, empathy, and experience as part of the research process; and challenge the overarching framework of a positivist science by noting gender differences in experiences of human behaviour.

During the collective process of constructing a feminist methodology, an internal critique emerged. Feminists were finding that while the suggested changes in methodology were indeed challenging dominant methodological scientific traditions they were presenting a fractured vanguard. This difficulty spurred feminists to forge new ground. From a review of this critique of feminist social scientific practices, I have identified three sets of issues around which feminist methodological problems coalesced by the late 1980s: justification of a feminist science, the exploitation of interactive research, and the action resulting from the research itself (Acker, Barry, and Esseveeld 1983; Stacey 1988; Currie 1988; McCormack 1989). Specifically, these issues had to be addressed by each feminist researcher for each methodological
question. If there is only a political justification for a feminist science, that is, a justification based on political dogma rather than on empirical evidence, then could any political orientation be justified? If there is exploitation involved in interactive research, then how do we as researchers engage and effect change in the process of legitimising women's subjugated knowledge? If the action resulting directly from the research threatens the social, political, or economic security of the women participating in the research, then what precautions do we take to avoid such breaches?

The ground feminists forged has come to be regarded as feminist perspectives on research. The argument in brief is that there is nothing intrinsically feminist about the methodological premises feminists are offering (Taylor and Rupp 1991). If this is the case, then what is feminist about a methodology? In the following sub-sections, I review some of the critical responses within feminist academic circles which seek to resolve these problematic issues.

(3.3.1) Scientific justification

Nonsexist research is not the same as feminist research. Nonsexist research includes those studies and investigations that do not incorporate anti-woman biases within the research process (see Eichler 1988 for guidelines in carrying out nonsexist research). Feminist research includes those studies and investigations that exhibit consistently the emancipatory implications of women's position in society.\(^\text{11}\) Lips (1989) notes that to equate the two misunderstands the distinction between bias and values:

\[\text{[a] feminist psychologist can be committed to values such as the personal dignity of women and fair treatment of the sexes, while still striving for unbiased knowledge (Lips 1989, p. 54).}\]

Hawkesworth (1989) approaches this same issue, but from another side. She said that:

\[\text{11. This definition is adapted from Alcoff's distinction of feminist-consistent theories (1987/1989).}\]
In focusing attention on the source of knowledge, that is, on men, rather than on the validity of specific claims advanced by men, the terms of debate are shifted toward psychological and functionalist analyses and away from issues of justification (p. 539). Hawkesworth’s insistence to shift the debate to grounds of scientific justification rather than on men and what they say, also makes a distinction - not between bias and values, but between values and dogma.

Alcoff (1987/1989) addresses the distinctions amongst bias, values, and political dogma by incorporating the three in a justificatory exercise on the choice of theory. She argues that feminists should justify their choice of theory both within their own theories and within those of androcentric science. If feminists do not, they run the risk of epistemic relativism, either through epistemological orientation or via floating signifiers. For example, on the one hand, replacing androcentric science with a feminist science makes little sense when confronted with the question of validity in terms of theoretical and political coherence. This is merely a switching of biases. On the other hand, if designating 'objects' as constituents of a socially constructed truth, then particular sets of relations, specific media, or persons imbibe contingent truths. This approach ensures that there is no attached political dogma. However, it does not acknowledge bias as fully problematic, that is, there is a multiplicity of truths.

By extrapolating Alcoff’s arguments to address the more general question of bias, values, and political dogma in feminist social science, I can offer a possible resolution to the issue of scientific justification. Feminist social scientists committed to social change must have a set of principles implicating women’s emancipation as a backdrop against which to contrast those issues and actions which feminist researchers are experiencing, researching, and hoping to influence. Without this political backdrop feminist efforts remain pointless because there would be no meaning attached to

research agendas or projects. Negating the immediacy of feminist endeavours in such a way would disempower researchers as feminists as well as the women with whom feminist researchers work.

(3.3.2) **Exploitation of the 'researched'**

Just as justification of a feminist science, and consequently a feminist methodology, hearkens back to epistemological assumptions, the choice of methods entails scrutiny of feminist conceptions of knowledge and politics. Once women have been identified as possible knowers, how then is their knowledge to be legitimated? In order not to extract information about experiences and use it only for her/his own benefit, the researcher may choose to befriend the 'researched'.

Presentation of that knowledge within academic circles, via discourse and publications, is then seen as contributing to the process of legitimating women's ways of knowing in the scientific community (Belenky *et al.* 1986).

The process of legitimation is not to be only part of the academy. In fact, early in the debate, Stanley and Wise (1983) disagreed with the feminist goal of 'doing research with women' because the power relations between the researcher and 'researched' are not presented for what they are - exploitation. Their solution was for the feminist academic to focus on her experiences as a feminist academic. However, feminist academics, continued researching on, for, and with women without much research actually changing focus. Later, Stacey (1988) raised similar concerns. She notes a contradiction within the feminist research process, that is, feminist methodology can indeed be potentially more exploitative than a positivist one. For example, rather

---

13. 'Befriending' is not a method *per se*, like "surrender" is for Wolff (1971). Often friendship is the outcome of the research process including in-depth interviews within a multiple interview format. Friendship does not preclude the researcher from extracting and using information for her/his benefit, but questions the ethics of such an act.
than subjugating women’s knowledge by negating women’s experiences through the recognition of women’s behaviour deviating from the norm, feminist academics carrying out feminist research take women’s experiences and knowledge and use them for their own purposes. This is the opposite argument of Oakley (1981), who argued that conversations with women were the most empowering method that women feminist researchers could use to legitimate women’s knowledge.

After befriending the ’researched’, how then does the researcher present sensitive information about the ’researched’? Or, does she/he just not mention it? Of course, this leads to the question: am I presenting an accurate account of the experiences and lives of the women participating in the project? Even if the end product is negotiated amongst the people participating in the project, the issue of authority of knowledge must be raised because the legitimacy in the academy must come through the researcher for the ’researched’. Such a position, in turn, may lead to an unwanted and unanticipated academic hegemony.

Cook and Fonow (1986/1990) outline a constructive set of guidelines for carrying out feminist action-oriented research. They distinguish two dimensions of feminist research: epistemological assumptions about a feminist methodology and the methodological practices of feminism. They argue that the degree of ‘being feminist’ is not the number of principles the researcher adheres to, rather it is in the maintenance of the commitment to social change:

an assumption of feminist methodology is that knowledge must be elicited and analyzed in a way that can be used by women to alter oppressive and exploitative conditions in their society. This means that research must be designed to provide a vision of the future as well as a structural picture of the present. This goal involves attending to the policy implications of an inquiry, and may involve incorporating the potential target group in the design and execution of a study. Finally, feminist methodology endorses the assumption that the most thorough kind of knowledge and understanding comes through efforts to change social phenomena [my emphasis] (Cook and Fonow 1986/1990, p. 80).
It does not appear that concurrence with or adherence to the epistemological assumptions of a feminist methodology is as imperative as the methodological implementation.

The methodological problems associated with processes of legitimating women’s subjugated knowledges have been left unresolved, but not unchallenged. I think interim resolutions emerge from each researcher’s self-critique and I address these in the following section and again in the conclusion.

(3.3.3) **Feminist action**

In addition to problems of justifying a feminist science (bias versus relativism) and implementing a feminist methodology (validation through action versus adherence to principles), problems inherent in choosing an appropriate avenue of action must be addressed methodologically. Adamson, Briskin and McPhail (1988) directly address this issue in an historical look at the women’s movement in Canada and develop a conceptual framework for understanding feminist practice and feminist choices for action.

They identify two types of feminist action: *mainstreaming* wherein feminists within the system try to effect change through reform and negotiation and *disengaging* wherein feminists opt out of the dominant set of social relations and create feminist alternatives. For example, sexual harassment laws are tangible evidence that demonstrate positive effects of feminist mainstreaming; feminist housing collectives are successful disengagement strategies. The conceptual distinction between mainstreaming and disengaging is not absolute. Every action embodies elements of both strategies. Perhaps a more instructive way to view feminist action is not as either one or the other, but as part of a continuum wherein mainstreaming is one pole and disengaging the other. This makes sense with regard to Adamson, Briskin and McPhail’s overarching
argument that some combination of the two action politics is necessary because either strategy in isolation is detrimental to feminist practice. Mainstreaming can lead to institutionalisation where feminist action is paralysed because of structural limitations, (e.g. the overall ratio between women and men within a occupation may be overlooked because of affirmative action hiring successes). Disengaging can lead to marginalisation where feminists are isolated from the rest of society and are outside the set of social relations that need to be challenged (e.g. separatist groups struggling against violence against women).

Actions that feminists have been calling for range from urging the adoption of gender-inclusive communication policy in government offices to challenging the human rights code regarding the definition of family. All feminist-oriented action implements a feminist politics, often with tangible results, like gender-inclusive language guidelines or a legal definition of family to include lesbian couples. Though the type of action is debatable, one thing is certain: feminists have redefined "action research" by implicating feminist action as part of the approach.

Nielsen (1990) provides some direction for resolving the problems arising around these three sets of issues: the justification of a feminist science, methods exploiting the 'researched', and feminist action oriented research. She draws on Gadamer's notion of "fusion of horizons" in a description of feminist inquiry. She defines horizon as "the full range of one's standpoint" and a fusion as "seeking knowledge while grounded in a perspective" (Nielsen 1990, p. 29). Horizon thus involves contextualising the research, the researcher, and the 'researched'. Fusion is that which cannot be ignored, held constant, or denied, while at the same time being open to competing and challenging ideas. Fusions enhance one's horizon because they
act as a check on a researcher's epistemological assumptions, politics, and personal integrity. This mediated resolution is extended in the following section where I set the framework for my own feminist methodology.

(3.4) MY FEMINIST METHODOLOGY

The following outline of the feminist methodology I used for this study originates almost exclusively from feminist and critical schools of thought. I draw heavily on Mies (1983) and Reinharz (1983) and extensions made by Maguire (1985), Nielsen (1990) and Moss et al. (1993), but not to the exclusion of the critical points raised by Alcoff (1987/1989), Stacey (1988), Cook and Fonow (1986/1990), and Adamson, Brisking and McPhail (1988). Each component does not exist independent of the next which creates a set of entwined, interactive principles for this study. After I identify each principle, I note specifically how the principle is implicated in my research project with women employed in housekeeping services franchises. I then discuss the advantage of such an approach in the subsequent section (Section 3.5).

First, research is a value-laden exercise. Feminist researchers acknowledge their bias and delineate their own values at the start of a research project. Objective neutrality is replaced by conscious partiality (Mies 1983, p. 122), that is, an empathetic understanding based on the researcher's own experiences and politics. Feminists lessen the differences between the 'subject as object' by treating the 'object as subject'. In this way an effort is made to liberate subjugated knowledges. I drew from my own set of values in making the assumptions that have influenced this study the most. I assume that: interaction and change are dialectical; a feminist marxist

---

politics is a constructive way to effect social change; and the academy is an appropriate forum to challenge the status quo. From these assumptions it is clear that I was not seeking objective neutrality. Instead I sought conscious partiality by gaining cleaning experience through employment. I chose to open myself up to the women participating in the study because I didn’t want to merely take their experiences for the benefit of my research project.

Second, the researcher takes on a 'view from below' and directly involves groups of people who are in less powerful positions in society. Instead of being used as an instrument to enhance the concentration of power in the existing power elite, research is to be brought to serve the interests of oppressed and exploited groups. Legitimation of experience and knowledge subjugated by groups with power through political action is crucial. My intention was not to exploit any woman in a less powerful position than I was. By choosing the multiple-depth conversation format (and to record them), I was able to re-tell the women’s stories in a way that conveyed the meanings the women intended, from both the women’s and my own political vantage points. I also wrote a lengthy report about the project for the women, much of which has been incorporated in Chapters Five, Six, and Seven (Moss 1992b). One of the women edited it and passed along a set of general comments. A 'view from below' requires that the researcher and the 'researched' share their lives and demystify the differences in relationships, build upon the commonalities. There were numerous incidents where we shared our lives by exchanging information and giving each other advice. The women asked me for advice on programmes for retraining, employers who don’t conform to the labour code, and ways to deal with wolf whistles. I asked

15. I also wrote a report for the managers/owners and the head office personnel (Moss 1992c); however, this was part of the agreement for granting me an interview. See Appendix H for the letter of consent for managers/owners and head office personnel.
for advice on organising time, finances, and relationships. The women wanted information from me about life insurance policies, sexually transmitted diseases, and the art scene in Hamilton. I asked for information on the public library system, stress management techniques, and storage facilities. Without this 'view from below', research would only serve to perpetuate the status quo and maintain feminist scholarship in an elite position.

Hence, the third element is to 'rupture normalcy' \(^{16}\) and change the status quo. Strategies to effect social and political change must be devised and implemented concurrently with the identification and elaboration of specific processes that perpetuate inequality, oppression, and exploitation. We should not only try to understand and explain the processes by which unequal power relations are expressed, like when men dominate women, managers manipulate workers, and whites oppress blacks, but also try to implement political strategies that seek to attain emancipation. Understanding and explanations mean little without action to challenge these relations! I tried to encourage the women to challenge the domination relations within which they engaged. I did not devise a grand scheme to rupture normalcy. However, whenever an opportunity arose within which I could express my opinion or suggest an alternative way to resolve a problem, I did so. But I did so only when I could express myself without either overtly or subtly pressuring the women to conform. For example, when Candy asked me if I went to a female doctor, I said that I did because I thought women probably understood women’s health better than men. When Nancy asked me how I thought franchise housekeepers could get higher wages, I said that formal organisation

\(^{16}\) This is not exactly Mies' (1983) intended meaning. I have chosen to present the information in this manner because I believe that at points where the status quo can indeed be challenged are in points of crisis. These points of crisis can be psychological, interpersonal, or social. The important criterion is a ruptured normalcy because it contributes to both the consciousness formation of oppressed and exploited groups and the break with the status quo.
through a union would bring about higher wages and probably other benefits like dental care or a prescription drug plan. In this way, I was able to implement my own political agenda for women's emancipation without undercutting my relationship with the women or alienating their friendship.

Fourth, power relations amongst the elites must be questioned in ways that empower less privileged groups. The researcher engages in interactive power relations instead of exercising dominating power relations. This leads to an ebb and flow of power (often in the form of knowledge) between the researcher and the women participating in the project. Both in turn are empowered: the former in recognition of another's less privileged position of power; the latter in awareness and enhancement of her/his own political position. I realised my own privileged position as a student in comparison to the women workers, especially financially. As a student, I made more money and had fewer expenses than any of the women participating in the study.17 I also had more knowledge about the services available to low-income women. During the recorded conversations, I was very open with my own personal experiences. This permitted the women to see my vulnerabilities. In addition, I organised the three multiple-depth conversations from the least to most personal. I figured that it would be easier to discuss impersonal subjects, like the tasks of the labour process, while we were trying to get to know one another. Once we knew each other better, the conversations could become more personal. In this way, I was able to redirect the distribution of power so that at different times each of us were powerful, vulnerable, and empowered.

Fifth, historical accounts force a material grounding of activities, events, and processes of the lives of those involved in the research project. Appropriation of

17. Even the two women who were single (during at least part of the project) paid more in rent and hydro bills than I did.
the history of our own lives within the research process is only fitting when power
relations between the researcher and the 'researched' are broken down. Note that this
also must involve the researcher's own life history. The subsequent placement of all
life histories in historical juxtaposition pulls together individual stories and forms a
collective. It is only with this action that a foundation for understanding amongst
participants can develop. Though I draw on the material and historical context of the
personal histories of the women workers, this aspect of the feminist methodology does
not emerge explicitly in the second half of this thesis. The juxtaposition of our own
personal histories was important during the recorded conversations. These contexts laid
the basis for our interaction and ongoing interpretation of each other's lives. There was
no formal meeting of all the women workers participating in the study. I have not
collected information on the impact this study had on the women workers. Though not
necessarily made explicit, this juxtaposed series of individual histories when pulled
together contributes to a theoretical account of dominant power relations that too can
forcefully challenge the status quo.

These components are not hierarchical in a sense that the upper echelons
dominate and determine the lower levels. Rather, the methodology includes all
elements interacting, much like how the research itself is carried out. For example,
individual or groups of components may be part of other methodologies, something
similar to the eidetic method in phenomenology or praxis in marxism. However, it is
this particular combination of elements as well as the conscious choice and subsequent
use of methods and theories that do not preclude these elements that is the basis for
feminist research (see Alcoff 1987/1989; Maguire 1985, especially Chapter 5).
(3.5) ADVANTAGES OF THIS APPROACH

There are four sets of advantages of this approach. First, this approach contests traditional epistemological assumptions by drawing on women's experiences - of a waged domestic labour process, for example - as a legitimate source of knowledge. Harding (1987b) states it best:

[O]nce we undertake to use women's experience as a resource to generate scientific problems, hypotheses, and evidence, to design research for women, and to place the researcher in the same critical place as the research subject, traditional epistemological assumptions can no longer be made (p. 181).

Research projects designed and implemented by feminist social scientists would derive from an alternative set of questions:

... who can be a knower (only men?); what tests beliefs must pass in order to be legitimated as knowledge (only tests against men's experiences and observations?); what kinds of things can be known (can "subjective truths," ones that only women - or only some women - tend to arrive at, count as knowledge?); the nature of objectivity (does it require "point-of-viewlessness"?); the appropriate relationship between the researcher and her/his research subjects (must the researcher be disinterested, dispassionate, and socially invisible to the subject?); what should be the purpose of the pursuit of knowledge (to produce information for men?) [emphasis in original] (Harding 1987b, p. 181).

One must bear in mind these questions when undertaking a research project in order to focus attention on the legitimation of women's subjective knowledge so that masculine reason (from Lloyd 1984) does not serve to perpetuate the subjugation of women.

Though in pursuit of a feminist science, this approach does not uncritically embrace a feminist politics. There is a difference between men's reason and men. Legitimating women's subjective knowledge is not as simple as refuting everything that men say and have said. If this were the case, then the rejection of what men say and have said would permit:

a number of contested epistemological assumptions about the nature of knowledge, the process of knowing, standards of evidence, and criteria of assessment to be incorporated unreflectively into feminist arguments (Hawkesworth 1989, p. 539).
For example, the adoption of intuition in some feminist arguments has led to promoting women’s experience as a privileged viewpoint. This is detrimental to feminist principles in that there is an implicit superiority of women in such a conception; one cannot replace ‘father knows best’ with ‘a woman knows best’. Hawkesworth (1989) cites feminist standpoint theorists as traitors to this point:

[for to claim that there is a distinctive women’s "perspective" that is "privileged" precisely because it possesses heightened insights into the nature of reality, a superior access to truth, is to suggest that there is some uniform experience common to all women that generates this univocal vision (p. 545).

The universality of women’s experience is contested constantly and this contestation process must be recognised. Would the similarity in experience between two women raising three children without partners bring them closer together or further distance them, where one is working for a housekeeping services franchise with social assistance supplements for compensation of low wages and the other is an upper-income woman not engaged in waged labour?

Second, this approach encourages the use of various methods within one project. Complete immersion can be important for feminist research because of the insights gained by the researcher through knowing the other in different situations and conditions of reality, like in the workplace(s), at home, or in an interview situation.

Certainly, as Maguire (1985) said:

[participatory research offers a way to openly demonstrate solidarity with oppressed and disempowered people through our work as researchers. In addition to recognizing many forms of knowledge, participatory research insists on an alternative position regarding the purpose of knowledge creation. The purpose of participatory research is not merely to describe and interpret social reality, but to radically change it. Furthermore, the intent is to transform reality "with" rather than "for" oppressed groups (p. 28).

I tried very hard to maintain the integrity of Maguire’s statement by being sensitive to shifting flows of power between myself and the people participating in the project.
Though participatory methods may be preferred, other methods for data collection are not excluded. Complete immersion is not a common technique used in geographic and economic restructuring projects (see Ley 1974; The Lancaster Regionalism Group 1985; Smith 1988; Evans 1988; Jackson 1988). By being a complete participant, a researcher can develop a conscious partiality based not only on a set of political principles, but also on common experiences. Likewise, various types of interviews are useful for different types of information. In collecting personal histories, multiple, in-depth conversations might be preferred over questionnaires if there are a small number of participants, like in this study. Structured interviews may be more appropriate with people who wield more power than the researcher, like managers/owners of housekeeping services franchises. In addition, reflective self-critique keeps the researcher in contact with her own thoughts as well as the relations within the research process. This can be accomplished by keeping a journal.

Analytical methods too vary. Aggregate analysis can be used for example to set in context local responses to macro processes of economic restructuring. Abstraction can be useful in distinguishing amongst multiple sets of social relations. Neither contravenes a feminist politics. For example, the strength in utilising Ollman’s abstraction scheme lies primarily in its flexibility. Re-conceptualising abstraction via the aspects of the mode of abstraction is an on-going process that enhances the construction of feminist theories by emphasising the complexity of the dialectical nature of the relations and processes that are being abstracted. Analysts can conceive of processes as being historically- and spatially-specific rather than total and all-encompassing. An analysis can be fixed at one level of generality while being situated in relation to other levels of generality; thus, the universality of women’s experiences

need not be misconstrued. Couching an analysis or parts of an argument explicitly in terms of a mental construct, a set of social relations, or a specific social-spatial process permits a commitment to a liberative science for disempowered groups, especially women.

Third, this approach permits a wide range of feminist action and feminist politics. Feminist politics, when simply stated, is the commitment to women's emancipation, or it might be more accurate to say e(wo)mancipation. Nevertheless, the inclusion of feminist politics into every methodological aspect of research shifts the basis upon which feminists committed to those politics shape their research projects. Thus, the feminist action orientation promotes mainstreaming and disengaging strategies at both individual and collective scales and from different perspectives, like liberal, socialist, and radical feminist perspectives (see Jaggar 1983; Donovan 1985; cf. Penrose et al. 1992).

Fourth, this approach provides an alternative direction for radical research in geography in its combinatory aspects. The five principles of my feminist methodology combine the central concerns of political economy and feminist analysts. It links political economic and feminist studies not only in its topic (class and gender) but also in its orientation to research (cf. Nelson 1986; Fincher 1989; Domosh 1991; Sayer and Walker 1992). The combination of methods is uncommon for socialist feminist or marxist studies. This study relies heavily on two traditionally opposed methods of inquiry, complete participant observation and abstraction. Though qualitative methods are becoming more common amongst critical geographers, few geographic studies utilise complete participant observation (e.g. Ley 1974). In order to grasp more fully the texture of everyday life, those advocating qualitative methods and/or feminist research would not be likely to advocate abstraction as an analytical
method (q.v. Smith and Eyles 1988; Moss et al. 1993). Awareness of the combination of the extension, level of generality, and the vantage point in each mental construct is particularly useful for geographic analysis. Since the limits are set through the process of abstraction, the conceptualisation of social objects, sets of relations, or processes of change must incorporate both time and space, over varying periods and at different scales. So instead of looking at the spatial variation within the applications of particular concepts, critical geographers can implicate space analytically as well as empirically. This supports the argument that geographers have been making for some time, that is, that social relations are spatially constituted (see Harvey 1973, 1985, 1989; McDowell 1983a; Gregory and Urry 1985; Scott and Storper 1986; Dear and Wolch 1989; Soja 1989).

(3.6) LOOKING TOWARD RESULTS

In reviewing the literature, it is clear that the discussion does not result in any fixed definition of feminist methodology. Though the issues remain somewhat confused, they are not unresolvable. What emerges for me is a feminist approach that seeks consistency in its epistemology and political implementation. The principles I outline above guided me throughout the research process, and guide me even now as I write. I am grounded in these assumptions and arguments and am not closed off to change or innovation, nor restricted to the auspices of this feminist shield.

It is from these principles that we take our politics to task. The methodological implementation of a feminist politics is realised through its research design. When we design and subsequently undertake research projects as feminist scholars, we must think about what we are doing. By what I mean appropriation, and by appropriation I mean understanding and exposing one's own lived world. Frieden
(1989), in her discussion of raising objections to the necessity of women's self-objectification in the canons of narrative, expresses the what in a similar way:

Appropriation, as a form of understanding, still takes place, but on terms other than those defined by dominant social patterns. The recognition of large social structures is rarely achieved in the individual instance: one woman, examining only her own life, can scarcely know that her arguments with prevailing values are echoed in other households. Rather, such recognition occurs as a function of sharing experiences and perceptions, so that (political) analysis takes place through consciousness raising or autobiography. The narration of such experience must be, on the one hand, sufficiently generalized to allow for widespread possibilities for identification, but, on the other, historically specific enough to maintain a basis in social and material realities. Concretized experience is thus made available for comparison and analysis (as well as for identification) on the levels of literary, sociological, psychological, historical, and political inquiry by virtue of its mediation through narrative (Frieden 1989, p. 185).

What is evident, though, when working through the information and stories I collected about the waged domestic labour process, about experiencing that labour process, about coping strategies at home and at the workplace(s), about the women's weltanschauungen is that:

[e]ach version of the truth - spun from the uneven threads of everyday life and woven into life stories that give shape to the experiences of different generations - is both compelling and conclusive, yet intolerant of other possibilities [my emphasis] (Ginsburg 1989, p. 80).

As an expected contradiction, I found each truth indisputable, and its intolerance, flexible. By setting out these assumptions and explicitly stating my approach, I have set my 'horizon' for this study. This, of course, in no way precludes my changing through the processes of learning, analysing, or empowerment. 'Fusions', no doubt, are possible.

The remaining part of the thesis is divided into four chapters. Chapter Four is an overview of the conceptual arguments I make in constructing a theory of waged domestic labour processes. In Chapters Five, Six, and Seven, I present the derivation of the abstractions I developed and extend the conceptual arguments introduced in
Chapter Four. Specifically, in Chapter Five, I argue that conceptualising production with reproduction will give an enhanced reading of what production and reproductive labour comprises. In Chapter Six, I draw on Burawoy's 'politics of production' in order to develop theoretical constructs which will assist in the explanation of relations in a waged domestic labour processes as well as the regulation of those relations. In Chapter Seven, I propose to conceptualise class and gender as a set of formation processes which result in individual and collective class and gender identities. In all three chapters, I demonstrate the conceptual arguments through information gathered about waged domestic labour relations in housekeeping services franchises and about the lives of some of the women who are franchise housekeepers.
CHAPTER 4
CONCEPTUALISING WAGED DOMESTIC LABOUR PROCESSES

(4.1) OUTLINE

In this chapter, I first provide a background for the identification of three sets of conceptual issues that are central to addressing theories of waged domestic labour. I then introduce and define the concepts I develop and empirically demonstrate in the next three chapters, namely 'total labour', production regime, and class and gender formation. Next, I distinguish the modes of abstraction of each of these concepts and discuss the use of concepts in theory construction. I conclude by noting the direction the analysis takes in the context of elaborating a theory of waged domestic labour processes.

(4.2) CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

In Chapter One, I identified three themes around which my experiences as a franchise housekeeper, and subsequently the information gathered in interviews, coalesced. To reiterate, the cleaning tasks were the same no matter whether the labour was waged or unwaged. Second, it was the organisation of the labour relations that differentiated particular types of labour. Third, workers who engaged in this particular set of labour relations forged specific class and gender identities. My initial interests shaped the reading of the information I gathered through the empirical investigation, and focused my conceptual concerns. Having been interested in waged and unwaged labour, production and reproduction, and class and gender at the onset of the project, I drew out a set of theoretical issues that paralleled the empirical investigation. The
three conceptual issues involve the consonance of conceptual and empirical distinctions: between waged and unwaged labour and the daily routine of carrying out the tasks; amongst labour, its regulation, and women workers’ experiences of both; and of class and gender within specific sets of (re)productive labour relations. I discuss each in turn.

(4.2.1) **Waged and unwaged labour**

Feminists within traditional marxist analysis examined the contributions of unwaged domestic labour in the household to the maintenance of capitalism (Kollantai 1977; Zetkin 1984). Second wave feminists reintroduced domestic labour as a theoretical issue in radical analysis with the question: does domestic labour produce surplus value? Since theorists oriented their explanations of unwaged domestic labour toward its actual productivity in the capitalist system, that is, from a production vantage point, the answer is no (Bentson 1969; Morton 1970; Dalla Costa 1972; Gerstein 1973; Guettel 1974; Coulson, Magas and Wainwright 1974; Gardiner 1975; Seccombe 1974, 1986; Armstrong and Armstrong 1983, 1984b). In their attempts to construct historical and materialist conceptions of unwaged domestic labour, analysts failed to realise that domestic labour need not be explained in production terms. From a reproduction vantage point, the answer to the question "does domestic labour generate surplus value?" is still no. But, the basis for answering the question expands to include figuring out how unwaged domestic labour contributes to constructing, maintaining, and reproducing existing sets of social relations. When couched in reproduction terms, the explanation of waged domestic labour processes becomes part of a larger project which encompasses not only the generation of surplus value from the production process, but also the construction, maintenance, and reproduction of a set of labour relations as well as a set of tasks. Thus, the conceptual distinction between waged and
unwaged labour loses its empirical importance when labour is viewed from a reproductive vantage point. What emerges as significant is the way a worker organizes her/his labour through a daily routine of (re)productive labour tasks.

(4.2.2) Labour, its regulation, and women's experience of both

Second wave feminists soon shifted from debating the role of unwaged domestic labour in the maintenance of capitalist labour relations toward building explanations of the uneven power relations between women and men. Feminist radical analysts focused on identifying the source of women's oppression (e.g. Rowbotham 1973; Millett 1970; Mitchell 1975; Eisenstein 1979; Barrett 1980; Sargent 1981; Vogel 1983). Many analysts located men's domination of women in either productive or reproductive labour, through which oppressive relations are reinforced and maintained in the home through familial relations and at the workplace through labour relations (e.g. Curtis 1980; Mann and Blumenfeld 1980; Young 1981; Hartmann 1981/1987; O'Brien 1981; Bryceson and Vuorela 1984). By developing theory from the vantage point of women, analysts could maintain a political commitment to women's liberation while elaborating the links between labour and its regulation. Feminist marxist analysts specified the historical and material conditions of productive and reproductive labour relations giving rise to women's oppression through specific accounts of women's experiences of labour and its regulation (Westwood 1985; Mackenzie 1985, 1986b, 1989a; Gannagé 1986; Glucksmann 1990a). These analysts have moved toward conceptually distinguishing between labour and its regulation and empirically accounting for this distinction by recording and analysing women's experiences of particular labour processes.
(4.2.3) **Class and gender in (re)production**

Class and gender are principal constructs in theorising waged and unwaged labour and production and reproduction, especially in attempts to explain women's work (Cowan 1983; Cockburn 1983, 1985; Armstrong 1984; Armstrong and Armstrong 1983, 1984a, 1990; Westwood 1985; Gannagé 1986, 1987; Parr 1990; Amott and Matthaï 1991). The key contribution from these works is that the attribution of class and gender is not static, nor is it fixed, nor is it simply assigned. Class is tied to the position of the labourer in the production process, but not entirely. It is also tied to the acquisition of organisational skills and educational training (Wright 1978, 1985). In this way, workers occupy contradictory class locations (see Figure 4.1). Because women and men have mixed access to the acquisition of skills and to education and training programmes, these class positions are gendered (see Figure 4.2). These works therefore focus on disparate aspects of *gendering* as a process, which makes a certain job or position either women's or men's work. This has led analysts toward conceiving class and gender as processes rather than attributes (see e.g. especially Cockburn 1985; Parr 1990). By conceptualising class and gender as processes through which individuals forge social and political identities, empirical distinctions amongst specific sets of (re)productive labour relations can be made, thereby concretely explaining women's and men's work as well as individuals' conceptions of class and gender.

(4.2.4) **Significance of these issues in geographic analysis**

These three sets of theoretical concerns, that is the consonance of conceptual and empirical distinctions between waged and unwaged labour and the daily routine of carrying out the tasks; amongst labour, its regulation, and women workers' experiences of both; and of class and gender and specific sets of (re)productive labour
Figure 4.1. Wright's (1985) typology of class locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner of means of production</th>
<th>Non-owners (wage labourers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>4 Expert Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Small Employers</td>
<td>5 Expert Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Petty Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>6 Experts non-managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns sufficient capital to hire workers and not work</td>
<td>Owns sufficient capital to hire workers but must work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns sufficient capital to work for self but not to hire workers</td>
<td>7 Semi Credentialled Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Semi Credentialled Workers</td>
<td>11 Uncredentialled Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Semi Credentialled Workers</td>
<td>12 Proletarians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Wright (1985), p. 88
Figure 4.2. Wright's (1985) gendered typology of class locations.

**Assets in the means of production**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner of means of production</th>
<th>Non-owners (wage labourers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>4 Expert Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M -1.84 (43) W -0.32 (14)</td>
<td>7 Semi Credentialled Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M -0.33 (71) W -0.29 (21)</td>
<td>10 Uncredentialled Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M +0.55 (11) W -0.65 (24)</td>
<td>11 Uncredentialled Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Small Employers</td>
<td>5 Expert Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M -1.18 (60) W -0.27 (30)</td>
<td>M -0.21 (76) W -0.32 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Petty Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>6 Experts non-managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M -0.18 (51) W +0.01 (51)</td>
<td>M +0.81 (134) W +0.70 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Expert Managers</td>
<td>7 Semi Credentialled Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M -1.84 (43) W -0.32 (14)</td>
<td>10 Uncredentialled Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M -0.33 (71) W -0.29 (21)</td>
<td>11 Uncredentialled Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M +0.55 (11) W -0.65 (24)</td>
<td>12 Proletarians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men (M): N=807
Women (W): N=680

Adapted from Wright (1985), p. 266.
relations, have been addressed in geographic analyses. Initial arguments over waged and unwaged labour developed into more sophisticated analyses of the spatial aspects of reproductive labour (Burnett 1973; Bruegal 1973; Hayford 1974; Hayden 1980; Mackenzie and Rose 1983; Bowlby 1984; Darke 1984; Breitbart 1984; Lowe and Gregson 1990). Analysts have used dual systems theory and urban politics as sites to debate the source of women’s oppression as, for example, in the control of labour, gender relations, or women’s rights within the political process (Walby 1986a; Foord and Gregson 1986; McDowell 1986; Johnson 1987; Knopp and Lauria 1987; Bendi and Peake 1988). Spatial links amongst gender, class, and labour (e.g. within labour markets and as part of deindustrialisation) have been drawn out in the literatures on localities, economic restructuring, industrial policy, and the local state (Fuentes and Ehrenreich 1983; Massey 1984; Fincher 1984, 1989, 1990; Lancaster Regionalism Group 1985; Nelson 1986; Holmes 1986; Mackenzie 1989a; McDowell 1990).

In order to address these issues in the context of this study, I now turn to a discussion of the analytical method of abstraction. I first review the modes of abstraction and then discuss the use of concepts in constructing theory.

(4.3) MODES OF ABSTRACTION AND USE OF CONCEPTS

One way to approach these conceptual issues lies in the analytical method of abstraction. Recall the three modes of abstraction: extent (temporal and spatial aspects), level of generality, and vantage point (Chapter 3, Section 3.2.4, pp. 38-40). Distinguishing the modes of abstraction of the concepts used in theories of waged domestic labour processes can shed light on the analyses themselves. For example, Bryce and Vuorela (1984) and Fraad, Resnick and Wolff (1989) develop separate

1. Even though most analysts do not make explicit their process of abstraction, one can still distinguish the modes of abstraction of a concept.
concepts that link women’s oppression to reproduction relations. In addition to each concept focusing on women’s power within capitalist relations, each concept attenuates specific temporal and spatial dimensions, sets a specific level of generality, and orients the argument from a particular vantage point.

Parallel to Marx’s mode of production, Bryceson and Vuorela (1984) conceptualise relations of reproduction and forces of reproduction as constituent of the *mode of human reproduction*.\(^2\) As an abstraction, mode of human reproduction extends temporally to include all class societies and spatially to include the territory of those societies. The concept’s level of generality draws out those specific reproduction relations and forces that characterise all class societies. From the vantage point of reproduction, mode of human reproduction addresses class society through the lenses of the relations and forces of reproduction. Since the mode of human reproduction and the mode of production are dependent on each other for their existences, Bryceson and Vuorela conclude that women’s oppression in class society stems from the alienation resulting from the tension between the wage earner and the mother - spatially restricted to the home.

In contrast, Fraad, Resnick and Wolff (1989) conceptualise the household as a site of fundamental and subsumed class processes.\(^3\) The household as an abstraction temporally extends throughout all class societies and spatially incorporates the area where surplus labour is appropriated. The concept of household individually characterises sites of surplus labour appropriation in relation to universal class

---

2. *Relations of reproduction* include social relationships between women and men concerning sexual union and the *forces of reproduction* include the control of women and men over nature, as in birth control.

3. In a *fundamental class process*, individuals either produce or appropriate surplus labour. In a *subsumed class process*, individuals distribute the appropriated surplus labour. *Surplus labour* is that labour not strictly needed to reproduce a domestic labourer herself/himself (Fraad, Resnick, and Wolff 1989, p. 13).
processes. Like the mode of human reproduction, household is conceptualised from a reproduction vantage point in that surplus labour is defined in terms of reproducing individuals. Women's oppression is place-specific because power relations between women and men vary depending on the particular organisation of class processes in a household.

These are but two examples of the ways in which analysts are clarifying the connections amongst production and reproduction relations (for others see Glazer 1984; Foord and Gregson 1986; Mackenzie 1988a; Glucksmann 1990a). Bryceson and Vuorela link women's oppression to reproduction through the tension between domestic and waged labour located in the home. Fraad, Resnick and Wolff link women's oppression to reproduction through the processes that organise the appropriation of surplus labour, that is, who generates and who appropriates the surplus labour.

Opening up analysis to varying modes of abstraction permits the construction of new concepts that can bring into focus historically mediated and materially grounded relations and processes involved in the organisation of the social relations of labour. This can assist in linking the conceptual and empirical facets of specific sets of labour relations in three ways. First, because of the temporal and spatial limits set by the process of abstraction, it is difficult to slide between various periods of time and scales of inquiry without compromising the integrity of a historically- and spatially-specific explanation. Second, the breadth of some concepts, like patriarchy and capitalism, prevent specific explanations of links between particular sets of class and gender relations in specific places (cf. Foord and Gregson 1986). Concepts that address relations and processes which characterise a particular society at one level of generality cannot at the same time address the specific properties of an individual situation at another level (e.g. Cox and Mair 1989). For example, 'capitalist
patriarchy’ can address the particular type of class society in Canada, but cannot address the various ways women organise their labour, both inside and outside the home, within those particular patriarchal capitalist relations. Third, the production orientation of many concepts in explanations of women’s participation in (re)productive labour indicate the pervasiveness of women’s oppression in both spheres of labour. Constructs conceptualised consistently only from one vantage point unravels the historical materialist conception of labour, that is, of including productive and reproductive labour in an analysis.

Distinguishing the modes of abstraction can also indicate avenues through which conceptual advances in theorising waged domestic labour processes can be made. Conceptualising labour at a level of generality which comprises both production and reproduction can overcome difficulties arising from simply applying complex explanations of production to reproduction. With less extensive abstractions, historically- and spatially-specific explanations of particular sets of labour can be constructed without conflating levels of specificity and levels of generality. For example, by conceptually distinguishing between the organisation and regulation of labour, specific tasks and rules can be separated at a more general level of abstraction. Further, more concretely, conceiving class and gender as historically mediated and materially grounded processes can explain very specific sets of labour relations in production and reproduction.

Identification of these conceptual advances leads to the issue of the use of concepts in an analysis. Concepts can be used either to explain or to interpret. ‘Concepts that explain’ point out causal relationships amongst relations or processes. For example, patriarchal gender relations, the uneven distribution of power between women and men, can be used to explain men’s domination of women in various places.
and be linked to spatial processes, like suburbanisation, household formation, and
gentrification (Mackenzie 1988a; Fraad, Resnick and Wolff 1989; Rose 1989).
'Concepts that interpret' situate relations or processes within specific contexts. For
example, 'reinventing home' serves to illustrate the ways in which working women
balance their home and workplace lives through reclaiming the home as a place that
offers mental stimulation and spiritual renewal, and not just a place for more work
(Abraham et al. 1991). Concepts can also be used to both explain and interpret. These
concepts demonstrate in part the arguments underlying the relations and processes
embodied in a particular concept and in part the causal links amongst relations and
processes. For example, division of labour can be used to explain and to interpret. In
spatial analyses of labour markets, the division of labour assists in situating a particular
group of workers within an historically specific context (e.g. Nelson 1986). Once
these links are drawn out, the concept is also the basis for explaining the existence of a
labour market (e.g. Nelson 1986). The combined approach is not tautological; it is
complementary.

In order to connect the conceptual issues identified in Section 4.2 to the
theoretical arguments I make in the following three chapters, I now define the concepts
I developed in conceptualising waged domestic labour processes. I then point out the
advantages of the use of these abstractions in the subsequent section (Section 4.5).

(4.4) DEFINITIONS

Once feminists reoriented analysis away from a production vantage point
toward reproduction, theoretical questions were no longer posed in terms of
production. Analyses shifted toward attempts to explain women's oppression and to
sort through the links between class and gender. Upon reflection, I see that there was a
need to reorient not only the vantage point, but the level of generality, that is, analysts need to address labour at varying levels of generality.\(^4\) In addition to labour being conceptualised as being specific to a particular class society, it also needs to be conceptualised at a level where it distinguishes a class society from the universal human condition. A production orientation restricts analysis to a specific type of labour, that is, to a labour that generates surplus value. When reconceptualised at a more comprehensive level of generality, labour becomes all labour, or total labour.

'Total labour' is a complex abstraction\(^5\) that seeks to capture the tension amongst the relations comprising production and reproduction. Labour means little unless, through utilising labour power, an individual can act and/or react to her/his material surroundings and natural environment. 'Total labour' includes all labour power, not just that which is sold. Following Marx, labour power is the capacity of individuals to produce use-values of any description (1867/1987, p. 164). This defining characteristic exists in both production and reproduction. Labour power is a simple abstraction and not intrinsically productive, reproductive, or unproductive.

---

4. I am proposing that labour needs to be conceptualised at level IV instead of level III (see Chapter 3, Footnote 9, p. 40).

5. In the "Introduction to a Critique of Political Economy", Marx distinguishes a complex abstraction in the context of simple and complex theory. Simple abstractions form the basis of simple theory. Simple abstractions are those that systematically go away from complexity in order to explain a complex entity in very simple terms. For example, population is a group of people within bounded space. Complex theories are based on complex abstractions. In order to construct complex theories, analysts must:

make the journey again in the opposite direction until one arrived once more at the concept of population, which is this time not a vague notion of a whole, but a totality comprising many determinations and relations (Marx 1857/1988, p. 140).

Thus, complex abstractions comprise multiple definitions, determinations, and configurations of the phenomenon under investigation. 'Population' would no longer be simply a group of people with a geographically delineated space. It would encompass all the interaction and change that a population undergoes and has undergone and all the relations that are part of the interaction within which that population engages.
'Total labour' comprises both productive and reproductive, waged and unwaged, and remunerated and unremunerated labour, and the social relations involved in each. I use 'total labour' in part to explain the connections between various types of labour and in part to interpret the women workers' gamut of labour activities involved in their daily lives (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4, pp. 99-121).

Introducing a comprehensive concept like 'total labour' into an analysis does not diminish the significance of the sets of labour relations within production and reproduction. Relations in a waged labour process as well as the relations that regulate that process differentiate productive labour from other types of labour. A production regime consists of a productive labour process and its regulatory apparatuses. The former is that coordinated set of activities and relations involved in the transformation of raw materials and labour power into useful products and services by women and men, wherein surplus value is generated. The latter are institutions that regulate labour relations and consequently shape struggles in the workplace(s). The conceptual distinction between the organisation and regulation of 'total labour' from a specific vantage point accentuates the extent of the diverse sets of labour relations actually comprising productive and reproductive labour. Reconceptualising constructs in a way that brings into focus particular sets of social relations from various vantage points gets beyond the difficulties of temporal and spatial restrictions of the process of abstraction. I use production regime to explain the particular organisation of this waged domestic

---

6. Likewise, a reproduction regime consists of a reproductive labour process and its regulatory apparatuses. The former comprise the organisation of tasks in the reproduction of labour power, persons, and the social formation or social 'fabric'. (Like population as a complex abstraction, by social 'fabric' I mean capitalist society in its entirety.) The latter are those institutions and ideologies that regulate or govern and legitimate the form and conduct of the way in which individuals, groups of individuals, and the state reproduce labour power, persons, and the social formation or social 'fabric'. See Moss (1992d) for a more fully developed account of reproduction regime.
labour process in addition to using it as the backdrop against which women workers mediate their experiences of at least part of their 'total labour' (see Chapter 6, Section 6.4 and 6.5, pp. 140-180).

Meta- and meso-level conceptualisations are useful, but only in limited ways. Production regimes sort through various sets of labour relations within 'total labour'. Less extensive abstractions can even further disentangle 'total labour' by bringing into focus those labour relations and processes through which specific workers forge individual and collective class and gender identities. Class formation is that set of constitutive processes that embody individual experiences of particularised labour relations as well as the particularised relations themselves which produce and reproduce individual and collective identities. Classes form through struggles over relations of power, inside and outside the relations of surplus value extraction. Gender formation is that set of constitutive processes that involve subjective experiences of the inequitable distribution of power amongst genders, struggles of gender in all aspects of life, and the objective conditions of subjectivity. Gender forms through engaging in (re)productive labour relations and incorporates the dialectical interaction between biological and ideological constitutive processes. I use both class formation and gender formation in part to explain how these various relations (based on the uneven distribution of power between classes and genders) shape women workers' individual and collective identities and in part to interpret the ways in which women workers mediate their experiences of these relations (see Chapter 7, Section 7.4, pp. 197-269).

(4.5) ADVANTAGES

There are four principle advantages to conceptualising waged domestic labour processes in this way. First, because the process of abstraction is defined, the
mode of abstraction for each concept can be clearly delineated (see Table 4.1). This brings clarity and specificity to the analysis. For example, from the vantage point of labour, 'total labour' as an abstraction characterises a class society and is spatially congruent with a society. The concept of production regime specifies a particular organisation of labour relations and regulatory apparatuses from the vantage point of production. Temporally, production regime extends over a period of twenty to fifty years, depending on the speed of change of relations within production. Spatially, production regime covers the range of places involved in the operation of the firm or can coincide with national boundaries of political or economic units. Class formation as an abstraction addresses the specific ways that people forge individual and collective class identities from the vantage point of class. The temporal extent of class formation extends throughout either an individual's life or a generation. The spatial extent of class formation is confined to either an individual's movements or the boundaries of political or economic units. The modes of abstraction of gender formation are the same as class formation except for its vantage point - gender.

Second, the process of abstraction implicates space analytically. By distinguishing the various modes of abstraction, an analyst acknowledges the limits set on a concept by the process of abstraction. The spatial extension of each concept is brought to the fore, and highlights the spatial aspects of specific sets of social relations and processes. This strengthens geographic investigations of waged domestic labour processes in that space is implicated in the construction of social relations of labour.

Third, by using concepts in a combined explanatory and interpretive approach, an analyst can address more fully the social relations of labour in waged domestic labour processes. By using a concept in part to explain and in part to
Table 4.1. Modes of abstraction for each conceptualisation used in this theory of waged domestic labour processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Mode of abstraction</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Level of generality*</th>
<th>Vantage point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total labour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>temporal</strong></td>
<td>10,000 years; coincides with class society</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>spatial</strong></td>
<td>congruent with class society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production regime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>temporal</strong></td>
<td>20-50 years; coincides with shifts in organization of labour</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>spatial</strong></td>
<td>can be discontinuous; coincides with firm operation or with boundaries of political or economic units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class formation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>temporal</strong></td>
<td>span of individual's life; contemporary and/or generational</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>spatial</strong></td>
<td>within the confines of an individual's movements; can extend to larger political or economic units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender formation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>temporal</strong></td>
<td>span of individual's life; contemporary and/or generational</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>spatial</strong></td>
<td>within the confines of an individual's movements; can extend to larger political or economic units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See p. 40, Chapter 3, Footnote 9 for the description of each level of generality.
interpret, an analyst can fill in the gap created by making conceptual distinctions of things that appear to be congruous. For example, by conceptually distinguishing between labour and its regulation, an analyst separates what appears to be a single labour process. Production regime then in part explains the link between the labour tasks and managerial relations and in part interprets the integration of the two vis-à-vis workers' experiences. In the presentation of the analysis, it must be made clear how the concept is being used, that is, as an explanation or as an interpretation.

Fourth, this approach is adaptable. As a set, these specific concepts comprise a theory of waged domestic labour processes and each abstraction relates to another in a specific way. (See Figure 4.3 for a visual representation of the set of concepts and Figure 4.4 for a visual breakdown of the links amongst the concepts.) However, the concepts are not restricted to a theory of waged domestic labour process. Individually, these concepts can be adapted to other theories without compromising the integrity of the abstraction. For example, 'total labour' can be used to explain or interpret other groups of labourers, such as men engaged in non-domestic waged labour processes, middle-income women who employ franchise housekeepers, or individuals not engaged in waged labour outside the home. Production regime can be extended to reproduction relations, without being a simple application of a production-oriented theory. Formation processes of social relations other than class and gender, like race and ethnicity, can also be a part of this theory. Or, gender formation can be used to explain how individuals forge individual and collective identities through non-labour relations.
Figure 4.3. Visual representation of the set of concepts used in a theory of waged domestic labour processes.

### A Theory of Waged Domestic Labour Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Generality</th>
<th>Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Total Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;III&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Mode of (re)production&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Production Regime &lt;Reproduction Regime&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Class Formation Gender formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Abstractions</td>
<td>Labour Power Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Real Concrete**

---

*a For a description of the levels of generality see Chapter 3, footnote 9, p. 40

*b The mode of (re)production and reproduction regime are not discussed in this thesis but have been included to place in context the newly developed abstractions. See Chapter 4, Footnote 6, p. 75.*
Figure 4.4. Visual representation of the links amongst concepts used in a theory of waged domestic labour processes.

Total labour encompasses production and reproduction relations; vantage point of production regime is production.

'Total labour' is demonstrated through individual experiences of 'total labour'.

Conceptual distinctions amongst production and reproduction within 'total labour' sheds light on the experiences of labour and its regulation.
(4.6) DIRECTION

Re-conceptualising7 'total labour' via less extensive and more concrete abstractions provides the foundation upon which a theory of waged domestic labour processes can be constructed. Together, these concepts advance theories of waged and unwaged labour, production and reproduction, and class and gender by addressing: labour from various extensions, levels of generality, and vantage points; labour relations comprising waged domestic labour as part of production and reproduction; and the relations and processes through which waged domestic labourers forge their own individual and collective class and gender identities.

In the next three chapters, I discuss the derivation of each of these three concepts in turn by reviewing the key contributions used in its formulation. In Chapter Five, through a critique of approaches to conceptualising production and reproduction, I cast 'total labour' as a more extensive conceptualisation than either production or reproduction, yet still useful. In Chapter Six, I extend Burawoy’s (1985) concept of factory regime to production regime. In the development of class formation and gender formation in Chapter Seven, I draw heavily on Lukács’ (1971a) concept of mediation in consciousness formation as well as Rubin’s (1975) sex/gender systems. Although the concepts are linked (see Figure 4.4), for the sake of clarity, I have chosen to discuss these links sequentially, that is, 'total labour' is linked to production regime in Chapter Six and to class formation and gender formation in Chapter Seven. Production regime is linked to class formation and gender formation in Chapter Seven. After each discussion, I empirically demonstrate the conceptual arguments by drawing on primarily the information gathered during the interviews and less centrally on my own

employment experiences as a waged domestic labourer. The demonstrations are explanatory, interpretive, or sometimes both.
CHAPTER 5
CONCEPTUALISING 'TOTAL LABOUR' AND DEMONSTRATING IT EMPIRICALLY

(5.1) OUTLINE

In this chapter I discuss key contributions in marxist and feminist analyses of waged domestic labour processes. I draw out the deficiencies in conceptualising production and reproduction as parallel sets of relations or processes in an attempt to construct a new way to conceptualise production with reproduction through 'total labour'. I then conceptually outline 'total labour'. I argue that 'total labour' is a complex abstraction that seeks to capture the tension amongst reproduction and production relations and their consequent contradictions. Finally, in order to demonstrate these conceptual arguments, I discuss the women’s experiences of maintaining a household while being employed at a housekeeping services franchise. I identify themes around which the information I gathered for the project coalesced. I elaborate upon them by citing specific instances where the women manage to: accomplish all they set out to do at the beginning of the day; finance their household operations; and cope with all that is going on in their lives because of their labour related to the household and the workplace. I conclude with comments on the direction an analysis based on 'total labour' can take.

(5.2) BACKGROUND AND CRITICAL REVIEW

The shift in focus from domestic labour to reproduction in feminist marxist accounts of women’s work did not diminish the importance of domestic labour in theories of reproduction. With this shift came two sets of problems: those associated
with dual systems theories and those associated with a wholly production-oriented
analysis. Analyses of domestic labour in feminist and marxist literatures generally have
developed either from economic relations and the type of labour performed or gender
as a social division of labour. Economic analyses based on the abstraction of domestic
labour, as the key set of relations that make up reproduction, at the mode of production
level result in (1) a discussion of the productiveness of such labour within capitalism,
as in the domestic labour debate, or (2) a separate conceptualisation of a mode of
reproduction, like in the analysis of Bryceson and Vuorela (1984) (see Chapter 4,
Section 4.3, pp. 69-73). Analyses of gender as a social division of labour usually focus
on one realm, sphere, or set of relations, such as the private realm, the domestic
sphere, or familial relations. Because of the production-orientation of these domestic
labour analyses, theoretical constructs derived from these approaches imply a specific
set of economic or production relations and a corresponding set of social or
reproduction relations. What results are dual systems operating separately, yet
interconnectedly: the former comprise capitalism; the latter, patriarchy (Young 1981;
Vogel 1983). This duality is expressed spatially with productive labour taking place in
public space and reproductive labour in private space.

Socialist feminists argue that women's oppression has its roots in these two
separate sets of relations. Each set of relations feeds into the other's maintenance and

1. In addition to Fraad et al. (1983) and Bryceson and Vuorela (1984)
(reviewed in Chapter 4, Section 4.3), see Briskin (1980), O'Brien (1981), Folbre
2. See, for example, Foord and Gregson (1986), Luxton (1980), Lowe
1988b, 1989a), Bowlby, Lewis, McDowell and Foord (1989), Walby (1986a), and
Walby and Bagguley (1989). Much of the dual labour market literature is based on this
distinction as well, see Peck's (1989) review. Most of the socialist feminist analysts in
geography use gender in social relations as a starting point in their analyses, e.g.
Maroney and Luxton (1987), Little, Peake, and Richardson (1988), and Andrew and
perpetuation. How the connections between the two are forged or why they indeed exist have not been entirely sorted out. Attempts both to illustrate and to explain their interconnectedness abound.³ For example, for Barrett (1980), domestic labour is the material basis for women's oppression. With the separation of home from places of waged work and the introduction of factories for manufacturing commodities, reproduction of the labour force through domestic labour at home emerged as the material base for women's oppression. In geography, Foord and Gregson (1986) seek to provide a sound epistemological base from a realist philosophical perspective for the conceptualisation of two sets of relations, production and gender, within their historical contingencies, capitalism and patriarchy. Critics argued that although the basis for the operation of dual systems differs, that is, production and gender instead of production and reproduction, the result is still two separate spheres, each with its own logical structure (McDowell 1986; Johnson 1987; Knopp and Lauria 1987).⁴

In addition to overcoming the problems associated with dual systems analysis, theorists could not entirely break from the production-orientation of explanations of reproductive labour relations. The break was difficult for two reasons. First, having for the most part been trained in the marxist tradition, theorists addressing domestic labour framed their questions in production-oriented terms (e.g. Bruegal

³ Nearly all the works cited as socialist feminist or feminist marxist speak to this issue. Feminists drawing on other theoretical traditions can be said to do the same. Of course, these debates are couched in another set of conceptualisations. For example, see Spivak (1985), M.G. Cohen (1987), Hanson and Pratt (1988), and Dyck (1989).

⁴ The fundamental separation of labour relations into dual systems precludes a dialectical materialist analysis. If there are two separate spheres, each of which operates according to its own logic, then the causal links cannot be conceptualised except structurally or functionally. Structural connections elaborate the intricate mechanical links between sets of relations and their position in a hierarchy based on relations of economic exploitation and social oppression (e.g. Arat-Koç 1989). Functional arguments emphasise the need for unequal power relations based on the appropriation of labour of women by men and of one group of people by another in order to maintain capitalism (e.g. Connelly 1978).
1973; Barrett 1980; Malos 1980; Fox 1980). This marxist orientation of feminist scholarship in geography is still very strong (e.g. Little, Peake and Richardson 1988; Bowlby, Lewis, McDowell and Foord 1989; Mackenzie 1989b, 1989c; Penrose et al. 1992). Second, in order to present an alternative theoretical orientation, theorists had to justify their approach not only in terms of its own conceptual coherence, but also within the predominant leftist paradigm. Thus, theorists introduced alternative concepts in theories of reproduction in one of two ways: (1) identifying parallel sets of relations or processes to production in reproduction (e.g. Bryceson and Vuorela 1984; Foord and Gregson 1986) or (2) addressing the 'woman question' in new ways through, for example, the formation of specific gender ideologies or the identification of the source of women's oppression (e.g. Foreman 1977; Eisenstein 1979; Sargent 1981). It was not until later that feminist analysts asserted and empirically supported that reproduction is a legitimate orientation in academic inquiry (e.g. in geography see McDowell 1983a, 1983b; WSGS/IBG 1984; Bowlby 1984). Hence, social theories of productive and reproductive labour from a reproduction vantage point are now emerging (e.g. Ferguson 1989).

Explanations and interpretations of waged domestic labour processes arise from the works that link domestic labour to production relations via the reproductive role of labour in the household in the maintenance of capitalism. Within these works, there are analysts that try to transcend the duality of production and reproduction and to break from a production-orientation toward either a reproduction vantage point or one which is more inclusive than just production. The clearest examples of these attempts are Delphy (1984a), Fraad, Resnick and Wolff (1989), and Vogel (1983).

---

5. See the discussion on scientific justification in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.1, pp. 45-47.
Delphy (1984a) develops a materialist analysis of domestic labour conceived as housework/familial work. Rather than focusing on the maintenance of the productive labourer, she focuses on reproductive labour in the household. She views the household as a place for the production and consumption of use-value commodities and the provision of services. In order to explain more fully the distribution of power in the household, she identifies a 'new' division of labour based on remuneration, that is, 'who does what for whom'. Her notion of exploitation does not incorporate surplus labour, or labour power that produces surplus value (from Marx 1867/1987, pp. 173-192). Instead, exploitation is based on who produces and who consumes.

This analysis starkly contrasts with Fraad, Resnick and Wolff's (1989) analysis of the household. They argue that relations of appropriation of domestic labour are not based on capitalist class relations. The basis for the appropriation of labour in the household depends on the class and gender relations between household members, not on the economic relations of the public sphere. This uncouples the conventional link between capitalism and domestic labour through the reproduction of labour power. This uncoupling permits a mix of class positions in the household that are based on fundamental and subsumed class processes. The intersection of the two sets of processes are discernible at particular sites in society. The household is one such site.

---

7. This is the most visible link between productive labour and domestic labour, that is, the reproduction of labour power. Practically, this translated into a movement in the early 1970s demanding wages for housewives (Dalla Costa 1972).
8. Their argument is recounted in Chapter 4, Section 4.3, pp. 69-73.
9. These are defined in Chapter 4, Footnote 3, p. 70. Household class positions can be ancien, feudalistic, capitalist, or communal (Fraad, Resnick and Wolff 1989, p. 13).
I discuss Delphy and Fraad et al. in order to make three points. First, both address the household from a production vantage point. While Delphy wants to get beyond its limits as a unit of analysis, Fraad et al. identify the household as a site of class struggle. Delphy argues that limiting domestic labour to the household restricts the definition of work. Her resolution is to make all work part of production relations. For Fraad et al. all reproductive labour that is not necessary is surplus; thus, reproductive labour is cast in production terms. In this way, the household is a site of class struggle, not a site of struggle for control of reproductive labour or for women's emancipation. Second, both bring relations of appropriation to the fore. For Delphy, domestic labour comprises relations of appropriation couched in terms of 'who does what for whom'. For Fraad et al., relations of appropriation determine the class structure of the household in terms of a parallel set of production relations. Third, both analyses collapse reproduction into production by not conceptualising domestic labour as part of a distinct set of reproduction relations. Both cast all labour as an inherent component of some set of production relations, either within capitalism or as part of another class structure within capitalism.

These critical points, however, do not preclude extending these analyses. Though neither analysis embraces a dual systems approach, each promotes the integration of production and reproduction wherein production relations dominate reproduction relations. Yet these production-oriented analyses in some ways break from a production toward a reproduction vantage point. Delphy's definition represents a partial shift in vantage point, from production to reproduction. She reorients the discussion of domestic labour from public to private space first by treating the household as a heterogeneous unit and second by emphasising relations of appropriation within the household. Domestic labour is no longer task-oriented, nor merely exists to
support the productive labourer. Domestic labour is a set of relations. In effect, she enlarges the concept of reproduction to include reproductive labour relations outside the household. These public relations do not include productive labour relations. They include, for example, grocery shopping, elderly care, and community service.

Delphy's shift is only partial in that the reproduction vantage point is not fully developed. Delphy maintains that production now includes unwaged labour as well as remunerated and non-remunerated labour. Work is production, whether or not surplus value is generated.

Fraad et al., too, partially shift away from production, but they move toward a more inclusive conception of labour. They argue that all labour is part of a set of class processes. However, labour inside and outside the household are not part of the same set of class processes. The difference in the organisation of labour inside and outside the home is not based on the productivity of labour; rather, it is based on the relations of appropriation, which parallel various organisations of class relations within different modes of production. This shift is toward a more inclusive conception of labour in that the models for the organisation of labour in the household are micro-scale spatial application of the relations that distinguish a mode of production. The shift is only partial because the basis for designating household relations of appropriation is still rooted in productive labour, that is, that labour involved in the generation, appropriation, and distribution of surplus value.

Vogel (1983) builds her theory of women's oppression from a similar set of issues and topics that Delphy and Fraad et al. address in their analyses. Like Delphy, Vogel (1983) sees that the material source of women's oppression is domestic labour, located in the household as part of the domestic sphere. Vogel goes on to argue that relations of oppression are integrated in reproduction and production relations as the
political rights of women. These rights are historically constituted within labour relations in each society. Like Fraad et al., Vogel argues that the economic conditions of the household, especially with regard to women bearing children, lactating, and caring for infants, are historically constituted. She sets up her arguments from a vantage point that encompasses both production and reproduction. She then demonstrates that domestic labour, organised around social reproduction including generational replacement of workers, is the primary source of women’s oppression from which other subordinate relations emerge. Because Vogel is interested in women’s emancipation, she takes the analyses further by stating that liberation of women comes through the socialisation of domestic labour.

The advantage of Vogel’s analysis is twofold. She does not adopt a dual systems approach, nor is her analysis wholly production-oriented. She avoids dualities by conceptualising the tension between reproduction and production without designating them as separate spheres. She does this in a number of ways. She approaches women’s oppression at a more extensive level of generality. She does not theorise patriarchy as a universal condition of existence, nor as a particular set of power relations characteristic of a group of people. She develops a theory of women’s position in society, while maintaining a commitment to women’s liberation. She does not begin her analysis with a characteristic set of labour relations. She abstracts labour in class society, not labour relations in a capitalist patriarchy. She bases her arguments on an historical, concrete analysis of women’s position(s) at present, but does not slip into designating as unique a particular set of circumstances.

Vogel’s analysis is important because she does not limit herself in discussing reproduction in terms of production. For her, to do so creates an unfortunate duality between productive and reproductive labour. She argues that in
such cases, reproductive labour is further restricted to just the household, which inadvertently focuses on the analysis on the functions of the family (Vogel 1983, p. 27). Instead, Vogel distinguishes between types of labour in public and domestic spheres in terms of surplus and necessary labour. The appropriators of surplus labour hold political rights. Vogel identifies the appropriators as men with money. Vogel does not collapse reproduction back into production after making a conceptual distinction between the two. She conceptualises reproduction with production in the form of class society.

These works indicate the conceptual boundaries that need to be challenged in a theory of waged domestic labour. First, the dominance of production-oriented abstractions in such a theory needs to be challenged. Conceptualising waged domestic labour processes from more than one vantage point, an analyst can enhance an explanation or interpretation by widening the scope and increasing the number of lenses through which the theorist views relations in waged domestic labour. Rather than including all labour as part of production relations either through surplus value generation or class, it is constructive to maintain that domestic labour not only can be waged, commodified, and appropriated through market relations (from a production vantage point), but also extends beyond one’s own household to public places and other private space (from a reproduction vantage point). In this way, for example, even though they carry out the same tasks in different places, franchise housekeepers are simultaneously engaged in production and reproduction. An explanation and interpretation of franchise housekeepers’ labour based on abstractions from various vantage points corresponds more closely to their daily activities of cleaning for money and cleaning for love.
Second, the equation of the household and domestic labour needs to be challenged. Analyses of domestic labour in the household have been restricted to the household as a spatial unit of analysis. By conceptualising domestic labour from a reproduction vantage point, an analyst breaks the spatial restrictions of the household. From a reproduction vantage point, domestic labour is all labour that secures the conditions for the reproduction of: (re)production relations (social reproduction); individuals engaged in (re)production relations (maintaining a household); and people as labour commodities (biological reproduction). This conception incorporates labour involved in maintaining the household which is outside the home, for example, grocery shopping, laundromats, and extended family care, and in collective consumption, for example, teaching, planning, and some medical services. In this way, domestic labour reaches beyond the household.

Third, there needs to be a clarification of the producers and consumers of use-values in waged domestic labour processes. If, according to Marx:

labour-power is to be understood [as] the aggregate of those mental and physical capabilities existing in a human being, which he [sic] exercises whenever he [sic] produces a use-value of any description (1867/1987, p. 164),

10. Though inclusive of numerous sets of relations, domestic labour from a reproduction vantage point still can be useful analytically. For example, at the level of generality of particular class societies (level IV in Ollman’s scheme of abstraction), domestic labour from a reproduction vantage point illustrates the extent to which labour power is expended outside production relations. It also highlights the production-orientation of the concept of mode of production, which identifies a society based on the organisation of productive labour. More concretely, at a level of generality that identifies general characteristics of individuals (level II in Ollman’s scheme of abstraction), domestic labour from a reproduction vantage point reinstates the validity of reproductive labour and the value of women’s labour. In this way, reproductive labour is recognised as a significant and valuable part of daily life. Recognition of the predominance of women’s participation in reproductive labour accents the distributive processes of power through relations of domination in and appropriation of labour that is often devalued (e.g. as in ‘just a housewife’). Recall the levels of generality in Ollman’s scheme of abstraction from Chapter 3, Footnote 9, p. 40.
then domestic labour is as much a part of labour power as labour that generates surplus value. Instead of focusing on whether or not labour is waged, analysts need to clarify who consumes and who appropriates the use-value commodities and services produced in domestic labour relations. This shifts the analysis from labour relations within production to labour power within reproduction. Most clearly, waged domestic labour processes would be part of the maintenance of a household. In the case of housekeeping services franchises, people hire labourers through a manager to get their houses cleaned. The customer 'consumes' the clean house that the labour 'produces'. Franchise housekeepers also 'produce' their own clean houses, which they and other household members 'consume'. Relations of appropriation are clear in the former example wherein labour is waged. In the latter, relations of appropriation are less clear because the extent to which the franchise housekeeper and other household member(s) 'produce' and 'consume' is not confirmed.

Challenging these boundaries brings into question the accepted set of links and connections amongst relations of domestic labour, household, oppression, reproduction, and production. The next section proffers 'total labour' as a reconstructed conceptualisation of reproduction with production.

(5.3) CONCEPTUALISING 'TOTAL LABOUR'

Labour power, as the capacity of individuals to produce use-values of any description (Marx 1867/1987, p. 164; see Section 5.2, pp. 84-94) is implicated in all labour relations, whether or not that labour is productive, reproductive, waged,

11. Waged domestic labour processes would also be part of social reproduction in that the labourers, for example franchise housekeepers, forge individual and collective identities (that are both gendered and classed) through interacting with managers, co-workers, and customers. These identities and relations shape individuals' actions with regard to acquiescing to, participating in, challenging, contesting, and transforming (re)productive labour relations within which they are engaged.
unwaged, remunerated, non-remunerated, domestic, public, necessary, or surplus. Within a set of labour relations, by utilising labour power, individuals act and/or react to their material surroundings and natural environment and produce use-value commodities and/or services. In a class society, labour relations, in any of its forms or combination of forms, distinguish a particular society. *Total labour* comprises all labour relations involved in the maintenance of life in a class society.  

Conceptualising labour relations in this way overcomes two of the difficulties theorists have had who are interested in explaining and interpreting domestic labour. First, the duality between productive and reproductive labour is overcome by conceptualising labour relations at a different level of generality. And, second, the concept of 'total labour' is not production-oriented thus breaking the cycle of addressing waged and unwaged domestic labour in terms of production. *Total labour* is a complex abstraction that seeks to capture the tension amongst reproduction and production relations and their consequent contradictions. It does so in two ways: labour relations can be understood as part of 'total labour' from either a production or reproduction vantage point and 'total labour' situates labour in such a way that reproduction and production comprise the same set of relations. I now turn to a discussion of each.

Labour relations can be understood as part of 'total labour' from either a production or reproduction vantage point. 'Total labour' is expressed as reproduction and production relations within particularised societies. Following from the discussion in Section 5.2 above (pp. 84-94), reproduction comprises three aspects: social reproduction, the reproduction of labour power as a commodity, and biological  

---

12. Conventional marxist abstractions at these higher levels of generality are production-oriented, as in mode of production. 'Total labour' is conceptualised from the vantage point of labour.
reproduction. Social reproduction comprises those labour relations that secure the conditions for sustaining the existing social relations of production and reproduction. The reproduction of labour power as a commodity includes all labour relations involved in the creation and maintenance of a household. Biological reproduction refers to the physiological and biological processes involved in having children. Also, from previous discussion (Chapter 4, Section 4.2, pp. 63-69), production comprises those relations involved in the process of the transformation of natural materials into commodities and services, which generates surplus value. Only within a particular organisation of labour relations, like patriarchal capitalism, can an individual sell her/his labour power as a commodity in market relations and engage in productive labour. Once an individual engages in labour relations that generate surplus value, from the vantage point of production, she/he is engaged in production relations. That same labour, from a reproduction vantage point, permits the individual to secure an income to finance her/his 'total labour'. The tasks performed do not define labour, the particular organisations of production and reproduction characterise more concretely specific sets of labour relations, like for example, a production regime.⁴¹

A second way in which 'total labour' seeks to capture the tension between production and reproduction relations is that it situates labour in such a way that reproduction and production comprise the same set of relations.⁴² Engels (1884/1983)

---

13. This argument is made more extensively in Chapter 6.
14. This conception has precedence in Marx's and Engel's works. In both The German Ideology and Capital, Volume 1, Marx states that production and consumption are simultaneously the same set of relations though not identical (Marx 1846/1988, p. 130; 1867/1987, p. 536-538). In explaining this set of relations vis-à-vis simple reproduction, consumption has a four-fold meaning (Marx 1846/1988, p. 131 and 1867/1987, p. 536). Consumptive production consists of the utilisation of a commodity produced within production relations, that is, the commodity's use-value is realised. The labourer engages in other two types of consumption, productive and individual. In productive consumption the producer consumes the labour power of the labourer and, simultaneously, the labour consumes the means of production. These relations set the scene for discussions of the circulation of capital and labour, and the
makes this point in his discussion of the materiality of history as the production and reproduction of life in The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State:

this itself is of a twofold character. On the one hand, the production of the means of subsistence, of food, clothing and shelter and the tools requisite therefore; on the other, the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species (p. 6).

This materialist conception of history has been part of the socialist feminist bond to marxism. Socialist feminists interested in domestic labour argue that labour power produces use-values *part passu* within reproduction relations (Vogel 1983; Mackenzie and Rose 1983; McDowell 1986; Mackenzie 1988a). This reinforces the argument that the defining characteristic of labour power, the production of use-value commodities and services, exists in both production and reproduction. From the viewpoint of 'total labour', the above passage illustrates that production and reproduction are the same set of relations. And, by extension, all labour power within 'total labour' can be sorted into two basic processes: production of the means of subsistence and the production of human beings, or production and reproduction.\(^\text{15}\)

There are two advantages in using 'total labour' to explain and interpret women's experiences of labour in waged domestic labour processes. First, by using 'total labour' I emphasise the simultaneity of reproduction and production relations, rather than their polarity (*cf.* Glucksmann 1990a, 1990b). An artificial division

\[^\text{15}\] This is a very general distinction. The production of luxury goods, scientific and technological research, and the built environment are also part of 'total labour'.
between waged and domestic labour has in the past prevented theorists from developing complete explanations and detailed interpretations of individuals’ experiences of labour. Since 'total labour' is expressed as reproduction and production relations in particularised societies, reproduction and production relations include all labour simultaneously.\footnote{16} Specific organisations of production relations can be seen as part of the reproduction of the human species just as easily as part of the generation of surplus value. The flexibility of the concept 'total labour', that is, viewing the same set of labour relations from different vantage points, permits an analyst to develop more fully an account of the labour relations within which individuals engage.

Second, class and gender are indeterminate in 'total labour' \textit{(cf. Glucksmann 1990a, 1990b)}. Only through less extensive and more concrete conceptualisations are class and gender fixed. If reproduction and production as sets of relations are kept at bay, wherein each has its own internal structure and distinct determinate relations, class and gender, too, must be kept separate (as in dual systems theories).\footnote{17} Within 'total labour', gender and class are collapsed into the labourer, and are only expressed when the individual expends, or attempts to expend, her/his labour power and enters into labour relations. Class and gender formation processes and conditions of formation, which constitute an individual’s class and gender, are integral to reproduction and production relations in that through these relations the social constructions of class and gender are forged by individuals through their labour. It is only in less extensive abstractions, like that of class formation and gender formation, that class and gender are conceptually distinct.

\footnote{16. Thus, 'total labour' is not an amalgamation of production relations and reproduction relations.}
\footnote{17. For a comment on the disadvantages of dual systems theories, see Section 5.2, Footnote 4, p. 86.}
In conceptualising waged domestic labour processes, I use 'total labour' as a concept that in part explains labour relations in specific places at particular times as well as in part interprets an individual's experiences of those labour relations. In the following section, I demonstrate 'total labour' by drawing on the experiences of the women employed in housekeeping services franchises. I organise the discussion around the three themes of managing, financing and coping with 'total labour'.

(5.4) TOTAL LABOUR AS 'I DO EVERYTHING'

'Total labour' as a concept cannot explain in detail the daily lives of the women participating in this project. It can, however, provide a set of guidelines within which I can describe the women's experiences of the labour relations comprising production and reproduction. My intent is to illustrate by example the ways these women manage to: accomplish all they set out to do at the beginning of the day; finance their household operations; and cope with all that is going on in their lives because of their labour related to both the household and the workplace. Managing 'total labour' entails the direct arrangements for running the household, which accommodates labour tasks both inside and outside the household. Financing 'total labour' deals with securing, budgeting, and distributing the household income. Coping with 'total labour' refers to the strategies the women have adopted or developed in order to be able to endure the pressures of having to take on such a large proportion of reproductive labour as well as being employed in housekeeping services franchises. These strategies have both temporal and spatial aspects. With respect to the conceptual arguments made in Section 5.3, I now turn to a discussion of the ways in which the women participating in this study manage, finance, and cope with their 'total labour'.
(5.4.1) Managing total labour or 'doing it all'

All but one of the women said they did everything when we talked about labour in the home. I brought up the subject by asking what did they do to maintain a household. Almost immediately, each woman took back "everything" and said "nearly everything". After talking through the specific tasks each member of the household does, it was clear that the women did do "as close to everything as possible" without actually doing "everything". And, as it turned out, the woman who did not respond by saying "everything" actually did more labour in the home than most of the other women. It only appeared that she did not do "everything" because she packed all her labour in on the weekend - preparing meals for the week, grocery shopping, laundry, cleaning, banking, and entertaining. So, how is it that a woman actually organises her time so that "everything" is done on a daily basis?

Anne lives with her husband, Jack, and 22 year old daughter, Carrie. Her day begins at 6:15a. She gets breakfast together, juice, toast, and tea for three. She showers, passes Carrie on the steps, and leaves at 7:30a. After cleaning for Hannah's, Anne comes home, pops dinner in the oven, and takes a forty five minute nap. She eats with Jack and Carrie and then cleans the kitchen afterwards. In the evening, she does a bit of laundry and turns in early. The rest of "everything" is crammed in on the weekends. She said that when she was home all the time, she had more choice of what to do and when, but she did not get any more done. Now that she has a routine, she feels better.

Michelle has to make sure her infant's needs are taken care of throughout the day. She said it was easier when she was living with Andrea's father. Their morning routine was getting up together at about 7:00a. James would play with Andrea while Michelle got ready for work. She drove to work at 7:45a. James was
left with the care of Andrea until he dropped her off at his mother’s and drove to work at 10:00a. He picked her up again at 2:00p and had supper ready for Michelle at 5:00p. James then went to his second job, from 7:00p to 11:00p. Michelle would care for Andrea from after supper until she put her to bed in the evening. This arrangement lasted for only three months.

After James moved out, Michelle had a difficult time arranging care for Andrea. At first she tried to maintain the ties with James’ mother, but the situation worsened when James threatened to sue for custody. Then, two new friends moved in with the idea of taking care of Andrea. Unfortunately, the friends failed to contribute any money toward food or rent and were not reliable in caring for Andrea. For example, they forgot they had to be home in the early evening for Andrea’s bedtime. This situation put Michelle in an emotionally draining state of mind as well as dire financial straits. She finally decided that living on mother’s allowance was the only viable option. She quit her job at the housekeeping services and hopes to take some classes at the local vocational college.

Beatrice’s daily life differs from both Anne’s and Michelle’s. She has no children to care for. She lives with Michael who is employed at a factory across town. The time in the afternoon between when she gets home and he gets home is the time she tries to get all the chores done around the house, because he prefers her to sit with him in the evening and watch TV. He complains if she has to do the laundry (which is downstairs) while he is home. For Beatrice, this means an added stress - she has to organise her time around his schedule. Beatrice accepts having to schedule her time around Michael’s because she loves him and wants to please him.

Traveling becomes an impediment when the woman does not own a car or when there is no direct public transit connecting her to her place of work. One of the
key factors in Lori’s decision to quit working at Hannah’s was the lengthy commute. She travelled between an hour and a half and an hour and forty five minutes one way from her home to the office. Since the buses ran only every twenty minutes in her area, she had to catch the 6:20a bus in order to make sure that she got to the office before 8:00 a.\textsuperscript{18}

To get to the office in the morning, the other women drive their own cars, like Michelle; drive the company car, like the supervising maids; or ride with a supervising maid. For the most part, the supervising maids did not mind picking up their cleaning partners in the morning and dropping them off at the end of the day. It only became a problem when a team finished across town and had to go through downtown to get home. Patrice’s cleaning partner, Kate, is single and lives downtown. Patrice sometimes dreads going through downtown traffic, especially when they end their day near her home. Kate offers gas money, but Patrice refuses because she thinks that Kate needs the money more than she does. Supervising maids at Hannah’s Housekeeping Services are not supposed to pick up other employees in the morning; everyone is to make their own way to the office. In practice, the supervising maids pick up the maids that live near them or are on their way to the office. The same goes for dropping workers off at night. Breaking this rule permits the women to make friends and gives them time to talk about the business. They break the rule as long as it doesn’t cut into the time they need, for example, to cook, shop, or run errands.

One of the most important perks for working as a supervising maid with a housekeeping services franchise is the use of the car during ‘non-work’ hours. Both Anne’s and Alice’s husband owns a car, and neither uses the car extensively outside business time. They both said that it would be more of a hassle for their husbands to

\textsuperscript{18} Susie had to give up a $10.40 per hour part-time job in food services at the university hospital because of a similar commute.
drop them off in the morning, but it would not be impossible. Nancy, being single and having no access to another car, used the franchise's car for "getting around town". Without the use of the car, she would not be able to visit friends or families as often, go out after dark, or accomplish her banking, laundry, and shopping on the weekends. More of her time would be devoted to organising her activities around available transportation networks, either public or through her friends and family. Amy, too, uses the car extensively for visiting family, running errands, shopping, taking the kids to various places, and so on.

Patrice's experience of the use of the car was empowering and liberating. We were discussing the possibility of going into her own cleaning business:

I would like to go into - well, my husband is unemployed at the moment - I've tried to get into the hospital [cleaning] a few times, without any success, but I really would like to get in. And, that's the only thing that's keeping me back is giving 'Clare' back. Because I don't know what I, I don't know what I'd do without her because I've never been on a bus in two, well, a year. ... And even the kids, like, you know, they don't like to drive in 'Clare' because it's got the Clare's Cleaning signs all over it. But, my son and his friends, like I drive them everywhere. I take them skiing, tobogganing, skidooving, or wherever it is to, like Chedoke. I take them roller skating in Burlington. And we go to the States. We go to Buffalo shopping all the time. And it's in 'Clare'. I take them all everywhere. ... You can't really lease a car for $32 [a week], you know? (Patrice)\(^\text{19}\)

The car gives her the freedom "to go here and there" which she never had before.

Accomplishing all the tasks comprised by 'total labour' is tiring, really tiring.

It wore you out by the end of the day. It was really hard work. The main drawback was that being real tired and the winter time it was worse. Because you had the snow and all that stuff, but the main drawback was being really, really tired by the end of the day. And not being able to do anything that night. (Nancy)

So, by the end of the week,

\(^{19}\) Quotes from the conversations with the women are referenced in this manner. Dates are listed under "Multiple-depth Conversations with ..." in the Bibliography.
If it is a heavy week, sometimes I actually think about, 'Oh, I wish this is over, I hate this house with a passion.' You know, it’s just because you’re tired, you know. (Francie)

Taking on paid labour outside the home is a double-edged sword:

It got me out and interacting with people, … [but] sometimes it would get too, too much at times. (Candy)

Coping with tiredness was an on-going battle for the women. Kelly would take a shower when she came home from Clare’s to refresh her for the rest of the day.

Francie would try to sit and relax, with her feet up, for at least a half an hour in the afternoon, before starting supper or the laundry. Amy taps the "Young and the Restless" during the day and watches it when she gets home.

But not all the women are able to take a break in the afternoon, especially if the day goes on longer than expected. Alice has hardly any time for herself:

By the time I get home, I don’t have the time to be just by myself. It’s go home, sit for five or ten minutes, then I got to start cooking. And I got to start cleaning. There’s just not enough time for myself. (Alice)

Patrice, Candy, Susie, and Michelle keep going nearly all day, until nine or ten o’clock when they can watch television while doing the laundry. Beatrice looks forward to the time that Michael is on afternoon shift because she actually gets time to herself. In between his rotating shifts, she rewards herself for surviving a week of work with a pair of earrings, some cologne, or some craft materials.

All the women in the study simultaneously accept and contest the unequal distribution of labour and responsibility for bringing home a income. For example, even though Amy thinks that "men are the breadwinners" and that women should not threaten men by pursuing careers, she works for Clare’s and plans to be a hospital care worker. She feels inferior to her husband, but says she likes it. Besides, that is the way things "should be":

You don’t have the pressure that a man does. Like taking care and supporting the whole family. And having that kind of weight on your shoulders. Whereas,
I think, like, I myself, I believe I’m just a supplement income right now.  
(Amy)

Anne, too, believes that men shoulder most of the responsibility for caring for the family. However, her husband is not exempt from taking on chores. Jack defrosts the meals that Anne has prepared on the previous Sunday. Jack also vacuums, dusts, and does the laundry occasionally. For Anne "housework is not just women’s work". But, Anne believes that there are "men’s jobs and ... women’s jobs" and there should be no crossover.  

Susie gets fed up with having to do everything. Her kids will not do their chores unless she yells at them. She introduced allowances for the kids if they kept their rooms straight, but it does not seem to be working. She encourages the older children to care for the younger one. Her husband lives near his job during the week and comes home on the weekends. She’s tired of all the responsibility for raising the children. It is:

[j]ust the same when I was single. Like I was a single parent then and I’m a married single parent now. Because that’s what it is. ... [I say] you’re the father-figure, you do something about it. Because I get tired of doing it. You know, they hear from me all the time so they just look at me and like laugh. Like, ‘She’s on the warpath again’. It blows over. Goes in one ear and out the other. So if he speaks then they know like, business. ... I have all the responsibility that two parents would have. (Susie)

It is different for Candy. After having a baby, Candy learned that life runs more smoothly if she does not openly confront her husband. She is involved in a church group for young mothers. The other mothers encourage her to keep the home a happy place for the baby and leave the breadwinning to Gary. She finds this very difficult to deal with because she thinks differently about relations between women and

---

20. Amy contributes just under 40 percent of the household’s monthly income. Her husband, Steve, collects unemployment insurance and takes a class at the local vocational college.

21. Anne expressed her concern over my future relationship with Karl and my career aspirations. She said they didn’t mix and that I should be careful. Amy expressed the same concerns.
men. Candy thinks that men feel superior to women because of a built-up resentment of their mothers and old girlfriends and that they shouldn’t take it out on their wives.

Financially, she is quite aware that she would be much better off if Gary were to leave, that is, she would be eligible for mother’s allowance. Yet, the satisfaction she finds in her daily life prevents her from actively challenging her surroundings:

I can accept the roles that I have, but I have a tendency to get ticked when somebody puts those roles on me, even if I am already taking on the role. Don’t tell me I’m a full-time mother. Don’t tell me. ... Don’t tell me that that’s what I have to do. Same as, probably four times a day, I walk around ‘I hate this place!’ I try not to do that. It angers me because of the class we’re in, because especially with the baby I can’t do all the things that I would like to do with him. ... If I thought that this was where I would be for the rest of my life, I don’t think that I would be able to enjoy it as much. Now I know that that’s not a very nice attitude to have, but just as a human being, if I find that this is my life. It’s not that I sit everyday and think ‘And someday I’m going to have a house, one day I’m going to have a two bedroom apartment.’ If I don’t sit and do that everyday, but I also don’t have that in the back of my mind that this is where I’m stuck. This is it. This is life. Because, it, you know, for sure, it’s a drag on your husband. Now, it [life] has a little boy, a family that loves me. But you still need those other things there. (Candy)

Still, Candy has to ‘do it all’, she has to do everything. If she does not do it, it will not get done.

As a teenager, Francie’s parents blamed her for her budding sexuality. They called her a tramp. In order to get out of the house, Francie married Elgin. Later, Elgin blamed Francie for many things, like not being able to hold a job (a job where her male boss made sexual advances toward her), spending money frivolously (for birthday gifts for her children), and always letting the children get away without helping around the house. Francie talks about having her teenagers not doing more for themselves:

That’s mainly my fault, too. I should have made them do more. I was always home to do it. So, I never thought much about it because I was home to do it. So, I did it. And, they were either in school or out playing. But by the time they got back, everything was done, eh? So, you know, they never had anything to do. And then on the weekends, the same thing. Then, when I was working I was so used to doing it that I get it done and in a routine that I don’t
have to do everything everyday. So, I don't make them do it. But my husband
thinks I should make them do it. But, again, it goes to the fact that it was too
much fuss and I'd rather do it myself. ... I don't like to hear a bunch of crying,
whining, fussing, and fighting. I don't like the fighting, I just don't like the
fighting. So you see the point that it is easier to do rather than to force them.
... They know how to do it ... it is just that [they] won't do it. (Francie)

Francie's attitude toward her family crystallised with a recent operation when she was
off work for six weeks. She realised just how much she did for everyone around the
house. For example, someone put the toilet paper roll in the bathroom, but it sat there
until Francie put it on the holder.

I get a little bit tired of that because I like taking care of people and I like taking
care of my home, but I would like to know that they can go on their own. And,
I know, my husband, definitely, if anything ever happened to me, he would live
in a slob house. And would eat things that probably went bad. ... Things like
that make me mad, because they don't even know how to use their own hands.
I see it and it irritates me. 22 (Francie)

(5.4.2) Financing total labour or 'paying for living'

Financing 'total labour' primarily involves two activities, securing incomes
in order to maintain a household and maintaining the household given the amount of
household income. All the women participating in this investigation had more than one
source of income (see Table 5.1). The distribution of the sources of income by the
number of household are presented in Table 5.2. 23 It is important to note that none of
the women finance their 'total labour' via one income. This is for two reasons. First,
income from housekeeping services franchises is not enough to sustain a household.
For example, the two women living 'on their own', one with a room mate and the

22. In nearly the same words, Patrice's expresses her attitudes toward 'doing it all':

He [husband] doesn't do anything, really. I do everything. ... I'm happy when
everybody else is happy. When everybody's happy, I'm happy. ... I feel
responsible. (Patrice)

23. I do not feel comfortable going into more detail about the distributions
of source of income by household composition. I want the households to remain
anonymous.
### Table 5.1. Household by number of sources of income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Number of Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One adult households:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one adult</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with one child</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with three children</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two adult households:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two adults</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with roommate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with one child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with two children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with three children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three adult households:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three adults</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The number expresses the total number of sources recorded during the investigation and includes all changes in the sources of income over the period September 1990 to May 1991, for all members contributing to the household income. There are a total of 16 different households (3 of the 13 women changed the structure of their household during the investigation) with 58 sources (see Table 5.2 for more information). Sources counted twice have been removed from the total.
Table 5.2. Source of income by number of households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waged labour:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman’s income from housekeeping service</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman’s income from additional employment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman’s income from change in employment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man’s income from paid labour</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baby bonus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welfare supplement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother’s allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployment benefits</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maternity benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency welfare funds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child support from biological parent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parent or other family member</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes all changes in the sources of income over the duration of the investigation, from September 1990 to May 1991, for all members contributing to the household income. There are a total of 16 different households (3 of the 13 women participating in the investigation changed the structure of their household during the investigation) with 58 sources (see Table 5.1).*
other by herself, cannot make ends meet on their own income: the former receives welfare supplements; the latter, money from family members and emergency state welfare funds. For two adult households with children, only two could make ends meet with an income each from the adults, plus the baby bonus. Moreover, one of the three sources of one of these households was unemployment benefits.

Second, though none of the incomes derived from housekeeping services franchises can maintain a household, nearly all of the women’s incomes are necessary to maintain their households. In other words, if any of the women’s income were taken away, the maintenance of the household would suffer. For example, in all but three households, if the woman’s income were deducted, the household income would fall below $26,000, the low income cut-off for a family of four in the Hamilton region in 1991 (Statistics Canada 1991, Income Distribution).

Details of the household finances can show where the money goes. Since all the women but one managed the household finances, a comprehensive picture of household members’ types of incomes, major expenses, and spending habits emerges. Only one woman was employed in a second job. It was a seasonal sales position for about a week before a major holiday, that is, Halloween, Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter. Only one man took on a second job, both part-time jobs in the fast food services. Clearly, the state supplements the income of most of the households. Aside from the universal baby bonus, 10 households received some type of assistance. Baby bonuses go directly for expenses for the children, whether it be clothes, school

24. One case is a surmise, since one woman gave me no financial information. All gave me monthly figures from which I calculated approximate yearly incomes. One woman told me that her husband had told her not to give me income figures or any other financial information. She said that she told him not to be "silly" and that she "wouldn’t be able to hide" their income.

Look around! Yeah, we’re just living like this because we like it. We’re actually millionaires!
activities, or leisure. Other income sources from the state are for subsistence and maintenance. Welfare supplements topped up the monthly income the women were making at the housekeeping services franchise to $1,000 per month. Mother's allowance requires the woman to be on welfare for three months before receiving benefits, which are about the same at $1,000 per month. Unemployment benefits are based on the amount of money the labourer was earning immediately prior to the claim. Only one of the women claimed unemployment during the investigation. Four women changed jobs, one went on maternity leave, and one went on mother's allowance. Child support cheques went into the household general funds with the rationale that the money was to assist in maintaining a healthy living environment for the children. Additional funds from parents or other family members assisted two households.25

   Household expenses were standard: rent or mortgage; groceries; hydro; phone; clothing; car insurance; gas; and cable. In all cases, most of these expenses, except the groceries, were covered by the man's income when there was a man contributing to the household income. The women's incomes covered groceries and most of the other expenses, for example, baby-sitters, birthday gifts, birthday parties, tuition fees, bus passes, cigarettes, and beer. Women purchased cigarettes and beer, though leisure items, every week. Household appliances and furniture, usually chosen by the women, were purchased on account. The property tax bill was the most difficult to pay, because it was a lump sum with no choice of 'on account'. Any extras, like trips, shopping for 'fun', or going out for an evening, were difficult to come by, because household expenses took up nearly all the household income.

   Working outside the home and control of the household finances indicated independence for the women: "I don't like to spend his money. I like to spend my

25. Nancy's mother gave her $50 so that she could pay the hydro bill one month and Michelle's grandmother bought Andrea's Christmas toys one year.
money." (Patrice) These women do not like to be financially dependent on men: "My husband? If I gave him my pay, he would not give me spending money". (Francie)

For Candy, controlling household income meant having one less stressful situation in her daily life. Candy expressed her concerns, after having a baby:

So it wasn't like I was going into the bank and monitoring the situation. And lately I found that we are almost going to be massively in debt if I don't start taking control. I tried to be nice about. But, basically, 'you cannot go to the bank anymore', 'you cannot take out any money', and 'you definitely cannot do it without asking me'. But, I don't want to say it in that way because I still respect him. It's important that people feel they are respected. (Candy)

Nearly every woman would deposit her cheque and then immediately withdraw money for groceries and shop on Friday afternoon or evening. Michelle gave me details about how she paid all her bills and managed the money:

When I get the bill, I just go to the banking machine with my card. And I put, uh, you know how you can make a bill payment right from the banking machine. Well, I just stick the stub of the bill in the envelope and it comes directly out of my account. ... I could go down to, I could go straight to the place and pay it. It would probably be cheaper, but I just think it's a lot easier to [bank by machine]. But if they charge you some money when you do it that way, but you know, I think it is a lot easier to be able to as soon as you get the bill. It doesn't matter what time of day it is. Instead of putting it off for days until you can get down there. ... [With my cheque] I go to the bank and cash it and buy whatever I need and if there's anything left over then I put it in the bank. Or, if there is only about forty bucks left I'll stick it in my wallet because I know I'll be needing stuff, like gas or whatever. (Michelle)

And then, if there is any left over money, the woman gets to spend her money on something for herself:

I like to smoke. If I have the cash, I will buy the cigarettes. I know it is not a very good habit. To me, it is a relaxing sort of thing. I guess psychologically, it tells me that I'm doing something that I'm enjoying because I have nothing else that I can enjoy on my own. And, I'm going to do it. This is what I like to do. (Francie)

When money gets 'tight', the women as household finance managers had to cut back. For example, Kelly was the only woman who said that she would buy on credit if money were tight. Patrice cuts back on the allocation of leisure funds to her
family. So, instead of $20 for the week, her husband and two children get only $10 each. Alice decides whether or not to buy beer or go to the movies. Most of the women, if they did go out every once in a while, simply do not go out. Beatrice does not like to cut back on leisure expenses because she thinks they are integral to one's psychological health (see Section 5.4.3). Instead, she plans for a small income week by buying food only on sale and not buying beer.

Sometimes, though, even more extras are cut out. For example, Kelly also tends to deplete her cupboards when money is tight. There is always enough food, it just comes from cans and boxes more often. Nearly everyone cuts back on snacks and candies. Lynn, Michelle, Amy, and Alice cut back on cigarette money. Women with cars will take gas money from friends and co-workers. At times, Lynn and Nancy have cleaned an extra house on the weekend to get a little bit of extra money. Patrice said that she calculates her driving time and plans her routes very well to save gas. And, like Beatrice, Francie plans well in advance for a drop in income. She will stretch the meat over a period of three weeks instead of two.

As a last resort, money is cut to affect household members' needs. For example, the women tend to go to work when they are sick because they literally cannot afford to miss out on one day's income. Patrice buys cornflakes for breakfast because her family doesn't like them, so she knows they will last longer than other cereals. Candy had to choose to move into housing geared to income because she could not afford daycare if she were to be employed outside the home. Nancy and Lynn applied for emergency welfare funds and received what they requested. Everyday is tough and cutting back on extras is difficult when there are very few extras to cut back on. With regard to her own spending, Nancy put it most succinctly:

Nothing really I can stop. All my bills have to be paid. I don't do that much out of work, so? (Nancy)
(5.4.3) Coping with total labour through a 'balancing act'.

To 'do it all' requires a 'balancing act'. That 'balancing act' includes the ways women deal with and confront their situations as well as challenge and formally contest the (re)production relations within which they are engaged. Strategies the women develop on their own, adopt from other women, and adapt to their own use permit them to adjust to their surroundings in varying degrees through processes of consent, concession, avoidance, tolerance, endurance, contestation, resistance, and opposition. Moreover, by actually accomplishing all the tasks involved in 'total labour', this 'balancing act' reconfirms women's experiences and validates the strategies they use for coping with both their waged and unwaged labour.

When dealing with conflict with people, the women said they would be passive at first, but when they finally took action, it was decisive. Susie’s mother-in-law is quite difficult for Susie to deal with. She challenges the way Susie raises her grandchild (Nick's child by another woman) in ways that subvert Susie’s authority in the eyes of the nine year old girl. Susie is not always home when Amanda gets home and when the mother-in-law finds out, she phones Susie and makes a point of telling her what a bad mother she is. After deciding that being quiet and taking the insults were not working and after Nick asked her to apologise to his mother, Susie began acting the part of "the bitch": "My name is mud anyway, so why not start acting the part". (Susie)

Michelle kicked James out after he beat her up and locked her outside the apartment. Unfortunately, this act of empowerment led to a series of Children's Aid investigations and a custody suit over Andrea. So far, Michelle has been able to keep Andrea. This situation was crucial in her decision to go on mother's allowance rather than be employed in waged labour outside the home.
Patrice finds that joking is the best remedy for coping at both home and work. However, with her daughter, conflict arises no matter what approach she takes. Angie does not go to school, does "absolutely nothing" around the house, and is out to all hours of the night. Patrice uses "telling her father" as the threat to keep her "in line". Often, though, the conflict comes to physical blows. Patrice still 'wins', but endures a lot of pain, emotionally and physically. Patrice encouraged Angie to get a job and try to make it on her own. After about six months, Angie came back home to live and has been going to school most of the time.

Kelly, Alice, and Francie cope with the labour in their lives differently. Not much stresses Kelly. Her life was the most even-keeled arrangement I have encountered (both inside and outside research). Kelly likes things to be ordered, but she now can live without it. She learned to be more tolerant of things going awry as well as to follow through with her "threats". For example, instead of fighting with the kids to get up in the morning, she has decided "If you’re late, it’s your problem". (Kelly) And she leaves them behind. She thinks that if everyone were to "pitch in" balancing work at home and at Clare’s would be easier. She does not want all the housework to be left for her and her two daughters. "Men can do women’s work".26 (Kelly)

The amount of labour is not the problem for Alice. She is tired of her position at Hannah’s. Alice’s home environment is more supportive than many of the other women’s households.27 When she was going through a difficult time at the

26. At this point in the conversation, Kelly took back what she had said, that is, that men are not supposed to do women’s work. The conceptions she had about class and gender (the third multiple-depth conversation) were quite complex and had many threads to pull together. Her recantation, in this context, is not a misrepresentation. It is an example of a gender and class formation process involving a reconstruction of identity. See Chapter 7, Section 7.4, pp. 197-269.

27. Though he is supportive, Alice only approaches Raymond when he is in a good mood.(Alice)
housekeeping franchise, her husband, Raymond, said "if you find it that hard and that upsetting, he said, then just quit". (Alice) But Alice has to take a lot of things into consideration, most importantly, securing an steady income, because her husband was getting laid off in a month:

I just want to give up. You know, like I'm just so frustrated. I get so angry sometimes that it's just, like I'd rather just say 'I quit' and go home. ... If I thought that it [cleaning houses] would be worth my while to do it on my own, I would. Like I do have a couple of people that want me to come and clean for them. And I told them I would let them know in the new year. (Alice)

So, she thought about asking for a raise. But, before she could ask, the manager said, "Don't ask me because you are not going to get one". (Alice) It is rather upsetting to have to keep 'doing it all' when you are unhappy and feel trapped:

Don't make us feel guilty, you know? It's our fault, like that's the way I feel sometimes, like it's our fault that some clients have quit. Because they've got [laid off], they aren't working, they can't afford to have us come and do it. Well, that's not our fault. She [the manager] uses this recession against us. Like, we have to be, what is the word she uses now ... like you're lucky you're here. (Alice)

For Alice, the best she can do right now is to go home and forget about work and try to ride out the recession at Hannah's.

Francie does not like fussing, fighting, and fuming. She does everything she possibly can to avoid conflict in her immediate family. For her, this entails caring for everyone and seeing to everyone's needs, materially and emotionally.

I'm always the one that has to be aware of this and that and be able to handle this and that and be, and uh, you know, always aware of how to handle this and cope with this and no matter what happens to you whether you're sick and dying on the ground, you still have to know where this is, keep this neat, and try to keep peace here. (Francie)

She knows that her family loves her, but sometimes it comes down to just needing a hug now and again. She wants to be taken care of and pampered and made to feel special - "but it never happens" (Francie):
I don’t think there is a woman that it ever happens to. Especially a working woman, unless she’s very rich. A working woman, it never happens to her. She’s basically the psychological stone in the family, really, because she has to keep all this up. Sometimes I feel like turning around and forgetting that I have any responsibility in the world. (Francie)

Francie has pinpointed 'total labour' as one of the major influences of women's lives and their ideas about lives. When it gets too much for her, she cries:

If I get depressed, I just cry. ... I may cry a day over something, then I say 'to hell with it'. (Francie)

No matter what strategies one uses to cope from day to day, sometimes feelings of 'too much' are just overwhelming. When this happens there is not much you can do except to be overwhelmed for a time and then go on. I know in my own experience in trying to clean houses during the day, write at night, and maintain my own household, feelings of being overwhelmed were particularly acute and consuming. I spent several moments crying over some customer’s toilet. Apparently this is not so uncommon. Michelle tries to cry in private. If she is at home, she goes in her room, crawls in bed, and cries herself to sleep. If she is at work, she cries a little bit while cleaning the bathroom, and then she perks up and starts singing. Susie used to cry a lot more than she does now. Amy, too. For them, work is a good place just to be able to forget about everything. All you think about is work, and, if you do think about home, it is pleasant. Amy thinks about her family:

Kayla is getting home. Andrew’s walking home [from school]. Steve’s on the couch. ... The second I pull in my driveway, that’s when I start worrying again. (Amy)

Talking to friends is another strategy the women used to deal with their daily lives. Though very few of the women had close friends, they did say that talking sometimes helps. Lynn is the exception. She has one close woman friend whom she shares her life with. Problems do not build up because "as long as I can talk about it, I'm fine". (Lynn) Only when she cannot talk to someone does she use drugs, mostly
tranquilizers. When cleaning, Lynn is able to keep busy and not think about problems. When she has difficulties at work, she has to wait to talk to her friend when she gets home.

Nancy, Amy, Kelly, and Lori try to keep work and home as separate as possible, that is, not let problems at home interfere with work and vice versa. All four said that there was more stress from outside the workplace, than at the workplace. 28 They all try "not to think about it". None said that they talk to friends or family members about their problems.

Beatrice, too, thinks that there is more stress at home to cope with because her home is where her heart is. She noted that at work, there is a formal process through which you are supposed to complain - the manager. It does not really matter what the problem is, whether it is too much work, not enough pay, or the speed of the clean, the manager is who you talk to. Granted, it is not ideal, but at least it is there. At home, you have to work things out. She tries not to let problems at home affect her ability to clean while at work. Thus, Beatrice lets things slip at home first. For example, if she and Michael are fighting about something, she will go to bed 'on time' instead of 'working things out' because she does not want to be tired while cleaning the next day. Yet she knows that the next time she faces Michael, they have to work things out.

Another strategy that Francie utilised, taken from her childhood, was talking to 'God'. She does not pray, because there are no beliefs attached. It is more like a child's imaginary friend. She simply talks out loud. She used to talk to Elgin, her husband, but he only blames her for everything. She cannot talk to her family.

28. Lori's decision to quit Hannah's was based on the lengthy commute and the cleaning itself. Once she quit, she said that the stress from work abated. Generally, there is more stress from home because that is what she is most concerned about.
because of long standing feuds. She has no close friends. This strategy only adds to her isolation and oppression, because Elgin thinks she is crazy.

In balancing 'total labour', these women are constructing a set of relations to which they can consent. Negotiating the time and money commitments are onerous, yet integral to managing their labour. Beatrice is the only woman who has set up her own system of reward, and sticks to it. She treats herself weekly for having made it through a week of labour at Hannah’s and a week of labour at home, even if it is just a "cheap pair of earrings". Her monetary strategy is to spend your money on the bills, buy something for yourself as a reward, and then, if there is anything left, put it in the bank. (Beatrice)

The 'balancing act' also involves tolerance and endurance. When I asked "what do you do when you don’t want to be doing what you are doing?", I asked it in the context of the cleaning tasks at the housekeeping franchise. Most women would:

Do it anyway. (Angela, Lori, Susie)

I would do it. (Kelly)

I do it. It’s not worth the aggravation. (Nancy)

Not much. There isn’t anything else that I have a choice to do. As I say, I like housekeeping because it’s the only thing I know how to do. But, I don’t like doing it, you know what I mean? It’s not what I would [like to] take as a job. Somebody has to do it. But it is not what I would [want] to take as a job. I guess I try to forget about it. You know. Just look forward to my days off. (Francie)

Bite my tongue and just do it, because there’s nothing else to do. (Patrice)

I don’t have a lot of choice, I’ve got to do it. Go in and do it and get it over with. (Amy)

However, it became quite clear that the response indicates more than just coping with the task at hand; it indicates a way in which the women deal with the drudgery of housekeeping in order to assure that there is money to finance their 'total labour'.
They endure and tolerate the conditions so that they can gain independence through having their own money, or driving the company car, or managing the household income.

None of the women have overt acts of defiance over the relations they are engaged. No housework strikes; no labour organising; no support groups; no networking. The closest to organised conflict over 'total labour' was a second hand story about a woman quitting. Elizabeth wanted to take her infant daughter to a specialist whose office hours were only on Thursdays. Since Thursdays are heavy cleaning days, the manager refused to drop Elizabeth from the schedule. Moreover, if Elizabeth were to take time off work, the manager said she would fire her. The manager said something like "the baby's not dying of pneumonia." (Michelle) Elizabeth quit on the spot and the workers supported her in her decision. As would be expected in such a regulated labour process, this open conflict was met with a new rule: no doctors' appointments on Thursdays and Fridays. In this case, the responsibilities of 'total labour' clashed - caring for children and securing an income. Elizabeth opted for caring for the child.29

Primarily, challenges to conventional divisions within 'total labour' come in the form of teaching children a particular set of values. For example, Patrice, Kelly, and Francie teach their sons to respect women (of all ages) and how to do housework. Patrice's son is more likely to help her put the laundry away than anyone else. Anne encourages her daughter to train at university for what she wants to be, not what she is supposed to be. Candy expresses her concern over raising a son:

I don't consciously say that I'm not going to buy him a doll. I just say 'All right! Look at that tractor truck!' And, we get it. I think a lot of it will be an unconscious thing. And with Gary, he's going to see a lot of [traditional]

29. Elizabeth is now on mother's allowance.
gender roles. He might not even take it in as that but when he grows up that’s just what’s going to happen. That’s not necessarily what I would like.

What would you like? (Pamela)

I would like him to be sensitive. I think that’s where his problem, his lazy eye, comes in really positively. I’m hoping that he’ll be a lot more sensitive to other people than most little boys are. Because of his problem, and that it’s okay to cry. It’s all right to, and I want him, and I’m going to teach him, that if he sees Daddy cry or if he sees Mommy - not to upset him but to show him that, hey, it is okay. I’m not going to hide affection from him ... I want him to see that it is okay to express affection. And touch is important. Whether that, those points really don’t depend on gender. (Candy)

Except these points do depend on gender. What Candy has identified emotionally in sensitivity and expression is implicated in the traditional definition of masculinity in their absence. And that, when translated into 'total labour' defines who does what type of labour.

Home or "outside work" was the place causing the most stress in the women’s lives. Getting out of the house, going to work, exerting yourself physically, all helped the women cope with the struggles they had on-going at home. The struggles at home varied from woman to woman and all centred on how women adjust to their surroundings. Sometimes it was about people, such as family members, ex-boyfriends, bosses, and children. And, sometimes it was about the division of labour, that is, having to do everything, being expected to do everything, and then not getting any help. Or, sometimes it was emotional like not getting respect, being taken for granted, or not feeling loved. All these struggles can be considered part of the way women construct, contest, and reconstruct consensual 'total labour' relations, develop tolerance and endurance for accomplishing the tasks comprising 'total labour', and actively, and sometimes collectively, resist traditional divisions of labour.
(5.5) CONCLUDING REMARKS

Unlike some professional couples, none of the women participating in this study could hire someone else's labour power. In order to ensure that the domestic labour tasks were being undertaken and carried out properly, the women carried out the labour themselves. The amount of money coming into the household set the boundaries for accomplishing the labour tasks involved in their 'total labour'. After the monthly bills were paid, there was very little latitude in the way the remaining money could be spent, nor was there a reserve upon which the woman could fall back.30 Struggles over the allocation of reproductive labour was not the priority in these women's lives. Coping day to day and earning a reprieve from their 'total labour', like a day off from work or having other family members actually doing the chores they are supposed to be doing, were the immediate aims of these women.

Conceptually, 'total labour' extends analysis spatially and temporally. Spatially, 'total labour' goes beyond the household as a unit of analysis of reproductive labour as much as beyond the workplace as a site of productive labour. Labour power is expended in multiple places. Temporally, 'total labour' expands the analysis at two scales. First, at the more immediate scale, is the daily schedule: 'total labour' encompasses time at work and time at home spent engaged in labour. Second, at the less immediate scale, are the weekly, monthly, and life-cycle schedules: 'total labour' includes financial management, job choice/career development, childbearing, and childrearing. In a marxist analysis, objective relations and subjective experiences of labour as a social activity should be central in an explanation of social relations involving unequal distributions of power. In a feminist analysis, an analyst must maintain the vantage point of women as the oppressed, which seems quite practical

30. Two women mentioned savings account of over $1,000.
given the political action components of feminist methods. Empirically, the exposition of the lives of the women participating in this investigation is an attempt to show concretely how women manage, finance, and cope with production and reproduction relations as 'total labour' on a daily, on-going basis. The 'entwineness' is as evident as is its 'immenseness'.

Substantively, it is clear that these women workers manage their 'total labour' precariously, that is, their daily schedules are balanced just right, and any deviation is accommodated at the expense of their own leisure time (compare experiences in Section 5.4.1 and 5.4.3). Also, it is clear that the money the women earn by working at the housekeeping franchise is not extra money. Their wages are crucial to the financial security of each household. Their contributions to the financial status of the household go beyond engaging in waged labour - the women manage nearly all the finances of the household. Further, in order to deal with their heavy work loads, the women adopt and adapt specific coping strategies to get them through the day.

Though this demonstration shows how the women 'do it all' surficially, there is little indication of the context within which these women live their lives, both socially and personally. Rather than narrowing the extension of 'total labour', it is better to conceptually distinguish production and reproduction at a more concrete level of generality so that an historically grounded analysis can be undertaken. In this way, an analyst can focus on the way power is distributed in a particular organisation of a set of labour relations and how individuals experience those relations.

I address this issue in the following chapter (see Chapter 6). Conceptually, I work through the implications of the extensive abstraction of 'total labour' in a meso-level conceptualisation, production regime (Section 6.3). Empirically, I first
demonstrate the links amongst relations in and relations of production in housekeeping services franchises by describing the labour process and explaining how the relations are organised so that the managers can more easily control the workers' labour (Section 6.4). I then present a interpretation of the women's experiences of both sets of relations (Section 6.5).
CHAPTER 6

CONCEPTUALISING PRODUCTION REGIME AND DEMONSTRATING IT EMPIRICALLY

(6.1) OUTLINE

In this chapter, I first review radical approaches to the explanation of labour processes in capitalist societies by drawing out the implications for an analysis of waged domestic labour processes based on the concept of 'total labour'. Next, I extend Burawoy's factory regime to production regime, a meso-level theoretical conceptualisation wherein production relations comprise labour processes and regulatory apparatuses. I then empirically demonstrate this theoretical concept by using information gathered from women workers, franchise managers/owners, and head office personnel. I describe the social relations of labour in housekeeping services franchises and partially explain how this specific organisation of labour relations regulate the women's labour. I also illustrate by example how the women's experiences of relations in and of production shape and are shaped by their actions and attitudes toward: the spatial fragmentation of their own labour; resolving conflict formally and informally; and building solidarity within waged labour at the workplace(s). I conclude with comments on the links between 'total labour' and production regime.

(6.2) A CRITICAL REVIEW

Analysts interested in labour processes in capitalist societies have developed explanations of specific sets of production relations by outlining the characteristic labour relation in an historically- and/or spatially-specific production process. There
are four principal approaches in the radical literature. The separation of conception and execution of tasks forms the foundation for theories based on relations of domination or control (e.g. Braverman 1974; Gorz 1976; Zimbalist 1979; Burawoy 1979; Fenstermaker Berk 1980; Luxton 1980; West 1982; Wood 1982; Johnson and Johnson 1982; Wright and Singelmann 1982; Hirschhorn 1984; Sacks and Remy 1984; Gannage 1986; Romero 1988a). Segmented labour market theorists try to explain both the appearance of various 'pools' of labour and the divisions of labour themselves. Thus, they stress the 'fit' between the tasks that need performing, and the characteristics of the labourer (e.g. Reich, Gordon and Edwards 1973; Piore 1978; Edwards 1979; Gordon, Edwards and Reich 1982). The world views approach focuses more on subjectivity of the labourer and, therefore, theorists using this approach emphasise the diversity of the labourers within a specific market (e.g. Sabel 1982). Most recently, theorists have called for a focus on relations of exploitation and/or the valorisation process as the basis for the explanation of production relations (e.g. Burawoy 1985; Cohen 1987; Warde 1988). I now briefly describe each approach and draw out its major strength in constructing a theory of waged domestic labour processes. (See Table 6.1 for a synopsis of the key points characterising each approach.)

The major strength of Braverman's analysis is that by conceptually separating labour task from its execution, relations of domination and the control of labour is singled out as cause of alienation in addition to the relations of exploitation in the production process. Rather than defining the labourer through the relation to the means of production and the position regarding the process of exploitation in the generation of surplus value, he defines the labourer by the potential labour power she/he possesses and is willing to sell. He argues that under monopoly capitalism a hierarchical managerial structure replaced the labourer/capitalist model Marx had
Table 6.1. Brief review of radical explanations of labor processes in capitalist society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brauermanian analyses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* separation of conception and execution of tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* leads to alienation and degradation of each individual worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor market segmentation theory</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* primary and secondary labor markets defined by laborers’ personal characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* leads to various ‘pools’ of labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World views approach</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* fordist dual product markets determine post-fordist divisions of labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* production is fragmented; thus, so is labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burawoy’s ‘politics of production’</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* organization and regulation of labor relations designate phases of capitalism, not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different modes of production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* fragmentation of labor is part of contradictory processes of resistance and hegemony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
elaborated, wherein services, rather than manufactures, characterise the production process. A progressive deskilling and atomisation of labour under monopoly capitalism forces the worker to endure excessive alienation of her/his labour as a worker. Once the labourer and her/his labour are separated, control over the labour as well as the labour process passes from the hands of the labourer to the capitalist, via the manager. In this way, Braverman reorients the basis of productive labour by shifting the foundation of productive labour from relations of exploitation under industrial capitalism to relations of domination under monopoly capitalism.

The conceptual separation of mental labour from manual labour in Braverman’s analysis helps to explain the structure of the relations of domination between "mistress and manager" and "manager and maid".¹ This lays the groundwork for reconceptualising the labour process to include not only the organisation of labour tasks, but also the power relations involved in labour’s organisation. More widely, rereading Braverman’s work from a 'total labour' vantage point, the production process is not the sole medium of alienation. That is, if relations of domination characterise labour relations generally, then it becomes clear that not all labour processes are part of production relations.

Radical segmentation theorists argue that conditions outside the production process, such as the characteristics of the labourer or the structure of the labour market, shape the needs of capital through dividing workers and segmenting labour (e.g. Doeringer and Piore 1971; Reich, Gordon and Edwards 1973; Freedman 1976; Friedman 1977; Piore 1978; Edwards 1979; Wilkinson 1981; Littler 1982; Gordon, 1986).

¹. The manager deals with setting up housekeeping services by liaising with the "mistress" and "maid" separately. The "mistress" wants a clean house (mental labour), but doesn’t want to clean it herself (manual labour). She makes a contract (mental labour) with the manager to provide this service (manual labour). Managers train workers to perform specific tasks (manual labour) in a specific way (mental labour). See Figure C.1, p. 303.
This theory can enhance theories of waged domestic labour processes from a feminist and marxist perspective by showing the connections between specific jobs in (re)production processes (e.g. franchise housekeepers) and amongst identifiable groups of labourers, based on either personal characteristics or attitudes of the labourer (e.g. a married white woman with no preschool age children with low self-esteem who likes repetitive tasks). These connections are mediated by the material conditions giving rise to the divisions of labour that form specific labour markets and by the changing needs of capital, for example, the shift from an industrial-based to a service-oriented economy.

Geographers carved out a niche in this literature by bringing out the historical and spatial specificity of social and economic change with regard to local responses to global restructuring processes (e.g. Massey 1984; Cooke 1986a; Scott and Storper 1986; Nelson 1986; Walby 1986a; Peet 1987; Wheelock 1990). Studies in industrial restructuring, especially those involving class and gender restructuring, also provide historically- and spatially-specific accounts of changing social relations.

2. Radical labour market segmentation approaches emerged out of the critique of neoclassical dual labour market theory (Blackburn and Mann 1979; Marsden 1986). Neoclassical dual market theory maintains that labour is allocated through fair and free competition in a market for a price known as a wage. Analysts utilising a basic radical segmented labour market approach view employable labour as two markets, the primary and secondary. The primary labour market consists of skilled labourers that can demand high wages, benefits, job security, and good working conditions. Labourers in the secondary market are relatively unskilled and work for lower wages. Across industries men compose the majority of the primary market and women, the secondary (Barron and Norris 1976; Connelly 1978; Phillips and Phillips 1983; Armstrong and Armstrong 1984a). Segmentation of labour and labourers is rooted either in the struggle over control of the labour process (e.g. Friedman 1977; Edwards 1979; MacDonald 1982) or in the role the state plays its regulation (e.g. Piven and Cloward 1972; Offe and Lenhardt 1984; Offe and Hinrichs 1985). More complex segmented labour market theorists identify more than just two labour markets (see Peck 1989). Variations exist which elaborate the characteristics of specific labourers or the extent to which available labour adapts to changing needs of capital as for example in the reserve army of labour theory (e.g. Connelly 1978; Beechey 1978).
(Massey 1983; Lancaster Regionalism Group 1985; Nash 1985; Cooke 1986b; Peet 1987; Walby and Bagguley 1989).

The world views approach, developed by Sabel (1982), places the labourer, more specifically the labourer’s subjectivity, at the centre of the analysis of labour processes in capitalist societies. For Sabel, just as the production process is fragmented, so, too, is labour. He argues that in the era of flexible production for mass market consumption the world views of workers are more important than the relation of the worker to the means of production, as an owner or non-owner, in the organisation of the labour process. Further, he argues that labour is divided according to self interests rather than the collective interests of workers. Because the workplace is not the centre of workers’ world views, any collective interests are organised around non-class issues, like the home or family. It is only when the rigid hierarchy of control is relaxed (where conception and execution of labour are fused, as in a post-fordist reorganisation of labour for the production of specialised products) that restrictions on creativity are lifted and the worker can and does refocus her/his world view.

This approach parallels feminists’ methodological concerns of validating women’s experiences as a source of knowledge (See Chapter 3, Section 3.3, pp. 40-51). Though Sabel’s characterisation of the post-fordist reorganisation of labour prevents a social-economic analysis of housekeeping services franchises, Sabel’s arguments about the importance of an individual’s world view can be useful in building a theory of waged domestic labour processes. Interpreting housekeepers’ experiences

3. Though recognised, a world views approach is not popular in geography.
4. The fordist dual product market, stable and fluctuating, establishes the basis for the division of labour in the post-fordist era, core and peripheral workers.
5. The conception and execution of labour is not fused in housekeeping services franchises, at least not in the way Sabel argues that they are. Franchise housekeepers are not artisans, they are service workers.
of labour relations in the franchise, within individual and collective material and historical contexts, can show that (a) these experiences shape each woman's world view and that (b) the material, historical, and spatial constitution of the individual's subjectivity shapes the labour process and her/his experience of it via processes of fragmentation and consolidation. From this, it follows that both the organised resistance (see Littler 1982) and the manufactured consent (see Burawoy 1979) of labourers are crucial in (re)structuring the labour process and constituting an individual's subjectivity. So, for example, though franchise housekeepers may individually desire to obtain for themselves higher wages, more benefits, job security, and good working conditions, collective struggles within the franchise are difficult to organise because the women are afraid that they might lose the job, which, especially in recessionary times, eases the struggle to make ends meet.

Burawoy's (1985) *Politics of Production* reoriented the labour process literature away from a discussion of the control of an individual worker and how she/he either 'fits' or comes to 'fit' the needs of capital toward the organisation of labour relations. He argues that the major difficulty with existing analyses of the labour process is that while each approach points toward regulations of the labour process, each collapses the regulatory apparatuses of production into the labour process (Burawoy 1985, p. 125). By "collapse" Burawoy means that the social relations of labour are not differentiated from the capital-labour relation that characterises the generation of surplus value. Burawoy conceptually separates the two sets of relations by designating relations *in* and *of* production:

... defining the labour process by the social relations into which men and women enter in order to produce useful things. I call these social relations between and among workers and managers *relations in production*. These must be distinguished from the *relations of exploitation* between labour and capital. Whereas the former refer to the organization of tasks, the latter refer to the relations through which surplus is pumped out of the direct producer. It should
be noted that relations of exploitation are part of the *relations of production*, which also include the relations among the units which organize exploitation. Thus, relations of production include both the appropriation and the distribution of surplus [emphasis in original] (Burawoy 1985, pp. 13-14).

Differentiating between relations *in* and of production can assist in explaining the commodification of domestic labour in the form of housekeeping services franchises. Though the labour tasks involved in cleaning a house are the same in commodified and non-commodified forms of domestic labour, the rules, statutes, and laws governing the organisation of labour differ. In this way, franchise housekeepers are not just getting paid for something they may have done at home for ‘free’ for years. The women are engaging in a set of labour relations organised around a different set of rules and regulations.

In isolation, none of these approaches provide a comprehensive enough framework within which to build a theory of waged domestic labour processes that is based on the concept of ‘total labour’. Implicating ‘total labour’ entails analysing the relations of exploitation and domination within productive and reproductive labour as well as the labourers’ experiences of those relations and how they shape their actions and attitudes toward their labour. By building a theory of waged domestic labour processes in this way, analysts can more fully examine and interpret the ways in which workers’ attitudes and actions shape and are shaped by a particular organisation of a specific set of labour relations. Such a theory can, for example, interpret and partially explain how women experience the labour relations *in* and of production in housekeeping services franchises and how these experiences shape the ways in which the women deal with the spatial fragmentation of labour, resolve conflict formally and informally, and build solidarity in fractured environments (see the empirical demonstration in Section 6.4). For now, in the following section (Section 6.3), I recast factory regime, the central theoretical construct in Burawoy’s ‘politics of production’.
This recasting clarifies the relations of 'total labour' from a production vantage point and at a more specific level of abstraction.6

(6.3) CONCEPTUALISING PRODUCTION REGIME

Conceptually central to Burawoy's relational analysis is the factory regime, consisting of the labour process and production apparatuses. The former is that coordinated set of activities and relations involved in the transformation of raw materials into useful products by women and men. The latter are institutions that regulate labour relations, and, consequently, shape struggles in the workplace. (See Figure 6.1 for a conceptual representation of Burawoy's politics of production and factory regime, the central theoretical construct.) Burawoy identifies various factory regimes drawing on historically specific information for their illustration. These regimes vary according to the organisation of the relations in and of production. The specific character of the regime itself differs because of the labour process, competition among firms, and the degree of state intervention in the reproduction of labour power (Burawoy 1985, p. 126; see also all of his Chapter 3).7

Local expressions of economics and politics are of particular interest to radical geographers (see e.g. Massey 1984; Lancaster Regionalism Group 1985; Scott and Storper 1986; Harvey 1989; Painter 1991), and some use Burawoy's factory

6. See Chapter 3, Footnote 9, p. 40. Production regime is conceptualised at level III in Ollman's scheme of abstraction which distinguishes a set of relations and processes because of their appearance and form.

7. For example, the introduction of minimum wage laws and extra payment for overtime as well as the fear of a crisis of overproduction transformed the despotism of earlier factory regimes into hegemonic regimes wherein wages and labour time are negotiated. This uncoupling of the production process from the state's role in the reproduction of labour power paved the way for a different set of production relations to manufacture workers' consent to participate in pursuing profit. Consent replaced coercion as the basis for securing production as well as securing the reproduction of labour power.
Figure 6.1. Conceptual representation of Burawoy's (1985) 'politics of production' and the formulation of 'factory regime'.

**POLITICS OF PRODUCTION**

**Production Relations**

Two types of division of labour:

(a) Technical  
   *e.g. drills, presses, computers*

(b) Social  
   *e.g. auxiliary labour, support staff, workers, supervisors*

**Relations in Production**

organisation of tasks a worker performs

**Relations of Production**

organisation of the extraction of surplus value

**Factory Regime**

**Activities and Relations**  
*e.g. presses, building a truck, workers' relations with each other and supervisors*

**Economic Exploitation and Rules for Legitimation**  
*e.g. firm's head office, labour, board, unions, worker's compensation, social assistance*
regime to assist in their explanations of labour processes. Warde (1988), for example, argues that factory regime does not account for restrictions imposed by labour markets. He offers workplace regime as a more descriptive term which would also include labour market relations. Drawing on Castells (1977, 1978), he resituates the source of class conflict from tensions in the relations in the extraction of surplus value to relations of unequal access to resources. Warde's concept of workplace regime is appealing because of its place implications. However, the focus on various organisations of the provision of resources does not address what I have already identified as central in a theory of waged domestic labour processes, that is, how workers' experiences of capitalist labour relations shape and are shaped by the workers' attitudes and actions toward their own labour and its regulation.

An alternative is to recast factory regime in terms of production (and reproduction). (See Figure 6.2 for a conceptual representation of production regime.) By conceptually differentiating between the social relations amongst labourers and the regulation of their labour in a set of production relations, an analyst can (a) explain the production process outside traditional industrial proletarian labour relations, like, for example, in waged domestic labour processes, and (b) more fully account, via interpretation, for the differences in labourers' experiences of relations of exploitation (i.e. the capital-labour relation of the generation of surplus value), the relations of domination (i.e. the distribution of power), the social divisions of labour (e.g. class, gender, and ethnicity), and the personal material histories of individual workers (i.e. the labourers' constituted subjectivity) within a particular organisation of waged labour

---

8. If a full account of 'total labour' is theorised, then a reproduction oriented analysis is called for. The departure point in such an exposition would be the development of a reproduction regime along side production regime. Because this is beyond the empirical scope of this project, I am confining the empirical discussion to production regime. See also Chapter 4, Footnote 6, p. 75.
Figure 6.2. Conceptual representation of a production regime.

PRODUCTION REGIME

Production Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations in Production</th>
<th>Relations of Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour Process</td>
<td>Regulatory Apparatuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of tasks</td>
<td>Organisation of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in producing a good</td>
<td>extraction, appropriation, and distribution of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or providing a service</td>
<td>surplus value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. labour tasks,</td>
<td>e.g. labour laws,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machines, tools,</td>
<td>unemployment insurance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedules,</td>
<td>safety codes, wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocation of labour</td>
<td>structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


relations. Production regimes vary in time over space. For example, for housekeeping
services franchises, waged domestic labour processes comprise the tasks and relations
organising the provision of housekeeping as a service as well as the relations organising
the extraction, appropriation, and distribution of surplus value in housekeeping services
franchises (see Figure 6.3).

The importance of casting production regime more widely than factory
regime is fourfold. First, production regime comprises those relations and processes
that organise productive labour power, constitutive of 'total labour' from a production
vantage point. This concept characterises the particular form production relations take
in capitalist societies. Production regime specifies a particular organisation of a set of
labour relations, which includes the labour tasks, rules for carrying out the tasks, and
the institutions that govern the extraction, appropriation, and distribution of surplus
value.

Second, production regime is a dynamic concept, in that dialectical change
can be accounted for. Since both relations of exploitation and of domination embody
contradictory processes of change, then alongside processes of alienation and
fragmentation are processes of resistance and consolidation. So, for example,
managers can try to evoke guilt in the workers in order to make them work harder so
customers won’t quit the service. The workers may continue working without openly
confronting the manager and refusing to work harder. However, though the workers
may seem willing to acquiesce, it may not be that simple. Struggles to control one’s
own labour in a fragmented labour process may be more indirect. That is, the women
resist the manager’s authority by for example completing the tasks haphazardly.

Third, production regime can address the principal problems identified by
analysts developing explanations of labour processes in capitalist societies: control of
Figure 6.3. Conceptual representation of a production regime for housekeeping services franchises.

PRODUCTION REGIME
for Housekeeping Services
Franchises in Southern Ontario

Production Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations in Production</th>
<th>Relations of Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour Process</td>
<td>Regulatory Apparatuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of tasks in providing housekeeping services</td>
<td>Organisation of the extraction, appropriation, and distribution of surplus value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. cleaning a house, relations between co-workers, vacuums, preparatory tasks</td>
<td>e.g. head office rules, labour code, state support system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
labour, social divisions of labour, the labourer’s subjectivity, and the valorisation process (from Section 6.2). By bringing both relations of exploitation and relations of domination to the fore, the control of labour and the valorisation process are included in the analysis. In this way, the concept of production regime does not locate class conflict only in the workplace, and implicitly acknowledges contradictory class locations.9 Production regime does not privilege a particular social division of labour. These social divisions are implicated in individual workers’ personal material histories. Workers’ experiences of the organisation of labour and its regulation shape and are shaped by their actions and attitudes toward their own labour.

Fourth, production regime is only a conceptual separation of the relations in and of production. Since workers’ experiences of labour and its regulation are simultaneous, this conceptual separation can assist in sorting through the various sets of labour relations and processes of change empirically. For example, the experience of cleaning your own house and cleaning a customer’s house while employed with a housekeeping services franchise differ. From a production vantage point, this difference can be explained partially in terms of the organisation of the labour tasks and the rules that regulate the cleaning process (e.g. the principles of team housecleaning) and partially in terms of the past collective experiences of labourers (e.g. there is a minimum wage).

Production regime as a concept cannot explain fully all labour relations in housekeeping services franchises. Nor can it explain in detail all aspects of the women’s experiences of the labour process. In the empirical demonstration, I use production regime as an aide to guide my description of housekeeping service

9. See Wright’s arguments about contradictory class locations (1978, 1985, 1989). Because production regime is not inclusive of all social relations of labour, according to other conceptualisations, like reproduction regime, individuals can occupy contradictory class locations.
franchises in southern Ontario in the early 1990s (Section 6.4). I also interpret some of
the women’s experiences of the relations in and of production in order to show how
these experiences shape the women’s attitudes and actions toward their own labour in
this particular organisation of labour relations (Section 6.5). I concentrate on the
women’s experiences of the spatial fragmentation of labour, resolving workplace
conflict formally, and building solidarity with their co-workers (Sections 6.5.1, 6.5.2,
and 6.5.3).

(6.4) DESCRIPTION OF A PRODUCTION REGIME

Shifts in the organisation of the relations in and of production indicate
changing production regimes. In order to be able to depict the production regime of
housekeeping services franchises in the early 1990s, it is useful to set the changes in the
relations and processes of the organisation of waged domestic labour processes into a
material and historical context. Negotiation over the labour process and the regulation
of labour varies from regime to regime. Rules governing the extraction, appropriation,
and distribution of surplus value change (e.g. minimum wages laws, rates in
unemployment insurance premiums) as do the relations organising the tasks also change
(e.g. live-ins, private maids, and franchise housekeepers). Workers’ experiences of
these relations set the stage for resolving the tension between contradictory processes of
change embodied in the relations in and of production. For example, in housekeeping
services franchises, workers’ strategies to challenge the spatial fragmentation of the
workplace depends in part on how a woman employed as a supervising maid views her
role as a "interim supervisor" in the customers' houses in place of the manager. If she
likes authority, takes her job seriously, and ensures that the rules set up by the
franchising firm are followed, then cleaning separate houses may increase the alienation
of the worker by her not being able to see how accomplishing her set of cleaning tasks contributes to her co-workers’ efforts. Strategies taken on by the women are individualised, contest only the immediate surroundings of the housekeeper, and are directed personally at the supervising maid (e.g. placing flies on window sills behind the drapes, ‘accidentally’ breaking a light bulb, and disagreeing the supervising maid). If the supervising maid takes the attitude that close supervision is not necessary, then the houses can be places where co-worker support is forged which can be part of collective strategies challenging the organisation of labour or even some of the rules (e.g. breaking rules to clean more quickly and break the monotony of the labour tasks or refusing to clean with bleach aerosol products or to use central vacuum systems).

In order to address each of these topics, I have divided the empirical demonstration into two parts, a depiction of a production regime (Section 6.4) and the workers’ experience of it (Section 6.5). In the first part, I set the material and historical context of waged domestic labour for the production regime of the housekeeping services franchises in southern Ontario in the early 1990s. I then draw out and describe the relations in and of production. In the second part, I interpret some of the experiences the women recounted to me of their labour in the franchise. In the three subsections (of Section 6.5), I interpret the women’s experiences of the spatial fragmentation of labour, formally resolving conflict, and building solidarity. These three themes best highlight the dialectical tension between processes of fragmentation and consolidation implicated in the relations in the organisation of waged domestic labour processes.

(6.4.1) Material and historical context

Since the onset of industrialisation in Europe and North America there have been four fundamental shifts in the relations in and of production of waged domestic
labour processes: around the turn of the century, during the inter-war period, after World War II, and after the 1973 economic crisis. Rather than reconstruct a complete historical account of waged domestic labour, including the emergence of housekeeping franchises, which is not the central focus of this study (see Chapter 2, Section 2.5, pp. 25-26), I want to draw out a framework that represents fairly the changes in waged domestic labour relations. The works I draw on centre on waged domestic labour in Britain, France, the United States, and Canada.

During the initial phases of industrialisation, domestic labour relations were reorganised according to who was freer to leave the homestead for factory jobs (Cowan 1983). The process of the commodification of domestic labour replaced the domestic labour of men in the homestead, not women. Once the end products of commodified domestic labour became widely available, for example, the separation of stoves for heating and cooking in the 1830s, the transport of processed flour in 1840 after the construction of canals, and canned goods during the 1860s with the widespread use of preservation techniques, factory work transformed much of domestic labour. Men were no longer tied to the home and could be away from the homestead in the factories. With this transformation, women were left doing more work at home than before.

Women with money (usually gained from another industrial sector through their own economic holdings, those of their husbands, and sometimes of their fathers) were able to cope with the increase in domestic labour by hiring women of another class. Hiring domestics could improve the social standing of a household in the community whereby unskilled, female labour was drawn into domestic service on the demand of upper-middle income households. 'Being in service' was so common that Davidoff (1976) even spoke of it once as part of the life-cycle of a working class
woman: many women saw being a domestic labourer as a transition period "from childhood to their own maternal role" (Katzman 1978, p. 267). This particular female labour force was often young, unmarried, poor, and rural. The high turnover rate indicated that these women were not entering domestic service as a career. Rather, they themselves were trying to save for a family in the form of a dowry. Once they found a husband, they usually left service.10 The state regulated immigration, not only for factory work, but also for domestic work. More often than not, young Irish women, from the influx of Irish immigrants in the 1840s and 1850s, were employed as domestics in North America (see Strasser 1982; Matthews 1987).

Relations in production were in a state of transition around the turn of the century. Feminism as a social movement was challenging existing gender relations and moving women to action (Donovan 1985; Showalter 1990). Much of the feminist organising around domesticity and the home shaped the dominant ideals of 'woman' and 'home'.11 Housewives (primarily middle income) trained to be home economists and to treat housework as a domestic science. These trends contributed to the redefinition of women's work which often increased women's 'total labour' in that they had to develop managerial skills and were being drawn to into labour outside the home, most likely in domestic labour or personal service.12 There was an increasing

10. Maza (1983, p. 31) found similar patterns in eighteenth-century France, the majority of female servants were from rural areas. The average duration of service women in service was eleven years, sometimes with the sole intention of securing a dowry for marriage (Maza 1983, p. 62). By the end of the nineteenth century, nearly 90% of servants were female and were still overwhelmingly from rural areas (Maza 1983, p. 314). The life-cycle was nearly the same where the women amassed a dowry then married.


12. For example, in the US, women employed between 1870 and 1930 increased from 1.9 to 10.8 million with non-agricultural industries growing the most.
separation of state and business in that the state was taking steps toward regulating the production generally, evidenced by the intervention of the state in the regulation of labour by setting minimum wages and maximum hours. As well, labour groups lobbied around social benefits and the 'family wage'. Though the unity of the state and business was being challenged in some areas of production, with regard to domestic labour relations, the state was not forced to action; there were no regulations (see Sutherland 1981).

Ethnic divisions in domestic labourer employment shifted during this period. Immigrant women were often employed as housekeepers, nannies, and general servants. In Canada, immigration officials became directly involved in recruiting domestics for households through a "passage assistance" programme whereby servants were selected, especially from England and Scotland, and then bound to a particular employer for a specified amount of service time (Leslie 1974). Women of colour, whether immigrant or not, were also more likely to be employed as domestic labourers than any other group by the late 1800s (Glenn 1980, 1988; Sutherland 1981, especially Chapter 3). In the early part of the twentieth century, only high and upper middle

The ratio for women to be employed in domestic and personal service was one in two in 1870; two in five in 1900; and one in three in 1930 (Katzman 1978, p. 284). For all those in domestic and personal service, nine in ten women were likely to be employed as housekeepers, servants, cooks, and charwomen in 1870; two in three in 1900; and three in five in 1930. Katzman (1978) uses US census data from 1940 with 1930 classifications for domestic and personal service. In particular, what these data give is a more inclusive picture of the types of domestic labour processes that were commodified and then classified as domestic and personal service. The occupations included are: barbers, hairdressers and manicurists; boarding and lodging housekeepers; hotel keepers and managers; janitors and sextons; elevator tenders; labourers, domestic and personal service; laundresses (not in laundry); laundry owners, managers, and officials; laundry operatives; midwives and nurses (not trained); restaurant, cafe and lunchroom keepers; housekeepers and stewards; cooks; other servants; waitresses; charwomen; porters, domestic and personal service; porters, professional service; and all other occupations (Katzman 1978, p. 282). When figures are adjusted for positions that are not actually part of domestic labour by task, e.g. elevator tenders, the ratios are nearly the same.
income households hired servants for domestic labour. The high income classes could always afford to hire domestic labourers. It was only through the process of commodification of domestic labour by task that upper middle class income households had access to hire domestics. Middle income households hired domestics for a particular task. Domestics were confined to those tasks that resisted mechanisation or commodification (McBride 1983, p. 117). Once some services and commodities were made available through the market, domestic labour in middle-income households decreased substantially to what it had been previously.

During the inter-war period, the relations in and of production were once again reorganised. Waged domestic labour as the dominant sector for women's employment further decreased. Specialised commodified services, like bakeries, laundries, and restaurants, were more widespread and were made available to most income classes. Vacuum cleaners and refrigerators were also becoming more accessible to a larger number of households. With the spread of affordable machines, demand for intensive labour tasks, like beating rugs, decreased. Yet it was the daily services of domestic labour, like dusting, vacuuming, washing dishes, and cooking, for which people were more likely to hire. Thus, the market still demanded that there be domestic labourers. And the state still responded with little regulation. Women in upper middle income households were focusing on the social and emotional needs of their husband and family (Palmer 1989). Women in working class households were focusing on survival. Native-born women were more likely to be day domestic labourers; immigrant women were more likely to be live-ins.

After World War II, waged domestic labour employment dropped dramatically (Palmer 1989; Matthews 1987). In Canada, the drop in employment was perceived as a domestic labour shortage. According to the government, domestic
labour demands were not being met by the Canadian labour force. A state agency introduced the "Domestic Scheme" in hopes of attracting foreign women to be domestic labourers. The programme's aim was to import women from the Caribbean specifically for domestic labour positions. The incentive was landed immigrant status for the domestic labourer after a year of service. Paternalist relations persisted and were even encouraged in light of the ethnic differences and unequal power relations between "mistress and maid". This situation exacerbated these women's already subordinate position in two ways: as a black woman being hired to serve predominantly white families and as an immigrant being dependent on her employer for a positive recommendation to the government to receive permanent residence status. This inequality was the background against which working conditions and tasks were negotiated between the "mistress" and the "maid".

The post-1973 organisation of waged domestic labour and its regulation in Canada is qualitatively different than previous organisations of waged domestic labour. During the period following the 1973 economic crisis, global economic restructuring processes pressured firms into rationalising the production process in ways that maintain or increase profit by cutting labour costs particularly through redistributing labour tasks so that one labourer does more work, collapsing managerial positions so that managers take on more manual labour while hiring more part-time workers, and drawing on marginalised labour pools (e.g. see Nelson 1986; Holmes 1986; Peet 1987; Marchak 1987; Harvey 1989; Castells 1989). The 1973 recession was the first deep crisis in the post World War II era to affect more than the economically marginalised. Most households had to curb spending while trying to secure even a greater income. In Canada, women's employment comprised 34.6 per cent of the total labour force with 40 per cent of all women fifteen years and over participating in waged labour in 1971;
comprised 40.1 per cent with 52.1 per cent participating in 1981; and 43.0 per cent and
55.4 per cent in 1986 (Statistics Canada, 1986; Statistics Canada, 1991, The Labour
Force, January, July, and November). Now that more women are employed outside
the home, women’s ‘total labour’ has increased because of the little shift in the
distribution of domestic labour in the home. Thus, women are either part of a ‘double
ghetto’ (Armstrong and Armstrong 1984a) or required to work a ‘second shift’
(Hochschild 1989).

For foreign domestic workers, the situation changed dramatically in the
post-1973 era. They were brought into the Temporary Employment Authorisation
programme applicable to all immigrant labour (Townsen 1987). Under this law,
foreign domestic workers were not allowed to apply for landed immigrant status. They
were permitted to work on visas for up to three years, after which the worker would
have to leave. Not until 1981 did foreign domestic workers win back the right to apply
for landed immigrant status, but could do so only after two years of service.13 At the
same time, they were included in the group of workers that were to be paid minimum
wage though the number of hours worked were still unlimited.

This period of reorganisation of production vis-à-vis commodified domestic
labour permitted the emergence of housekeeping services franchises. Managers in
housekeeping services franchises hired part-time workers from marginalised pools of
labour. In addition, in the services sector, the specialisation of tasks corresponds with
the move toward specialised products in a flexible production process (cf. Oberhauser
1990). With more women in the workforce and less households employing domestics,
from the viewpoint of the founders of housekeeping services franchising firms, people
needed an alternative to the privately employed maid. Economically, baby boomers

13. See Patterson and Kim (1981) for a look at the impact of the 1973 and
1981 changes in the regulation of foreign domestic workers.
(people born between 1946 and 1962) were 'coming of age', with regard to high earning capacity, and it became clear from a marketing viewpoint that domestic services could be offered to dual-income earners who were interested in carving out quality time with their families (Field Journal #3 1990/1991; Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 39; The Globe and Mail, March 13, 1990). Members of some households were so busy they didn’t have much time for leisure activities when they had to spend time cleaning the house on Saturday mornings. The women in these households could not keep the pace of a full-time job as well as all the domestic labour and hired affordable 'help' (e.g. Shaevitz 1984). Purchasing services from a franchise made housekeeping services available to middle income households as well as higher income working class households since franchise services are a little less expensive than hiring a domestic part-time and a much less expensive than hiring a live-in (Field Journal #3 1990/1991; Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 34). There was also no commitment from the customer to hire the housekeeper regularly. Housekeepers in franchise services also take less time to clean a house than a private housekeeper,14 are more flexible in scheduling cleans, and have a reputation for uniform quality and service (Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, Nos. 32 and 34).

By setting the relations in and of production of waged domestic labour processes into a material and historical context, I have shown specific changes in the organisation of labour relations comprising the production regimes of waged domestic labour since industrialisation in North America and Europe. Housekeeping services franchises as a particular type of production regime of waged domestic labour consists of a specific set of relations that organise the tasks to be undertaken and relations that

14. The difference in time it takes a team of cleaners and a private housekeeper to clean a four bedroom, two storey house is about three and a half hours.
govern the extraction, appropriation, and distribution of surplus value. I now turn to a
description of the relation in and of production in housekeeping services franchises.
(6.4.2) Relations in and of production

Housekeeping services franchises exemplify but one format of a production
regime for waged domestic labour (see Appendix I).15 As part of a complex services
industry, these particular firms rely on the sale of specialised housekeeping services.
The waged domestic labour production regime of housekeeping services franchises in
southern Ontario is set out conceptually in Figure 6.3. A description of the relations in
production is presented in Appendix C. This particular set of relations in production in
housekeeping services franchises coalesced in the late 1970s in southern Ontario (Field
Phone Conversation 1992).16 A woman was running a small housekeeping business
out of her home in Toronto. She and a friend cleaned houses together. A group of
marketing consultants bought the name of her company and the 'system' she had
devised to clean houses quickly and began selling franchises. Other franchising firms
followed quickly. Two firms had already amassed a large client base in the cleaning
industry (i.e. private office, office buildings, and stores) and subsequently undertook
franchising as a side venture. One of these firms initially franchised with the Atlanta
firm, but quickly bought the Canadian rights to franchising. The second firm slowly
built up a solid franchise base across Ontario and gave up the smaller private office
cleaning business. The fourth firm entered the housekeeping services industry well

15. Recent romanticisation of the past organisations of waged domestic
labour around the turn of the century, with respect to the 'comfort' of home life, has
led to a renewed interest in hiring foreign nannies and housekeepers (Canadian
16. A similar system developed in Atlanta, Georgia. After several
unreturned phone calls and unanswered letters, I decided to use the information I
gathered about the Atlanta connection from one telephone conversation and the
responding franchising head office in southern Ontario.
after the other three were established, yet was able to hone the 'system' and adapt it to create another economic niche.\textsuperscript{17} The marketing background of its founder enabled him to foster a competitive services position even in the midst of economic recession in the early 1980s. Because of the popular perception that housekeeping services franchises make lots of money, many small housekeeping firms attempted to sell franchises. Nearly all failed.\textsuperscript{18} Though the exact size of the industry is confidential,\textsuperscript{19} Table 6.2 indicates the number of franchises for each firm operating in Ontario. Table 6.3 shows the size of the firm in terms of the number marketable areas (potential service areas), designated by the franchising firms' head offices.

The relations of production include the regulatory apparatuses that organise the extraction, appropriation, and distribution of surplus value. In the case of housekeeping services franchises, there are three sets of regulatory apparatuses: statutes and regulations; the state support system in the form of the provincial labour code; and the franchise head office (see Table 6.4). Statutes and regulations are those long-standing laws that were struggled for and adopted to control employer/employee relations, especially when there was no organisation to represent a worker.

As a worker, franchise housekeepers have access to the state support system,\textsuperscript{20} which guarantees a minimal level of economic subsistence for the reproduction of labour power.\textsuperscript{21} Workers can claim unemployment insurance.

\textsuperscript{17} That economic niche was created and filled by providing three types of services, a light, medium, and heavy cleaning service.

\textsuperscript{18} One large firm was exposed as selling contracts for franchising without providing any of the support it guaranteed (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation 1987).

\textsuperscript{19} All head office personnel were adamant about not giving details about the size of the firm. The information for Tables 6.2 and 6.3 are drawn from the interviews I had with head office personnel at the four firms. They only give an estimated size and are not to be considered exact.

\textsuperscript{20} Recall the material and historical context within which changes in the relations in and of production emerged (Section 6.4.1).

\textsuperscript{21} In the midst of the recession of the early 1990s, managers have adapted the provisions by the state support system for their own gains. Michelle told
maternity leave benefits, and income supplements. The state secures for itself on-going income from labourers producing surplus value in the form of income tax deductions. Another programme, the Canada Pension Plan, to which the labourer contributes, secures an income for a worker when she/he is too old to work. Not all financing for the state support system, however, comes from the labourer. In Ontario, a recent law passed forces the employer to pay all of the employees' medical insurance premiums.

Other parts of the state support system to which the franchise housekeeper has access includes boards and services funded by the state. For example, some legal clinics have been set up specifically to deal with labour disputes. Daycare programmes ease women into the workforce after infant care. Franchise housekeepers are not represented by a union, organisation, or association, but can bring grievances against their employers, either the franchise owner or head office, through a labour relations board which acts on behalf of the state to guarantee the worker's rights. There is an organisation which seeks to guarantee employment rights of foreign domestic workers. This particular group, however, focuses its efforts on private housekeepers and does not deal with franchise housekeepers (Arat-Koç and Villasin 1990; INTERCEDE 1992).

The third set of regulatory apparatuses consists of the rules and regulations made up by the franchise head office personnel and franchise owners (see Appendices A and B for descriptions of the structure and type of firms, respectively). Many of the head office rules are part of the orientation and training of the owners, managers, and workers and encoded in the franchise agreement (Field Journal #1 1990/1991;

---

me that her manager decided to let her work while she's on Mother's Allowance only at a reduced wage. Candy's manager refused to accept her maternity leave papers because they were delivered a week and a half early. Nancy's manager filed the wrong papers for her unemployment insurance and stated that she had not left on account of health problems, which she had.
Table 6.2. Size of franchising firm by number of designated areas served. (Figures reported only by corporate firms.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Areas Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clare's Cleaning Service</td>
<td>in 160 of 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavares</td>
<td>in 78 of 120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3. Size of franchising firm by number of franchises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Franchisor</th>
<th>Number of Franchises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clare's Cleaning Service</td>
<td>33-35 (^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah's Housekeeping</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavares</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Maids</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Precise head office figures were not revealed
Table 6.4. Regulatory apparatuses of housekeeping services franchises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutes and regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• minimum age law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• minimum wage guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• designation of overtime pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• definitions of full- and part-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State support system and labour code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• unemployment insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• mother's allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• income tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canada Pension Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• medical insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• state funded services and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• labour relations board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• layoffs, dismissals, working conditions, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• workers' compensation for injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WHMIS (Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Franchise head office personnel and franchise owners and managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• guidelines for managerial techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• guidelines for ideal worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• safety rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• rules for behaviour inside and outside the workplace(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wage rates and wage structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews with Head Office Personnel, 1991, Nos. 32, 34, 36, 37; Interviews with Managers/Owners, 1991, Nos. 30, 31, 33, 38). Other head office rules are meant to be indicators or guidelines to a smoothly running business, like guidelines for management styles and hiring the ideal worker (Field Journal #1 1990/1991; Interviews with Head Office Personnel, 1991, Nos. 34 and 37; Interviews with Managers/Owners, 1991, No. 30 and 33). Though franchise rules vary from firm to firm, many safety rules are the same. Some rules deal with professionalism, for example, employees wearing uniforms when on firm business (Introduction to Working as a Franchise Housekeeper 1990).

Another set of rules set by the firm regulates the behaviour of workers both inside and outside the franchise. Excessive drinking and drug use are considered taboo and, though illegal, are grounds for dismissal by some franchise owners/managers (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 38). Friendships amongst workers within the franchise are discouraged by the managers/owners, just as friendships between franchise managers/owners and workers by head office personnel (Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 37; Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 38). The women may talk too much and not clean. When the women are too friendly, the manager switches team members. In addition, the wage structure of the franchising firm governs the labour process. The type of wage structure can influence the pace the workers work. Hourly rates slow down work; percentages speed up work (Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 34; Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 33).
(6.5) WORKERS’ EXPERIENCES OF A PRODUCTION REGIME

Production regime conceptually embraces the notion of dialectical change.
Thus, within this particular set of relations in and of production, there are contradictory processes shaping labour relations and the experience of these labour relations. In the case of housekeeping services franchises, the locations of particular labour tasks are the fundamental organiser of the fragmentation implicated in the organisation of the production process. Managers use this spatial fragmentation to control labour and, in the case of conflict, encourage specific resolution strategies (see Section 6.5.1).
Though formal organisation strategies of have been thwarted by the franchising firm and individual franchises (see Section 6.5.2), informal resistance strategies abound. It is through these informal resistance strategies that workers consolidate their interests. Thus, within this milieu of separateness of labourers, there emerges a solidarity based on trust and a woman’s character (see Section 6.5.3).

(6.5.1) Spatial fragmentation of labour

Space is integral to the women’s experience of this production regime of waged domestic labour. Spatial fragmentation consists of the multiple workplaces, the separation of the workers because of the rules for carrying out the tasks in a specific way, and the organisation of workers into teams whose members may not see each other for weeks at a time. Spatial fragmentation of labour and its regulation in housekeeping services franchises abounds: from scheduling individual cleans to seating arrangements in the car; from the principles of team housekeeping to the wage structure; from training strategies for interchangeability to divisive strategies for supervision. At a micro-spatial scale, I was able to sift through the impact of this spatial fragmentation by talking with the women. I thematically organised their

22. For a review of the principles of team housekeeping see Chapter 1, Section 1.2, pp. 2-3.
experiences around fragmentation of relations in production and relations of production. In order to highlight the spatiality of these experiences, I draw out instances where the spatial fragmentation of labour affects the social interaction of the workers.

The workplace is split amongst the office, the car, and the customers' houses. Even though the manager tries to "keep us in one area" (Amy) it doesn't always work out that way. First you're here. Then, you're there. Schedules change. Routines break. Someone cancels. Yet another forgets you're coming and asks you to leave. Managers do try to construct routes and schedule cleans based on the location of the office and customers' houses as well as flows of traffic. (Journal #3) Practical adjustments in the layout of the route have to be made, with regard to the workers' health, the number of cleans per day, and the time for which the customers requested the clean. For example, one team cannot be responsible for all the customers in a rich subdivision in Ancaster, a suburb of Hamilton. Cleaning two storey, four bedroom houses all day every week is too strenuous. Besides, most of these customers want the service on Thursday or Friday, which forces the manager to overlap routes. Nor can a team maintain a full downtown route. There are simply not enough apartment and office customers.

Lori hated working at Hannah's and quit after three months, primarily because of a long commute. We talked about it in the context of changing the franchise for the better:

I think the travelling time [should change] ... either if they could be paid for, everybody paid for it ... and I don't think I would have people, I would, more I guess by area so that we're not travelling all over the mountain, all over the city, taking up so much time for that ... I don't know how they would do it. I was tired most days, exhausted. The odd time I would get headaches, but just totally exhausted. I found it very tiring. (Lori)

Driving around so much and going in and out of different parts of the city almost makes time collapse:
Some of them you feel, because you’re there every week or every second week, you feel like you’re never out of them. So, it’s like having your own second house. (Kelly)

The organisation of labour inside customers’ houses is fragmented as well. Aside from the entry and exit, team members are rarely in the same room. This drastically reduces the amount of interaction, which is supposed to be confined to housekeeping business anyway.

You just go about your business. When there’s only two, it’s hard [to talk] because they’re usually in another part of the house than you’re in. (Susie)

You don’t get a chance to get close. Which, in a way, is good. (Amy)

We talk while we’re working. If we’re on the same floor, of course. (Francie)

When there are more than two women cleaning the house, then they usually run into each other someplace. If there are only two, you see the other "either going in or coming out". (Susie)

"Going about your business" entails each team member undertaking tasks in a particular order at a particular speed.

We have a set pace. Like each team has their own set pace that they’re used to how each other works. And the pace is set. And we usually always stick to that pace. ... Usually if you’re with a team for a while, you get to know how each other works and you’ve got a set pace. It’s pretty easy. (Angela)

You go in; you clean; you leave. The division of tasks:

[Works out perfect almost in every house. Like the timing is almost to a tee. Like by the time I’m finished the bathroom and the kitchen she’ll be done with the dusting and vacuuming. (Amy)]

In this instance, the fragmentation of labour coincides with the expectations the workers had of their labour which makes them more comfortable with one another. This seems to happen only when a team has been together for some time. Team members adjust to one another. The clean is the same but the time it takes and the thoroughness varies. For example, I cleaned the same house with different partners.
Since I dusted both times, I should have been a little quicker the second time around.

But I wasn’t.

I found a couple of places I missed. I did do the house before with Cassie. This was where she had said I was slow. We did the house in an hour and a half - it took me and Roxanne an hour and fifty minutes. (Field Journal #1 1990/1991, May)

I am still not sure why there was such a difference. I do know that Roxanne and I worked at about the same pace. Perhaps Cassie was right - I was slow. But, then, so was Roxanne.

During orientation all workers are trained for each cleaning position on the team which makes workers’ positions interchangeable. Through switching team members, the manager is able to achieve two goals. First, she/he maintains divisions amongst the workers by not letting any one team get too comfortable together or the team members may get too friendly, neglect their cleaning responsibilities, and jeopardise the quality of the clean. Second, she/he sets up an informal assessment programme for quality. Since the supervising maid acts as interim supervisor who reports back to the manager, maids can be and are reported on routinely. To similar ends, teams are sometimes juggled in order for the manager to get a clearer picture of the quality of work. Particular houses are exchanged so that a supervising maid can report on the quality of another team. These acts by the workers are called "squealing". (Francie) If the clean is not up to franchise standards, then the supervising maid is required to report back to the manager. (Nancy) This point is clearly made by Kelly:

As [the manager] said one time, 'They’re not your customers. They’re my customers.’ ... and it’s true, eh? [emphasis reflects Kelly’s voice intonation]. (Kelly)

23. There are two firms that do not train new workers on kitchens until after they have been employed with the franchise for three months.
It is also fairly easy to see the thoroughness of another team's clean:

You can tell a week's dirt from two week's dirt. Or from four months. Like you can tell the amount. Especially like on ceiling fans. (Lynn)

Supervising maids squeal to the manager about 'poor quality' because:

It's not fair not to talk to her. ... She'd [the manager] rather have you go and tell her than have somebody cancel out and not know why. (Anne)

Co-worker pressure is another effective regulatory relation used by the managers to maintain control over labour and fragment the labourers. Having a co-worker who is fast, good, and dependable makes a worker want to do just about anything to keep on working with that co-worker. And you certainly don't want to let her down. Competition between team members, however, is fostered by the manager by switching team members around, even if they work well together. Resentment builds up over having to "break in a new maid" or "someone else is doing my cleans". The bottom line for management here is to promote competition amongst the workers and further fragment them.

I think it's more like when it comes down to other teams, it's a lot of competition because we could easily go into their homes [cleans] and find this and that. Like if you're looking for it you're going to find it. (Candy)

Less visible is fragmentation resulting from relations of production. Rules directly regulating the organisation of labour, like the principles of housecleaning and 'common sense'24 are not going to be broken. Most of the women told me that they pretty much stuck to the rules. Left, right, up, down. You start here; you go there. You clean this; you wipe that. They aren't that hard to follow. Besides, you always want to finish as fast as possible, so it really isn't worth breaking these rules. If

---

24. 'Common sense' guides the franchise housekeeper through the experiences of her labour. It is her reality check against which she weighs certain actions. Her common sense emerges out of her past experiences and her own personal material history.
someone needed to get home sooner than usual, you might skip a door frame or maybe
the baseboards in the living room, you pick them up the next time.

Certain times we might change something here and there, but very seldom. We
usually try to keep to the rules we’ve been given. … They’re not that hard to
follow. I mean they’re pretty easy, you know. Make sure, you know, most
people, they, if they want to have a cigarette they can wait until they get
outside. Like, I don’t think it’s necessary to be wandering around somebody’s
house with a cigarette in her hand. (Alice)

Materially, the hourly rate wage structure that pays for supervising maids’
travel time and regular maids’ cleaning time pits maid against maid (Interview with
Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 39). It is an important rationale for the manager to
be able to say that the supervising maid is being paid for driving time, not for travel
time; and that there is no need to pay for the maids’ resting time, between cleans
(Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 39). Given that the managers
actively discourage talk amongst employees about wage rates, the actual wage
differential already existing between the supervising maid and maid is not common
knowledge, but all workers know that the wage differential exists.25 Once in a
supervisory position, the worker is reluctant to jeopardise the extra money by talking
about it. The difference in an average day’s wage between a supervising maid and
maid can be as high as $12.00 once the wage differential and driving time is included.

From a workers’ viewpoint, typically, everything is fine when:

[y]ou don’t feel superior and you don’t feel lower than the other person.
You’re a partner, and that’s the way it should be. (Francie)

And when you have a good partner, you don’t want to lose her. So you try not to get
sick or take any time off. When asked about flexibility in making up the schedule,
Amy said:

25. Only the supervising maids that had been maids knew the wage
differential.
Well, I guess there is, but I don’t allow it to be. You know, like, I mean, uhm, I’m particular. I don’t like anyone else to do my work. You know, so I don’t take any time off. I would rather go to work and deal with what I have to.

(Amy)

There’s more to it than just keeping a good partner; the job itself may be in jeopardy.

Later, in the same conversation, Amy said:

[The manager] tends to give you a hard time if you want a day off. She doesn’t, like, sympathise with you if you’re not feeling well. That way, she doesn’t like, she doesn’t want you to take any time off. Ever. You know? She just gives you that impression. She comes off with that impression. It makes you feel guilty when you do take a day off. ... I was afraid to call her and tell her that I woke up this morning with the measles. ... [She said] ‘How long are you going to be off? Two days? I’ve got estimates to do’ (Amy)

Francie was concerned about having an operation. She was not sure her job would be there when she returned:

I asked, ‘Do I have a job to come back to?’ because if I didn’t I wasn’t going to have the operation. I can’t afford to not have a job. (Francie)

Workers are penalised if they are sick, either in lost wages or in lost jobs.26

Management, both the manager of the franchise and the head office personnel, takes advantage of the fragmentation of the workplace in order to sort workers into power hierarchies which further fragment labourers. Assigning an interim supervisor, "who acts as our supervisor" (Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 32) in the houses and the car sets the terms for distributing power amongst the workers. Of interest is the spatial manifestations of these power hierarchies on a micro-scale, because it is here that workers are in contact on a daily basis, make friends, and discuss their labour in the franchise.

In the car, the hierarchy of power relations is very well-defined. When I first worked with Janine and Roberta, Janine drove the car and Roberta was the maid.

26. This is very difficult to substantiate across the industry, because of the transiency of labourers and the reluctance of franchise managers and head office personnel to discuss the topic (Field Journal #3 1990/1991; Interviews with Head Office Personnel, 1991, Nos. 32, 34, 37, and 39).
Roberta was the helper whose only responsibilities were cleaning. Roberta made it clear to me the first day that I was to sit in the back seat. After all, I was only in training. But it went even further than that:

... Next, we stopped at the variety for Roberta to get some coffee. She got the last cup so I ended up getting chocolate milk. I ate my muffin in the car (... in the back seat) and drank my milk (... (Field Journal #1 1990/1991, February)

I was expected to yield to her social position within the franchise and in public as well.

This seems to be the case for most interaction with co-workers. I finally got to sit in the front seat when I got a regular cleaning partner, Roxanne. But even then it was a fleeting privilege for me. Seating arrangements were not based simply on seniority. Privilege was tied to the history of the third person to the supervising maid, or driver. For example, Lisa, who was called back to the franchise to take my place at the end of May, needed to refresh her skills. She worked with Roxanne and me for the last few days I was employed. Lisa sat in the back seat. Yet when Dorothy, who was Roxanne’s previous cleaning partner, worked with Roxanne and me, I sat in the back seat. Lisa had no history with Roxanne; Dorothy did. These hierarchies filtered back into the office:

... Roberta was going out the door. I handed my cup to her and asked her to get me a cup. She said something like ‘My name is Roberta, not Mom’ and that she ‘would like a cup with milk’ when I got mine. She said it in such a way that I wasn’t offended in the least. I got up and away I went ... (Field Journal #1 1990/1991, August)

There was another instance where it became clear to me that I was at the bottom of the power hierarchy. Conversations in the office usually centred on what everyone did last night. Initially, I was never included in the conversations, unless the manager directly asked.

At one point in the conversation, the manager turned to me and asked me how I was. I said fine. (Field Journal #1 1990/1991, March)
It was obvious that the manager treated me differently than the other workers. Apparently, she singled me out as being unlike the other workers. I think she treated me with more respect because she knew I was in university. She rarely looked up when she talked to any of the workers in the office. Yet:

... [the manager] always looks me in the eye when she talks to me. No one else makes this point consistent ... (Field Journal #1 1990/1991, April)

One day I offered to get her coffee:

... I went and got coffee. I asked Judith if she wanted me to pour her coffee and give it to her. She said no that she would get it herself. Fine ... (Field Journal #1 1990/1991, March)

In this case, though I was seemingly reinforcing the existing power relations between the manager and the workers, the manager was seemingly trying to dismantle the power hierarchy.

Micro-spatial hierarchies are prompted by the type of women hired by the managers of the franchises. Managers not only look for docile workers, but also for women who will make good supervising maids. Managers either train an employee to be a supervising maid upon hiring, or promote 'good' workers who have been with the franchise for while. The women's attitudes toward supervision of other workers varied quite widely, from embracing authority as a personal high to resenting the responsibility that goes with the supervising maid's position.

Lynn enjoys being a supervising maid. "I like having authority, it makes me feel good." (Lynn) This feeling, when translated into work, makes her a good supervising maid, especially in the eyes of the manager (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 30). She says:

Here [at home], I'm not too particular, but there [at other people's homes], I have to be very, very particular. Because I don't want to be in trouble myself. ... I got my eyes open all the time. ... When they [maids] are working on another team, you wouldn't believe what they get away with. ... I don't let
them miss nothing ... and get away with it. ... No one really checks my work. But then I know my work is done right. Because I have to do it right. (Lynn)

There is also reluctance to tell a co-worker how to behave, what to do, or even how to clean, because they don't want to treat others like children. Kelly gets angry when she has to tell a maid to mind her manners:

I don't want to be a bitch, but you shouldn't be standing there with a cigarette. (Kelly)

Nancy does too. She expressed her disgust when a new maid left a pop can and food wrappings in the gutter when they cashed out one Friday afternoon. Nancy didn't say anything on their way into the office. When they returned, there was a note on the windshield when she returned to the car:

I told her off then. I says, 'you don't do that'. I says 'you're in a cleaning, you work for a cleaning company. You don't litter'. (Nancy)

For the supervising maids who see her team members as equals, supervision becomes extremely difficult. Kelly talks about her cleaning partner:

She's a big girl. ... I don't want to be chasin' after her. (Kelly)

Patrice makes it even clearer:

I don't enforce the rules. ... I don't think I'm any better than Kate and Kate's not any better than me. I know I'm the supervising maid. I'm responsible if she doesn't do anything correct or if I don't do anything right. It doesn't matter, either way, it comes back to me and I'm to take the blame. ... I don't think you need to check anybody's work, unless it's somebody just new, that's just started. Then you have to check them. Or, if the customer complains, and then it comes back to us. The manager will say 'Be careful the next time'. So the next couple of times we go, I'll say did you - I won't check her then. But most of the time I don't check her because I think she knows what she's doing. (Patrice)

Even training is an awful supervising job, as Amy says:

I knew things would be disorganised. I had to go behind her and check, uhmm, her work, and she said that she had experience before for seven months at another cleaning company. I don't think so. So, and, like it's frustrating when you have to go 'optical' behind somebody and tell them every two minutes,

27. Amy raised her hand to her face as if she were holding a magnifying glass.
'Did you do this?', when you know that it didn't look like it was done. And, she said, 'Yeah, I already did it,' and then you go over it again. And, you know, you can see that she's getting ticked off like every time you do something. Like I've told her two or three times already 'Make sure you dry out your tubs.' And stuff like that. Because that is important. Like the bathrooms are important. ... Yesterday we did an initial, and she forgot a lot of things. And it was like I did my job and hers, you know. Her job over again, because I'm so used to doing a really good thorough job and it just wasn't up to my standards, you know. [interruption] Whereas, it takes a long time to get, to get good at it. It does. It takes a long time. Like you get to know exactly what the customer likes and exactly the way you leave things. I wasn't as good when I started either, but I was probably was just as bad as she was, you know. But, but, I've worked there for over two years and I'm confident in my work and I'm, I think I do really good job, you know. (Amy)

Some of the women have ambivalent feelings toward the responsibility which further fragment workers from each other. On the one hand, negatively, there are tasks which are passed off the supervising maid that should probably be 'directives' from the manager. Amy, as a supervising maid, is supposed to tell one of the maids on her team that she is not allowed to bring her purse into the house during cleans.

[T]he manager says it's up to me to tell her, but I don't really think that I should be put in that spot. You know? She's told her [the maid] I think twice. I've told her two or three times, but she still says, 'Well I need my purse inside'. I tell her to put it in the bucket. But she won't. (Amy)

Nancy, too, had mixed feelings. Although she liked being a supervising maid, she wasn't all that comfortable with the responsibility all the time:

I'm the one always in charge. I'm the one that has to deal with the problems. (Nancy)

I have sympathy for this position. When I was a maid, my supervising maid had to leave notes to the owners of the house ever time I did something wrong. She left a note each time I broke a light bulb (too numerous to count), when I pulled the shower doors off the rack (luckily nothing broke), and when we set off the house alarm.

On the other hand, positively, some supervising maids find satisfaction in their supervisory position. Susie finds satisfaction when customers phone in and compliment her team's work. The manager passes on the compliment to the maids:
When [the manager] compliments my workers, it compliments me also, because I’ve made sure that they have done it properly.

So, it is the team? (Pamela)

It is, yes. That’s what keeps the customers happy, is the working together. It’s just not me. It’s not just them. It’s everybody together. And [the manager] sort of trusts us. (Susie)

(6.5.2) Resolving conflict formally

This waged domestic labour production regime for housekeeping services franchises fractures women’s experiences of labour and its regulation through the formal ways to resolve conflict within the franchise. For example, the first stage in the formal avenue for resolving conflict within the franchise is set up so that each woman individually has to approach the manager and openly confront the issue ‘behind closed doors’ without the support of her co-workers (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 33). Also, when workers do bring up an issue with the manager, the managers are encouraged to use interpersonal interaction techniques that evoke emotional responses from the workers, without being belligerent or argumentative (Field Journal #1 1990/1991; Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 39; Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 30). These initial encounters in formal avenues of conflict resolution nearly closes off the women’s access to formal contestations of the organisation of labour. However, out of this fragmentation arises conflict over the control of labour power as well as over the regulation of the labour process.

Resolution of the conflict takes two forms: direct contestation of the regulations set by the firm or the state and informal resistance strategies. I now turn to a presentation of the women’s experiences of formal and informal strategies for resolving conflict in

---

28. Recall that managers purposefully hire women who have low self esteem. Also, though staff meetings are encouraged by the franchising firm, the franchise managers do not always hold regular meetings, and, if they do hold a meeting, contentious issues are not discussed unless brought up by the workers.
order to be able to show how these experiences of resistance to regulation shape and are shaped by their attitudes and actions toward their own labour.

Each firm's guidelines for resolving conflict state that any conflict within the franchise is supposed to be dealt with inside the franchise (with the exception of injuries) (Interviews with Head Office Personnel, 1991, Nos. 34, 37, and 39; Interviews with Manager/Owner, 1991, 30, 33, and 38). Each conflict is treated independently, as a separate case. Power in decision-making rests primarily with the manager,29 except in the case of conflict between the manager and firm. The manager usually relies on her/his own experiences and common sense to make decisions. Head office personnel are in place to make suggestions and give advice. When the conflict goes beyond the scope of the production process, for example, when a supervising maid is arrested while driving with an invalid driver's license, the manager, franchise owner, or head office personnel is quick to point this out and wash their hands of the situation. These guidelines provided by the firm encourage managers to deal with co-worker conflict individually. 'One-on-one’ is the most popular way managers deal with conflict with employees and between co-workers. This style of interaction allows the manager to "transfer responsibility" back to the worker. It is important not to get angry, because anger breeds anger; it is important to make the worker feel guilty, because guilt brings about the desired behaviour (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 30).

One group oriented way to bring up problems is holding regular staff meetings. Head office personnel from each firm assured me that all their franchises hold regular staff meetings. I found that this wasn’t the case. One franchise never had staff meetings. The other franchise managers intended to hold meetings, yet their

29. When the manager is not the owner, the owner usually holds more power.
schedules don’t often permit these meetings. One had a meeting once every six to eight months. The other had meetings twice a year. For the duration of this project, between January 1990 and May 1991, the franchise where I was employed had two. Given the infrequency of staff meetings when compared to the average length of employment\textsuperscript{30} for housekeeping services franchise workers, this formal avenue for challenge is all but closed off to most franchise employees (see example above, p. 166).

Thus, the one-on-one style is given more credence within the firm and franchises and is encouraged for all forms of conflict. This individualisation of challenging regulatory relations, and in many cases the regulator directly, often prohibits workers to come forward to resolve conflict with the manager. The manager who helps the most staff meetings actually prefers the one-on-one style. She is very practical:

It comes down to the bare bones where there is a job to be done and you have to do it. And it often times comes to a question of ‘if we can’t put aside the things that are not truly intrinsic to the business long enough to do the business, then there is no point in being in the business’. And if you don’t like it, leave. You know, I’ll acknowledge that there are problems. Sometimes those problems have to be set aside if, if problems that are not basic to the business are starting to interfere with the basic business, then you sometimes just have to confront people and get them to agree to set them aside or, you know, somehow resolve them - and it would often times. What, what in people’s minds are enormous problems truly are not problems. They are simply often imaginings. They are often just complete psychological conditions of the people involved and have nothing to do with reality. And yet those, those things can become all-consuming to those people and actually prevent them from doing the job. It’s like being afraid of the dark. (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 33).

So, whoever is having problems are the ones that need to get together and talk.

Formal challenges to the state are made to specific organisations or ministries, as in labour relations boards or employment and immigration programmes.

\textsuperscript{30} The average length of employment is estimated by head office personnel and franchise managers to be six months.
Contesting relations of production involve struggles that are located outside workplace organising, like in disputes over practices that contravene any part of the labour code or infractions of contractual agreements. Given the extensive use of contracts and percentage waged structures, both franchise owners and workers enter into legally binding relationships with the firm (Private Documents 1991). Basic labour rights gained from struggles in the past have been circumvented through the use of contracts designating an amount of money for an end product. In this way, daily minimum wage, paid break entitlements, unpaid eating period, and overtime pay, are not necessarily part of the contract (Ontario Employment Standards Act 1991). Hence, struggles forming around conflict over one’s contract feed into more widely based legal struggles over the control of one’s own labour power. These transformative struggles will shape future struggles of resistance.

None of the women were involved in any formal challenges over the relations of production. Candy filed a worker’s compensation report when she got a two centimetre long splinter under her fingernail. Nancy slipped on icy steps and bruised her tail bone while working as a maid. She received four days compensation for the injury. She also sprained her ankle and was off work for two days without wages. A month into my employment I sprained my ankle on the job while delivering flyers. Because I could not perform the tasks I was hired for, the manager laid me off for a week. I received no compensation.

31. The Ontario Employment Standards Act (1991, p. 129) states that a worker called into work on a given day must be paid the equivalent to three hours of work at minimum wage.
32. S. Cohen (1987) differentiates struggles over the control of labour and the regulation of labour. She refers to struggles over the control of labour (relations in production) "struggles of resistance". She refers to struggles toward new forms of the organisation of labour (relations of production) "struggles of transformation".
Unions are uncommon. A manager told me she "dumped" a woman for making overtures about unions:

I did have someone try that. ... I just dumped her. I just didn't give her a chance. I was, you know, 'you're out the door'. And I didn't even tell her why. She hadn't worked for me - like if you get, what is it, 10 weeks, there is a maximum amount of time. She hadn't worked for me for that long. She was within that, that, that area, so I just dumped her. (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 30).

It was a 'legal' firing according to the Ontario Employment Standards Act in that she was dismissed within three months of employment (1991, p. 136). She was not directly fired; she was simply not asked to come back.

Head office personnel and managers are threatened by formalised resistance in the form of unions. Head office personnel were vehement. Their reasons ranged from "the customers won't allow it" to "our workers are happy the way they are":

I'm terribly anti-union. ... I can't possible see what we c'n't do. We are very careful of, of what [inaudible] provincially as well as federally. We are very careful that minimum wage is met at all times regardless of the amount of money available. Those types of things. They [the workers] are very well looked after. I would see no benefit, whatsoever, except to make life [pause] miserable. (Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 37).

Yet the minimum wage level has to be legislated. One head office person suggested an alternative:

If there was some kind of unionisation of what I would call the underground economy of the maid services industry which is a huge part of our industry [privately employed domestic labourers], then we would probably stand on top of the buildings and celebrate. Because that would, in essence, force people out of the woodwork, to claim the income they're making. We put some numbers

33. Formal resistance is regulated by the state in the form of unions. Franchise housekeepers are not targets for organising support by community based groups. As I mentioned above, the group organising domestic workers focus all its efforts on privately employed domestic labourers and do not ever deal with franchise housekeepers. Transiency and average length of employment prevent larger unions from getting involved. These waged domestic labour positions may still largely be considered 'labours of love' since women perform the same tasks at home for 'free'. Any such formal attempts at organising have evidently met dead ends in housekeeping services franchise industry.
together for Ottawa. It's staggering, the income that the government's not getting through legitimate taxes that are being invaded by the underground economy. So, if, if the unionisation of domestics resulted in some of those, or a lot of those people being to forced out into the open, and then that would be great. We would certainly, we would be very happy to see that. The unionisation of our own people? Certainly my gut reaction is, is, that, that we would to anything and everything to avoid that. And, I don't know if they can ever, really, can ever properly pull that off, given that each location is independently owned, and that each owner has their own ability to set wages, in essence. We provide the scale for them. We dictate what happens, but through their pricing, they are controlling how much the maids get paid and, and how many houses they clean in a give week. [my emphasis] (Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 32)

Managers' responses regarding collective organising were uniform, reflecting firm policy.

And, uhm, I don't believe that would be, it would be very difficult having a union. I think one of the reasons being that is you have a transient, uhm, you have a transient, uh, staff situation. So, really these people go from working for maid service to working at Harvey's [fast food industry]. You know that sort of thing. (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 30)

I don't think I'd like that at all. ... I think unions have lost their usefulness, I really do. And I'm just big enough. To even consider right at the moment, I just, I don't know what the implications would be. I have no idea. I never thought of it before. (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 31)

I don't know. I never worked for a company that was unionised. So, I don't know the first thing about unions. I don't think it would be a good idea. ... The pay and the pay system is, is not horrible, but it is not fantastic. Like for a sole supporter, you couldn't make it. It's all right for a second income. (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 38)

Thus management is against unions and organising.

But, so are the workers. None of the women said that they would support another worker in a grievance against management on principle. The women call it character. By character, the women mean how much they trust the co-worker and how much she believes that that co-worker would be telling the truth.

34. I requested a copy of these numbers, but never received them. I was not able to find a published version of what the person was talking about, nor could he provide a copy for me.

35. As an aside, only one of the women participating in this study was ever employed in a fast food franchise. The women leaving the housekeeping services franchises have not taken jobs in the fast food industry.
If I knew that facts and the worker was being accused of something that I knew. For instance, okay you didn’t clean the kitchen sink or kind of a work your full hours sort of thing. Now if I was there when the person cleaned the sink. I saw them clean the sink or I saw the sink clean afterwards, then yes I would say, you’re wrong. You know? The kid came in after that and dirtied it or whatever. Then I would. But, if I knew, uhm, I wouldn’t do it just on character. (Candy)

In addition, the feeling of powerlessness prevents some women to support co-workers:

I wouldn’t make enough difference. ... I’m not that forward that way. I’m not that assertive. I mean I’m assertive to a point, but not, but not to that point. There are other women there that are more assertive that way than I am. But I would follow their lead. (Susie)

Beatrice is a little bit different than the rest of the women. She doesn’t mind breaking the rules or challenging the manager’s authority. She was angry about there not being a lamp in the pantry where the supplies are kept. Supervising maids have to go in the supply room and put together their equipment and cleaning products each morning.

[The manager’s] always talking about public relations. I’m thinking, well, what about employee relations. Spend a few bucks on a lamp and put a lamp in there for them so they don’t have to do it in the dark. (Beatrice)

She finally got the lamp.

Pay for driving time is the most contentious issue in Beatrice’s franchise. Most supervising maids supported maids on the issue of pay for travel time. The united stance is that both do the same job and should be paid the same. The supervising maid’s time is no more ‘valuable’ than a maid’s time. The wage differential makes up for the additional responsibilities, driving included. Supervising maids don’t tarry between cleans. You either pay everyone for travel time, or no one.

Beatrice waited a long time for the manager to call a staff meeting, the formal contestation route. After three months of waiting after she requested a meeting specifically, the manager called a meeting. During the meeting, Beatrice was silent.
Beatrice felt the issue’s time had passed. The upshot of all this is that the momentum for the request for pay for driving time was lost.

(6.5.3) **Building solidity**

From the experiences of the production regime, one might expect the destruction of a labourer’s subjectivity. However, processes of consolidation were just as ubiquitous as fragmentation in the social relations of labour in the franchises. Where there is an absolute division, there is a forging of a connection; where there is a break in continuity, there is a building of circuitous routes; where there is a forced parting, there is a constructed coming together. The women built solidarity. They did so primarily through informal struggles within the labour process. Because of the spatial fragmentation of labour, there is little direct supervision by the manager which leaves much room for workers to interact and build solidarity. For example, in order to compensate for the lack of paid travel time for the maids, supervising maids will add time to the record of the clean, especially if travel time is heavy for a particular day. (Kelly, Beatrice) Struggles over the control of labour are successful if they bring the workers closer together or force the manager to compromise on an issue. Workers develop strategies and pass them along to co-workers. Though there may not be a formal labour organisation, the women are organised in informal solidarity.

On most teams, workers break many of the rules - they clean in their sock feet, swear, talk to each other while cleaning, bring purses into the houses, listen to the radio in the houses, watch television, and flirt with other drivers. There is some theft, like toilet paper, cookies, and newspapers, but rarely is something of value taken. On hot days workers don’t wear their smocks or aprons. They rearrange schedules to save gas money and they use the cleaning products to save their own money. You have
gained respect when you break rules with your cleaning partner because you join her in a secret that the manager doesn’t know about.

In contrast to these rules, the three principles of team cleaning, 'left-right-up-down', 'inside-out', and 'helping-out' (see Chapter 1, Section 1.2, pp. 2-3) are not worth breaking because it would only slow down the clean. The women might skip over some tasks, but thoroughness can be foregone if the worker has an appointment to make by 4:30. Being quick endears you to your cleaning partner. If you’re lucky, you get to work with someone who is especially fast who will teach you:

Well, I see, I think with Lynn what happened because I seen with for my eyes. She, one thing about Lynn is that she had really good judgement. She knew when to cheat. I have, I have seen her cheat. But see I don’t know how often she did it. But she knew when she could get away with it and she knew what customers would check and what customers wouldn’t. And she just knew how to make things look a certain way. And you couldn’t tell, right? You just couldn’t tell. So, maybe that’s what she had, was the best judgement. See, I, I’ve got pretty good judgement, too. Now and then, I’ll cheat in a small way. I hate using the word cheat, ’cause I don’t really think it’s cheatin’. I figure if, if a house has like two living room suites and it’s a medium [service] and we have to pull out both living room suites. That takes a lot of time. And, that’s hard on your back. So, a lot of times in these fancy homes one living room is the living room and then like a family room or a rec room type of thing and the living room is like a showcase. They don’t even eat in there or anything. They probably don’t even sit in there. There’s not one crumb under the cushions. Sometimes I just lift up the cushion; look underneath it; stick my head on the floor, look at the couch; nothing’s under there. So, I’m not going to bother ripping all the cushions off the couch and vacuuming underneath. Or moving the couch. I’ll do the rooms that they use, right? So things like that where you can save some time, if you know the room’s not being used, you know, why, why move it? (Beatrice)

There are even more challenging informal resistance strategies which are 'illegal' and very effective in building solidarity. For example, workers can refuse to clean particular houses unless certain conditions are met, for example, the dogs are put outside, the place is tidied up before the team arrives, the people have to be out of the house, or the fee is raised. If the worker does not like the customer, she does the minimum clean, just enough so she doesn’t get fired or reprimanded. A supervising
maid can refuse 'add-ons' which results in the franchise losing a clean for the day.

(Lynn) A worker can refuse to work with another worker, resulting in the manager
reorganising teams or perhaps, in extreme cases, firing the less-valued worker.

Workers can either speed up or slow down in response to a trainee, depending on
'how' they want that new worker to 'look'. Whole teams can 'walk out' putting the
manager in a position where she has to meet their demands on the spot in order to keep
customers (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 38). Some demands might
include taking a house off the schedule or redistributing the cleans, especially in
franchises with a percentage wage structure. Even though the conflict in most of these
instances is between the manager and the supervising maid, all the women in the
franchise feel like they 'won' because one of them stood up to the manager. Such
refusals challenge the relations of production. All the women participating in this study
have at one time engaged in one or more of these strategies.

One effective strategy to challenge the domination of the customer is to
control the information or provision of services to the customer. This strategy is
condoned by almost all the workers because their jobs are not threatened.

I say things to her [a customer] and set her off. She wanted [a clean] done for
Christmas. Cause her day was Christmas day. She goes, 'Well when can I get
done?' I says, 'No, we don't work Christmas day.' She goes, 'Well, when can
I get done?' I said, 'I don't know. I don't make up the schedule. you'll have
to call [the manager].' [laugh] ... That was in October. And she kept bugging
and bugging and I says, 'I don't know. You know there's a lot of other
customers.' And she was freaking out. But, I knew [the manager] had her
down for the twenty fourth, for the Monday. And I knew, and I wouldn't let
her know that she was there [on the schedule]. And, she was going crazy.
She's a monthly customer. And I just like to bug her, you know? (Patrice)

Beatrice gets back at this one particular customer "when he backstabs" her team:

When he talks and he's all friendly to us and then, the next thing you know, as
soon as we're out the door, he's calling the office saying that we didn't do this

36. This was reported once by a woman manager who has been connected
to the housekeeping franchise industry since its beginning.
or that. How dare him, when he doesn’t even sweep his floors between visits. He doesn’t know a thing about cleanin’. (Beatrice)

Every Wednesday he wants his floors waxed, but he’s too cheap to get them stripped.

So, Beatrice figures:

To hell with you. If you’re not satisfied with how we do your floors anyways, then I’m not wasting my time with you. You’re getting a quickie. And we’ll just go in and out and I’m out of here. (Beatrice)

And the manager knows nothing about it.

Rather than viewing the spatial fragmentation of the workplace negatively, workers view it as a part of the freedom of the job. Instead of being a place of isolation and alienation, workers see the car and the houses as places where they are not being watched all the time. You work at your own pace. You don’t get nervous. You relax and even goof off if there’s time. But what is at issue is the control over the organisation of one’s time within the labour process. Scheduling a day’s work and the order in which the specific tasks are to be performed are usually set by the firm.

Experienced labourers can often shorten the time it takes to either squeeze in a extra customer or finish all the cleans by mid-afternoon. For example, Candy was particularly concerned about making it through the day quickly. The supervising maid on her team, Cora, was the quickest cleaner in the franchise. She and Cora made a pact: because there were so many different houses, they would always do the same task. Amy and Francie had the same arrangement. Angela preferred to negotiate duties on an individual basis, which is the way the rest of the workers did. (Angela)

Non-exchange of duties makes for monotonous work, but cleaning a house takes less time if team members are always doing the same set of tasks.

Also, while the specialization of tasks acts as a limit on what an employee is supposed to do, the same specialization prevents the labourer to perform additional tasks - within the labour process, for example, providing plantcare, chatting to elderly
customers, or fixing an old lamp. This happens often, especially when customers are home. In the two weeks I worked with Cassie, we refused to clean a chandelier by leaning over the banister; scrub glue strips from the bathtub; vacuum a fireplace and hearth; dust the tops of kitchen cabinets (you could only reach them by standing on the counter); and empty a kitty litter box.

Management’s one-on-one style of conflict resolution is flexible enough to face problems arising on a daily basis which are specific to a particular set of workers at a specific time. For example, an employee got angry and quit because the manager refused to give her time off to take her baby to the doctor on a Thursday (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4.3, p. 120). The following week the manager made a rule that no employee can make medical appointments on Thursdays or Fridays.

Enhancing the flexible management style are 'spies' in the 'ranks' who keep the managers informed of 'trouble' brewing. The manager usually acts quickly on the information without confronting the 'accused' in order not to have to reveal her source and not to have open conflict around which the worker might rally. Dismissal during the initial phases of employment need not be explained. This was how the union organiser was 'found out':

But, I won't even if I - I always have key people who, who, who listen for me and give me feedback on potential problem areas. And I, and this is what happened in this instance. And I dumped the person right away. (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 30)

Safety in the houses and the cars is the most uncontrollable aspect of the labour process. The women developed strategies for resisting all other forms of authority, but could not really be assured of their safety and health inside the homes. Yet through learning to cope with unsafe conditions and situations women find commonalities with her co-workers which builds solidarity amongst them. For the

37. None of the women admitted to being a 'spy'.
most part "the customers are very nice, [but] some of them are weird". (Patrice) You
never know what's going to happen. Amy told me about this one man who was drunk
while she was trying to clean the house.

One time we went in there and he wasn't there. When he came in and I was
cleaning the kitchen ... he opened the door. I looked at him and said 'Hi.'
And he [leered at me]. And my heart started pounding. And I thought, oh,
he's going to do something. ... I looked around for something to grab just in
case, you know, I get kind of scared and that. So I just cleaned really fast. I
didn't care if he complained because after that day I wasn't going to clean him
anymore anyhow. I just hurried up and got out of there quick. ... I'm pretty
defenseless.38 (Amy)

Amy kept a knife within reach until she left.

Alice hates cleaning bathrooms because of colds, flus, and other diseases.

Who's got a cold? Has anybody got some kind of disease? And you're thinking
of these things when you're doing it [cleaning]. I find that it sometimes does
get to me. (Alice)

Bathroom cleaning products are corrosive. Lynn complained about her finger tips
bleeding and trying to cover them with plastic kitchen bags because she didn't have
rubber gloves that day:

I probably don't have any fingerprints left, you know. (Lynn)

Animals can pose a threat to a franchise housekeeper. Anne had a problem
with a pet. "Terror", a cat, foaming at the mouth, lunged at Anne when she entered
one of the bedrooms. She slammed the door and did not go back in. Later, the owner
of the cat phoned and apologised for the cat's misbehaviour. And then there are bugs.
Cockroaches can be a problem when they get into your clothes or the equipment and
come home with you. One franchise has a policy to refuse work if a maid sees a
cockroach (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 38). Other insects are more

38. Sexual harassment is discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.4.3.3, pp. 261-
263.
difficult to deal with, because they are not 'unhealthy' or 'dangerous'. Candy told me that one woman:

had left dinner from a few nights before and there were actually ants crawling in the dinner sitting on the counter. And the smell was just incredible. That gives you a feeling of not so much of safe, but just the uncleanliness of it. You know, it makes you wonder, you know? (Candy)

She had to clean it up.

Other women saw that being on the road so much was the primary safety concern. Alice as a supervising maid expressed her concern:

The most dangerous part of this whole job is being on the road so much. Having to watch for other vehicles. Make sure [you're] driving safely. I find sometimes I worry about the other people in the car with me. (Alice)

In order to make the women feel safer while on the road, some of the firms require that an extensive first aid kit be in the car; that all employees have valid driver's license; and that the supervising maid take a defensive driving course, paid for by the franchising firm. Although these acts would enhance safety, requiring driver's license of all employees would severely restrict women's access to this particular type of job.

(6.6) CONCLUDING REMARKS

Shifts in the organisation of the relations in and of production direct the development of production regimes over time and space. Workers' experiences of these reorganisations set the conditions within which new production regimes emerge. I have demonstrated that the post-1973 organisation of waged domestic labour of housekeeping services franchises varies considerably from previous regimes in its qualifications for employment, delineation of tasks, technical division of labour, distributions of labour tasks, codified regulations, and managerial supervision. It follows that workers' experiences of this particular organisation of relations in and of production too vary considerably.
In addition, experiences of the relations in and of production in housekeeping services franchises differ from woman to woman. Through contradictory processes of change within relations in and of production, these experiences both fragment and consolidate workers. While some of the women find it difficult to challenge the manager directly, the spatial fragmentation of the workplace allows workers to resist authority openly (but still not out of the reach of management since there are 'spies'). If conflict arises, the matter is resolved on an individual basis. Workers, however, develop ways to overcome the fragmentation at least partially by challenging the control of their labour power. These informal resistance strategies are based on breaking rules together and building trust. Thus, informal solidarity is constructed and rises in tandem with new rules set by managers as a result of the ongoing resolution of conflict.

The concept of production regime is the result of conceiving of the relations and processes involved in productive labour power of 'total labour' at a less extensive level of abstraction from a production vantage point. Production regime brings into focus relations of domination and economic exploitation within the production process by distinguishing between the social relations of labour and the relations and processes regulating labour. The conceptual distinction between the labour process as the organisation of tasks and regulatory apparatuses as institutions governing the labour process can explain more clearly productive labour, dialectical change in capitalist labour relations, and social divisions of labour. Production regime permits the identification, description, and explanation of particularised (materially and historically) sets of productive labour relations. Though production-oriented, production regime does not diminish the significance of simple reproduction or the reproduction of labour power. The generation of surplus value identifies a specific set
of economic relations as productive labour. Like 'total labour', production regime embodies contradictory processes of change. An analyst using production regime is better able to explain how workers struggle for control of their own labour power and why they are not always successful in transforming labour relations because this conceptualisation calls attention to the simultaneous control, reinforcement, and maintenance of the existing organisation of productive labour relations as well as their contestation, (re)construction, and transformation. Using production regime is more flexible than using radical labour market segmentation theories in explaining spatial and temporal variations in specific organisations of labour primarily because it does not root divisions of labour in product or labour markets. The social divisions of labour are already embodied in the relations organising the labour process. Experiences of labour and its regulation are meaningful and significant in (re)constructing individual and collective identities.

The women's experiences of the particular organisation of waged domestic labour indicate specific ways in which women workers negotiate power within the relations in and of production. These instances include negotiating power: in a spatially fragmented workplace, organised around informal resistance strategies in lieu of formal organisations (like unions), and in finding commonalities upon which to build solidarity. In the absence of a manager's supervision, workers break the rules that have little to do with the length or the quality of the clean. Breaking such rules with a co-worker is somewhat akin to a loyalty test, in that it sorts through whose on the manager's side and who isn't. Because formal conflict resolution channels are nearly closed off to the workers, in addition to breaking rules, the women develop informal strategies that resist the manager's authority in specific places. It is through these challenges that the women build solidarity.
I address this latter point in the following chapter (Chapter 7). In order to
detail the formation processes of social identities, less extensive abstractions are
needed, so that one can directly and more concretely address the emergence,
maintenance, and transcendence of spatially- and historically-specific social divisions of
labour. Conceptually, I work through the formation processes of class and gender
within 'total labour' (Sections 7.2 and 7.3). Empirically, I demonstrate these processes
by drawing on the experiences of the women participating in this study (Section 7.4).
CHAPTER 7
CONCEPTUALISING CLASS FORMATION AND GENDER FORMATION
AND DEMONSTRATING THEM EMPIRICALLY

(7.1) OUTLINE

In this chapter, I first review radical approaches to conceptualising class
and gender and highlight specific conceptual advances theorists have made in
attempting to sort through class and gender relations and people’s experiences of them.
Next, I present an alternative conceptualisation of class and gender as sets of formation
processes. I then argue that by conceptualising class and gender as processes, whereby
individuals attach meaning to their material lives as women, analysts can examine more
concretely how women forge individual and collective identities through their own
labour. I then demonstrate these concepts empirically by drawing on women’s
fragmenting and consolidating experiences of labour and its regulation in housekeeping
services franchises. I conclude with comments on the empirical links between ‘total
labour’, production regime, and class formation and gender formation within these
women’s lives.

(7.2) A CRITICAL REVIEW

Class relations are emphasised in radical approaches to the explanation of
labour processes in capitalist societies in one of two ways: either by distinguishing
buyers, sellers, and controllers of workers’ labour power or by indicating workers’
positions in the process of the generation of surplus value (see Chapter 6, Section 6.2).
These production-oriented analyses privilege the examination of class relations over
other sets of social relations, like for example gender, because the fundamental
characteristic in the identification of the production process under capitalism traditionally has been the capacity of an individual to sell her/his labour power. By basing analyses on this premise, analysts tend to view jobs, class positions, and labour markets as sex-typed or gendered instead of viewing the distribution of power between women and men as part of the construction of the labour process in these jobs, class positions, and labour markets (see e.g. the treatment of women workers theoretically in Barron and Norris 1976, pp. 47, 51-57; Wright 1985, pp. 126-130, 197-200, 230-232, and 260-278; Burawoy 1985, pp. 91-108, 111; Sabel 1982, pp. 98-99).

Feminists interested in gender relations and labour have contributed to radical labour process studies by empirically linking, both materially and historically, relations of domination between women and men with a particular labour process in capitalist society. For example, Palmer (1989) shows how the dominant ideology of sexuality in the inter-war period contributed to the process of making domestic labour jobs part of women's work. Cockburn (1985) illustrates the process of gendering by investigating power relations between women and men in occupations where mostly women are employed as labourers and men as managers. And, from rich, textual accounts of women's everyday lives, Westwood (1985) elucidates the interconnections between the distribution of power within relations of gender, class, and ethnicity on the shopfloor and in the home by linking women's actions with their attitudes.¹ These works stress the importance of including the uneven distribution of power between women and men in explanations of labour processes in capitalist societies and in interpretations of women's experiences of this gender division of labour.

Rather than recasting key concepts from each of these literatures from a feminist vantage point, it is more useful in a theory of waged domestic labour processes

¹. Other examples include Remy and Sawers (1984), Gannagé (1987), and Lipsig-Mumme (1987).
to reconstruct the conceptions of both class and gender from the vis-à-vis of 'total labour'. This reconstruction has two major advantages. First, because 'total labour' conceptualises those relations and processes through which labour power is expended, the social divisions of labour are already implicated in the organisation of labour via the relations of exploitation and domination (see Chapter 5, Section 5.3, pp. 95 and 98 and Chapter 6, Section 6.2, pp. 131-132, and Section 6.3, p. 135). Second, the historical and spatial specificity of workers' experiences of various organisations of labour can be more fully incorporated into an explanation of waged domestic labour processes by interpreting the complex ways in which workers' attitudes and actions shape and are shaped by contradictory processes of changing capitalist labour relations. In this section, I first call attention to critical points made by four theorists in the analysis of class formation (Section 7.2.1). I then review the key contributions from radical analyses of labour in formulating gender formation as a concept (Section 7.2.2). I end this section by pointing out the distinguishing features of my approach.

(7.2.1) Class formation

and Wright (1985, 1989) argues that the process of class formation is shaped but not determined by the class structure. I chose these particular works because each theorist: (a) has an interest in but not solely on labour processes in capitalist societies; (b) views class as a process either implicitly or explicitly; (c) maintains that class relations shift and change over time; and (d) is committed to overcoming dichotomous conceptions of class. In combination, these analysts have laid the groundwork for conceptualising class as a set of concrete processes whereby an individual's class identity is defined not only objectively within the relations of exploitation or domination, but also subjectively by their experiences of labour and its regulation.

Lukács (1971a) argues that since the immediacy of everyday life obscures the social relations within which people engage, individual experiences are reified. In order for individuals to overcome this immediacy and consequently the mystified relations, they have to strip bare their relations of social existence and separate the objective relation from the subjective mediation of that relation. Individuals can resist an organisation of social relations by identifying the conditions of existence (e.g. the position of the worker in relations to the ownership of the means of production) and becoming aware of her/his experiences mediating those conditions. Class consciousness is the state of dialectic interaction between the relations of economic exploitation and the individual experiences of it, that is, the tension between the objective conditions and subjective experiences of labour.

By implicating 'total labour' in Lukács' analysis, the scope of class widens from a narrowly defined concept of a set of labour relations to one that includes individuals' experiences without dividing labourers into groups of workers with a similar set of characteristics (like in radical labour market segmentation theory) or without collective interests in waged labour (like in a world views approach). This is
important because class would then involve productive and reproductive, waged and unwaged, and remunerated and non-remunerated labour. If this were the case, then Lukács’ analysis would widen to include: (a) the rationalisation of capitalist labour relation; within ‘total labour’, which would result in the fragmentation of not only waged labour processes and alienation of the waged labourer, but also unwaged labour processes and of the unwaged labourer; (b) the reification of the distribution of power, which would reinforce the ‘naturalness’ of divisions of labour based on for example gender, and affirm the state of alienation for all labourers (cf. Vogel 1983); and (c) resistance strategies organised around reproductive labour, which would include struggles over the allocation of domestic labour in the household, struggles over the regulation of reproductive labour, and struggles over the provision of state services.

Fincher’s (1983, 1984) arguments dovetail with Lukács’ conception of mediation in the context of class struggle. She argues that analysts do not need to build multiple constructs to explain each phenomenal manifestation of class. Rather, by conceptualising class relations more widely than workplace relations through the process of abstraction, spatially specific class structures can be explained. More specifically, she argues that classes form through struggles over the relations of power either inside the labour process or outside the production process. Fincher stops short of identifying labour as the embracing concept that signifies the formation of classes in that she does not identify non-productive labour processes as sites of class conflict. For Fincher, relations of exploitation still organise class relations. Even so, the expansion of the concept of class conflict to sites outside the production process points toward the

---

2. Unsuccessful struggles, too, can indicate class links within relations that are not conventionally defined as relations between labour and capital.
conceptualisation of 'total labour' as translated into the 'reproduction regime' (see Moss 1992d).³

In his relational analysis, Burawoy (1985) argues that political struggles over class power emerge out of the organisation of labour and its regulation. Manifestations of class conflict vary from regime to regime and may be cloaked in other sets of relations, especially in the transition from hegemony to hegemonic despotism.⁴ These 'politics of production' are significant in shaping classes and directing class struggles over relations in and of production. By implicating 'total labour', a 'politics of reproduction' emerges wherein class struggle outside production is located and class forms through struggles over reproductive labour.⁵

Wright (1985) argues that objective material conditions exist outside individual consciousness and that class structure is irreducible to class ideologies held by individuals and organisations. The social mediation through subjective experiences of material objective class interests results in consciousness formation. Through the concept of contradictory class locations,⁶ Wright advocates looking at constitutive class formation processes, wherein social and cultural mediation form concrete, individual subjectivities within objective material conditions. These objective conditions of subjectivity merely shape an individual's experiences and by no means determines it.

---

³. Her later studies show her interest in the regulation of the reproduction of the social relations of the local state in the provision of services for the reproduction of labour (Fincher 1989, 1993).
⁴. See Burawoy's (1985) Chapter 3.
⁵. For example, the organisation of struggles over a pregnant woman's choice for abortion has class implications. Making it illegal for a woman to choose abortion without the consent of a medical doctor and withdrawing state funding for abortion clinics draws a distinct class line between those who can and cannot afford to secure a safe abortion either through travel or status connections.
⁶. See Chapter 4, Section 4.2, p. 66, and Figure 4.1, p. 67.
(7.2.2) Gender formation

Like class formation, the concept of gender formation is theoretically derived from a number of works. Because gender and class are not categorically the same, the theoretical derivation is not the same, that is, gender and class do not comprise the same set of relations from different vantage points. Rather, they are central constructs of feminism and marxism with respect to inequalities in the distribution of power. Three specific works have influenced my formulation of gender formation, Rubin (1975), Burstyn (1986), and Wright (1985). Rubin (1975) develops an anthropological concept of sex/gender systems in an attempt to pull together social and biological conceptions of femininity and masculinity to be used in the explanation of differences in the distribution of power between women and men. Burstyn (1986) unravels the dominating power relations of capitalism and patriarchy and introduces gender-class, economic-class, and masculine dominance to assist in explaining the distribution of power within capitalist labour relations. Wright (1985), in the context of contradictory class locations,\(^7\) provides insight into the construction of gender and gender relations and into gendering as a process. I chose these three analyses of labour because together they outline the framework within which I conceptualise gender as a set of concrete processes through which individuals gain experience of and attach meaning to the uneven distribution of power between women and men.

In her construction of a political economy of sex, Rubin (1975) argues:

...we cannot limit the sex system to "reproduction" in either the social or biological sense of the term. A sex/gender system is not simply the reproductive moment of a "mode of production." The formation of gender identity is an example of production in the realm of the sexual system. And a sex/gender system involves more than the "relations of procreation," reproduction in the biological sense (p. 167).

\(^7\) See Chapter 4, Section 4.2, p. 66, and Figure 4.2, p. 68.
This exposition of sex/gender systems by Rubin hints at the formation of gender and the production of meaning in the sexual realm as constitutive processes of gender identity. These gender formation processes involve subjective experiences of gender relations, struggles over sex and gender in all aspects of life, and the objective conditions of subjectivity. Implicating 'total labour' into the notion of sex/gender system shifts the focus of Rubin's analysis away from procreation and sexuality toward a more extensive conception of reproduction, and consequently, production. Thus, investigating the constitution of gender would entail setting subjective experiences of the socially constructed differences between femininity and masculinity and the behaviour associated with them in context of labour relations over time through formation processes.

Burstyn (1985) contributes to this understanding of the formation of gender identity through the politics of masculine domination. The source of masculine dominance is the sexual division of labour. Gender-class refers to the material and political bases of the control of the relations of appropriation. Economic-class describes the relations of economic exploitation. On the one hand, Burstyn’s conceptualisation is innovative in that many analyses of masculine dominance would acknowledge only relations of domination at the expense of the relations of exploitation. However, without any attempt to explain these relations misses the point of the relational entwinement of productive and reproductive labour. On the other hand, Burstyn’s distinction lacks integration. Though gender-class and economic-class assist in sorting through relations of domination and appropriation, what is of equal, if not more, importance are the concrete processes that form class and gender in individuals’ lives within those relations.
This issue of formation processes is indirectly addressed by Wright (1985). Contradictions within one’s position within a class structure are influenced by social structures, for example gender, and historical factors, for example one’s own experiences of labour. This notion can be applied to gender in that both females and males take on social constructions of what it is like to be a woman and/or a man. From these somewhat polar aspects of gender emerge complex identities which include aspects of both femininity and masculinity as transformations of one’s own identity.

These works on class formation and gender formation have brought into focus three primary points which distinguish the approach I am developing from other investigations of class and gender in waged domestic labour studies. First, class and gender are not static conceptions as in a simple division of labour. Class and gender are conceived as concrete social processes constructing and reconstructing class and gender relations, roles, and identities within particular organisations of 'total labour'. Second, such a conceptualisation embodies dialectical change in processes forming class and gender identities within a set of labour relations that implicates both objective relations and subjective experiences of those relations. These individual and collective experiences of and (re)actions against uneven distributions of social power reinforce, challenge, contest, and even transform class and gender relations. Third, conceptualising class and gender formation takes to heart the concept of process. Rather than describing a set of class and gender relations as a 'slice of reality', that is treating class and gender as simple abstractions, class and gender as a set of concrete

---

8. I say "somewhat polar" because the poles in the social construction of gender, that is, of femininity and masculinity, are mainstream conceptualisations of what it is like to be a woman and a man.
formation processes permit a materially and historically grounded explanation of a specific manifestation of social experiences within relations in and of production. This benefits a theory of waged domestic labour processes in that an analyst can more fully account for waged domestic labour relations in part by explaining the organisation of labour and in part by interpreting workers’ experiences of these relations in the formation of their own individual as well as collective class and gender identities.

(7.3) FORMATION PROCESSES IN CONTEXT

Class and gender formation processes have been objects of analysis in both marxist and feminist literatures. Marxists have focused their attention on the ways classes form. Unlike class formation in the marxist literature, gender formation has been less scrutinised as a process in the feminist literature on labour. Because feminists are chiefly concerned with the imbalance in power relations between women and men, much of the feminist literature focuses on drawing out the links between gender and class. Since the mid 1980s, socialist feminist studies in the social

9. Some analyses have focused on a class-based structural limitation of bureaucratic power or access to bureaucratic power, e.g. Poulantzas (1975), and a mediation of objective and subjective conditions of class existence, i.e. a class-in-itself and a class-for-itself according to Lukács (1971b). Other analysts have distinguished classes based on struggles over class capacities (Therborn 1978 and 1983); the development of productive forces (Cohen 1978); and antagonisms over subject-positions (Laclau and Mouffe 1985).

10. Ferguson (1990) being one exception. See Appendix J for an account of Ferguson’s arguments.

11. Variation in the socialist feminist analysis stems from the central question the feminist is addressing. For example, some analysts were looking for a material base for women’s oppression, like women’s oppression being structurally embedded in capitalism (Barrett 1980), women’s role in reproductive labour (O’Brien 1981), or economic exploitation combined with a lack of political rights (Vogel 1983). Other analysts used gender in a way that brought into focus the inequity between women and men in the public sphere by situating the source of oppression in the private sphere, e.g. women’s oppression is rooted in men’s control of women’s labour (Hartmann 1981), in the capitalist form of the family (Briskin 1980), and in the alienating labour of child bearing and child rearing (Bryceson and Vuroela 1984). While still others located the source of women’s oppression simply in the act of
sciences have moved toward a multifaceted analysis concentrating on the
interrelatedness, interconnectedness, and entwinement of the processes of the social
construction of gender, class, and race/ethnicity/culture (Palmer 1989; Gorelick 1989;
Frager 1990; Amott and Matthaei 1991). This movement has been partially in
response to the postmodern philosophical challenge of the 'celebration of difference'.
Some socialist feminists have moved away from universal claims of women being
connected by virtue of being woman toward woman as a process comprised of many
experiences (see Nicholson 1987; Nye 1988; Spelman 1988; Personal Narratives Group
1989; Lorraine 1990). One way to reconnect the scope and range of individual
experiences of gender, class, race, ethnicity, and culture is through context:

The word context literally means to weave together, to twine, to connect. This
interrelatedness creates the webs of meaning within which humans act. The
individual is joined to the world through social groups, structural relations, and
identities. However, these are not inflexible categories to which individuals can
be reduced. The more we considered context, the more we realized that while
the general constructs of race, class, and gender are essential, they are not
rigidly determinant. Context is not a script. Rather, it is a dynamic process
through which the individual simultaneously shapes and is shaped by her
environment. Similarly, an analysis of context, which emphasizes these
dynamic processes, is an interpretive strategy which is both diachronic and
synchronic.

Obviously, the richest contextualization would seek to understand all the
relevant parameters of a life. But the very act of interpretation requires us to
choose among the multiple identities and associations shaping a life.
Furthermore, addressing context involves understanding the meaning of a life in
its narrator's frame of reference, and making sense of that life from the
different and necessarily comparative frame of reference of the interpreter.

Recasting context as process, wherein social relations are seen as threads of
a tapestry woven together to produce a richly textured social formation, reinforces the
notion that specified sets of relations, like gender, class, race, and ethnicity are not
isolated systems of relations operating according to that system's logic. Rather, they

biological reproduction (Firestone 1970), men (Delphy 1984c), or class conflict (Curtis
1980).
are relations that shift in meaning for individuals through mediation via experience. Thus, unequal power relations based on gender, class, race, and/or ethnicity can only be understood and, consequently, explained in context. In order to avoid relativism as a basis for argument,¹² instead of situating women’s experiences in specific contexts, experiences of gender can be incorporated in the formation of one’s identity which in turn shapes the attitudes and actions of the labourer toward her/his labour. By adopting subjectivity in context one must not only acknowledge difference in context, but also recognise sameness in process.

In radical geography, class formation studies are becoming more common (e.g. Harvey 1985; Hudson and Sadler 1986; Fincher 1989; Sayer and Walker 1992). Studies of gender tend to be one of two types: gender-sensitive or woman-centred. The 'gender-sensitive' analyses tend to regard gender as one set of social relations that must be recognised as part of, but not necessarily be central in, the explanation of a social phenomenon (Eyles in Moss et al. 1993). 'Woman-centred' analyses are those that place women's struggles front and centre in both the topic of analysis and explanation in analysis (Rose in Moss et al. 1993). Most socialist feminists in geography take on a combinatory analysis utilising both class and gender as central conceptions in explanations of the spatial and temporal extents of urban social and economic processes (e.g. Bondi and Peake 1988; Bowlby, Lewis, McDowell and Foord 1989; Rose 1989). These geographers have been particularly interested in demonstrating the imbrication of patriarchal gender relations in specific locations (e.g. Nelson 1986; Rose 1989; Fincher 1993).

¹² See the discussion of scientific justification, Chapter 3, Section 3.3.1, pp. 45-47.
In order for geographers to take seriously gender as a process, geographers must not simply\(^{13}\) view gender as just a division of labour, nor as an attribute of a social actor, nor as a 'layer' in the state bureaucracy. Rather, gender needs to be conceived as a process in context whereby workers forge individual and collective identities of being a woman or being a man and then mediate their experiences of being a worker in a particular organisation of labour. In this way, gender is already implicated in the relations of exploitation and domination, that is in the conditions of existence, because workers with individual and collective identities comprise those particular relations. Once the process of 'gendering' is incorporated into an analysis, gender then is no longer a simple abstraction. Gender as a process, like class as a process, is integral to a social formation.

In order to get beyond traditional conceptions of gender and class as constructs in the study of waged domestic labour processes in capitalist societies, analysts need to examine labour as a specific set of social relations in such a way to bring into focus gender and class formation processes. The intention here is not to assume a gender division of labour within the production process; nor to add on 'gendered' notions of traditional political economic analytical tools. My point is to take seriously the relational notion of process in that gender and class form and are socially, materially, and historically constituted. That is, gender and class identities emerge not only from the relations in which we engage, but also from our on-going experiences of them. By focusing on the interaction of the formation processes of gender and class that partially constitute organisations of labour, analysts can shed light on the ways in which unequal distributions of power based on gender and class spatially fragment labour and labourers and distinctly manifest in particular places at specific

\(^{13}\) I mean "simply" in the context of a simple or a complex abstraction.
times. Also, because individuals are engaged in multiple sets of social relations at any
given time, they continually construct and reconstruct the specific configurations of
power by incorporating or 'internalising'\textsuperscript{14} their experiences of the unequal
distributions of power, experiences which are often contradictory (Chouinard and Moss
1992). Their identities, both individual and collective, emerge fragmented and
sometimes even place-specific.

Theoretically, explanations of waged domestic labour processes lay not so
much in gender or work, rather, domestic labour as women's work involves the
relational aspects of gender and class, the experiences of these relations, and what the
individual brings with her to the labour relation, that is, her personal material history.
Social processes are continually constructing and reconstructing individual and
collective identities of gender and class through various organisations of labour via
particular processes that spatially fragment labour and labourers while workers try to
consolidate their interests. With these social processes come individual and collective
strategies to resist domination and control as well as to transform domestic labour
relations such that domestic labourers' have more control over the relations \textit{in and of}
production and that the distribution of power is more equitable. I now turn to an
empirical demonstration of class and gender formation processes within the
particularised set of labour relations in housekeeping services franchises.

(7.4) DEMONSTRATING CLASS FORMATION AND GENDER FORMATION

In a theory of waged domestic labour processes, class formation and gender
formation as concepts are intended to explain the process through which workers forge
individual and collective identities. Class formation processes comprise the objective

\textsuperscript{14}. Individuals incorporate or 'internalise' these relations of domination
and oppression through subjectively mediating objective conditions of existence.
relations of economic exploitation and the individual and collective experiences of them. Likewise, gender formation processes comprise the hegemonic relations of domination and the individual and collective experiences of them. In order to be able to identify these processes and show how identities are forged, analysts need to interpret workers’ experiences of a specific organisation of labour, like housekeeping services franchises, in relation to their individual and collective class and gender identities. Specifically, class and gender formation processes within the relations in and of production in housekeeping services franchises as a waged domestic labour process are mediated through the material conditions of the women’s lives and their own personal histories. From the discussion above (Section 7.3), it is clear that a worker’s personal material history is important in how she/he acts or reacts toward the relations of exploitation and domination within a set of capitalist labour relations. Since these formation processes are on-going, workers construct and reconstruct their own identities in ways that continually alter their experiences of those relations. Because these processes are relational and because these individuals embody past experiences of these formation processes, workers experience processes of class formation and gender formation simultaneously, even though it may appear that only one set of relations is involved in the interaction amongst workers at a time.

15. I refer to these histories as ‘personal material histories’.
16. The processes are based on the construction and reconstruction of social relations over time and space. Thus, the processes are relational.
17. The mediation of capitalist labour relations through experience shape workers’ individual and collective class and gender identities. Yet individual workers embody their past experiences of various organisations of labour because the mediation is on-going.
18. What seems to be a similar experience based on the same act between women and men or between women of different classes takes on a different meaning in a social-political context. For example, the act of cleaning a sink in the social political context of Canada in the 1990s can take on three of many meanings: a ‘natural’ act of life; only women’s work; or dirty work that soils one’s hands.
However, for the sake of clarity in the demonstration, I have conceptually distinguished between the two.

The following empirical demonstration focuses on the collective recounting of the personal material histories of the women franchise housekeepers (Section 7.4.1) and their experiences of the relations in and of production\textsuperscript{19} that have shaped their individual and collective class and gender identities (Sections 7.4.2 and 7.4.3).

(7.4.1) \textbf{Material and historical conditions}

I have chosen to present the collective personal material histories of the women working in the housekeeping services franchises for two reasons. First, I want to indicate commonalities and divergences amongst the women’s personal histories, which embody the fragmenting and consolidating experiences of relations in and of production as part of ‘total labour’. Second, I want to keep the confidentiality agreement I made with the women.

The material and historical conditions giving rise to particular class and gender identities in waged domestic labour are employment histories, household organisation, and household income. All the women had been previously employed in one of the following: retail services, caring/nurturing work, or cleaning (see Table 7.1). Traditional caring/nurturing and cleaning positions account for 34 of the 86 jobs the 14 women have held. Five women were previously employed as private cleaners and one woman had waged labour experience in cleaning. Half the women ended their

\textsuperscript{19} Though I mostly draw out the women’s experiences of the relations in and of production, I also extract specific experiences of the relations in and of reproduction (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4, p. 75) as part of the women’s personal material histories. Because most of the discussion in the recorded conversations around the topic of being a woman centred on personal relationships much of the empirical demonstration of gender formation rests on the interpretation of women’s experiences of the relations in and of reproduction, but not exclusively. Though the guidelines were not organised along the lines of personal relationships (see Appendix D, pp. 304-311), much of the discussion was oriented that way anyway.
Table 7.1. Collective employment history of the 14 women participating in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Category</th>
<th>Number of Jobs Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Services</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring/Nurturing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Manufacturing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Industry</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes employment in housekeeping services franchise.

<sup>b</sup> Includes commissions on home sales, security guard, and paper deliverer.
employment during the length of the investigation.\textsuperscript{20} Plans for future employment varied. Only one woman was interested in going into her own cleaning business; none was interested in buying a franchise.

The organisation of households, including tenure, living arrangements, household composition, and money management, varied. (See Tables 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4.) Three women took out mortgages with their husbands.\textsuperscript{21} The rest of the women lived in rental units. One woman previously owned a house with her husband, but subsequently sold it and were now renting. The household composition and living arrangements varied during the period of the investigation. Only one woman lived alone during part of the study period. Another woman lived with a roommate for part of the time and then moved in with her husband and children. The others were living with their husbands and children, with just their children, or with a fiancé. With regard to money management, the women had considerable amount of control. All but one of the women had their own chequing account.\textsuperscript{22} The three women who were the only adults contributing to the household income managed all of their own finances. Of the eight remaining women (who discussed their finances with me) five managed all the finances, two nearly all, and one woman managed her own income only. About half the women have credit cards, either bank or department stores, with which they purchased clothing and small items. All but one of these women have the credit card in her own name. Household goods, like beds, wall units, and fridges, were purchased on account.

Contributions to the household income vary quite widely. Universal

\footnotesize{20. Their subsequent positions are included in Table 7.1.  
21. This is partially a surmise. One woman gave me no specifics about her or her husband’s financial arrangements.  
22. The women without the chequing account had no part in managing money.
Table 7.2. Housing tenure and living arrangements (given in numbers of women’s households in each category). a

| Tenure and type of housing | alone | roommate or fiancé | w/parents & children | w/husband only |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------
| Mortgage to own house      |       | 1 b                | 4                    |                |
| Rental unit                |       |                    |                      |                |
| Rental unit (geared to income) |       |                    |                      |                |
| apartment                  | 1     | 2 c                | 2                    | 1              |
| townhouse                  | 1     |                    |                      |                |

Numbers do not add up to the number of women participating in the study because some of the women moved during the period of the investigation, September, 1990, to May, 1991.

b Parents own the house.

c One arrangement with a male roommate and one with her fiancé.
Table 7.3. Household composition by tenure and living arrangements.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mortgaged home owners:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two households each with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two adults, two teenagers, one child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three adults, one teenager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental units:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One household each with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one adult, one infant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two adults, one infant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two adults, one teenager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two adults, two children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two households each with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental units geared to income:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One household each with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one adult, two teenagers, one child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two adults, one infant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two adults, two teenagers, one child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three adults, one teenager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The number of households does not equal the number of women participating in the study because some of the women moved or changed living arrangements, during the period of the investigation, September, 1990, to May, 1991.
Table 7.4. Working women’s incomes as percentage of household income.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Income</th>
<th>Number of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>varies up to 50% with social assistance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 25%, but less than 50%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 50%, but less than 75%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 75%, but less than 100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Though the figures indicate that all the women responded, this was not the case. Numbers vary because of changes in the financial arrangements of some of the households.
childcare allowances (baby bonuses), alimony, and the partner’s income are the main sources other than the woman’s income. At the time of the investigation 11 of the women were receiving baby bonuses, at $33.33 for each child. Two women were receiving alimony payments from their ex-husbands and biological fathers of their children. One woman was receiving alimony payments from her husband’s ex-wife and biological mother of his child. Table 7.5 shows the distribution of the occupations of the women’s husbands and fiancés. All but one of the households received some form of social assistance during the period of this investigation: mother’s allowance, welfare supplements, disability payments, sick leave, emergency benefits, or unemployment. Most of the payments, save emergency benefits, made up over half the household’s income.

All the women were earning money by selling their labour power. None had been a previous owner of a business; all but one were not interested in going into her own business, primarily because of the equipment and automobile expenses. Most of these women were working outside the home in a struggle to make ends meet, not to earn pin money as the managers and head office personnel suggest (Interviews with Head Office Personnel, 1991, Nos. 32 and 34). Only one woman was able to maintain a household on her own for a short time. Because of her health, she was forced to change jobs and had to give up her apartment because it was too expensive. These women are selling their labour power for very low wages and are dependent on social services for a ‘living wage’.

Several commonalities amongst the personal histories are worth noting because they have been significant in shaping these women’s attitudes and actions toward themselves and their labour as franchise housekeepers. Half the women considered themselves the ‘black sheep’ of the family, the other half ‘fit’ without much
Table 7.5. Distribution of the occupation of the women's husbands and fiancés contributing to the household income.³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Category</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed⁴</td>
<td>1⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Sources of household income changed during the investigation so numbers do not add up to the number of women with partners.

⁵ Includes sick leave and disability.

⁶ Includes services occupation.

⁷ Includes services and trades occupations.
conflict. Of the 'black sheep', most did not get along with their mothers as youths, but are now close. Five women have been married for over 20 years; three women have been divorced and are now into nearly ten years of a second marriage; two women have been in relationships for less then two years; two women are not involved with anyone in particular; and one woman has been with the same man for ten years. Three women grew up as primary carer for younger siblings when the nuclear family was disrupted by either her father's death, her parents' divorce, or her mother's employment schedule. Three women talked to me about physical violence committed against them by either their husband or boyfriend. I inferred that an additional five women were probably abused either at an earlier time in their marriage or in a previous relationship/marriage.\textsuperscript{23} Another woman discussed abusive relations in her childhood.

If half the women identified themselves as the 'black sheep' of the family, then having to 'fit in' is probably an important element in these women's lives. This can indicate a willingness on their part to follow instructions from people in authority to gain respect so that they will 'fit in' at work. Nearly all the women are involved with men, sometimes for over twenty years, whom they respect and whose own attitudes and actions influence the women's. In order to be able to interpret these women's experiences of the relations \textit{in} and \textit{of} production, it is necessary to recognise and account for these influential relationships in shaping their attitudes and actions toward their own labour. These common experiences of abuse by men and by people in authority reinforce the existing distribution of power based on gender and class as acceptable because it seems 'natural'.

\textsuperscript{23} I say "inferred" because they did not directly discuss the abusive relationship with me. They referred to the abuse in the relationship when we were talking about previous relationships.
This depiction only gives a general indication of the relations and conditions that give rise to specific class or gender identities. In the following sub-sections, I demonstrate class formation and gender formation processes by drawing out the distinct spatiality of the women's experiences of the relations in and of production in housekeeping services franchises. I do this by interpreting the women's experiences of the relations of exploitation, the emergence of their individual and collective class identities, and their strategies to resist control of their labour and to transform the relations of production.

(7.4.2) Demonstrating class formation

Individual and collective class identities manifest differently in the various places women engage in waged labour relations. In housekeeping services franchises, women workers' experiences of class relations have a distinct spatiality. Depending on where the workers engage in the relations of domination and exploitation, experiences of labour and its regulation differ. For example, workers experience the relations in production differently in the office, the car, and the customers' houses. The experiences vary according to whether or not the customer is home during a clean, the class position of co-workers, managers, and customers, and the view that the car is part of the workplace. For women engaged in the multiple sets of relations within housekeeping services franchises, specific characteristics of a worker, for example, a worker's age, employment history, seniority in the franchise, and personal history in relation to other franchise workers, shape the intensity of the experience of the labour relation, their abilities to cope with their labour, and their capacities to challenge the relations in and of production.

I now turn to an empirical demonstration of class formation drawing on the women's experiences of the relations in and of production (Section 7.4.2.1), emergence
of their class identities (Section 7.4.2.2), and their collective strategies for changing capitalist labour relations within which they are engaged (Section 7.4.2.3).

(7.4.2.1) *Experiences of relations in and of production*

The objective relation of exploitation organised around the extraction of surplus value in housekeeping services franchises is removed from the point of production (the customers’ houses) and not realised until after the service has been provided and the cheques have been deposited (in the bank). Hence, the franchise housekeepers experience the labour it takes to clean the house, not the exploitation (e.g. Marx 1867/1987, pp. 173-192; 1844/1986, pp. 106-119). Thus, the separation of relations in and of production is not experienced by the workers. The means by which surplus value is extracted is included in the labour process as part of the routine - picking up the cheque from the kitchen table. In this way, workers are privy to the total income of the franchise for the day and most likely for the week. The manager or owner is dependent on the worker for the collection of her/his income. And the workers hold, at least for some time, the source of the surplus value.

Only the supervising maid is supposed to know the fee and actually see the money. This is rarely the case. The workers know a 'light' from a 'heavy' week and generally translate this into 'less' or 'more' income. A light week is between 12 and 15 hours with a gross pay of between $104 and $210; whereas a heavy week is between 27 and 30 hours with a gross pay of between $233 and $430 (differences between the maximum percentage of supervising maid and the minimum percentage of a maid). This varies in the franchises that pay wages rather than percentages; between $62 and

---

24. This, of course, depends on the worker calculating their 'cashing out' amount with respect to the other teams' cleans. Though not an exact amount, the worker has a rough idea as to the gross intake of a franchise either daily or weekly.
$141 for a 'light' week and between $162 and $230 for a heavy week (differences between a maximum wage for a supervising maid and a minimum wage for a maid).

Class identities form not only from the objective relation of exploitation, but also from on-going experiences of labour and its regulation. Three sets of experiences bring into focus most clearly the formation of the women's individual and collective class identities as franchise housekeepers. These three themes emerged from the conversations we had during the course of the investigation. Each set brings to the fore the experience of a concrete process of class formation, that is, the experience of: (1) the type of job or position a worker can hold, (2) the relations of domination within a labour process, and (3) the social political context of being a maid.

The first set of experiences comprise the women's choices for employment at either Hannah's or Clare's. Some said they 'just needed a change'. Nancy was tired of selling clothes to people who didn't want to buy them. Others, like Kelly, felt that housecleaning was an avenue to break into the workforce after having raised three children.

I took the job now because that was the only thing I had been doing for the last 15 years. And, when I decided that I better get out and start looking for a job, I couldn't. I didn't feel like I could go to an office and apply in an office because I have no experience on computers or typewriters or anything like that, or dictaphones or they probably don't even use that anymore. Or, any kind of office skills. I don't have any. ... I'm dated. ... I felt I was more qualified for this. It was a starting point for me, too, eh? Being out of the workforce for such a long time. I had to start somewhere. I didn't want to start at a fast food joint or a doughnut shoppe, or someplace like that. So, I thought, well. I saw the ad in the paper a few times so I thought, "Well, why not give it a try?".

(Kelly)

Kelly felt more than qualified for the position. She linked her experiences in the home directly with the type of work she thought she would be doing in the franchise.

That's what I did, you know. You kept house and watched the kids. ... So, that's basically why I probably went to Clare's Cleaning because every time I would be doing something at home I would be thinking to myself I should be out somewhere getting paid for doing this, you know? I mean, I do it all the
time, right? ... I might as well get paid for what I’d done for fifteen years at home, right? (Kelly)

After her daughter graduated from high school, Anne re-entered the workforce in the housecleaning industry, first as a private housekeeper, then for Clare’s.

Clare’s has a specific way of cleaning, okay? Everybody can clean. We have to learn the way they do it. What’s expected of us. I found it very easy. I’ve been married twenty eight years. So, it’s just finding just exactly what they do. I didn’t find it difficult at all. (Anne)

Once Anne learned the principles of team housekeeping, she took on a supervisory position right away.

For Beatrice, the job at Hannah’s was "more perfect" than others. She had been a clerk at the library. Though the hours per week and the wages were about the same, the maid’s position fit into her fiancé’s schedule better. She wouldn’t have to work evenings at Hannah’s. Beatrice thought the cleaning houses wouldn’t be too difficult and what she didn’t know she could learn:

I didn’t have any formal training but I thought that since it’s a natural part of life, like I was saying before, something everybody does. Everybody does housework, maybe you don’t do it to the same standards a company would like you to do it. Like, I wasn’t - I didn’t know the professional way of doing it. But it’s, it’s still something that everybody likes to have, a clean home - everybody likes to be clean. ... I just thought I’d do something that would be natural and I figured that anything I didn’t know how hard would it be to learn, you know? (Beatrice)

Francie links her job choice to restrictions from her educational background and emotional stability:

And again, too, it falls back on the very relevant thing that I cannot do anything other than housekeeping or look after kids. Something that doesn’t have a lot of stress and education in it. Because I just can’t. (Francie)

She too likes the job at Clare’s because it’s almost perfect:

It’s a nice job. It’s a comfortable job. ... I like doing it to the extent that’s, that it meets my hours. And it gives me my days off. I hate working, period. I’m a homebody. You see, if I had the money, and I knew, and didn’t have to worry about money, I would stay home. To me, looking after my family and
being here for my husband is, is the way I like it, hey? These days you can’t do that. (Francie)

Both Beatrice and Francie want part-time work. Being franchise housekeepers permit them leeway with their time while securing some income for maintaining the household. Neither feels qualified for other occupations. Beatrice is ‘naturally’ qualified because everybody can clean and Francie is restricted in her ability to acquire skills other than domestic ones.

Patrice changed jobs. She had been working in housekeeping at a large hotel chain in Hamilton. She had been both a maid and a supervisor. She wanted to change jobs primarily because of the tension with hotel management. The switch was easy because:

I knew what I was doing. And, you know, I had the speed because when I worked at the hotel we had to clean sixteen rooms a day - clean washrooms and make beds. So I had the speed. (Patrice)

The speed wasn’t the only thing that mattered. At Clare’s Patrice had to learn the system, too. It wasn’t that big of a deal:

To be quite honest, you have to be bit of an airhead if you don’t know how to clean. ‘Cause I think everyone knows how to clean. But it’s the way to clean. You know what I mean? It’s the routine of doing it. [emphasis reflects intonation of Patrice’s voice] (Patrice)

Patrice felt qualified because of previous experience at home and in the hotel.

All the women in some way devalue their job. They see housecleaning near the lowest rung of the occupational ladder.25 Being a maid at a housekeeping services franchise involves skills that have been acquired "naturally" through running households and through caring for younger siblings or raising children. Different reasons keep the women in a job that isn’t so "glamorous", though maintaining a

25. The only occupations that the women saw as lower than franchise housekeepers were occupations in the fast food industry.
continuous income is important for all the women. Kelly is pragmatic. She wants to be employed with the same company for at least a year before she moves on.

I don’t plan to do this for ever and ever. This is just sort of ‘get-back-into-the-workforce’ job.26 (Kelly)

Anne is pleased with where she is and doesn’t plan to change jobs. She was promoted to an office job in the franchise for two days per week. Patrice stays on because she would be lost without ‘Clare’:

I drive everybody, everywhere. ... And, that’s the only thing that’s keeping me back [from going on my own] is giving ‘Clare’ [the car] back. Because I don’t know what I would do without her because I’ve never been on a bus in two, well, a year.27 (Patrice)

In place of paying for training programmes, these women choose to use their expertise in waged labour. Amy would like to go out on her own and clean houses privately. Like Patrice, Amy would have to give up the car:

And that’s mostly the main reason why I’m sticking with this job. It’s because of the car. You know, because it is a good benefit. Like, I’d be lost without that car. Lost without it. (Amy)

Alice, too, has thought about going out on her own. Aside from not being assured of customers, she doesn’t want to have to depend on her husband’s car. If private housekeeping were to fall through, she is not sure if she would be able to find something right away:

Right now, I’m not too happy with where I am. So, I’ve thought of leaving and going somewhere else. But, you know, right now it’s so hard finding a job that I’m afraid to give up [mine] and find out I can’t get something else right now. ... I’m stuck with cleaning in hopes that something better would come along. So far it hasn’t. (Alice)

---

26. This doesn’t seem to be the case for Kelly. She is still in the same position two years later.
27. See also Patrice’s comments in Chapter 5, Section 5.4.1., p. 103.
The women who have quit the franchise experience their class position differently. Some women link their job choice to their past training opportunities.

Lori is critical of her upbringing:

I was never encouraged what to do with my life and what to do in school or no one ever advised me what I should take when I went to high school. I found that not very good.  (Lori)

And, she is critical of the choices she made because of her upbringing:

I didn’t know what I wanted to do. Once you take a commercial course you sort of are forced into going into office work. Which I did. I don’t know. I should have taken the other course and gone on and done something else. (Lori)

She worked for a few years at an insurance company in the office. She met a man, whom she later married, at the firm. A year or so later, when she was pregnant, she quit her job to raise the child. Two years later she had another one. She is now trying to re-enter the workforce after having raised her two daughters. If she were able to live that part of her life over again:

I wouldn’t have given up my office job to begin with. ... I don’t remember anyone ever taking maternity leaves and that kind of thing back then. I don’t remember. It’s just, you didn’t even talk to my [inaudible]. I just quit. I gave up all the years at the insurance company, which I don’t think I really should have done. (Lori)

Michelle, too, links her job choice to training opportunities. She was in a co-op programme in high school, but was unable to find a position upon graduation.

The manager of Hannah’s gave a presentation at Michelle’s high school on "Careers Day". So when Michelle couldn’t find a job, she went to Hannah’s. Rather than be in the position where Lori is today, Michelle decided to go on mother’s allowance and to take paralegal courses at a local college. She figured:

I’d better go back to school and make something of myself before it’s too late.  (Michelle)

Women’s experiences of having to choose between a devalued job and formal training highlights the tension between waged and unwaged labour. This
tension involves both the women’s expertise in unwaged labour not being valued in waged labour processes and the need to secure an income as quickly as possible. Training programmes take time and are relatively expensive. Because of their limited labour experience, they choose jobs that have few formal skills required. They choose housekeeping because they can use the skills they have acquired by engaging in reproductive labour in the home and transferring them to a waged domestic labour process.

The second set of experiences brings into focus relations of domination specifically in the customers’ houses. Class distinctions come to the fore in the interaction between franchise housekeepers and customers under the façade of the traditional “mistress and maid” relations. However, unlike traditional maids, franchise housekeepers have a reprieve: they can refuse work on the basis that they are not paid to do a specific task. They can do so without feeling that they are being disrespectful or aggressive, both of which are important in their own definitions of what it is like to be a woman.

With regard to customers wanting "extras" (without being charged for them), Lori said:

I don’t think it’s the right thing to do. They are being charged for doing certain things and I don’t think we should do extra things for them. (Lori)

Doing extras without charge is a reward for the customer. While I was working, Cassie removed the dried glue from traction stickers in the bathtub and Vivian cleaned a hearth. Patrice would do extras for the elderly:

I feel sorry for them because nobody loves them. (Patrice)

Kelly, too, would do extras, but they were extras of a different kind. She made friends with some of the elderly customers, and helped them out. For example, in the
summer, she picked the garden for one elderly woman during the time for the clean. On her own time, she did her grocery shopping for her.

The women prefer the customers not to be there when they do the cleaning. Amy describes the drawbacks while cleaning when customers are there:

It confuses you. You get used to a routine, working from one side of the room and going around. And if someone’s in your way and you have to start over here and go back over there ... that’s why you would probably get complaints. (Amy)

Even though some customers "will look at you like, 'You’re a maid,'" (Angela) I don’t think that the workers are avoiding the social stigma of a traditional relation between "mistress and maid". Wanting the customers out of the house during the clean has more to do with accomplishing the tasks in a given time period:

I like it when they’re not there ... some of them follow you around and watch what you’re doing and talk to you too much. (Lori)

If the customers slow down the work, the day gets longer and everyone gets grouchy. I was out on a clean with a manager observing a four member team clean. The customer was home talking to the woman cleaning the bathroom adjoining the main bedroom. After about 45 minutes, the other three team members had completed their tasks as well as the tasks of the woman talking to the customer. The woman in the bathroom upstairs was still not done. For the rest of the day the team was about a half an hour late for each clean.

Most conflict with customers does not surface explicitly in verbal confrontation. The woman in a subordinate position defers to the customer. Conflict arises over the women’s expectations of the customer. By giving gifts and money to the women, customers try to encourage good service. When they receive tips, the women feel their work is appreciated. Yet, tips are few and far between.

I don’t know what’s wrong with some clients. They’re just not very generous. (Beatrice)
Only once did I receive a monetary tip. Barb and I each got five dollars from a business woman. We cleaned her home and her office. During the holidays, customers tend to give the women chocolates, soaps, or cookies as gifts for the year’s service.

The women were not impressed by the customers who took on maid service for status. Beatrice saw this as being a distinct class division. Wrapped up in Beatrice’s conception of class is the attitude of the customers, not just the amount of money they had:

When I first started, I thought a lot of them were rich snobs. But then as time went on the only people that really bothered me were the ones that - that weren’t! The ones that actually proved themselves to be snobs [were] the ones that complained over nothing. That, you know, they’re on call. They only get us to come in maybe once a month, once every two months. Their place is super-clean. They cleaned it just before we get there. And they’re just looking for something to complain about. They don’t even need us in their house. They are just wasting their money. (Beatrice)

The women expected to be at the very least useful.

Although the women see housecleaning as ‘common sense’ and think that only "airheads" (Patrice) can’t clean houses, once employed as housekeepers, the women expect to be treated as experts in cleaning. This expectation shapes the women’s class identity in two ways. First, it assists in building the workers’ self esteem and self worth through waged labour. Francie said it best:

It’s good when they ask you that because you feel important, eh? And I like feeling important. I think everybody does. (Francie)

Second, it legitimates the labour as meaningful labour. For years, their labour may not have been meaningful because it was unpaid. By engaging in waged labour, the

28. It is not clear how many customers took the service for status. From my experience, I figure that only a handful were for status, because most of the houses we cleaned were actually dirty. This could reflect in part Roxanne’s heavy route being mostly houses with four and five member families. The motives for taking the service are not clear unless there is some interaction with the customer. More often than not, the customers were not home when we cleaned.
women know her work is useful in a conventional way. Nancy wasn’t quite sure about
the expert angle, but she was sure of her labour and her knowledge of it:

I wouldn’t call it an expert, but like I know what I’m talking about. ... Because
I know what I’m doing. (Nancy)

In general, the women said that they would like to be seen as paid professionals,
instead of just as maids.

A spatial displacement of relations with the customers does not influence
the distribution of power between the customer and the franchise housekeeper.

Michelle describes what relations are like inside the house:

The people when they see you coming to clean their house, they kind of treat
you like bad, because they feel that just because you are working for a maid
service and that. They’re rich and they have all this money to hire a maid to
clean their house. A lot of them seem so unsociable. You know, it’s kind of
like, they seem cold toward you because you are lower class than them. And
they just got to realise we aren’t. I mean, we’re people, too. We’re not stupid
just because. (Michelle)

It does, however, alter the experience. Outside the house, the women are invisible:

Where, like, at Hannah’s, we have run into customers and they don’t even
acknowledge you. ... It’s almost like ‘Well, she cleans my house, I don’t want
to talk to her in front of people’. Like, you know. Yeah, but to my face. If
you’re [meaning customer] at home, you’re as nice as pie, but you don’t want
to say ‘hi’ to me because I’m getting into a ‘Hannah’s Housekeeping Services’
car and you’re not. Not in your driveway. That happened to me once. This
woman is very nice, the friendliest lady. I enjoyed cleaning her house. She’s
very appreciative of what you’re doing. But we ran into her one day and she
wouldn’t even look. And I thought ‘Holy Smokes!’ (Susie)

In the customer’s house, the maid is a uniform, not a person.29

The third set of the women’s experiences of labour and its regulation deals
with coping with being a maid. Franchise housekeepers continually negotiate their own
class identity through attitudes about maids and the distribution of power within the
relations in and of production. Susie gets disgruntled when she thinks about the people
who use maid services as well as the people who look down on housekeepers:

29. I had the opposite experience (see Chapter 1, Section 1.2, p. 15).
I still get sort of angry about how people think of people who clean homes. Very low class, almost. It really makes me angry because you work like a bugger and, you know. And when I think of the people whose houses we've done and half of them are really capable of doing it themselves. I don't know why they do it - why they have someone doing it for them. (Susie)

If this is the case, how is it that women are able to continue cleaning houses? For the most part, the women thought that cleaning someone else's home is different than cleaning your own. Nancy thinks:

It's easier to clean somebody else's house than it is to clean your own. ... I just like doing it. I like ... making someone else feel good about themselves or good about where they live. (Nancy)

But, even if it's easier, you still have to like cleaning, at least a little bit in order to keep on cleaning. Nancy talks about her job satisfaction:

Ninety per cent of the time I do my best. But there are days when I just, I don't feel like doing it. Something's happened or I just, I don't feel good and don't want to be here and sometimes I just don't care. (Nancy)

Like Nancy, Susie endures a tension between what she enjoys doing and what she's doing for wages. That is, Susie likes cleaning, but the lower class stigma attached to cleaning prevents her from enjoying her position:

I've always enjoyed cleaning. I never ever thought I'd make a profession of it. I don't, shoot, I don't plan on making a profession of it. For now it is. It embarrasses me when someone asks, asks me what I do. ... I tell them, but I usually, I just say that I do housecleaning. Maid service, I don't like that term, maid service. I'm not, I don't feel -

Do you like housekeeping services, or do you just like housekeeping? (Pamela)

Housecleaning. Yes, or housekeeping. To me it sounds better than maid service. I don't know what it is, but I just don't like that phrase - "maid service". Like I hate driving that car, with that on the side.

Have you asked to take it off? (Pamela)

No.

Do you think it would be okay? (Pamela)

She wouldn't.

She wouldn't do it? (Pamela)
They, those letters don’t come off. They just, they just don’t come off. And they won’t come off. ... And put something over them and they won’t come off, right. ... It would be better if they had something magnetic that you could put on when you’re working and take off when you’re not. But, in a way, I guess it’s advertising, too. If you’re driving it after hours, it’s advertising. (Susie)

No matter where Susie goes, the maid service stigma goes with her - home from work, to the grocery store and back, and to social gatherings. She can’t escape it unless she quits the job.

Some of the women described being a maid in terms of how the customers treated them. For example, a few women said "we were mud beneath his feet" or "we were shit beneath his feet". (Nancy) Sometimes they gave general impressions, "I don’t love it". (Kelly) And sometimes they were a bit more specific, "Oh, God! I got my head in another toilet bowl". (Kelly)

There are, however, more threatening associations made that could endanger the women while doing a clean. Susie expressed her deep concern over the possibility of women walking into situations that would threaten their personal safety. Being in a subordinate position from the initial contact with the customer puts the worker at a severe disadvantage when dealing with fear and uncertainty (see discussion of safety, Chapter 6, Section 6.5.3, pp. 178-180). The popular stigmas have developed on the basis of the traditional "mistress and maid" relation, particularly the sensuous French immigrant maid. Susie recalled a clean where the man customer was sitting at the table, drunk.

If I walk into something like that; that I’m not too comfortable with, it makes me afraid. It really does, ’cause I’m always, there’s always this thing in the back of my head that sometimes there’s a stigma with being a maid, you know. Like, uhm, I don’t know.

Like a 'French maid'? (Pamela)

Yes, exactly! That even when you’re driving the car, and the guys are in trucks and they’re leering at you. And they say things to you. And they say things to you and that’s exactly what they think you do. (Susie)
Being a private maid not only has sexual connotations, but also has a more intense relationship with the employer. Though some of the women would like to go out on their own as private housekeepers, most of the women wouldn’t like to be private maids:

I don’t know if I could handle being a private maid. That would be boring. You figure, a private maid, you go in, you clean one house per day, if that’s the way you worked. All by yourself. And then a private maid, you would have to do dishes, you would have to do laundry, you would have to do ironing, ironing, ironing. Stuff like that. Stuff that we don’t do. Like we don’t do dishes, we don’t do laundry, we don’t do the outside windows. Where these people would expect that, right? (Lynn)

All the women had clear notions of the negative attitudes people hold about maids. They also recognised that it was a class difference. There is no doubt about it, cleaning someone else’s toilet is a "shitty job". Kelly copes with her job by treating it as a job.

Sometimes it’s embarrassing to say that you work for Clare’s Cleaning; but then again it is a job - a lot of people don’t have a job. It’s exactly that - when I’m at work, it’s a job. I don’t think of where I am. When I come home, it’s gone. I don’t think that I was cleaning Joe Blow’s ... oven, or whatever, or scrubbing the floor that was disgusting. It’s just gone. It’s a job. (Kelly)

She separates her class identity from her occupation:

I think of it as a job. Everybody’s got to do a job. Some, like mine, ... happen to be a shitty job. I mean if you think about it, somebody does something for everybody all along the line. There’s hairdressers, there’s the guy who works in the grocery store, there’s the mailman, there’s my husband, he’s building stuff for other people, like, you know? He does shitty jobs, too. But, I mean, mine just happens to be one of those. ... When you think about it, right down the line, everybody’s doing something for somebody else, some kind of service for them, you know. No matter what it is. I mean, it just happens to [be that I’m] cleaning their house. (Kelly)

The women’s attitudes toward being a maid are part of their attitudes toward waged labour. They can accept a lot of discontent from their relations within the labour process, control from the manager, condescension from the customer, and flak from a co-worker, because they are supposed to work for a living. The women
feel that they are supposed to work for a living because they need money to make ends meet. They rationalise their choices in terms of the lack of skills they have acquired up to now.

Susie thinks that when other people put you down and think that you are lazy, you end up getting a negative self image so that you don’t think that you can do anything, anything at all. You get this way:

[b]y other people that probably are higher class and they push you out of that middle [area]. You know, just the way they treat, the way they speak to you. They belittle you to make you feel like you’re stupid or you don’t know what you’re talking about. (Susie)

But, you still had to try. "Trying" comes from the "bootstrap" approach to economic well-being. About half of the women expressed anger at people on unemployment and welfare. They reasoned that they should be doing something, anything at all, even if it were only "simple-bodied", like housekeeping. (Beatrice)

Being a maid, cleaning someone else’s house, and being forced into a lower class sometimes gets to the women. When she thinks about it, Beatrice starts feeling down:

Yeah, maybe if I start gettin’ down because, if I’m havin’ a lot of bad days in the job then I’ll start gettin’ negative and I’ll just start thinkin’ well, maybe it just serves me right, because, maybe I should have gone to college. I should have worked something out. I wouldn’t be in this position today. Then I start thinkin’ about way back when I was in high school, well, I should have got better marks. Maybe it would have been easier to get into college. And I just start thinkin’, fuck.

And then you wake up the next morning ... ? (Pamela)

Well, yeah, it goes away. And, the next day I get up and think oh, well, who cares. So I’m workin’ at a maid service, I don’t care. I’m not going to be doin’ it forever. Then I’m not so down about it. ... It just comes and goes, those feelings. (Beatrice)

It gets to Nancy, too, sometimes:

Oh, I don’t know. I just take a couple of deep breaths and say relax and just let it wind itself away. (Nancy)
(7.4.2.2) Emerging class identities

From these three varied sets of experiences of relations in and of production in housekeeping services franchises, the women have forged distinct individual class identities. The women have taken their fragmented experiences and sorted them into a series of class positions in well-structured definitions. From the descriptions the women gave me, I was able to develop conceptual representations of these definitions and note where the women see themselves fitting in.\(^{30}\) (See Figure 7.1 for conceptual representations of each woman’s class structure.) These definitions are important because they set up the framework for interpreting the women’s actions regarding individual and collective strategies to resist authority and transform the relations in and of production. I first describe the characteristics on which the women based their class identities discussing them with regard to the women’s aspirations and feelings of being trapped. I then illustrate the women’s collective class identities in terms of formal and informal resistance strategies (Section 7.4.2.3).

All the women except Anne defined their class outside a relationship to a man.\(^{31}\) The women who saw themselves as ’middle’ class (Susie, Lori, Amy, Nancy, and Alice) did so with greater attention in making distinctions between the different

\(^{30}\) I sorted through their conceptions of class position by asking where I, as a student working on a doctorate, was located in their scheme. Francie evaded the question and I forgot to ask Beatrice. Patrice placed me in the upper-middle class because of my education. Anne and Susie said I was middle class. Amy said I was struggling to be middle, but I needed to set my ”family goals”, i.e. planning to have children. Candy and Lori placed me in 'low' because of my income. Kelly said I was 'working my way up'. Michelle said I was 'low' because I was easy to get along with. (She also asked me not to take offence.) Nancy said I was where she was. Alice said I was 'like her' because:

You don’t come across trying to be better than the rest of us. (Alice)

\(^{31}\) Stratification studies often define women’s class in relations to a man (see Garnsey 1981, 1982; Delphy 1981; Murgatroyd 1982; Crompton and Mann 1986; Cockburn 1986; Walby 1986b; Bennett and Alexander 1987).
Figure 7.1. Conceptual representations of the women workers' class structures.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNE</th>
<th>SUSIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upper</td>
<td>higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle/working</td>
<td>upper middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower</td>
<td>normal/working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMY</th>
<th>LORI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>higher</td>
<td>higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper middle</td>
<td>uppermiddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lowermiddle</td>
<td>lowermiddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper lower</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRANCIE</th>
<th>KELLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>upper working female/male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower working female/male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underline type indicates the class to which the woman sees herself belonging.
Bold type indicates the class to which the woman aspires.

* Only 12 women discussed their conceptions of class with me. The 13th interview was incomplete.
Figure 7.1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MICHELLE</th>
<th>BEATRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between middle and rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANDY</td>
<td>NANCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper</td>
<td>richer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower</td>
<td>upper middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lowest</td>
<td>lowermiddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICE</td>
<td>ALICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper-upper</td>
<td>upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper</td>
<td>(in between classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper-middle</td>
<td>middle/working/more money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>middle/working/less money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower-middle</td>
<td>(in between classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>border-line</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower/welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Underline* type indicates the class to which the woman sees herself belonging.

*Bold* type indicates the class to which the woman aspires.

* Only 12 women discussed their conceptions of class with me. The 13th interview was incomplete.
types of 'middle'. Anne equated the 'middle' class with working class. The rest of the women positioned themselves in lower classes and had aspirations to be middle class, that is, Francie, Kelly, Michelle, Beatrice, Candy, and Patrice.

Income and attitude toward other people were the two key characteristics distinguishing an individual's class position or situation. All the women used either one or both of these factors to define class. Of the two, Anne, Lori, Nancy, and Kelly used income; Francie, Amy, Candy, and Alice used attitude; and Susie, Michelle, Patrice, and Beatrice use both. This is important for two reasons. First, the women define class with a material base. Anne's and Lori's definition of class is based solely on income. Nancy's conception of class is based on income and what you can purchase with that income or possessions. Kelly's conception has a material base, income, as well as potential for changing class through education and occupation. Kelly distinguished both a female and male upper and lower working class. She used gender as central in sorting through the variation in income according to education and occupation. Of the women who did not use income to define class, Francie, Amy, and Candy used tenure and debt. Both of which address money and financial status, that is, spending, saving, and investing. Alice pointed to family background (in the form of inheritances) as the other important determinant of class.

Second, for the women class implicates individual values expressed in interpersonal communication. The women emphasised people's attitudes toward other people in their conceptions of class. When we discussed class (in the recorded conversations), attitude emerged as the foremost indicator of accepting someone else's

32. Only in this section (Section 7.4.2.2) am I using the various words that the women used in describing where they fit into their class structure, i.e. situation, position, class, class system, and place, because this is the women's very specific way of making sense of class society. They were roughly equivalent to Wright's (1985) concept of class location. I use the term position in other sections.
class position much more so than being in the same class. Attitude emerged as the foremost indicator for two reasons. First, the women needed to sort people by something other than occupation, education, and income, because in each of these cases, the women would be in the lowest category. Second, attitude erased class differences and enabled the women to be equal to everyone else. Using a universal characteristic to categorise people breaks down the barriers in class society and places everyone on an equal footing.

Other characteristics cited by the women as part of their definitions of class were age, knowledge, respect, and how people want to participate in society. Michelle, Amy, and Beatrice were the only ones that noted age as an indicator of class, emphasising life-cycle as part of class society. Susie noted knowledge, but excluded education on the basis that you don’t have to have a formal education to succeed. Francie was the only one who recognised an individual’s desire to be able to participate in society the way she/he wants to as being part of class.33 I now turn to an illustration by example of how these women use these characteristics in forging their individual class identities.

For Michelle, both attitude and income were important in defining class as revealed in her description of the class system:

High class people are people who have tons of money. Don’t care how they spend it. Like, they care, but they got all kinds of extra things. It doesn’t really matter. They live in big, huge houses. They got like four cars and sixty million boats. And, you know, they’re always taking vacations. They always - they’re hair looks nice. They dress nicely.

The middle class is just your average family of two kids, husband, wife, you know. Three bedroom house. Suburban street. It’s kind of one of those types of things. They’re not under. They make just enough money to get by on pretty well. You know, they still get to take a vacation once a year. That’s about it.

33. Her observations are interesting in light of “from each according to his/her needs; from each according to her/his abilities”.
There's your lower class and it's people who [inaudible]. They try to make their house look nice and everything. And they really try. But they just don't have enough money for all kinds of extra things. People just see them as - because they're low class and they don't have a lot of money that they're always - slummy, even though they're not. They're still nice people and they think - usually they're a lot nicer than these high class people. More down to earth. That's how I see it. Oh, I see myself as low class. (Michelle)

No matter their definition, the women were quite vivid in their descriptions of particular classes. Candy described her own 'low' class:

Then, there's us ... the lower class being generally that they can't afford their own home. Or, from week to week, it's like Thursday or Friday comes and you're like 'All right! It's pay day!' Or, we can't shop until Saturday. Or we can't eat that yet. Or, making payments on certain things. Just really trying to keep ... Just to make ends meet. I think that's what it is - making ends meet. (Candy)

Nancy depicted class in practical terms:

When money's tight you want to do things that you can't, because you know you can't afford it. So, it cuts back on leisure time. You more easily, it's more easy to get laid off or fired because you're a clockshooter. (Nancy)

Kelly explicitly designated that the "female working class" was all:

[w]omen in the workforce. Female working class is all females with any kind of a job for me. (Kelly)

Her "for me" means with her qualifications.

For these women, "passing" yourself off as a higher class than you are is one of the worst offences you can commit. It is crossing class-lines by changing your attitude. Honesty is valued as part of the universal decency of an individual. Many of the women told me that their manager sometimes tries to come off being in a higher class than she actually is. This caused problems and fueled resentment. Though Anne saw herself and her manager in the same class individually, there was still a class difference:

Her husband works as a lawyer and my husband works at a factory. There must be a difference there. (Anne)
"Passing" for Anne is connected to the occupation of your partner. If the "passing" happens to be the other way around, from higher to lower class, the women are much more accepting, because they value class attitudes over the material bases of class:

I guess you could be a high class person when it came to financial status and that, but you could be low class because you get along with people so well. And, you know, you’re friendly all the time. And you can associate with people who are low class. (Michelle)

The women emphasised the importance of class in organising day to day interactions with people. It wasn’t everything, but it was at the forefront of their planning and lifelong goals. Francie talked about class:

It plays a big part. I never thought it did, and I still don’t really think it should, but it does. (Francie)

Following up on this point, Francie further noted the importance of class:

I think - I don’t think there should be [classes], but I think there is because the difference in money. I don’t think there should be because I don’t think anybody’s better than anybody else. But, the different ways that people are living and their backgrounds and stuff like that, you can’t work around that. There always was and always will be [classes]. You know, like, you look back, way, way, way back, in the days, the ones that did have money, they stuck by theirselves, too. They all hired servants and stuff like that. They did live in better houses, even those houses, those days. They had better places, more stuff. It always was that way. ... But what are you going to do? (Francie)

Michelle had similar sentiments.

I don’t think there should be, but just because of the amounts of money that people have. That’s just the way it is. (Michelle)

Nancy thought that there had to be classes for some sort of income or possession measure:

Somehow I don’t think there should be, I guess there has to be in order to get anywhere. ... Like to upgrade yourself. There has to be classes. To better yourself or just survive, actually. (Nancy)

Alice wanted things to be the same, to be nice:

If everybody could be in the same class, whether it be upper, lower, or middle. Just everybody be the same. Everything would be a lot nicer. Everything would be easier. But, I know it’s impossible. (Alice)
Kelly and Beatrice were even more fatalistic:

Oh, I don't know whether I think [there should be classes] or not. It's just the way it is. They're there no matter what. (Kelly)

It's just a fact of life. (Beatrice)

Nancy didn't like the whole concept of categorising people. She drew parallels between classes and racism. She questioned the fairness of it all:

It's not fair to separate people. Like, everybody's into segregation and that kind of stuff. The racism. It's not fair to separate everybody. You shouldn't put them into boxes. (Nancy)

Patrice was especially interested in the 'unfairness' to the low class, that is, the low class is blamed for not being able to get good jobs and make more money. She doesn't think it is their fault. And, the 'bootstrap' approach doesn't work:

It's not fair for the low class because they never get anything and never get anywhere. Even the low, some of them don't deserve it cause they don't try to better themselves or help themselves, they just sit there and get everything handed to them. ... I think everybody should be equal. (Patrice)

Susie was even more unequivocal about class and class positions:

I would like there not to be lower class. I would like everybody to be recognised as the same - just an even. But an even ... that [we] probably realise that there has to be different categories. People don't fit into those categories. 'Cause, I know that I wouldn't, if I was put from here to here [from lower to upper class] I don't think I would be comfortable up here. I wouldn't know how to act, or how to deal with that. But, down here, I can deal with this and I can deal with this. I don't like dealing here, but I like here [middle]. I think if it was possible everything on the even, the middle, was comfortable. I don't like being hungry. And I know other people don't. I shouldn't say I don't like being rich, but I don't want that [being rich]. The attitude that comes with money, I don't want that. I would take the money, but not the attitude. I would take the money but still be here [the middle], attitude-wise. Like, you got to understand. I don't understand this [the higher class], how they perceive other people. I don't understand that. It's almost like they have no feeling. You know, they don't want to associate with someone from in the middle or below. But if you are from here [low] or here [middle], you understand sort of. You have to understand. (Susie)

Though difficult in places to follow, Susie's comments reveal not only her ideas about class, but she also shows where and how an individual fits in a class structure. Susie
uses income and attitude to distinguish between upper, middle, and lower classes.

Understanding what it is like to be hungry and what it is like to work at being financially comfortable is part of the middle and low classes. This is the attitude she prefers not to give up.

Most of the women aspired to be middle class. Only Lori wanted to be in the "higher class". Most of the rest of the women wanted to be comfortable, maybe a little bit more than what they had, but not a lot more. For example, Nancy wanted:

[j]ust enough to survive on and be happy. You know, not ecstatically rich and the snob, the whole bit. (Nancy)

Amy was willing to put in extra effort and wait a little longer:

Like I’m contented now. But I know I want more. I don’t want more, like my status, my position. Like I’m not out to get a great job or anything. But I want more. Like I want to have my house again. I want to have two cars in the driveway. I want to try to be able to go on trips. And, just, respect. More respect. You know, which I think I’ll never get because I’m not so young. (Amy)

Unlike Amy, for Michelle it’s too early to set such far off goals. Michelle sees herself in a low class job.

Hannah’s is pretty well a low class kind of job. You don’t see - it’s low paying, you know. So, I think that because of my, because I didn’t go to college or whatever, that’s basically the only kind of job I could get. I don’t know, it’s too hard for me to understand. (Michelle)

Being satisfied in a class position is important for Michelle, like many of the other women. So, rather than seeing income as the only determinant of class (which would make her in the lowest class), she brings in attitude as part and parcel to locating someone in a class system:

I’m not embarrassed because usually lower class people are the easiest to associate with. I don’t mind it really. I don’t care whether I’m rich or not as long as I’m having a good time. (Michelle)

Attitude alone as a rationalisation of a class position is not enough for any of the women. There is a material base entwined with the attitude. Michelle talks
about the interconnectedness between attitude and income by expressing her fear of being trapped.

Sometimes I get scared that no matter how much I work. You know, I feel like there's no way I can get out of this - the way I am now. So, I'll probably just be happy being that. You know, I can have these goals [going to school], but, you know? (Michelle)

Susie, too, implicates attitude in her conception of class, not just as a rationalisation, but as integral to situating someone in a class position. She discusses her class position:

Most of the time, I'm okay about it. There are times when I would like to be higher class. Not necessarily higher class, but monetarily, what is higher class. ... We survive. You know. There are tough times, but I would like there not to be tough times, mostly. That will come, one day. You know. As long as we're happy and we're healthy, I'm okay. ... I just want to be comfortable. I don't want to be overly comfortable. I don't want to take things for granted. Because I know how I have to, we have to work for things now. And what we have is honest. Like it's honestly gotten, you know, by hard work. You know you deserve it once you have got it. A lot of people that have money, I don't think they appreciate a hell of a lot of things. You know. I think that's how then they treat someone else shitty and that's how that person feels down. And, you know, I really wouldn't want to get that way. (Susie)

The concept of being trapped in a class is pervasive. None of the women believe that they are wholly responsible for their class position but half of the women see themselves as trapped in the class they are in. Susie was part of the "lower class" when she married young:

I had no choice at the time. There were times when there wasn't food and there wasn't money. And I had a baby. (Susie)

Francie, too, had misgivings about restricted choices she had in her past, especially when she was young:

I do think that if I would have been more pursuing and more interesting in my early part of my life, like when I got the job at the hospital. If I weren't so involved in gettin' out of the house, I think I would've stayed single. And saved and went to the places that I wanted to go instead of gettin' married. I still think of that. Because, it was a good job. I think if I was a little more tolerant as I am now, then, I think I would've been in a little better position than I am now. ... I wouldn't have settled for what I got. Mind you, what I
got, there’s nothing wrong with it, but if I would’ve been a little more pursuant. But because of the family background, you’re so anxious to get out of that, that you don’t, and if you don’t have very much option, you take what option you’ve got instead of thinking about what options you may be able to have. And there was always that fear of me not being able to keep a job. And then what would happen? (Francie)

For Candy, being trapped has an additional dimension. She thinks that individual goals and standards are compromised because of what class you’re in.

Though Candy thinks you have to hold on to your goals and have hope, the choice of the path to attain the goals is restricted. Especially now:

There’s not too many choices out there. ... They fire and hire people as they want. They just don’t care for the people. (Nancy)

Being ever practical, Beatrice seems to think that with a partner making ends meet within your class restrictions is a little bit easier. But, when your partner is not getting work, goals have to be put on hold:

Michael don’t get anything. That is really going to hold us back right now. Even if we stay the same way we are. That’s better than fallin’ back. (Beatrice)

For Beatrice, and nearly all of the other women, 'struggling to stay where you are' has replaced 'struggling to get ahead'.

(7.4.2.3) **Collective strategies for changing relations in and of production**

Thus far, I have focused on the women’s individual class identities and paid little attention to the women’s collective class identity. I chose to specify the women’s collective class identities by noting how common experiences and informal resistance strategies in the workplace(s) shape the women’s identification with other workers in similar class positions. Though experiences of a fragmented labour process are fractured, having experiences in common should bring workers together, especially in struggles over the control of their own labour (known as "struggles of resistance" and struggles over the relations in production).\(^{34}\) I have demonstrated how control of

\(^{34}\) See Chapter 6, Footnote 32, p. 170, for a differentiation between "struggles of resistance" and "struggles of transformation".
labour through various management techniques impede the formation of formal collective struggles ("struggles of transformation" and struggles over the relations of production) (see Chapter 6, Section 6.5.2, pp. 167-174). However, within a spatially fragmented labour process, informal resistance strategies emerge as the most important element in consolidating counterhegemonic power relations amongst the workers (Chapter 6, Section 6.5.3, pp. 173-180). They are the most important for two reasons. First, formal collective strategies have been nearly closed off (see Chapter 6, Section 6.5.3, pp. 173-180). So, the only forum through which workers can challenge or contest the manager's authority is through the informal support of each other as workers (see also Chapter 6, Section 6.5.3, pp. 173-180). And, second, because franchise housekeepers spend the vast majority of their time with their co-workers unsupervised (by the manager), challenges to the relations in production are more likely to emerge between co-workers. Thus, co-worker relations, including the interpersonal interaction of team members, are the avenues through which franchise housekeepers can contest the manager's authority without directly confronting the manager and forge a collective class identity. Together these common experiences and informal resistance strategies characterise the collective class identity of women franchise housekeepers.

There are two types of informal resistance strategies. One type is directed at the manager/owner; the other, at co-workers. The strategies directed at the manager/owner involve the support of co-workers, either implicitly or explicitly. Quitting is an individual act that can be part of a collective resistance strategy. Recall that Elizabeth quit over taking her child to the doctor (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4.3, p. 120). In this instance, no other worker stood up for the woman by either quitting or challenging the manager's authority. Yet they all respected her for her choice. All the workers recognised that underlying the manager's decision was securing enough labour
for the heaviest days of the week. Rather than set a precedent, the manager risked losing the worker by saying no to her request for time off. Not all workers would have quit in that situation, but they supported her action.

Resistance is mediated through each woman’s experience of the manager’s authority. If one of the women got along with the manager and found her supportive, then she was less likely to challenge her authority. For example, Anne said that working with her manager was fine and there were no problems:

It’s easier when [the manager] being the kind of person she is. ... [I] know that I can pick up the phone and she’ll be there. (Anne)

Beatrice, who worked with Anne, also respected the manager’s position of authority:

I don’t like to bother the boss with things unless they’re important because after a while you get to be a thorn in her side, you know, as the saying goes. So I don’t like to say too much unless it’s really important. (Beatrice)

Likewise, telling on a worker is not “squealing” in all circumstances; it can be an act of one worker in support of another. Patrice is sensitive to the power relations within the franchise. When she has to report back to the manager about a maid, she does so in private so that the maid doesn’t think she is being ganged up on. Patrice doesn’t like the thought of having to confront both the manger and the maid:

It would be awkward. But, I mean, if I really had to, if it was really, was that bad of a situation, I would come forward and say something. Maybe I wouldn’t speak to her [the manager] about it when the person was there, but maybe call her on the phone later and discuss it with her. But, I wouldn’t, I don’t know if I would bring the subject in front of the other person in case it caused a three way fight type of thing. (Patrice)

As I have already noted (see Chapter 6, Section 6.5.2, pp. 167-174), when asked if they would support another worker in a grievance against the manager, the women said only if they knew that the worker was right. Or, the women confined their support even more narrowly as a worker’s own problem, as Angela notes:
If I seen there was a problem and I agreed with it. If I was having a problem with it too. ... If it wasn’t my problem, I wouldn’t get involved with it.

(Angela)

None would support a co-worker on principle. This breaks apart the traditional base for a collective identity, that is, support for a co-worker because she/he’s in the same position that you are.

Though there was no formalised collective struggles of resistance or transformation, the women engaged in informal, on-going collective resistance over the control of their labour. For example, where I worked the manager split up Janet and Barb and set Roxanne up with Janet, and me up with Barb. Janet was three months pregnant at the time. Roxanne’s route was heavier than Barb’s. Janet saw this as a direct threat to the health of her unborn child. There were quite a few rumblings from the other workers as well those expressed individually, informally to the manager during office visits. The pressure from the workers was successful in that the workers were reshuffled back to their original teams after only three days.

There was much support for co-workers on an informal basis. A ripe issue for collective action was the payment for travel time, which nearly all the workers supported. By putting off the meeting and talking about the recession, the manager effectively squelched the action (see Chapter 6, Section 6.5.2, pp. 173-74). The women workers tend to shy away from money issues. This hearkens back to Alice’s comments that the manager makes her feel guilty about customers quitting (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4.3, p. 116). Anything having to do with money is blamed on the recession, higher prices, less cleans, lower gas allowance, et cetera. One woman had to pay for a new spring mechanism in the hatchback of the car (see Chapter 1,

---

35. The women introduced "attitude" into principle and refer to it as "character" (see Chapter 6, Section 6.5.2, p. 171).
36. This is the case even though head office personnel claim that housekeeping services franchises are not recession sensitive (Interviews with Head Office Personnel, 1991, Nos. 32, 34, 37, and 39).
Section 1.2, pp. 14-15). Kelly didn’t think this was fair. Any other time the firm
would have picked up the bill:

I don’t think we should be having to pay for something like that, which I don’t.
I don’t think she should have to pay for something like that. To get the
hatchback fixed on the car. (Kelly)

Kelly stopped short of bringing this to the attention of the manager. Like Angela said
before, Kelly didn’t want to get involved.

Informal resistance strategies directed at co-workers are intense
experiences. Co-worker conflict can make your daily life miserable. Being able to
forge class solidarity in the context of a spatially fragmented workplace enhances the
role of the interpersonal relationships in these various workplaces and dampens the
significance of commonalities in class positions. Because of the spatial organisation of
the labour process in housekeeping services franchises, the women spend most of their
time with one or two other workers. It is difficult to see the similarities between their
positions in the objective relation of exploitation, their common bond of selling labour
power at a low wage and being partially financially dependent on social services, and
their fragmented position in the managerial control of their labour through separation of
the conception and execution of a labour task. What is immediate is the interpersonal
relations which dominates the interaction between co-workers; personal conflict
between workers cloaks an underlying competition for a job. So, negative daily
interaction with co-workers undermines worker solidarity by focusing conflict amongst
workers rather than between workers and the manager and the firm.

Francie exemplifies this point in her account of her struggle with Helga.
Both Francie and Helga needed a job to make ends meet. Both have relatively few
skills to be qualified for other jobs. Yet, their daily interaction undermined the forging
of worker solidarity. Francie thought Helga was too serious:
Because when you have to go to work and you’re in a car, and you’re in a house with somebody for over four hours a day, you know, that gets to you. She would not talk, she would not joke. She wouldn’t let me listen to the radio. You know. She really got to the extent that she would even argue, eh? So, it really got me to the extent that it was upsetting me. And, no matter what I said to the boss, apparently she had, had something that the boss just loved, and I wasn’t right. (Francie)

The manager wasn’t very supportive in her situation. By reputation Helga was the best cleaner in the franchise. The manager told me that she knew there was conflict between Francie and Helga, but she didn’t want to lose either worker, so what could she do? (Interview with Manager/Owner, 1991, No. 31). Francie dug in her heels and stuck it out:

It would really irritate me. But, I was determined that I wasn’t going to let her shoosh me out of this job. And, I think I’m the one that shooshed her out of the job. Because I told her so. This is a good job and I know what I’m doing. And I know I can do it good. And you or nobody else is going to chase me out of it. (Francie)

Though Francie seemingly struggled on her own, other supervising maids and maids encouraged and supported her case to the manager and her supervising maid. Helga left the franchise to move to the newly unified Germany. Francie is still working at Clare’s.

Forging class solidarity in the workplace also involves confidence in the expertise of your job. In knowing the job inside out, workers use this expertise in order to be in a better position to challenge the manager’s authority. For example, if a customer forgets to leave a cheque and the supervising maid knows that the customer will not pay, yet the manager insists on the maids cleaning the house, the supervising maid will refuse the clean. Her refusal is based on her own knowledge of the business. By standing up for herself against the manger, she reinforces her position of a powerful supervising maid.

Susie, when talking about another job, expressed this concept most concisely:
Sometimes I feel I have the upper hand, because I know more about what I'm doing. At one time I didn't. When I first started working there, I really didn't know the "ins and outs" of the job. Now, I have a better idea of it and I sort of have that feeling of being one step ahead of anyone that comes in. (Susie)

Being on top of things is what matters. Being confident sets you in a better position to encourage co-workers to resist authority. Alice appears to the other women in the franchise as easy-going, complacent, and easily controlled by the manager. However, she continuously encourages the maids on her team to stand up and take care of themselves and challenge the manager's authority by showing her you won't take "shit" from anyone. Anne does the same:

Don't be afraid of her. Don't be afraid of [the supervising maid]. She says, 'I'm not goin' to be afraid of her. I just don't want to lose my job.' I said, 'You're not goin' to lose your job.' [The manager] is just going to put you on another team and you aren't going to have to work with her. (Anne)

Alice and Anne know the ropes and they know just how much to get away with, without losing their jobs.

Informal resistance strategies directed at the manager/owner or co-workers shape the class identities of franchise housekeepers at the workplace. The women's individual class identities are clearly set out, but not only in material terms. Attitude toward other people is crucial in the women's acceptance of people in the same class position, which sometimes serves to undermine collective struggles in the workplaces. Though the workplaces are sites for forging class solidarity, individual attitudes toward co-workers set the tone for the interaction.

Conceptualising class as a set of concrete formation processes benefits a theory of waged domestic labour processes in three ways. First, class is not conceived only as a set of objective relations. As a process in context (refer to Section 7.3), class embodies both objective conditions and the subjective experiences of those conditions. The conditions of class as a social position are set in part by an individual's relations to the ownership of the means of production and in part by the amount of money her/his
level of skills acquisition (or her/his historical material circumstances) can obtain. An individual's mediation of these objective conditions shapes the (re)actions she/he can and/or will take in the workplace(s) with regard to challenging a particular organisation of labour relations, as in the case housekeeping services franchises. Second, when class includes both objective conditions and workers' experiences of them, an analysis can further sort through the relations in and of production. Because individuals comprise the various sets of labour relations within a production regime, an account of their experiences can indicate how production regimes manifest in particular places and how they change over time. Class formation processes must include the historical material context within which a particular organisation of labour emerges. That context is inclusive of individuals' personal material histories. Third, conceiving class as a formation process provides clarity in the ways individuals organise their lives around their labour. Such an account is not just an explanation of the links between the organisation of the labour power of individuals in the social context of labour. Such an account identifies specific material and historical processes within which workers actually forge individual and collective class identities with respect to their experiences of particular organisations of labour.\textsuperscript{37} Class identities as a result of these formation processes affect the organisation of their 'total labour', that is, a worker's individual and collective class identity will shape her/his choice of job, use of resources (e.g. financial, friends, family members), and daily schedule.

(7.4.3) **Demonstrating gender formation**

Individual and collective gender identities, like class identities, manifest differently in the various places women engage in relations in and of production. Workers continually construct and reconstruct what it is like to be a woman worker in a

\textsuperscript{37} I say "organisations" of labour because I do not want to discount labour that is not productive.
particular waged labour process. How these women forge particular gender identities is mediated by the constitutive processes of their own personal material histories as women as well as the dominating relations within which they engage. Each of the women participating in this study has forged an individual and collective gender identity. These identities emerge in context of the women’s personal material histories and in turn shape their actions in the workplace.\textsuperscript{38} I am confining this empirical demonstration to the gender formation of women for two reasons. First, as a feminist, I am interested in women’s daily lives and how they contest, challenge, reinforce, sustain, and transform the relations of masculine dominance.\textsuperscript{39} Second, only women participated in the project. Because of the differences in the ways men and women experience domination in capitalist labour relations, I cannot extend these empirical findings to the gender formation of men. However, I can demonstrate some of the ways in which these women forged their individual and collective gender identities of being a woman. Such ways can probably be extended to studies of men workers forging individual and collective identities.

I identify some of the concrete processes through which these particular women forged their gender identities as franchise housekeepers in a waged domestic labour process in three ways. First, I investigate the cumulative result of these processes, that is, I look at the women’s conceptions of what it’s like to be a woman (Section 7.4.3.1). Second, I illustrate by example how specific behaviours of the women in the workplace and at home are manifestations of the ways in which they

\textsuperscript{38} Though the class and gender processes may be constitutive of the same set of relations, for example, relations \textit{in} and \textit{of} production, I cannot organise the empirical demonstration around the same themes (see titles of Sections 7.4.2.1, 7.4.2.2, and 7.4.2.3). Class and gender relations are not organised around nor arise from the same set of conditions (see the end of Section 7.4.3.3).

\textsuperscript{39} See Burstyn’s (1986) account of masculine dominance in Section 7.2, p. 191.
developed and acted out their conceptions of being a woman, that is, I depict their
dividual and collective identities in the workplace, and to a lesser extent in the home
(Section 7.4.3.2). Third, I interpret how women’s experiences of labour and its
regulation shape the formation of their gender identities and how their gender identities
in turn affect their (re)actions to particular aspects of the workplace(s). These aspects
include sexual harassment, carrying out housekeeping tasks, and maintaining one’s
health (Section 7.4.3.3).

(7.4.3.1) Conceptions of gender

Unlike the well-structured definitions of ‘class’, nearly all the women were
unsure of the meaning of ‘gender’. They talked in terms of female/male,
feminine/masculine, woman/man, and girl/boy, but not in terms of biological sex,
socialised beings, and young socialised beings. As we talked, their meanings were
fluid and overlapped with each other. Eventually, however, my understanding of their
meanings of ‘being a woman’ clarified. For example, Beatrice made a distinction
between feminine and woman:

Feminine is how you come across to guys and that’s just not in a sexual way.
All males are alike, right? Like when I’m around a man, I don’t like to make a
man feel uncomfortable like that, you know. I always want him to know that
he’s the man. Not that he can tell me what to do or boss me around or push me
around or make me do something that I don’t want to do. I always feel like
men like to feel like, you know, they’re the men and macho or whatever. So, I
don’t. I always try behave in a certain way so that I don’t overpower them. It’s
really hard to explain. But, I guess that’s what being feminine is - to me.
(Beatrice)

Femininity defines her womanhood. Similarly, Susie differentiates between women
and female:

When they say act like a lady, it means don’t be crude or, cross your legs, that
kind of stuff. Being female is just what you are. (Susie)
Female is what you can’t change (the biological); being a woman is how you are supposed to be (the social).40

I tried to comprehend the gender formation processes that the women have undergone and are undergoing by asking directly about their experiences of being a woman in the workplace(s) and in the home. Their stories exemplify the processes through which they, as individuals, go through collectively. There were many similarities, in their backgrounds, in their attitudes, and especially in their views of women’s and men’s work. Individual gender identities tended not to be as clear as collective identities. I say this because the women recounted their experiences of being a woman in terms of their individual attitudes conflicting with their conception of how women were supposed to act. This reflects both the clarity of the social conceptions of what women should be like as well as the tension between women’s individual actions in the context of these social expectations.

The women’s conceptions of being a woman were couched in terms of how being a woman differed from being a man.41 Rather than positively identifying with women, most of the women negatively identified with men. Four of the women said they preferred being a woman because they didn’t want to be a man. Anne, Amy, Kelly, and Francie did not want the economic responsibilities of a man.

40. Michelle and I discussed this distinction and she was quick to point out that transsexuals did change their ‘femaleness’. Though many of the women and I discussed transsexuality, homosexuality, asexuality, and hermaphroditism when we discussed contradictions in the manifestations of gender, I won’t be focusing on this in this empirical demonstration for two reasons. First, this topic was not covered in the recorded conversations with all the women. Second, because none of the women identified themselves as transsexual, homosexual, asexual, or hermaphroditic, I did not pursue this topic. One woman was bisexual whose experiences are interpreted in this section, p. 245.

41. This is not a framework I devised to discuss gender with the women. Every woman discussed being a woman in terms of how being a woman differed from being a man. The question “If you had a choice, would you choose to be a woman or a man? Why?” turned out to be appropriate in light of the women’s definitions (see Appendix D, pp. 304-311).
Three women wanted to be men because of their negative conceptions of
woman (Michelle, Patrice, and Susie). Michelle wanted to be a man because women
have to do too much work:

There’s just so much more that happens to a girl than a guy. Like, you know,
you have to have the babies. And it’s traditional for you to have to stay home
with the kids and be barefoot and pregnant. Do all the housework. And,
prepare the meals. And it just seems like a lot of work. And most guys, I hate
to admit it, but most guys these days don’t see it that way. (Michelle)

Patrice would prefer to be a man because it is difficult for women:

Because as I said, when a woman works she still has to come in and make
supper and take care, if they have small kids, bathe them, change them, get
them ready for bed. I lived in a household like that, my husband does nothing.
He goes to work and that’s it. He doesn’t lift a finger, unless you ask. (Patrice)

And even then he doesn’t help. Patrice went on:

If I was to come back, I’d come back as a man. Or, if I had a choice, I’d be a
man. Because I think it is a man’s world. Even though there is a lot of
opportunities there, equal opportunities for women, I still think it’s a man’s
world. And, I think it always will be a man’s world. (Patrice)

Susie was the only other woman who expressed a wish to be man. She
wanted to be more like a man sexually so she could legitimise her sexual aggressiveness
without detracting from her femininity. (Susie) Susie made a spatial distinction which
also incorporates ‘equality in the bedroom’:

In the house, no, they should be equal. For example, if we have company, I’m
the one who makes drinks, or whatever. Whereas he’s quite capable, it’s his
company, too. But I feel also like a servant. You know, and I shouldn’t be. I
mean I see it bad in our friends, too. You know, certain places that it is always
the female will serve. ‘Get us a cold drink’. (Susie)

Aside from sexual aggressiveness, Susie "wouldn’t want to change into a man",
because women have relatively few constraints. The constraints Susie refers to are the
economic responsibilities she sees that men have to take on because they are men and
are providers.
Lynn didn’t want to be a man because she didn’t want to scare women. She was in a physically and psychologically abusive relationship for 15 years. From this experience, she was afraid of men and had no respect for them.

I would rather be a woman any day. Except when [men] try to control you. (Lynn)

When a man would try to control her, she would "freak out". As a response to the domination, she decided that, as a woman, she could "use your body as a weapon - towards a man" in an attempt to try to control him. (Lynn) As part of her rejection of men, Lynn turned to women for support and comfort.

I enjoyed being a women more when I was lesbian. ... It was fun. It was a lot of fun. (Lynn)

The rest of the women preferred being a woman for the positive aspects of being a woman (Beatrice, Lori, Alice, Nancy, Candy, and Angela). The positive aspects of being a woman centred on the choice of either a family or a career, not both. Beatrice’s attitudes were typical of these six women. She made the distinction of "gender positions"42 based on the goals of an individual. (Beatrice) She said that it would be easier to be famous if you were a man and that family goals are women’s goals. Beatrice’s goals are family-oriented. She thinks that caring for her little sister made her aware of the "responsibilities of life" for women which "put me where I am". (Beatrice) Yet Beatrice still sees she has a choice. Candy agrees, as a woman she can choose from men’s and women’s goals:

Being a woman has a lot more possibilities. (Candy)

The implication here is that men can only choose men’s goals, a career and providing economically for a family.

42. Beatrice used this term.
The women's definitions of femininity, female, and woman implicated their own sexuality. The most common story the women told me, when defining what being a woman was all about, was not being able to go into a bar without being 'hit on'.

Alice most poignantly describes the links between being a woman and going into a bar:

I find that because I'm a woman I can't go [inaudible] ... sit at a bar without being harassed. And that annoys me. They think because we're there, we're there for one thing. And we're really there for a good time. A few drinks. A few laughs. And then go home. I find it very difficult to go and sit there and not be, you know? If somebody doesn't bug me at least once in an evening, I'm disappointed. Because, I don't get the chance to tell them off. (Alice)

Beatrice doesn't think men understand the difference in their "gender position":

A guy can go and sit in a bar and have a drink and it feels all right. He's just having his beer after work. A woman does it and there's something kind of funny about it. Like they think well, she's just wants to be picked up, er. They can't understand it. (Beatrice)

Amy points out in detail the implications of women acting like men were they to go in a bar and flirt:

Men - they don't just tease. They just dig in - go for the gusto, you know. Like if they start to flirt, then they want something if you flirt back. And if you say 'no, no, no, no, no, I was just kiddin'. Blah, blah, blah.' Then you're automatically labelled a bitch. (Amy)

Alice, Beatrice, and Amy describe the social context of women's sexuality with regard to their behaviour in public places. Their collective gender identities constrained their mobility choices in that although their individual gender identity does not restrict them from going to a bar alone after work, their collective gender identity does.

Patrice and Nancy are upfront about their sexuality in a way that parallels patriarchal relations of sexual dominance. They both had 'hunk' calendars of 'Chip 'N Dale' dancers. Patrice and Nancy take on a 'what's-good-for-the-gander-is-good-for-the-goose' attitude, that is, through the same method of sexual objectification they define for themselves an ideal sex object (cf. Wolf 1990). Unlike Susie wanting to be a
man in order to legitimize her sexual aggressiveness, Beatrice disputes this parallel perspective using the same example as Patrice and Nancy:

I've been thinking about this for a long time. You ever notice like on those signs for strippers and stuff - Girls! Girls! Girls!, right? They don't say women. But would you ever see something like that for males that said - Boys! Boys! Boys! - it would be like guys or male strippers or 'hot' men. (Beatrice)

Events like these shape and are shaped by the women's conceptions of gender and experiences of the distribution of power between women and men in public places. The way in which these women define their sexuality is important because they define it through either the dominant hegemonic paradigm of gender (like Susie, Alice, Beatrice, and Amy) or in masculine terms (Patrice and Nancy).

(7.4.3.2) Emerging gender identities

The women's individual and collective gender identities emerge out of their personal material histories. I can identify specific behaviours of and choices by the women that are manifestations of the ways in which their conceptions of being a woman were developed and acted out. Rather than isolate specific incidents, I prefer to illustrate gender formation processes by presenting short synopses of the women’s experiences influencing their own individual and collective gender identities. In this way, I am able to point out commonalities and differences in the women’s histories as well as in their actions within the process of shaping their individual and collective identities.

Amy and Anne seemingly willingly accept that men should have power over women. For Amy and Anne, in the context of labour, this acceptance translates

---

43. See this section, p. 244, with regard to sexual aggressiveness in the bedroom.
44. The distinctions between what is masculine and feminine is based on Lloyd (1984).
45. I say "seemingly" because there is a tension between relations of domination and the beliefs that support those relations. That tension shapes women's
into differentiating women's and men's work on the basis of the type of labour tasks.

For example, Amy states that women should do all the household labour:

    I believe that it's a woman's job. I've seen it all my life. My mom always did the housework, the cooking, the cleaning. I was just brought up like that. And I just believe that I should do it. (Amy)

While growing up Amy's mother taught her to stay home with her kids and not to work.

    She pretty well stayed home, because my father never wanted her to go out and work. (Amy)

Amy, however, was 'forced' into employment by the economic situation arising when her husband was fired from his job:

    But, unfortunately we need two incomes now, so. Like I wouldn't be working, if I had money. I wouldn't be working. Because I'm not really high on this "Well, I have to find myself, and be a career woman and make something of myself in the world." I'm satisfied with just being myself - looking after. Sure, I'm a little more independent now, but, and, I think it's good. But, I'm not out to see how much power I can get or how much prestige I can get or whatever. (Amy)

She thinks "men are the breadwinners" and women should not threaten men by having careers, because men then would be "stuck doing the women's jobs, cleaning houses or whatever". She feels inferior to her husband, but prefers it that way. Plus:

    If you thought too much about it. I think women would probably want more than they already have. Or, men would get a 'hate-on' for women for trying so hard to be equal. You know, and I think - do you understand what I'm saying? Because I think men right now, some of them, resent that women are trying to be equal. (Amy)

Her mother continues to be the most influential individual in her life. Amy talks to her everyday and her mother encourages her to take the same path she did years ago. This interaction between Amy and her mother strengthens the existing set of gender relations within which Amy engages.

experiences of patriarchy and their actions to reinforce, challenge, or transform those relations of domination.

46. One is unemployment insurance benefits.
Anne, too, believes that women should do housework at home. She feels lucky that her husband pitches in around the house. She extends this division of labour to waged labour:

I think there’s men’s jobs and I think there’s women’s jobs. (Anne)

Anne encourages her daughter, Carrie, to pursue a career in sports medicine. When I asked if sports medicine was women’s work, Anne responded by saying that it was women’s work - there are many women athletes. Anne thinks generally that women and men have specific jobs, but makes individual exceptions when her family is involved. Her attitudes reinforce the dominating gender relations within which she engages and she rationalises exceptions to fit her conceptions of a collective gender identity.

Candy, Francie, Kelly, and Patrice willingly accept that men should have power over women. In order to get out of a strict, Christian-oriented home environment, Candy took a job at a fast food restaurant where she met Gary, whom she soon thereafter married. Because of the low wages she was earning on a part-time basis, she took a job as a on-floor sales clerk for a major department store in Hamilton. Gary wanted to try his hand in Vancouver, so she and Gary moved to the coast. After a short look at the availability of jobs, they moved back to Hamilton. Gary continued his trades apprenticeship and Candy began working for Clare’s Cleaning Services.

Candy learned that life runs more smoothly if she does not openly confront her husband’s authority.47 When Candy was employed at Clare’s, she “ranted and raved” to get Gary to do something around the house, but to no avail. She found herself “losing it” quite often, just like her mother did. Only after they bought a television did the number of fights she and Gary have decrease. Once the baby arrived,

47. Recall my account of Candy’s life in Chapter 5, Section, 5.4.1, pp. 105-106.
Candy stayed home and became a full-time mother, housekeeper, wife, and household manager. She found it less of a hassle to care for the baby and maintain the household when she did not try to get Gary to do any of the domestic labour. Financially, they make ends meet on his apprentice training funding and her unemployment. Once her maternity benefits ran out, they moved to an income-geared rental unit. They now receive welfare supplements. When asked who most influenced her, Candy says:

Mainly my mother. ... Uhm, like listening to her. Like do this, do that. Or, no you shouldn't be saying those things. (Candy)

Even in her unwillingness to accept men’s power over women, with regard to the domestic ideals that pervade her thinking, she strives to maintain a peaceful life for her child and her husband. Her interaction with the church group solidifies and reinforces these dominating gender relations which shape her individual gender identity by setting prescribed behaviour for Candy into the context of ‘God’s will’.

Francie also unwillingly engages in masculine dominated gender relations. She grew up in a strict, religious household where her stepmother continuously treated the four daughters as if they were "tramps", no matter what their social activities were. Francie dropped out of school at a young age. Her primary social outlet was the church. Francie was in her mid-twenties when she married Elgin, the ‘boy next door’. They had children and she quit her job to raise them. Francie worked on weekends as a banquet server for a local dinner club as her first employment outside the household since her first child was born. Elgin considered this an interim position until she got a real job:

My husband says - well when I got a real job, like after my kids were in school, both of them all day, and we moved here, uh - I got a job at the bakery on [the mountain]. I worked there. But I found that the two jobs were too much. Plus coming home and working and stuff like this, too, hey. So, my husband said I had to give up Mountain Brow. So I did that. (Francie)
There was little negotiation over the choice of employment. Elgin decided that the bakery was a "real job". Francie absolutely hated the bakery job. It was too much pressure, running here, running there. She also had a difficult time in getting two days off in a row. Her boss also sexually harassed her. Though she disagreed with Elgin’s choice, she accepted the decision because she does not like to fight.

Francie challenges her husband’s authority in very specific ways. She uses her economic independence to support her children, against Elgin’s wishes. She plans her money around giving birthday presents to Mary and Tim, even though Elgin thinks it is a waste of money. She contributes to the cost of Mary’s contraceptives. Elgin doesn’t know that Mary is sexually active. Mary is at university and pays most of her own tuition. Francie wanted Mary to have a desk for her studies. She fought with both her husband and father to buy the desk. In the end, the three of them split the costs evenly.

Kelly, too, unwillingly acquiesces to masculine dominance. She explains this in terms of the role she had to take on when her father died. She never got along with her mother:

I couldn’t keep my mouth shut. I would just argue with her all the time. Steady. ... I guess I blamed her somehow for his dying. You know, like in weird kind of way. And, I had to take over everything. When he died she went back to work and my two older sisters were working. I was still at school and had two younger brothers. So, I had to be home for her to cook supper, make sure there was somebody home for them to come to after school, clean up after work. We still all did it [and] helped clean up. I’m not saying that I did it all, but I did the majority of it. (Kelly)

Her life continued on what she called a "traditional path":

I think I’m in one of those categories where, uhm, I fell into the category - I got married young. And, that’s what you do, you got married and you have kids and the woman stayed home and did this that and the other thing. Maybe because I did it when my dad died [that] I did it. I sort of took right over from my mom at an early age. I just figured that was the thing to do. ... Now, it’s okay, my daughter, she wants to go off and be a tradesman. For me, you just never did. (Kelly)
Here Kelly points out that although her life was/is traditional, she thinks that her daughter will be able to choose more easily a vocation or trade for waged labour. Kelly doesn’t think that her daughter will have the same constraints that she had when she was growing up. In some instances Kelly would like to challenge her collective identity (evidenced by the plans for her daughter), but she is much too practical to incorporate this kind of struggle into her daily life.

Kelly raised her children at home. Although Kelly actively participated in the decision for her to stay home, she phrases it like this:

He figured, and so did I, that there should be a good supper on the table.
(Kelly)

Kelly manages the finances and is quite capable at it. She says she knows when the bills have to be paid, which ones can slide, and how much money is needed to cover them. Ken, her husband, has to look over them:

He says to me, 'the bills need to be paid'. I have a little thing, I keep them when they come in. I write the date on them, when they’re due. I keep them in a little serviette holder. So, I’ll pull them out and say this one’s due, or that one can wait until next week. So he’ll check them over and he’ll look at them. "Okay, I’ll pay this and that, then I’ll leave this one". Or, "I’ll pay them all". And he usually stops at the bank Thursday night on his way home. (Kelly)

Especially since she’s been working for Clare’s, Kelly feels that Ken’s vacation pay is his, not hers or the family’s. Though she is somewhat more economically independent while working at Clare’s, her gender identity is shaped by her and her family’s dependence on Ken’s income. Kelly says that he works hard and has many aggravations. Though she knows his money is her money too (because they use it to pay for the household bills), she still feels deep down that it’s really his money and that he should spend it.

Kelly’s gender identity in part arises out of the social relations in her childhood. Though she has come to grips intellectually about equality and
opportunities, she still holds closely those values that 'forced' her into taking on most of the domestic labour in the home after her father died: women are nurturers and primary carers. She thinks "being stressed out is a pile of shit" and that even though you disagree with something, you know what you should do, so you just do it. (Kelly)

It seems that she doesn’t really want to acquiesce but does so because its not that important to openly challenge dominating gender relations.

Like Candy, Francie, and Kelly, Patrice acquiesces to dominating gender relations most of the time primarily because she thinks men are more intelligent than women. Patrice's mother never worked outside the home. Her father worked in a factory. She grew up adoring her father and taking her mother for granted. She said her father was "very intelligent" and she "had a lot of respect for him". Her father died suddenly, in an accident when she was in her teens. She didn’t have many more choices for a career. She married, had children, and stayed home to raise them.

Patrice used the same phrase to describe her husband that she used to describe her father in separate conversations. She has "a lot of respect" for her husband because:

He's a thousand more times intelligent than I. (Patrice)

For Patrice, men are respected because they are intelligent. Patrice wants her children to have more choices in their lives than she had in hers. For her, the key to these choices is education. Angie, her daughter, has not yet finished high school and actually dropped out for a little while. Patrice tried to encourage her, but when verbal support was not enough, she used physical force. It didn’t work. Angie moved out. Though the fight with Angie was not over a man, Angie was not respecting something that Patrice held in high regard, like with her husband and her father, education,

48. She thinks that the only way to improve one’s class position is through formal education or training. In Patrice’s view, it’s easier for men to change classes than it is for women, because men seem to be more intelligent than women.
intelligence, and, consequently, men. This makes sense in that Patrice thinks that
sometimes women need to be slapped, especially when they are manipulating the man
or "humiliating the man in front of his male peers." (Patrice)

The other women actively and openly challenge (or have challenged) the
dominating gender relations within which they engage (Lori, Alice, Beatrice, Lynn,
Michelle, and Susie). Lori married young and quit her job when she got pregnant.
Her husband drank a lot and became abusive and violent. She walked out and was glad
to be through with a "man that drank so much". She remarried a few years later to a
high school sweetheart. She connects her choices to her past:

I was different. As soon as I started working, I wanted to buy my own car and
I had different ideas than what my other brothers had. I just wanted to be out
fooling around doing things with my friends. ... Being the only girl it was kind
of funny growing up with two brothers. (Lori)

These experiences of being different made her strong enough to marry a man from
outside her small town as well as walk away from a bad relationship. Ironically, she
wants to resume the path she began years ago: she wants to stay home and take care of
the house and be there for her children.49 She doesn't like to work outside the home:

It's nice to have the extra money. Because when I didn't work, it seems that
things were always kind of tough. It's nice to have the extra money. Really
that's about, I guess the only reason why I work. ... Being home so long, and
some days I just [trail off]. I really like just to be home, but, but the money is
nice, though. That's about all really. Like the summertime will be different
when it's nice out. [inaudible] But, now it's ... . (Lori)

Alice married young at 18 and had a child at 21. For her, the marriage was
a disaster. She feels that she had been sucked into the marriage ideal and feels lucky to
be out of it. Her choice to be married was wrapped up in her collective gender
identity. She sees her past decisions as:

49. In another conversation Lori said that if she had to live her life again
she would have never quit her job at the insurance company (see Section 7.4.2.1, p.
214).
... stupidity on my part. The thought of being married, and a family and all that. It was just a dream and it was exactly what it was. It just didn't work. (Alice)

Alice had a lot of support from her family. After a couple of years she met a man and married him because they were good friends. She had a chance to "marry for money", but didn't because she wasn't in love with the man. To 'marry for money' went against her redefined individual gender identity: abuse was out, love was in. She gets a lot satisfaction from being able to do different things, small or large, it doesn't matter:

When I start something and when I finally accomplish it. I see the final result and then I feel, well, I've accomplished something. It makes you feel good. (Alice)

This helps to reconstruct her self-esteem.

Beatrice isn't married and lives with her fiancé. She grew up having to care for her younger sister when her parents split up. In her mid-teens years she moved in with her father and his family. She adopted their strict religion. After she turned 18, she decided that her family was too much for her and rejected the "brainwashing" and promptly moved in with Michael. This action challenged the central element of her individual gender identity at the time: sleeping with a man before marriage is a sin. By moving in with Michael, the crux of her identity as a woman was shattered. She now spends lots of time thinking about what it means to be a woman, both individually and collectively.

Like many of the women in this study, Lynn married young, had children, and stayed home to raise them. The turbulent relationship with her husband soon became violent. She endured many beatings and daily verbal abuse. After an intense episode of violence, Lynn left with a woman friend with whom she became intimately involved. Her family shunned her and she was cut off from her children. Though she was happiest during this time, she eventually returned to her husband. Not for love,
but for the kids. As part of her gender identity, it was important for Lynn as a woman to be a mother to her children (all of whom are boys).

Michelle had a child but didn’t marry the father. Her relationship with the child’s father was physically abusive. Also after an intense episode of violence, she kicked the father out and countersued for custody. Getting out of an abusive relationship is not easy, especially if a woman (like Patrice) thinks that women should be slapped around from time to time. Michelle did leave - but I am not sure if she will stay away from James or will not get involved in another abusive relationship.

Michelle also challenges the notion of motherhood as part of her gender. Whenever she can, she goes out on the weekend and is a teenager:

[We go out drinking or we sit here and drink and we uh, ... Or we go out driving to pick up guys and stuff. You know, [like] every tit. It’s kind of stupid for me to do it because I’m a mom, but when I can get a baby-sitter and go out on the weekend I do, because I’m still a teenager really and you know I’m a mom, too. So, I don’t know. You know we do stuff normal teen-aged girls do. ... Drive by downtown. Check out the meat. (Michelle)

Though going out is in part an escape from being a mother and other pressures in her life, for Michelle it is also a challenge to the conception of what it is like to be a woman. She can be a mother, a teenager, a daughter, a lover, a kid, a sister, a student, a worker, all at the same time because she is all of them. For her, none are mutually exclusive.

Nancy is a middle child. She has always had to struggle for affection which has caused extreme sibling rivalry. Both her sisters are married and there is pressure from her parents and sisters to get married and have children. She felt trapped:

What you hear about middle children is the truth. ... It’s not too bad now that I’m out on my own. But, when I was at home. ... I still just get left out. ... It hurts. (Nancy)
In the past, her family has not condoned her choice of men which compounds the pressure. Conflict with her mother was particularly deep:

She disowned me. Totally. Like she'd walk by me in the mall. We worked in the same mall everyday, and she'd walk by me and turn her face the other way and not even look at me. (Nancy)

The conflict was resolved after a few months, but the hurt is still there. Nancy gets along on her own, by herself. What she would really like though is for someone to come along and take care of her for awhile. She's tired of struggling. Though she actively challenges dominating relations while she is single, Nancy would like to willingly acquiesce to a man for a while as a respite.

Initially Susie's life was pat:

I went from high school, to pregnant, to marriage. Like it was just da, da, da, da, da. And then a long story. (Susie)

Susie, too, left an abusive relationship. One of the most important things she's learned is standing up for herself as a woman. Susie doesn't think that it is okay to divide labour into women's and men's work. But she understands why it is the way it is:

Back then, it was the 'stereo-girls-typing' and stuff like that. Well, that's, that's what I, I had no, nothing in mind as to what I wanted to be even in grade eleven. You know, I just didn't think about it. But it was more so, you like know I took the typing, and the accounting, home ec. The normal girly stuff, back then, you know. (Susie)

Now, Susie can easily identify inequities in power between women and men, and can act on them as long as an emotional attachment is not involved. For example, she knows that she is a "married single parent",50 but in order not to disrupt her family's unity, she chooses to remain "in control". She also knows that marriages are not forever, just like jobs: you learn from both, teach what you can, and then move on.

---

50. Susie uses this term to describe her responsibilities in raising her and Nick's children (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4.1, p. 105).
Her individual circumstances and experiences have transformed her gender identity and consequently has strengthened her interaction within relationships.

(7.4.3.3) Actions in the workplace(s)

Concrete processes of gender formation can be identified from the women’s experiences of labour and its regulation. Since these processes are not static, the formation of gender identities, both individual and collective, are on-going processes that vary temporally and spatially within the relations in and of production. For example, solicitous remarks may be flattering while riding a bike (Francie), but connote something entirely different when you are in a customer’s home wearing a maid’s uniform (Kelly). Or, if a woman willingly accepts all the reproductive labour, then gaining experience of a systematic labour process can be a pragmatic coping method making life a little easier. Since being a woman influences the choice of waged labour, then the consequences of that labour for the woman is constitutive of her individual and collective gender identities. In order to demonstrate this point I note the women’s attitudes toward waged labour generally and housekeeping services specifically and draw out their implications for the women’s gender identities. I then show how these gender identities affect the women’s (re)actions to three particular aspects of the workplace(s): sexual harassment, carrying out housekeeping, and maintaining their health.

The women’s gender identities shape and are shaped by the women’s attitudes toward waged labour generally, and housekeeping services franchises specifically. The women identified construction workers, firefighters, police officers, lawyers, and doctors as men’s positions, and housekeepers, teachers, daycare workers, social workers, and nurses as women’s.51

51. These examples are a combination of the women’s and my examples. Who suggested which occupation varied from woman to woman.
Housework, people just automatically think that it’s woman’s work because from so long back. (Amy)

Kelly reasoned that she didn’t apply for a job in construction:

Maybe because I don’t have enough confidence that I could do that. (Kelly)

Lori said the men did "business" whereas women would "talk more and kid around". (Lori) Lori’s comment reinforces the stereotype of men being more and women less serious in public business relations.

For all the women, there was a sense of independence arising from having her own money to spend. Patrice makes this clear:

I don’t like to spend his money. I like to spend my money. (Patrice)

The problem is that being a woman, and especially working for a housekeeping services franchise, you don’t get very much money. Since the women knew they would be receiving low wages, they coped by planning for a low income. This also reinforced the notion that women’s labour was valued less than men’s because the women were limited in the type of jobs they could get as well as amount of money they could make.

For some of the women, managerial techniques seemed to differ according to the gender of the worker. Francie, for example, pointed out that because you are a woman, you tend to get bossed around more at work:

I just did not like the fact of being bossed around because you’re just, because you are a woman. ... Just because you’re a woman doesn’t mean you’re stupid. A lot of men think that. (Francie)

This is compounded when the customers were condescending:

I found that a lot [of the customers] would categorise you - because of your gender because of the role you were playing, so to speak. So they treated you different because of that. (Candy)

All these conditions and relations shape the ways women act, react, and interact as women in the workplace(s). For example, Candy didn’t want to make her
supervising maid, Cora, look stupid. Although she didn’t get along with Cora, she took on Cora’s duties so that the manager wouldn’t find out that Cora couldn’t do everything a supervising maid was supposed to do:

She didn’t like writing notes and that. She couldn’t put sentences and phrases together. She wasn’t a great speller. So, I would write the note for her. But that wasn’t, like I said, we weren’t supposed to do that. (Candy)

Candy didn’t want the manager to know that Cora could barely read and write. Candy said Cora couldn’t really afford to lose her job because she had a daughter to raise.

Candy’s collective gender identity incorporates women’s specific needs in the context of waged labour.

Reacting to conflict in the workplace was also affected by the women’s gender identities. Beatrice exemplifies this by recounting a conversation with Michael about a problem she was having with her supervising maid:

Michael was sort of joking around but in a way he wasn’t. He was saying, "Well, look. Why don’t you just take her into a corner of the house one day and when no one’s lookin’, back her up against the wall and say ‘Look.’” You know. ... "Put your fist up to her face.” I said, "Michael, you guys handle things like that in a factory. You beat each other up behind the press like that. But we don’t do this.” At Hannah’s, it’s all women who work here. We just don’t run things that way. Or, when we’re cleanin’ people’s houses, and I mean you don’t want to break something. The client might be home, and, just the whole job. Everything about our job is too feminine. (Beatrice)

Beatrice wants to resolve conflict as a woman because it is more socially acceptable when all your co-workers are women.

At the workplace, contradictions between the women’s individual and collective gender identities arose when there were decisions to make which affected more than one of the women in the franchise. For example, Kelly was mulling over the pros and cons about being able to make more money than she is making now through getting more cleans:

When [the manager] gets new customers, I don’t know exactly how she goes about picking who she gives to and who she doesn’t. Because she knows some
girls are on their own and have bills. Some girls are on their own with children and have bills. To me they would probably get first, I would think that they should get first priority. Uhm, than maybe someone like myself who’s married and got a husband and works as well. Mind you, I’m working. And then again, too, I’ve got, I should get the same type of thing, like some benefit, too, you know what I mean, uhm. Like because they’re on their own and have got a child. That’s not my fault. I’m working, too, right, I mean, they shouldn’t get all the new ones. She should split them up. (Kelly)

Similarly, Lynn was having difficulty understanding how women could make it on their own, when she was having a tough time sharing expenses with a roommate:

I don’t know how these other girls are doing it just making [so little]. But then they’re married. They have husbands who work. Where I’m by myself … and I have to make it on my own. (Lynn)

Lynn gets welfare supplements so that she can make it on her own. She was torn between wanting more cleans and making sure the other “girls” were making ends meet. Like Candy, both Kelly and Lynn acknowledge that securing an income is an important part of a woman’s life.

Michelle sees a dismal future for young people, in particular, young women:

Who cares about them older people? Like what about us, you know? I mean, like sure it’s okay for the older people, but we need jobs, too. Especially just coming out of school and everything… You can’t get experience unless someone hires you and no one’s going to hire you without the experience. ... Like how do they work that? (Michelle)

Her questions for the future are: how is it that ‘old people’ get to be ‘old people with jobs’ and who are these ‘old people with jobs’ going to be in the future, women or men? Michelle is concerned that they may all be for men given that men’s waged labour is valued more than women’s.

Experiences of actions in the workplace shaping the women’s individual and collective gender identities coalesced around issues of sexual harassment, cleaning carrying out housekeeping tasks, and maintaining their health. I specifically asked questions about these issues to all of the women (see Appendix D, pp. 304-311).
Sexual harassment in the workplace(s) is exacerbated by the social connotations of being a maid. All the women reported being taunted with comments like:

Oh, when you’re finished up there, you can come clean mine. (Beatrice)

Sometimes, the jokes, gestures, and crudeness are offensive:

I don’t like it when guys, like I said. We get a lot of comments from truckers. They haven’t been rude, but since the insinuation is there. ... You consider the leering and the not rudeness, but the - ... When I’m in that car, I find it very disgusting. (Susie)

For the most part, the women see these comments as harmless:

I find we get stared at a lot. But, you know, it doesn’t bother me. It bothers some of the girls in the car with me. They get very upset when they get stared at. But, it just doesn’t bother me. ... We’ve had comments made like ’where’s your French maid uniform?’ and that. I just laugh it off because I don’t let it bother me. If they were making comments other than that, I might get a little offended. I’ve never had that problem. (Alice)

This hearkens back to the idea that women need to be put into their place by men so that men’s egos may remain intact.\(^{52}\)

Wearing a uniform enhances these stereotypes. It was only within the last couple of years that hats and ruffles have been dropped from the uniform of one of the corporate firms. Smocks, blouses, pants, and shorts are more reasonable, both symbolically and practically:

If the clients are home I don’t want to be having my backside sticking out anywhere. (Susie)

Uniform or not, the social connotations of being a maid are still there. Michelle related the following incident to me which happened to a friend of hers. At the time of the incident, the friend was not wearing a uniform; she was cleaning in her own clothes:

There was an old man there and she was bending down dusting something. And, uh. He came in his housecoat with a pair of underwear in his hands and

---

52. Compare Patrice’s and Amy’s experiences (Section 7.4.3.2, pp. 248-249 and 253-254).
he goes, "It's been a long time since I've seen a young girl on her knees like that." So sometimes it gets pretty scary you know. (Michelle)

Other situations threaten the woman's safety. One woman walked into a clean where there were three or four men sitting around the table with alcohol and drugs:

That stuff reminded me of my ex-husband, that's why. ... To tell you the truth, I walked in there and I could feel myself just getting madder and madder. ... You go away and come back the next time and it looks the same. I don't want to clean up after this pig. ... I was mad the whole time I was in there. (Susie)

Most of the women's individual gender identities included a gender division of labour where domestic labour was women's work. So, one of the positive results of working for a housekeeping services franchise was that the franchise was a source of cleaning information. The women were not only able to bring their skills as housekeepers from the unwaged labour process in the home, but also to transfer knowledge from the waged domestic labour process in the housekeeping service franchise back to the home. Alice said:

I didn't know how to clean a wooden floor at first. I do now. Like, some you can use vinegar on, other you just use clear water, others you have to use Murphy's Oil. ... There's certain things I've learned about cleaning which makes pulling out a little easier. (Alice)

The women were also able to use the routine they learned, and sometimes even use the cleaning products. All but one of the women thought that the franchise way was quicker. Lori didn't find any of the team cleaning principles useful in her own home. She didn't see that it was any more time saving like it should have been. About half the women said they cleaned the same way and about half said they were more thorough at work. Some of the comments were:

I have to do it the right way at work. At home, I'll do this and then that. (Kelly)

Pretty well the same way. ... I take more time here [at home]. (Lynn)

About the same, except Clare's is more thorough. (Nancy)
Everything has to done in a certain way and a certain length of time. At home, I usually take my time and do it my way. Some things we do at work, I wouldn’t think to do at home, because it’s too much time. Other than that, they’re pretty well the same. It’s just that they’re done a little bit different and I don’t do it at home. (Alice)

Sometimes I’m not as fussy as I would be at a customer’s house. (Amy)

It’s easier at Hannah’s because you are only stuck doing one thing. Here you have to do it all plus you have to tidy up. You don’t have to tidy up after the people when you are at Hannah’s. And another thing is that, when the phone rings here and you’re cleaning, you have to stop and answer it. But, you see you get a lot of interruptions or you know, a good song comes on the radio, or something good comes on TV, or if the baby cries. You get a lot of interruptions when you’re cleaning here, so you don’t get to go straight through. But at Hannah’s, you know, you get no interruptions so you usually just go straight through. … People can’t believe how fast I, you know, can do it. (Michelle)

I notice that I’m a little more thorough in my home than I would - when I first started there the [supervising] maid told me I would probably clean their homes a little bit better than you would your own. You know that kind of standards, just give it an extra sparkle. But, I found that I did it just the opposite. (Candy)

Candy noted that when she cleaned for Clare’s she cleaned more often at home:

I think that because before I never really - when I look at the first apartment that we lived in before I worked with Clare’s - if I didn’t vacuum for two weeks, it wouldn’t bother me. But when I started with Clare’s, it got to the point where my husband had to tell me no you’re not going to vacuum, because I’d vacuum everyday. … Some people would think that strange if you did it all day long that you wouldn’t want to go home and do it, but because I had set a pattern at work, it was easier to get started in my home pattern which then would make it go a lot quicker than standing around and thinking ‘Oh, I don’t want to do this’. (Candy)

Since these women think that housecleaning is women’s work and because their gender identities include doing women’s work, their position in the housekeeping services franchise supports their conception of what it is like to be a woman. This legitimation of knowledge assists in re-valuing women’s labour both in the workplace and in the home in two ways. First, housekeeping is considered a skill. It is a skill that can be acquired in the home as part of a woman’s ‘common sense’ and as a ‘natural’ part of life. Yet it only becomes a skill when they engage in waged labour; at home, housekeeping is not a skill. Second, in being paid for domestic labour, franchise
housekeepers legitimate their skills acquired as a woman. Because housekeeping is women’s work, selling her labour power for a skill she acquired ‘naturally’ affirms her identity as a woman. By linking waged and unwaged domestic labour, these women have not only challenged the notion that housekeeping is women’s work, but also have transformed their conception of the value of women’s work.

The physical toll that housecleaning takes on a woman’s body is a health concern. Although housekeeping is part of the domestic labour in all households, the intensity of the physical problems of such manual labour increases with women who clean houses all day long. If housekeeping is women’s work, then the associated health problems should be considered a consequence of women’s work. Cause for most concern are injuries, repetitive actions, extended exertion, and fatigue. Most of the injuries are small: jammed fingers; cuts from nails and knives; burns from stove elements; knots or bumps from windows, tables, and rangehoods; hip pointers from running into doorknobs; slivers from old furniture; stubbed toes; ripped fingernails; and little cuts and bruises nearly everywhere (from almost everything imaginable). Some of the more serious injuries call for medical attention and require reports to be filed with Worker’s Compensation Board immediately after the injury occurs, for example, sprained joints, broken bones, deep cuts, blister burns, and strained muscles. Head office personnel reported that the most common compensation claims include strained backs, broken tailbones, and carpal tunnel syndrome. The latter is caused by extended overuse of the wrist through repetitive motions, like scrubbing, dusting, and vacuuming.

Some injuries are not clearly identifiable as injuries in the workplace(s). For example, Amy strained a back muscle without knowing it. So, she wasn’t quite sure if the injury were related to work. The doctor advised her to stay home for a
week, but she didn’t. The same thing happened to Lynn. She couldn’t afford to.

Beatrice has a 'bad arm', but doesn’t know if it is related to work:

Last year, actually, my arm was really, really sore and I’d never ... go to a
doctor because I always figured if I just take it easy and try to rest it, it would
get better. ... My boyfriend thinks it’s tendonitis. (Beatrice)

Nancy has had serious injuries on the job which have resulted in chronic pain:

I’ve got a bad wrist now from work. ... [My ankles,] they’re pretty well done.
... I think I told you last time about when I sprained my ankle at work. Back in
May, I guess it was. It still hurts. Like it still bothers me. If I stretch the
wrong way, the pain just shoots right up the leg. (Nancy)

She also hurt her tailbone from slipping on icy steps and received compensation for
time off. She eventually had to leave Clare’s on account of a chronic skin condition,
dermatitis. What has happened with Amy, Beatrice, and Nancy, is that they have
developed on-going chronic conditions from which none has recovered. Alice
expressed concern over her health in the long term, especially with regard to her joints:

Yeah, sometimes I wonder. I do have problems with my knees, doing floors on
my hands and knees so much. And my elbows from carrying equipment and
reaching. It hasn’t been anything serious that has keep me off work. But,
eventually it just might. (Alice)

Injuries and chronic pain were not the health issues the women talked about
most. It was the constant fatigue from being emotionally and physically drained.
Beatrice said that cleaning really put you into shape the first few weeks with all the new
muscles that you are using. But, after that, tiredness set in. Anne said that at the end
of the day you push to finish and by the end of the week you’re "dragging". Lori said:

The odd time I would get headaches, but just totally exhausted. (Lori)

Susie drank and smoked a lot more while she was working at Hannah’s and found that
she would find more excuses to be sick and not go to work. Dreading being tired is
part of the daily routine. Francie noted:
If it is a heavy week, sometimes I actually think about, "Oh, I wish this is over, I hate this house with a passion." You know, it's just because you're tired, you know? (Francie)

In order to ward off constant fatigue, Angela tries to relax and take a bath when she gets home:

My mom watches the baby during the day. I usually go there and I pick up the baby and I go home. And her father will watch her so I can soak like in a nice tub or something. He cooks the meals so that gives me a bit of time to relax and that... I don't get too much rest, really. (Angela)

However, no matter what you do, you are still tired.

By experiencing the relations in production as women workers in ways that causes injuries and unknown sources of muscle and bone trouble, the women incorporate these health concerns into their own gender identity. This, in turn, affects their choices for future waged positions as well as their conceptions of what it is like to be a woman. For example, Susie decided that she needed a rest from cleaning houses and took a job as a secretary for a local business school. Lori took a job as a food server at a place less than five blocks from her home. She was exhausted from the cleaning as well as from the long commute to Hannah's. Francie's comment on how she would like to be pampered exemplifies the way the women link their health and their labour to their gender identity:

I don't think there is a woman that it ever happens to. Especially a working woman, unless she's very rich. A working woman, it never happens to her. She's basically the psychological stone in the family, really, because she has to keep all this up. Sometimes I feel like turning around and forgetting that I have any responsibility in the world.

Finally, Francie was just plain at the end of her rope and elected to have surgery to correct a long standing problem with her foot.

I needed the time off work and I couldn't get it any other way. (Francie)

Conceptualising gender as a set of concrete formation processes benefits a theory of waged domestic labour processes in three ways. First, women's experiences
and knowledge can be validated. From the vantage point of women’s liberation, acknowledging that women’s gender identities (in part\textsuperscript{53}) result from an on-going mediation of their experiences of a particular set of labour relations assists in setting up a context within which women’s actions in the workplace can be interpreted and explained. In this way, women validate their own experiences as labourers which can account for actions that both reinforce and challenge (sometimes simultaneously) the existing distribution of power between women and men. Second, conceiving gender as a process gets beyond the attribution of characteristics to a group of labourers. By engaging in labour relations, workers can be seen to (re)construct actual individual and collective gender identities; that is, more specifically, workers’ mediations of a particular organisation of labour set the context within which their own gender identities are truly negotiated, and not ascribed. Third, when gender is conceptualised as a process, individual (re)actions toward an organisation of labour can be seen to comprise simultaneously acts that strengthen and contest the existing distribution of power between women and men. In this way, an individual’s own personal material history can be taken into account in order to explain or interpret a particular action in the context of engaging in waged labour, securing an income for the household, and coping with all the labour in a day. For example, in the lives of the women employed as franchise housekeepers, gender formation assists in interpreting the women’s ‘choices’ to: continue working at Clare’s or Hannah’s when they want to find another job (Alice, Beatrice), quitting and going to another job (Lori, Nancy, Susie, Lynn), pursuing an extended health leave (Francie), not changing jobs in order to keep the use of the car (Patrice, Amy), raising a child without engaging in waged labour (Candy, 

\textsuperscript{53} I say "in part" because gender identities form through other sets of social relations, for example, in relations with the state (Chouinard and Moss 1992), as consumers of commodities and services (Wolf 1990), and in interpersonal relationships (Lorraine 1990).
Angela), gaining work experience (Kelly), going on Mother’s Allowance and continuing to work at a reduced wage (Michelle), or being content at the job through a promotion (Anne).

(7.5) CONCLUDING REMARKS

Class and gender conceived as social processes continually (re)constructing labour relations and labour identities enhance a theory of waged domestic labour processes in that individual and collective experiences of an objective set of labour relations can be addressed more fully. Class formation and gender formation are relatively concrete conceptualisations of particular processes within 'total labour'. Workers forge specific identities through their mediation of 'total labour' via particular organisations of (re)productive labour. The material and historical context within which workers negotiate their labour shapes the emergence of individual and collective identities in particular places.

In a theory of waged domestic labour processes based on 'total labour', conceptualising class and gender as a set of formation processes is a way to bring into focus the processes through which individuals forge identities that in turn shape their (re)actions toward the various organisations of (re)productive labour. The use of an explicitly production-oriented concept, that is production regime, is one way to focus a particular organisation of waged domestic labour relations within the more widely cast 'total labour'. The (re)actions of workers in such an organisation include the ways they consolidate their interests, build solidarity, and direct their struggles of resistance and transformation. It is useful to account for the variation via class and gender formation processes because individual mediations of the relations in and of production embody the very tensions that shape the organisations of 'total labour'. If these mediations can
be shown to embody various sets of tensions through formation processes, then specific (re)actions within a particular organisation of labour can be more fully understood. These mediations include the tensions between: productive and reproductive labour; the conception and the execution of a labour task; the production process and its regulatory apparatuses; workers’ class identities and their individual and collective actions; and the prescribed behaviour of a worker based on collective definitions of femininity and masculinity and her/his action in the workplace(s), both individually and collectively.

Together, the four conceptualisations introduced in Chapter Four and elaborated in Chapters Five, Six, and Seven, that is, 'total labour', production regime, class formation, and gender formation, address these tensions. Each concept complements the others in its extent, level of generality, and vantage point. (Recall Figures 4.3 and 4.4). I comment on the contribution of each to a theory of waged domestic labour processes in the following chapter (Chapter 8, Section 8.3). I also note the methodological and topical contributions of this study (Section 8.2 and 8.4) and suggest directions for future research (Section 8.5).
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUDING REMARKS

(8.1) OUTLINE

This thesis was based on a study of the commodification of domestic labour in a particular type of domestic labour firm, housekeeping services franchises, in southern Ontario. Specifically, I investigated the labour-related experiences of the women employed in these franchises. The specific research questions I addressed were:

(1) in what ways do women employed in a commodified form of domestic labour accomplish those daily labour tasks associated with the home and the workplace?;

(2) how does the organisation of production relations in a waged domestic labour process enable both managers to control the waged domestic labourers and workers to develop resistance strategies to the manager's authority?; and

(3) how do women workers employed in a specific waged domestic labour process forge individual and collective class and gender identities?

I focused on the two goals identified in Chapter Two, that is, (1) to draw out, describe, and analyse the relations and processes within which women engage while employed as workers in housekeeping services franchises and (2) to devise conceptual tools that can be used to refine and enhance explanations of waged domestic labour processes.

I have sorted this study's results into three sets of contributions, that is, methodological, theoretical, and topical. I address each set of contributions in turn (Sections 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4). I translate these contributions into challenges for future research by posing directions in the fields of feminist methodology, feminist-marxist theory, and domestic labour studies (Section 8.5).
(8.2) METHODOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A review of the literature on feminist methodology pointed out the problematic issues facing feminist researchers, especially in the social sciences (Chapter 3, Section 3.3). In constructing and implementing my own feminist methodology, I offer an alternative way to redress some of these concerns.

With regard to scientific justification (Section 3.3.1), this study can be justified both within feminist methodological circles as well as within radical political economy in geography. The explicit inclusion of subjectivity (of the researcher and the 'researched') into a methodology leads to an acknowledgement of more comprehensive and non-exclusionary forms of knowledge as legitimate. In this study, the documentation and interpretation of individual experiences of the objective relation of surplus value generation and the organisation of labour relations (Sections 6.4 and 6.5) provide a more detailed account of the social aspects of labour than most other radical labour process studies (Section 6.2). These social aspects of labour include the relations within which the women engage with their co-workers, managers, and customers, both as workers and as women. Bringing forward the women workers' subjugated knowledge in this way is crucial in unraveling the constitutive processes of gender and class formation (Section 7.4).

With regard to the exploitation of the 'researched' (Sections 3.3.2), the use of a set of complementary methods (Section 3.2) avoided dependence on a sole source of information while counteracting the exploitation of the women via active means. Depending solely on women in positions of lesser power than a researcher makes the women in the study particularly vulnerable. A waged domestic labour study could have been undertaken without interaction with any of the women working in the franchises. Yet, instead, I was able to gather information from a variety of sources that would
make up for sensitive material the women were not willing to tell or simply did not want me to know. By having worked in the franchise, made friends with some of the women, and talked extensively with the workers, I was able to empower the women participating in the project without merely extracting something from them for my own benefit. I, too, was empowered throughout the research process by gaining information and experiences during the project with the women.

Also, analytically, the use of this specific complementary set of methods is useful. If a researcher is committed to a material dialectic and if she/he wants to theorise dialectical interaction and change, then some combination of abstraction and interpretation is warranted to account for and (re)construct personal narratives (Sections 3.5 and 4.3).

With regard to feminist action, I have made clear that social change leading to an emancipation for women in particular is an on-going challenge (Section 3.4). Throughout the research process, from its design to its closure, a feminist researcher must be not only committed to a collective sense of women’s oppression, but also sensitive to a woman’s personal material history. The interaction I had with the women not only extended my own feminist goals of, for example, the liberation of subjugated knowledge, but also demystified feminism generally and women as feminists specifically for the women. Exposure to radical principles in a non-threatening manner enhances liberation because the women negotiated the meaning of our interaction in the context of ‘making sense’ rather than outright challenging the foundation of patriarchal gender relations upon which they (we, myself included) have attached meanings and significance to other people and principles in their lives. The smallest of a feminist researcher’s action may bring about the largest of emancipatory steps in another woman’s life, including rupturing normalcy.
(8.3) THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A review of feminist and marxist theories of (re)production, labour processes in capitalist societies, and class and gender (Chapter 4, Section 4.2; Chapter 5, Section 5.2; Chapter 6, Section 6.2; and Chapter 7, Section 7.2) revealed common points of interest that could be drawn together into a theory of waged domestic labour processes. By building on contributions made by both feminist and marxist theorists, I tried to make very specific arguments about labour power in general (Section 5.3), conceptual distinctions within production relations (Section 6.3), and how class and gender identities emerge from experiences of labour relations (Sections 7.2 and 7.3). The basis for these specific comments was the use of a particular scheme of abstraction, from Ollman (1990) (Section 3.2.4).

Theories of (re)production have often resulted in dual systems operating (see the comments in Chapter 5, Footnote 4, p. 86). By abstracting labour power complexly, I was able to offer 'total labour' as a concept that embodies production, reproduction, and the tension between them. In recognising multiple aspects of an abstraction, specific sets of labour relations can be brought into focus via less extensive abstractions, like production or reproduction, without compromising the internal coherence of a theory (Section 3.3.1) or the conceptualisation process itself (Section 3.2.4).

Unlike (re)production, the tension between the labour process and the regulation of the labour process has often been collapsed into one concept, the labour process. Making the conceptual distinction between relations in and of production clarifies the social relations within the production process, that is, those relations within the labour process and those that govern the extraction, appropriation, and distribution of surplus value. In this way, workers' experiences of both can be accounted for more
fully, as in for example, the development of strategies of resistance in lieu of transformation (Sections 6.4 and 6.5).

Analysts have shown that class and gender relations are implicated in spatial processes of uneven development. What this study suggests is that the formation of domestic labourers' individual and collective class and gender identities also develop unevenly. Workers in part forge their identities through their waged labour (Sections 7.3, 7.4.2.3 and 7.4.3.3). Fragmented identities emerge which contribute to the uneven development process by simultaneously challenging and reinforcing the distribution of power along the social divisions of labour.

By focusing on a waged domestic labour process, I contribute to the construction of the geography of domestic labour (e.g. WGS/GIB 1984; Mackenzie 1989a; Rose 1990; Fincher 1991). Though I have outlined the advantages to this approach (see comments on abstraction in Section 3.5; see also Section 4.5 and parts of Sections 5.3, 6.3, 7.3, 7.4.2.3, and 7.4.3.3), I reiterate the advantages of conceptualising waged domestic by sorting them into three groups: spatiality, flexibility, and complementarity.

The spatiality of a social phenomenon is both analytical and empirical. Because the process of abstraction includes a spatial aspect, a spatial dimension of the object being conceptualised is incorporated during the process of abstraction and not left only to be illustrated through empirical evidence. By conceptualising the spatial dimension of labour relations alongside their specificity (see Chapter 3, Section 3.2.4, pp. 38-40, especially Footnote 9, p. 40), an analyst can bring together in thought that which has been separated in geographic inquiry for years, that is, the separation of the social and the spatial (Harvey 1973; Gregory and Urry 1985). The combination of an analytical and empirical spatial dimension further strengthens the connections amongst
time, space, and actions in a way that highlights the complex entwineness of the three. The flexibility of the concepts developed in part explain and in part interpret workers’ experiences of waged domestic labour processes. This flexibility also reinforces the notion that dialectical interaction and change is not reducible to one particular relation or process, or set of relations or processes. This non-reducibility element promotes the use of complementary sets of concepts in theories involving domestic labour. The complementarity of concepts is built through consistency in the analytical methods adopted in a research project as well as the methodological orientation of the research (see Section 8.2).

(8.4) TOPICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A review of domestic labour studies showed there were two areas of concentration: unwaged domestic labour in the home and waged domestic labourers as private housekeepers and live-ins (Section 2.3). Domestic labour studies do not focus on domestic labourers engaged in a set of labour relations that produce surplus value. Labour process studies do not focus on commodified domestic labour relations either (Section 6.2). In choosing to investigate housekeeping services franchises, I tried to extend domestic labour studies in ways that would: (a) address the commodification of a domestic labour relation, (b) identify a group of domestic labourers not extensively studied, and (c) draw out the links between the organisation and experience of domestic labour relations and tasks.

Housekeeping services franchises are part of a relatively new organisation of domestic labour relations (Section 6.4.1). Its organisation is unique in that the commodification process transforms the relation of the "mistress and maid", with the manager being an intermediary (Section 6.4.2 and Appendix C, Section C.3). In the
post-1973 era, explanations of impediments to the socialisation of domestic labour must centre on the transformation of domestic labour relations into commodified forms.

Like other occupations in the services industry, such as temporary support staff workers, contract consultants, and retail clerks, this particular commodified form of labour relations is the flexible result of economic restructuring processes. A geographic understanding of waged domestic labour processes assists in explaining the place specificity of the particular actions workers take on in the absence of formal organisation, like for example the informal resistance strategies that challenge the manager’s authority, sometimes openly, in place of unions (Sections 6.5.2 and 7.4.3.3).

As a group of domestic labourers, franchise housekeepers are marginalised, but not from the conventional social divisions of labour most influencing domestic labourers, such as race, ethnicity, and citizenship (Arat Koç 1989; Palmer 1989). They are marginalised as low-income workers on the edge of the welfare system in Canada. These workers are also excluded from community group organising on behalf of domestic labourers (Section 6.4.2) as well as other groups of women in low paying jobs in the sense of a collective class identity involving women workers. The spatial fragmentation of the workplace and the time demands of their ‘total labour’ contributes to this exclusion and isolation (Sections 6.5.2 and 5.4). A geographic understanding of waged domestic labour processes indicates that changes in and the reactions to these changes in the relations in and of production will be fragmented and possibly place specific (Sections 6.5.2, 6.5.3, and 7.4.3.3). Using this study as an example, such class differences can once again become part of the research agenda for feminists interested in domestic labour.
The organisation of a set of domestic labour relations lays the foundation upon which workers experience their labour. Drawing out the links between the two involves identifying the ways in which workers strengthen, reinforce, challenge, contest, and transform waged domestic labour and its regulation through various actions in the workplace(s), like resistance, financial management, and coping strategies. With regard to their identities, on the one hand, the women in this study forged distinct individual class identities and indistinct collective class identities. Most of the women saw class as a necessary sorting of people, even though nearly all of the women thought that there should not be classes. One of the important elements in defining class for the women was attitude in the way people interact. The weak collective identity reinforces the idea that formal organisations like unions are not appropriate for housekeeping services franchises. On the other hand, the women in this study forged clear collective gender identities and unclear individual gender identities. They were clear on how women were supposed to behave, and not so clear on how they, as an individual woman, should behave. One of the primary sources of conflict in the women’s personal lives was the clashing of these two identities. The women tended to assess other women’s behaviour, both inside and outside the workplace, according to their collective gender identities. In addition, when men’s behaviour was part of their collective gender identity, the women assessed men’s behaviour by the same standards. However, they made exceptions for the appropriate collective behaviour. For example, if part of a woman’s collective identity was that men sometimes should beat their wives, that women shouldn’t go to university, and that women should not work outside the home, then that women might endure physical abuse by her husband, but teach her son not to hit women; she might encourage her daughter to go to university, but did not think about going to school herself; or she might engage in waged labour because the
family needed two incomes for the time being. Pinpointing and interpreting workers' specific mediations of labour relations between, for example, managers, co-workers, and customers in particular places, sets a framework within which wider labour issues of organised resistance (Littler 1982) and manufactured consent (Burawoy 1979) can be addressed.

(8.5) DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Though this thesis has addressed some of the timely issues facing researchers interested in domestic labour (inside and outside geography), areas for future research remain challenging methodologically, theoretically, and topically. It is within this context that I pose the following directions for inquiry in the fields of feminist methodology, feminist-marxist theory, and domestic labour studies.

Feminist methodology is more than just a collection of critical approaches and methods. Feminists researchers must persist in designing projects that implicate a feminist politics replete with feminist action. The choice of a research topic must also be part and parcel to feminists undertaking research. Feminist researchers need to choose topics that will assist them in meeting their own goals as well as the people with whom they work. Method-wise, carefully constructed combinations of methods can bridge gaps between traditionally opposed analytical and information gathering techniques, like for example abstraction and full participant observation. More studies that indeed combine these methods can further enhance and justify feminist approaches to research.

This theory of waged domestic labour processes is but one of the many possible contributions to a significant reconstruction of feminist and marxist theories in radical geography of (re)production, waged and unwaged labour, labour processes in
capitalist societies, class and gender studies, and divisions of labour. Bringing together these elements in a theory of waged domestic labour can be beneficial in a number of ways. First is the development of the concept of reproduction regime (see Chapter 4, Footnote 6, p. 75). A reproduction-oriented theory of waged labour is desperately needed to challenge as well as complement the production orientation of spatially or environmentally sensitive theories of labour (e.g. Mackenzie 1988a; Sayer and Walker 1992). Second, (re)production regimes of other sets of labour relations need to be identified and elaborated, that is, within other organisations of labour in capitalist societies. I think post-1973 organisations of productive labour, like piecework in the home, care provision, and management consulting, would prove to be fascinating case studies of labour and its regulation. In addition, demarcating differences between production and reproduction regimes of domestic labour would be useful because the viewpoint of domestic labour varies according to the conceptualisation of labour and its regulation. Third, applications of this set of concepts in other low-income occupations for women would assist in refining the nuances of the arguments and the quality of the interpretation of the formation of individual and collective class and gender identities. Formation studies could be extended to include identities based on race and ethnicity and to investigate changes in identities over time. Also, studies of men and their experiences of a particular organisation of labour relations would strengthen the arguments about the formation of class and gender identities. Fourth, another theoretical challenge involves adapting this set of concepts to other sets of relations, like labour within the local state involved in the provision of services that take the place of waged or unwaged domestic labour. In this way the theoretical concepts themselves can be scrutinised and refined and the flexibility can be enhanced. Finally, radical geographers interested in the social relations of labour have ample terrain within the
relations in and of (re)production to contribute to the emerging geography of domestic labour. Responses, mediations, and experiences of a particular organisation of domestic labour are place specific. This place specificity is the crux of a geographer's contribution to domestic labour studies because each response, mediation, and experience demonstrates the vicissitudes of women's domestic labour.

Within domestic labour studies more generally, studies of domestic labour need to widen to include various organisations of domestic labour relations. Comparative studies are integral in setting a context for domestic labour studies. Although the tasks comprising waged and unwaged domestic labour are in practice the same, the organisation of the relations in and of (re)production differ significantly. Research into the changing formats of historically varying (re)production regimes of waged domestic labour should become part of the research agenda in domestic labour studies. In addition, other waged domestic labourers need to be investigated, like for example, caregivers of the infirm and elderly, 'surrogate' mothers, childcare workers, and paramedical service providers. In all these cases, for geographers, the spatiality of the specific set of labour relations under investigation should be the departure point of the study.
APPENDIX A

FIRM STRUCTURE IN THE
HOUSEKEEPING SERVICES FRANCHISE INDUSTRY

(A.1) DEFINITIONS

For housekeeping services, two types of firms exist. The firms can be characterised by the style through which management seeks success by expansion and tends to daily business. Head office personnel in what I call the parental firm endeavour to assure success by being highly selective of potential franchisees and having extensive involvement in the day-to-day activities of the operating franchise. In contrast, upper management in the corporate firm secures the firm's prosperity via selling a guaranteed system and mark to financially sound individuals, while monitoring individual franchise operations on a monthly or quarterly basis. See Table A.1 for a comparison of characteristics of both types of firms.

(A.2) PARENTAL FIRMS

An ideal franchisee is a woman with a mature family, married to a professional, and is interested in the franchise as a sideline business. Acquiring a franchise from a parental firm is difficult. Head office personnel in parental firms prefer to sell franchises to extroverts, self-starters, and go-getters. Preference also goes to people who have life experience measured by the firm as those people over thirty, with some managerial job experience. Head office personnel screen potential buyers against a set of detailed guidelines.

Only after sorting through applicants for franchises and conducting a series of extensive interviews will head office personnel inquire about financing the purchase.
Table A.1. Characteristics of franchising firms in the housekeeping services industry: a comparison of parental and corporate firms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View on:</th>
<th>Parental</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial expansion</td>
<td>comes in time; prefer to have healthy franchises rather than covering much territory</td>
<td>essential to health of firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Success</td>
<td>assured through success of franchise</td>
<td>assured as part of franchise agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise agreement</td>
<td>used as protection for the franchising firm</td>
<td>used as a fixed set of rules for franchisees to abide by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of head office</td>
<td>a place to report daily activities</td>
<td>as a resource centre; problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head office personnel</td>
<td>background in sales; small company business; connections to cleaning industry</td>
<td>background in marketing; corporate business experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>comes through nurturing franchises</td>
<td>written into franchise agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial scope</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Firm Structure:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head office structure</th>
<th>minimal; all personnel are involved in all franchises</th>
<th>can be elaborate; specific persons assigned to specific franchises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price of franchise</td>
<td>relatively high; in the low $20,000 range</td>
<td>relatively low; in mid $10,000 range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise autonomy</td>
<td>almost none; rules vary</td>
<td>nearly total; rules fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system</td>
<td>flexible; based on workers</td>
<td>no variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mark</td>
<td>complex logo</td>
<td>simple logo; popularly recognised; embodies firm and must be protected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Franchise operations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation of teams</th>
<th>varies depending on availability; two to four</th>
<th>fixed; either two or four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expense allocation</td>
<td>start up fees included in purchase; benefits package for employees</td>
<td>passes on most expenses to franchisees and workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty rate</td>
<td>between 5% and 7%</td>
<td>between 6% and 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National advertising rate</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2% with additional 2% allocated for local advertisement campaigns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wage structure</th>
<th>wages</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (other than required by the state)</td>
<td>additional medical; drug plan; dental optional</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>identifiable piece of clothing; mark not required</td>
<td>full uniform; mark required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the franchise. The price for franchises in parental firms are relatively high with no hidden costs. Everything for a start up is provided, including office supplies, official papers bearing the mark, cleaning equipment, automobiles for the labourers, and the first few months of firm-sanctioned cleaning products. The franchisees train for an intensive three week period and actually clean houses using the system. Franchisees are in constant contact with the head office throughout the first phase of setting up the business - hiring labourers, advertising for customers, and setting up accounting systems. Head office personnel are available around the clock. Head office personnel reason that since there are few problems with the system or the mark, nurturing successful franchisees is the best way to ensure their own success. Frequent contact between the head office and each franchise enables the franchiser to have input into the daily business of the franchise and to monitor the activities of the franchisee.

Parental firms have minimal staff actually located at the head office. See Figures A.1a and A.1b for a schematic representation of parental firm structures. The head office is referred to as the "home" office wherein all staff members respond to the needs of each franchisee, both of which foster a family-like environment. The franchiser acts as the head of the family, and the franchisees under her/his tutelage are fledglings struggling for independence, at least initially, and as exemplars after proven to be successful. The relationship between the two is based on three fundamental principles: the franchisee must acknowledge the experience and expertise of head office personnel; the franchiser must trust the franchisee to manage the franchise; and both must have a mutual vision of economic success. On paper, the relationship is legalised through a franchise agreement.

The franchise agreement sets out obligations between the franchiser and the franchisee as well as financial specifications. Clauses include a designated moratorium
Figure A.1. Firm structure in the housekeeping services franchise industry.

(a) Parental Firm

(b) Parental Firm

(c) Corporate Firm

(d) Corporate Firm
on opening housekeeping services within a certain radius of the revoked or sold franchise; royalty and advertising rates; allocation of expenses; rules for use of mark; and a promise not to sell privileged information. Head office personnel view the franchise agreement as a set of guidelines for carrying out the business as well as protection against "bad apples" (Interview with Head Office Personnel, 1991, No. 39). Rarely are revocations of franchises based on a violation of a clause in the franchise agreement, such as selling trade secrets or misrepresenting the mark, in parental firms. Rather, franchises are taken away when there are persistent problems, like in hiring labourers, obtaining customers, or budget overruns. The franchiser might put the franchise up for sale when a franchisee's personal problems interfere markedly with the business or when the franchisee is not willing to put in the time needed to maintain the business. This of course does not preclude revocation when a clause is violated like in the case of a blatant scamming, the misrepresentation of gross sales.

Spatial expansion of the firm is not an overriding directive of the parental firm. Generally, the firm advertises for potential franchisees once a geographical area has been delineated through careful marketing research. On occasion, the firm conducts the research after someone has made inquiries. Stability of the venture is based on the character of both the franchisee and the market area. Constant growth is favoured over increased profits, thus, parental firms will not enter unstable ventures.

(A.3) CORPORATE FIRMS

Franchises from corporate firms are usually less expensive than franchises from parental ones. Even with the additional start up costs which can boost the price into a competitive range, they largely remain less expensive. The lower initial outlay of capital is attractive. Preferred attributes of potential franchisees are very much like
those of the parental firm. However, good credit and financial stability of the franchisee far outweighs all other characteristics. This does not diminish the ideal franchisee, rather, their select strategy for growth and expansion underlies the decision to sell or not. Economic success rests squarely with the ability of the franchisee to run a business that has a proven system and a recognisable mark.

Corporate firms have traditional corporate structures (see Figure A.1c and A.1d). Tasks are divided amongst many employees. Head offices are organised hierarchically with a president, several vice-presidents, various managers, specialised divisions for sales, marketing, and operations, and a board of directors. Regional offices may be set up to deal administratively with franchisees' day-to-day concerns. International divisions deal exclusively with franchises located in other countries.

Marketing strategies and accounting formulae secure economic success of the franchise. The firm designates ratios between gross sales and expenses such as labour, advertising, supplies, insurance, benefits, taxes, and rent. Franchisees attend a three week training seminar that prepares her/him for running the business. During the period when the franchise is getting off the ground, contact between the franchise and franchisee involves ironing out snags in the system as it applies to the specific geographic area - perhaps as much as weekly contact. Once the franchise is fully operating, contact with head office is minimal and usually reserved for problems or as a resource.

Though not as severe as a 'sink or swim' situation, franchisees dealing with corporate firms are encouraged to run the business on their own as soon as possible. Growth is necessary and is actually written into the franchise agreement as in within two years from date of purchase four teams must be fully operating. Corporate firms require that franchisees strictly follow the terms of the franchise agreement. Any
infraction, especially if it mars the mark, can be cause for revocation. Revocation is a serious action and the firm must engage in a series of three discussions over a period of three to six months before any legal action is taken. For example, refusal to launch a local advertisement campaign can initiate revocation processes, just as quickly as can ordering grey Sables instead of orange Chevettes. In order to monitor this strategy, the franchise agreement stipulates a tenure period of five or ten years which upon maturity can be renewed up to five times for similar periods.

Expenses are allocated between the franchiser and the franchisee. For example, breakage insurance is to be picked up by the firm whereas the franchisee pays for personal accident insurance. Often, expenses that the parental firm picks up will be passed on to the franchisee, or even the employee, in corporate firms, like uniforms, car maintenance, and gasoline. Indemnity clauses are particularly important wherein the firm and the franchisee are protected against any damage, action, or liability suits arising out of the tasks the domestic labourer performs. For example, if a worker spills bleach on the carpet after moving a chair to vacuum, the worker must pay for all damages or any suit that follows from such action.

Corporate firms are specialists in franchising. Having created a system and forged a reputation, the firm sells franchises, not housekeeping services as franchises. Head office personnel are more likely to have marketing backgrounds from large corporations, rather than formerly being part of the housecleaning industry. Spatial expansion is important. Discrepancies amongst growth of franchises are resolved by adapting the franchise/operation to a particular location reflecting differences in local labour and consumer markets. Only as a result of franchising does the franchisee prosper; the firm prospers through selling franchises and collecting royalties.
APPENDIX B
ORGANISATION OF FRANCHISES IN THE HOUSEKEEPING SERVICES
FRANCHISE INDUSTRY

(B.1) FRANCHISE ORGANISATION BY TYPE OF FIRM

Contact between franchiser and franchisee\(^1\) varies according to type of franchising firm. Head office personnel in parental firms are quite involved in the day-to-day activities of running the franchise. The phrase 'only a phone call away' represents the attitude of both the franchisee and the franchiser. Such interaction allows the franchiser to supervise the activities of the franchisee. By overseeing the franchises regularly, the economic health of the franchise can be determined before any financial problems arise. Weekly, bi-weekly, and monthly reports are sent to head office to review the financial status of the franchise and to collect the royalties. In order to facilitate the frequent interaction between the franchiser and franchisee, a stable office environment is not only encouraged but is spelled out in the franchise agreement. An optimal office location is selected after a site analysis. Since employees report to the office nearly daily and interact with the franchisee, both professionally and informally, a stable location sets up a place for a quasi-business-like atmosphere where employer and employee are able to reproduce a familial environment. Coffee and doughnuts are regularly available as well as special treats on holidays.

\(^1\) In nearly all franchises, the franchisee is both the owner and manager. Exceptions are corporately owned franchises and franchises owned by business partners. When I use franchisee, I refer to the manager/owner. When I discuss labour relations, I use manager or owner depending on whether I am discussing management or ownership.
Corporate firms are more lax regarding contact with its franchisees and prefer to deal only with problems or to act as a resource centre. Through weekly paperwork prepared by the franchisee, for example, reports on revenue, payroll, expenses, supply, and employment changes, the franchiser is able to monitor the financial success of the franchise. Monthly, quarterly, and annual reports are also prepared by the franchisee and submitted to the head office. Guidelines for creating a pleasant office environment is part of the training process and not in the franchise agreement. Guidelines promote the use of office space as office space. Yet some franchisees set aside part of their home for franchise business for their own convenience.

(B.2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF FRANCHISEES

Aside from the differences in atmosphere of the offices and degree of autonomy from the franchiser, the franchisees basically perform the same duties. Financially, franchisees are on their own and prepare the necessary reports for the franchiser. Usually the franchisee hires an accountant to check the annual statement before submitting it to head office. Payroll deductions, expenses, depreciation of equipment, rents, insurance rates, repairs, supplies, and bonuses are calculated by the franchisee. Also, special discount rates for insurance, supplies, and replacement equipment are provided by head office. Some firms insist on approving supplies before labourers use them. Others leave this to the franchisee. In all circumstances, the franchisees are to ensure that all workers are versed in Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System.²

² The Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System (WHMIS) is required in housekeeping service franchises because of the chemicals used in the cleaning agents. WHMIS is a "standardised system of labelling hazardous materials used in the workplace" (Health and Safety Handbook 1990). The information system
Franchisees from both types of firms manage the operations of the franchise: hire workers, organise advertising campaigns, quote fees, make schedules, take care of customer complaints, and take care of employee complaints. Hiring workers is a routine process with little variation. The manager usually places an ad in the local newspaper, and receives plenty of responses. Occasionally, the manager will hire friends or relatives of a worker already employed by the franchise. The ideal worker is a middle-age woman with a mature family and an employed husband who is working only for extra money. Very seldom does this ideal worker materialise and the manager must follow alternate guidelines. For example, the manager might seek out workers with particular personality traits, such as low self-esteem, timidity, or humility. People who enjoy repetitive tasks, like a person with quilting as a hobby, probably also enjoy housework. Job history can indicate potential successful employees, such as those previously employed as housekeepers or those entering the labour force after a hiatus of raising children. Workers are bimodally distributed across all types of firms’ franchises: early twenties without children and early forties with non-preschool children.

Much of the manager’s time is taken up with attracting customers. Advertisement campaigns in the form of flyer distribution is the most popular and most direct form of advertising taken on by the franchise. Franchisees are required to remit 2 per cent of gross sales to a national advertising fund from which national campaigns

identifies materials that are biohazard infectious, corrosive, flammable and combustible, poisonous, dangerously reactive, compressed gas, oxidising, and toxic. Cleaning agents used by the franchises include materials that are corrosive (general purpose cleaners), flammable and combustible (air fresheners), oxidising (bleach), and toxic (nearly all products). Safety measures to ensure worker health include proper ventilation when using products containing bleach and a pair of rubber gloves for use when cleaning with all products. Some firms will not allow their employees to use certain products, especially those that are hardest on the respiratory system.
and home shows are funded and Yellow Page ads are purchased. Other local advertisement campaigns include local radio spots, sometimes associated with home tours or real estate agencies. Telephone solicitation is also a technique used, but less so more recently.

Once a potential customer contacts the office, the manager must "do a quote". A quote entails the manager going to the customer's home, viewing the house, gauging the dirtiness of the house, estimating the cleaning time, and quoting a dollar fee. Various formulae are used to make the quote. Some managers use a mathematical formula derived by head office personnel based on the area of the house to be cleaned. Others use a simpler formula based on the number of rooms and the service to be performed (see Appendix C for a description of the variation in services offered). While still others go from room to room and add up the time it would take the workers to clean the room and multiply by a labour ratio. With experience, a manager can make a quote over the phone with a simple description of the house to be cleaned.

Scheduling cleans creates the most headaches. Location of the houses determines when the house is cleaned and who cleans it. By scheduling a group of houses in proximity on the same day with the same group of workers, managers keep gasoline costs down and travel time to a minimum. From this basic principle, particular routes are established wherein routine cleaning times emerge. In this way, the manager, the workers, and the customer can schedule their days. Last-minute changes, through cancellations, rescheduling requests, and injuries, can be monitored. This requires almost hourly attention by the manager in order to make the day run smoothly.

Complaints are handled by the manager, both the customers' and the workers'. Customers most often complain about the quality of the work. The manager
either calls the workers back to re-clean the house or room, or makes the necessary adjustments herself/himself. Sometimes the complaint is more serious involving breakage or possibly theft. The manager investigates the matter and implements the policy the firm has in place for such incidents. Just as there are complaints, there are also compliments. Customers may be especially pleased with the cleaning and want the manager to know. The manager then passes along the compliment to the worker(s).

Managers also handle workers’ complaints. If there are problems with the duties that are to be performed by the worker, like for example the customer insisting that the worker climb a step ladder, then the manager talks with the customer and explains that workers are not allowed to stand on countertops or climb to a height of over three steps. Other workers’ complaints revolve around worker relationships such as not being able to work with a particular co-worker. Managers attempt to keep their employees happy by creating harmonious cleaning relationships.

Managerial tasks described herein comprise the bulk of the franchisees’ work. This does not include all tasks. For example, franchisees field telephone calls, help train new franchisees, and maintain information on the competition. They train all new employees. They may be required to attend yearly seminars by the firm. It is only in a pinch that the franchisee/manager cleans houses. Franchisees as managers are responsible for distributing cleaning agents and equipment on daily, weekly, or an ‘as needed’ basis. If supplies are purchased in bulk, some managers mix the solutions and pour them into appropriate bottles. Managers order and often pick up supplies and take equipment in for repair. In some franchises, managers maintain quality through surprise inspections. Often the manager organises on-going events like lottery draw, or seasonal barbecues and holiday dinners for all employees.
APPENDIX C

DISTRIBUTION OF LABOUR TASKS, SERVICES OFFERED, AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE "MISTRESS AND MAID" RELATION IN HOUSEKEEPING SERVICES FRANCHISES

(C.1) LABOUR TASKS FOR TEAM MEMBERS

Parental and corporate housekeeping service franchise firms base their business on a system. The system comprises the tasks and the organisation of the labour process. In housekeeping services franchises, the system designates that each member of a team of workers performs a specific set of tasks with appropriate cleaning products and equipment in a particular way. Specific cleaning tasks are listed in Table C.1. Allocation of specific labour tasks for each team member according to number of workers on a team is presented in Table C.2. A list of cleaning products associated with a set of cleaning tasks is shown in Table C.3. All equipment is listed in Table C.4.

The system is designed to emphasise efficiency and teamwork. Since teams of workers clean houses more quickly, workers are organised into teams of two, three, or four, depending on the firm. Each team has a supervising maid, who is responsible for her share of the cleaning in addition to supervisory tasks (see Table C.5). Other team members are maids. Each maid carries out a specific set of tasks. Throughout the day cleaning tasks are rotated; supervisory tasks are not. During the training process, workers are taught how to clean kitchens and bathrooms as well as how to dust
Table C.1. Specific cleaning tasks as part of the waged domestic labor process in housekeeping services franchises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General (to be carried out in all rooms):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• dust walls and draperies for cobwebs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• all vertical and horizontal blinds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• spot clean walls and doorknobs for fingerprints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe all switch plates and surrounding area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dry dust light bulbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• damp dust lampshades, inside and outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean light fixtures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum underneath and behind all furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum upholstered furniture once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• collect and put out garbage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe all baseboards, doors frames, radiators, vents, deflectors, and window sills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean sliding glass doors and front door glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe mailbox top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tidy all areas, including desks, refrigerator tops, tables, vanities, shelves, and magazine racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• straighten pictures, paintings, rugs, pillows, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum pet hair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bathroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• clean and sanitize toilets, inside and outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean bathtub, shower stall, and sink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down and polish tiled walls and shower doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wash and dry drinking glasses, tooth brush holders, soap dishes, and waste basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dust or wash all knickknacks on vanity and shelves, including baskets, cosmetic trays, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down vanity fronts, linen closets, medicine cabinets, hampers, and splashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean mirrors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• polish all chrome on taps, fixtures, and shower doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe towel racks, toilet paper holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• fold all towels in thirds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum, wash, and wax floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• wash breakfast dishes and ashtrays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• scrub and clean kitchen sink and surrounding area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wash kitchen window above sink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean stove top, including rings, drip pans, knobs, and handles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean range hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down all small appliances, including coffee makers, can openers, crock pots, televisions, radios, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down all large appliances, including stoves, refrigerators, freezers, microwaves (inside and outside), and dishwashers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down all cupboard fronts, splashboards, countertops, tables, tiled walls, highchairs, furniture, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• polish all chrome on taps, fixtures, and all appliances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen (continued):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• clean all glass and mirrors and polish all wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down kitchen chairs and table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down and sanitize garbage pail and surrounding area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum, wash, and wax floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedroom:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• change linens and make beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down waste basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean closet door tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dust and polish furniture, including handles, chests, desks, headboards, footboards, dressers, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dust all knickknacks by removing then replacing them and dust all shelves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean all glass and mirrors and polish all wood, including picture frames, picture fronts, desk tops, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum draperies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum underneath bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• dust all knickknacks by removing then replacing them and dust all shelves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dust and polish all wood, including chairs, couches, clocks, televisions, tables, pool tables, chests, desks, pianos, plant stands, wainscot, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean all glass and mirrors and polish all wood, including picture frames, picture fronts, television screens, curio cabinets, coffee tables, books, magazines, shelves, lamp bases, baskets, entertainment centres, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tidy room, including arranging fireplace pieces, straightening fringe on rugs, placing pillows on couches, organising magazines, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dust and polish wood in entrance area, including wainscot, tables, plant stands, bannisters, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• move and vacuum underneath and behind upholstered furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum draperies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum floor and stairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laundry or utility room:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• scrub and clean sink and surrounding area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down and polish washer and dryer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wipe down cupboard fronts, splashboards, and countertops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean all glass and mirrors and polish all wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dust all knickknacks by moving then replacing them and dust shelves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• vacuum, wash, and wax floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special (on request and/or extra fee):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• cleaning inside of oven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cleaning inside of refrigerator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• inside or outside windows (within reach of a small step ladder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• polish silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clean hearths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• spring cleaning, including cleaning and organising cupboards, closets, drawers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• basements, garages, and verandas as extra rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.2. Allocation of cleaning tasks by number of workers on a team.

| (a) Teams of two          | Supervising maid: Kitchen and bathrooms |
|                         | Maid: Dusting and vacuuming             |
|                         | Rotate tasks after every clean          |

| (b) Teams of three       | Supervising maid: Kitchen               |
|                         | Maid #1: Bathrooms                      |
|                         | Maid #2: Dusting and vacuuming          |
|                         | Rotate tasks after every clean or maids rotate tasks after every clean |

| (c) Teams of four        | Supervising maid: Kitchen               |
|                         | Maid #1: Bathrooms                      |
|                         | Maid #2: Dusting                        |
|                         | Maid #3: Vacuuming                      |
|                         | No task rotation                        |
Table C.3. List of cleaning products for each type of cleaning task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General purpose cleaner:</td>
<td>walls, cleaning shower stalls and tiles, wall and door smudges, splashboard,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wiping down cabinets, baseboards, and switch plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degreaser:</td>
<td>stove top, cleaning heavily soiled shower stalls and tiles, greasy wall and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>door smudges, and grimy baseboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid soap:</td>
<td>washing breakfast dishes, linoleum floors, and as a substitute for general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purpose cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window cleaner with ammonia:</td>
<td>dusting, mirrors, glass top tables, curio cabinets, and buffing chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinegar and water mixture:</td>
<td>dusting, floors, ceramic tile floors, and as a substitute for window cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with ammonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid toilet bowl cleaner:</td>
<td>toilet bowls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrasive cleaner:</td>
<td>stainless steel sink and basins, enamelled tubs and sinks, and as a substitute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for liquid toilet bowl cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft abrasive cleaner:</td>
<td>acrylic tubs and sinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinfectant:</td>
<td>general cleaning in the bathroom, especially the commode and training toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air freshener:</td>
<td>bathroom, kitchen, and foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusting polish:</td>
<td>polishing wood furnishings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty cleaning products (provided by the</td>
<td>e.g., enviro-products as a substitute for general purpose cleaner, wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customer):</td>
<td>soap oil for wood cabinets, teak wood oil, carpet dusting powder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Used only with manager's prior approval.
Table C.4. List of equipment for each type of cleaning task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upright vacuum cleaner:</td>
<td>carpets, floors, upholstered furniture, and rugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand vacuum cleaner:</td>
<td>steps and bathroom floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum cleaner attachments:</td>
<td>vacuuming upholstered furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloths, tea towels, and paper towels:</td>
<td>cleaning, dusting, mirrors, sliding glass windows, buffing chrome, and drying tubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrubbing pads:</td>
<td>soap scum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothbrush:</td>
<td>chrome scum and rust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet brush:</td>
<td>toilet bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustmop:</td>
<td>wooden floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mop:</td>
<td>large tiled areas and linoleum floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb’s-wool duster:</td>
<td>fluffying, light dusting, cobwebs, blinds, and some knickknacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step ladder:</td>
<td>used to reach light fixtures and tops of cabinets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckets:</td>
<td>mopping and carrying equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic bags:</td>
<td>garbage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special equipment*:</td>
<td>central vacuum systems and electronic alarm systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Used only with manager’s prior approval.
Table C.5. Responsibilities of a supervising maid, other than cleaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ordering supplies from the manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• collects money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• keeps record of time spent at each clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-related:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• odometer readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• driving the team to each clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• picking up each team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• pays for car maintenance, including oil changes, lubrications, gasoline, normal wear of brakes, mufflers, and alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• picks up part of leasing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• washes cloths and tea towels each evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning supervision:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• checks maids’ quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• times breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• organizes clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• any problems arising during the clean, e.g. breakage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• interacts with customer face to face and by leaving written note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• contacts manager for special instructions throughout the day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and vacuum. In this way the labourers are interchangeable and can be inserted into any of the cleaning positions on the team.

(C.2) SERVICES PROVIDED

Firms offer three basic services, equivalent to a light housekeeping, a moderate clean, and a thorough going-over. Some may offer a special spring cleaning for one room each month, whereas another may offer spring cleaning only in the Spring for a minimal increase in the regular service fee. Such flexibility in service provision attracts customers and orients the franchise toward the customer. Cleaning intervals also are part of the service package, sometimes with variation in price. The majority of cleans are bi-weekly, with the remainder divided between weeklies, monthlies, and on an 'as needed' basis.

(C.3) TRANSFORMING THE "MISTRESS AND MAID" RELATION

Organising domestic labour through the franchise system transforms the "mistress and maid" relation into "mistress and manager" and "manager and maid" relations (see Figure C.1). No longer does the "mistress" deal directly with the "maid", nor vice versa. Both the "mistress" and the "maid" deal with a manager who negotiates services with the "mistress" and labour with the "maid".
Figure C.1. Conceptual diagram of the transformation of the "mistress and maid" labour relation.

(a) Traditional labour relation:

```
"mistress and maid"
```

(b) Introduction of manager in housekeeping services franchises:

```
"mistress"    manager    "maid"
```

(c) Service and labour relations in housekeeping services franchises:

```
"mistress"    manager    "maid"
```


APPENDIX D

INFORMATION GUIDELINES FOR WOMEN WORKER’S MULTIPLE-DEPTH CONVERSATIONS

The following is the set of questions that served as the baseline information guidelines for the multiple-depth conversations. Each meeting began with a preamble that was to set both myself and the woman at ease. The preamble altered only in the description of the topics to be covered.

Preamble to multiple-depth conversation number 1.
This is the first of three multiple-depth conversations. There are two main topics I want to cover: your employment and job training history and the specific work you do at [the firm’s name]. If at any time you feel uncomfortable with a comment or question please tell me and I will skip that question and/or apologize for the comment. If at any time you would like to end the conversation please do so. This is the most detailed conversation and will probably be the longest of the three. We can break at any time.

What I will do when we change topics is to say something like "Now we should talk about injuries." This way I will be sure to cover all the topics I need to and you will be aware of my train of thought. When you think of something that you wanted to say earlier, tell me. Don’t be shy. I realize that that is more difficult to do than to say.

I would also like to encourage you to give me as many examples as you can.

Preamble to multiple-depth conversation number 2.
This is the second multiple-depth conversation in a series of three. Last time we covered your employment and training history and the work you do at [firm’s name]. During this conversation I would like to cover the work you do at home, family, coping strategies, leisure activities, and economics. If at any time you feel uncomfortable with a comment or question please tell me and I will skip that question and/or apologize for the comment. If at any time you would like to end the conversation please do so. We can break at any time.

What I will do when we change topics is to say something like "Now we should talk about hobbies." This way I will be sure to cover all the topics I need to and you will be aware of my train of thought. When you think of something that you wanted to say earlier, tell me. Don’t be shy. I realize that that is more difficult to do than to say.

I would also like to encourage you to give me as many examples as you can.
Preamble to multiple-depth conversation number 3.

This is the last multiple-depth conversation in a series of three. The first two interviews covered your work and your personal life. I now want to try to link these together by talking about being a working woman. I will ask you to define some things, but don't be pressured to give a "correct" answer. There really is no correct answer. I want to be able to make sure we both know what we are talking about. It is okay if we disagree about definitions. If at any time you feel uncomfortable with a comment or question please tell me and I will skip that question and/or apologize for the comment. If at any time you would like to end the conversation please do so. We can break at any time.

What I will do when we change topics is to say something like "Now we should talk about women and work." This way I will be sure to cover all the topics I need to and you will be aware of my train of thought. When you think of something that you wanted to say earlier, tell me. Don't be shy. I realize that that is more difficult to do than to say.

I would also like to encourage you to give me as many examples as you can.

Multiple-depth conversation number 1: Employment history and the labour process

I. Employment and training history
   A. Employment record
      The following points (in question form) are to be covered while talking about employment history:
      1. What job(s) did you hold before this one? When? [Approach employment history with "what job did you have before this one? . . . And the one before that? . . . And before that? . . . until the person is an adolescent or pre-adolescent at home dependent on parent(s) economically.]
      2. Why did you take this job? What other choices did you have? What sorts of things did you do at this job? What was the pay? Were there any benefits offered?
      3. Did you have any on-the-job training? Would you explain how the training worked? Did the training help you do the job? If so, how? Who trained you?
      4. Did you like working here? Why or why not? What parts did you like and what parts did you not like?
      5. Why did you this job end?
      6. [The topic of injuries is to be brought up after the employment history is complete, unless the topic comes up before that.] Were you injured on the job in any of these jobs/positions? Did you report all injuries? Why or why not?
   B. Position at housekeeping firm
      How long have you worked for this firm?
      Why did you take this job?
      Did you have any on-the-job training? Would you explain the training process? How appropriate is the training for the job itself? Did you benefit from the training process?
C. Linking training and past employment to franchise work
   Are the skills that you have learned transferable to other positions? How so?
   Generally, how useful has your previous work experience been in working in this particular job? Were there other job training experiences, like at home growing up doing the housework, that have influenced your choice of this job?

II. Labour process
   A. Particulars about the firm
      Who runs [the firm’s name]? Tell me how it runs, e.g. as a franchise, out of a main office, independently. How does franchising work?
      Are you in contact with any of the other [franchises, offices]? Or with a head office? Under what circumstances?
      Do you know anyone from the other franchises or offices? Manager? Worker? Supply manager?

   B. Particulars about the franchise
      How does your franchise ‘operate’? How does [manager/owner] run the business?
      Whom do you know at [the firm’s name]? Managers? Workers? Other?
      How many hours per week do you work? How are these determined?
         Are the hours distributed evenly among the workers?
      Who makes up the schedule? Is there any flexibility?
      What is your pay? Are there wage differentials or scales?
      Are there benefits? What are they? What about the automobile? Is there a gas allowance? And insurance?
      What type of fees do [the firm’s name] charge? Hourly? By house?
         How do the fees vary? By how often the house is cleaned? By what services are requested? By size of house or apartment? By number of workers in the house?

   C. Tasks and rules for carrying out the tasks
      What specific cleaning tasks do you perform? In what job position?
      Are you expected to perform all these tasks? Why or why not?
      How are the tasks divided up between/amongst workers in the house?
      About how much time do you spend on each task?
      What tasks other than cleaning do you perform?
      Describe cleaning a house.
      Is cleaning different from house to house? How so?
      Are there special machines or appliances that you have to operate or know something about?
      Are there rules you have to follow when performing the cleaning and non-cleaning tasks?
      Are you comfortable with them? Do you ever bend the rules? Why or why not?
      Is there supervision in the house? Who enforces the rules or how are they enforced?
      What do you do if something happens that you did not expect to happen, regarding carrying out the tasks, e.g. breaking the garburator or
the shower? Is there anyway to check up on this, e.g. other workers or the manager?
Who assesses the quality of your work? How is it assessed?
Are there informal checks on the quality of your work?
Have you ever been injured on the job? How? Did you report the injury? When? To whom? Did you follow the correct procedure? Why or why not?
What safety training did you have?
[If not mentioned, ask have they ever heard about WHMIS.]
Do you consider that your job is a safe job?

D. Attitudes toward the tasks performed
Do you like doing the tasks that you do? Why or why not?
Are you satisfied with the tasks that you perform?
Are some tasks more important than others? If so, are you "picky" about anything? Which tasks?

What do you think about while you are working?
How does the actual cleaning of the house affect you physically?

E. Social interaction in the workplace(s)
Where do you see your workplace location? Define your workplace.
Does your workplace include each house, the car, the office, your laundry room, or all of these?
Do you talk with people at the office? What do you talk about?
What do you talk about in the car between the houses?
Do you ever stop at other places in between? Why?
In the house, do you talk to your cleaning partners? Why or why not?
If so, how? What do you talk about?

Have you ever encountered sexual harassment in the workplace(s)?

F. Relations with the manager
How often do you see the manager? When?
Are there staff meetings? What sorts of things do you discuss at a staff meeting?
Does the manager encourage you to raise issues of concern at staff meetings? Are there matters you would like to discuss at staff meetings, but can’t?
Do you like the manager? Do you think the manager likes you?
[This set of questions will vary according to structure of franchise. Do you like the supervisor? Do you like the head maid? etc.]
How does the manager treat you?

Does the manager offer any "perks" for your work? In what form, e.g. bonuses or notes of praise? How is this measured?

G. Relations with co-workers
How often do you see each of your co-workers? When?
Do you like them? Do you have friends within the franchise?
Are your co-workers cooperative and helpful in the workplace?
Is there anyone in particular that you do not like? Why? How do you deal with this tension?

Would you ever support a co-worker in a grievance against the manager? Under what circumstances?

H. Relations with customers/clients
Generally, do you like the customers/clients?
Are the customers/clients there when you clean the house? Which do you prefer -- the customers/clients being there or not being there? Why?
Do you give some customers/clients special treatment? Why or why not?
Do you receive (monetary) tips from the customers/clients? What about praise from the customers/clients? Do they report to the manager?
How are grievances handled by you and the manager from the customers/clients?
Do you give (cleaning) tips to customers/clients? Are you considered an expert in any way?

I. Ideal living spaces
Describe the ideal house to live in.
Does your own home have these features? Are there other homes that have these features?
Do you like the houses you work in? Have you ever thought about them? Do you ever use some of the decorating ideas in your own home?
Would you like to live in any the houses that you work in? Why or why not?

J. Resistance strategies
Do you follow the rules? Always? Are you able to bend the rules? Which ones? How far? How do you get around them? Do you ever ignore rules?
Are there any rules at [the firm's name] in particular that you are challenging, have challenged in the past, or would like to challenge in the future? How do you [did your or plan to] challenge these rules?
Do you question the management's authority? In what ways?
Are you ever tempted to "get back" at the manager? Other supervisors? Customer/client? A co-worker? Why or why not? If so, how?
What do you do when you really do not want to be doing what you are doing? For example, you have an extra house on your route for the day. What is your response?
Do you work differently if you are paid an hourly wage than when you are being paid a percentage of the total cost to the customer of the house? For example, slower or faster, skipping or doing extra tasks to take up time.
How do you cope with the physical strain of cleaning the house?
How do you cope with the customers when they are in the house where you are cleaning?

K. Changes to the structure
What changes would you like to see in the franchise that would make you more satisfied with your job or position?

If the woman has held a previous job/position in a different franchise or housekeeping firm, topics covered in Part II. Labour Process, are to be sensitive to both jobs/positions held by the woman.
Multiple-depth conversation number 2: Interface of home and the workplace(s)

III. Domestic labour
    What do you do to maintain a household? What specific tasks are included?
    Which of these tasks do you perform at home? Who performs the tasks that you
do not perform? Who determines who does what?
    Compare your work at the franchise with your work at home. Is it similar? Do
you clean your house the same way you are supposed to clean the
customers' houses?

IV. Familial relations and personal history
    Where did you grow up? Tell me about your family? Where did your father
work? Where did your mother work? Was your mother employed
outside the home? Where? When? For how long?
    What was your childhood like? How did your father influence you? And what
about your mother's influence? And siblings? Who were the most
significant and influential people in your life growing up?
    How do you see yourself with regard to your family growing up? For example,
I am the "black sheep" and my younger brother "can do no wrong". How
would you describe your relationship with your family? Has this
affected your choice of employment? How? How has this affected your
level of satisfaction in your job?
    Are you married or seeing someone? Do you have children? How does your
family life affect your choice of employment/career?
    Do/would you encourage your daughters and sons to pursue certain careers?
Which ones and for whom?
    Are there any other important events in your life that you would like to bring
up?
    How is your health? How does your job affect your health? How does your
health affect carrying out the tasks for your job?

V. Coping strategies and balancing acts
    What situations cause stress in your life at home? At work? Give examples.
    When under stress, how do you cope at work with manager(s)? Co-workers?
Clients? Family? Friends?
    How do you cope with stress from work at home? How sympathetic is your
family?
    How do you cope with stress from home at work? How sympathetic is your
manager? Co-workers?
    Can you compare your home and workplace in terms of stress?
    Do you ever just get overwhelmed either at work or at home? By exhaustion?
        By repetition? By emotion? By amounts of work that have to be
completed?
    How is that you can manage working at [the firm's name] and maintain a home?
What benefits do you see from working at [the firm's name] and maintaining a
home?
    What drawbacks to your own life do you experience from working at [the firm's
name] and maintaining a home?

VI. Leisure
    What do you do to have fun? What hobbies do you have?
How much money do you spend on leisure activities for yourself? For your spouse? For your children?
Do you enjoy your leisure time? How much time do you spend in leisure activities? At what times?
Do you spend time with your friends? Do you enjoy spending time with your friends? And time with your family?
What gives you the most satisfaction -- time at work or time at home? Why?

VII. Economics of the household

Why do you work?
Who else contributes to the household income? What are their occupations, specifically?
How important is your income to the household? Which expenses does your income cover?
About what percentage does each income contribute to the whole? Which expenses does this or do these income(s) cover?
Who manages the finances? If money gets 'tight', where do you cut back?
Who gets affected the most by the cut back?
[If figures for income do not come out, ask for approximate numbers.]

Multiple-depth conversation number 3: Synthesis of discussion topics in the context of gender and class

VIII. Gender

Do you see a difference between being female (male) and being a woman (man)? Why or why not?
How do you define gender?
Can there be inconsistencies in which gender you are? For example, can you be more like a man (woman) sometimes? Under what circumstances? Why? How?
How do you feel about being a woman (man)? Are you satisfied with being a woman (man)?
Do you feel constrained in any way because you are a woman (man)? Why or why not? If so, how so?
If you had a choice, would you choose to be a woman or a man? Why?
How did your family life growing up affect the way you view being a woman (man)?
How does being a woman relate to the topics we have discussed in previous talks? Topics include:
labour at work;
management;
co-workers;
leisure;
family;
spouse;
economics in the household;
houses;
domestic labour at home;
attitudes;
customers/clients
Do you see differences in woman or a man in your daily life? If so, what are they?
Are there changes that you would like to see at home or at work regarding being a woman or a man? Are these changes possible for you to make at home or at work? Why or why not? Do you want to make the changes? Why or why not? If so, how?
Should there be differences between women and men?

IX. Class

How do you define class? How do you see class? Can you give me examples?
What do you mean by [response given]?
What class do you belong to? Can there be inconsistencies in which class you belong to? For example, can you belong to two different classes? How?
How do you feel about [your class position] being [response]? Are you satisfied with that? Why or why not?
Do you feel constrained in any way because of your class? Why or why not? If so, how so? Can you give an example?
If you had a choice, what class would you want to belong to? Why? What benefits do you see from belonging to this class? Are there any drawbacks?
Does your spouse [children] [siblings] [parents] belong to the same class you do? How did your family life growing up affect the way you view your class?
How does class relate to the topics we have discussed in previous talks? Topics include:
- labour at work;
- management;
- co-workers;
- leisure;
- family;
- spouse;
- economics in the household;
- houses;
- domestic labour at home;
- attitudes;
- customers/clients

Do you see differences in classes in your daily life? For example, are there differences in the type of car you would buy if you were in [differences in class in terms of response]. If so, what are they? Can you give examples?
Are there changes that you would like to see at home or at work regarding class? Are these changes possible for you to make at home or at work? Why or why not? Do you want to make the changes? Why or why not? If so, how?
Should there be different classes? Why?

X. Class and gender

Do you see gender and class relating? Why or why not? If so, how so? Under what circumstances? Is one more important than the other?
Do you have more in common with a woman in a different class [a woman like Mila Mulroney] or the a man in the same class [like ----- or a man
working at a cleaning agency]? For example, interests in leisure or
amounts of housework you do or being in a position of work. Why?
Are your closest friends women or men? Are they members of the same class?
Which life experiences have been most influential in shaping your view of being
a woman? Your class?
How has being and woman and your class shaped your choice of doing
housework at home and working for a housekeeping agency?
What alternatives do you see for yourself in the future?
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS WITH MANAGERS AND HEAD OFFICE PERSONNEL

The following is the set of questions used in the structured interviews with franchise managers and head office personnel. Each interview began with the preamble.

Preamble to manager/head office personnel.

There are three areas I want to cover: your employment history; the particulars about the franchise [firm]; and the relations between the management and the workers. Some information will be readily available in printed format, e.g. resumé, franchise history, or annual reports. If you want, you can leave that information with me and we don't have to talk about it. I might have to clarify some points at a later date, so I may contact you in the future. Feel free to interrupt me at any time or if there are some questions you don't feel comfortable answering, then tell me.

I. History
   A. Employment record
      What jobs and positions have you held in the past?
      What was the wage or salary?
      Why did you take that job or position?
      Was there on-the-job training?
      What did you like and dislike about the job and position?
      Why did the job/position end?
   B. Training and background
      What schooling, training or other preparation have you had that led you to take on these jobs and positions?
      Are there other experiences you have had which have shaped your employment history, e.g. a move from B.C. to Ontario?
      What is the history of this franchise, e.g. did someone own it before you, how did you go about acquiring it.
   C. Personal
      Are your skills transferrable to other jobs/positions?
      Do you think your choices for training have prepared you for your career?

II. Particulars about franchise
   A. Franchise structure
      Describe the way the firm is set up.
Would you go into detail regarding your decision to buy [the franchise/start the company]?
How did you raise the capital to [purchase the franchise/start the business]?
What is/was your training [process for franchisees/as a franchisee]?
What things do you wish you had known in advance? e.g. preferred to have more specific training in finding supplies
What is the size of the business: geographically, number of workers, number of customers, etc.

The following questions are for franchise owners:
What commitment do you have to the head office or franchisee?
What restrictions are there for you from the franchiser? e.g. cleaning supplies; services offered
What expenses are picked up by the head office?
What changes would you like to see that would make you more satisfied with being a franchise owner?

The following question is for head office personnel:
What commitment do you have to the franchiser?

B. Tasks
What specific tasks do you carry out daily? monthly? quarterly? yearly? prompts: e.g. hiring/firing; setting and distribution of schedules; organisation of keys; keeping workers' hours; maintaining supplies; soliciting new customers; advertising; telephone services; car maintenance; laundry; advertising; bookkeeping; policy changes
What commitments do you have to the head office [or franchisees]?
Do you clean or have you cleaned houses yourself?

C. Hiring practices
What is the "ideal" worker for [firm's name]? Do you prefer certain kinds of workers? How close are your workers to the "ideal"?
What is the "ideal" franchisee for [firm's name]? Do you prefer certain kinds of franchisees?
What benefits do you offer to employees? Are there incentives or bonuses?
What are the wage levels and wage differentials amongst the workers?
Are these set by the head office?
How do you establish a working relationship with a new employee?
Who trains new workers? What is the training process?
Are your employees bonded? Describe the bonding process.

D. Housekeeping service and expectations of individuals as workers
What do you see as the workplace? Each house, the car, the office, or all of these?
What tasks are to be performed inside each home for cleaning?
How is the work/cleans allocated amongst the teams, e.g. by number of cleans, by time it takes to complete cleans
What are the rules that the employees have to follow inside the house, the car, the office?
Are there restrictions of a worker's behaviour outside the workplace, e.g. like not driving the company car out of town?

E. Economic aspects
How do you set your rates?
Do you take a salary?
What are your expenses? e.g. supply costs; insurance; taxes; employee benefits
How much of total expenses is spent on labour?
At what profit rate do you like to operate? What's your income in a good year? A bad year?
What steps, if any, are taken to deal with slumping profit in a 'bad' year?
What is the worker turnover rate?

III. Relations between management and workers
A. Interpersonal relations
   Are your employees happy working with each other? For example, are there any circumstances whereby you cannot schedule two employees to work together?
   Have you developed friendships with any of the employees?
   Are any of the employees friends outside of work?
   How much importance do you place on working relationships and friendships within the franchise(s)? Within the firm?
B. Managerial techniques
   How important is a pleasant work environment?
   How do you keep a pleasant working environment?
   How do you pair workers?
   How do you motivate workers?
   Do you have staff meetings? What issues are discussed at staff meetings?
   How important is the input of the workers?
   How do you reprimand a worker who is too slow, too clumsy, irresponsible, etc.?
C. Health and Safety
   What precautions are taken to ensure the safety and health of the workers?
   Are there worker compensation cases pending?
   What injuries are most common at [the firm's name]?
   What is your policy on injuries occurring in the workplace(s)?
D. Problem-solving
   Is there a simple set of rules when dealing with conflict, like e.g. "The customer is always right"?
   What is the policy on conflict between:
      client/customer and one of the workers?
      workers?
      yourself and a client/customer?
      yourself and a worker?
      yourself and [the head office/franchisee]?
   How do you maintain quality?
   What would be the implications of union organising?
APPENDIX F

TRANSCRIPTION FORMAT FOR CONVERSATIONS WITH WOMEN WORKERS AND INTERVIEWS WITH MANAGERS AND HEAD OFFICE PERSONNEL

Because of the restrictions in time and skill, I used a shortened transcription format. Rather than verbatim transcriptions, I listened to the recorded conversations and interviews and transcribed passages and phrases that epitomised the points the workers, managers, and head office personnel were trying to make. The format for each set of transcriptions follows.

(F.1) FIRST MULTIPLE-DEPTH CONVERSATION

Transcribed [date]

Conversation number 1: Employment history and the labour process

Name:
Franchise:
Position:

I. Employment and training history
   A. Employment record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Wage</th>
<th>Reason for employment</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Reason for leaving</th>
<th>Length of employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
1.
2.
3.
Likes and dislikes of job:
1. 
2. 
3. 

Responsibilities:
1. 
2. 
3. 

Injuries:
Type of injury | Reported | Compensation
1. 
2. 
3. 

B. Position at housekeeping firm

1. Why [firm’s name]?
2. On-the-job-training process:

C. Linking training and past employment to franchise work

1. Transferable?
2. Are skills useful?

II. Labour process
A. Particulars about the firm

1. Who runs [the firm’s name]?
2. Tell me how it runs.
3. Are you in contact with any of the other [franchises, offices]?

B. Particulars about the franchise

1. How does [manager’s name] run the business?
2. Whom do you know at [the firm’s name]?
3. Hours per week on average:
4. Who makes up the schedule?
5. Are there wage differentials or scales?
6. Benefits?
7. What type of fees do [the firm’s name or the manager’s name] charge?

C. Tasks and rules for carrying out the tasks

1. Specific cleaning tasks:
2. Non-cleaning tasks:
3. Tasks performed and why:
4. Position:
5. Labour process:
Preparation:
Time:
Bathroom:
Kitchen:
Bedrooms:
Living Room:
Dining Room:
Basement:
Family Room:
Special:

6. Managerial relations amongst workers:
   Supervision in the house:
   Supervision outside the house:
   Who enforces the rules:
   Supervisor's role in the house:
   Manager's role:
7. Special machines:
8. Rules to follow while cleaning:
9. Bending and breaking the rules:
10. Things going wrong in the house:
11. Quality:
    Formal assessment:
    Informal assessment:
12. Safety training:
13. Injuries:
14. Process of reporting injury:
15. Compensation:
16. Safe job?
17. WHMIS:

D. Attitudes toward the tasks performed
1. Do you like the tasks and why:
2. Satisfaction level:
3. "Picky" tasks:
4. What do you think about while you are working?:
5. How does the actual cleaning of the house affect you physically?

E. Social interaction in the workplace(s)
1. How do you define your workplace, each house, the car, the office, your
   laundry room, or all of these?:
2. Talk in the office:
3. Talk in the car:
4. Stops in between the houses:
5. Talk in the house:
6. Where talk in the house:
7. Sexual harassment:

F. Relations with the manager
1. See the manager? When?
2. Staff meetings?:
3. What is discussed at a staff meeting?
4. Does the manager encourage you to raise issues of concern?
5. Do you like the manager?
6. Do you think the manager likes you?
7. How does the manager treat you?
8. Any "perks" for your work:

G. Relations with co-workers
1. See each co-worker:
2. Do you like them?:
3. Do you have friends within the franchise that you see outside of work?:
4. Co-workers co-operative?:
5. Anyone that you dislike:
6. Would you ever support a co-worker in a grievance against the manager?
   Under what circumstances?:

H. Relations with customers/clients
1. Do you like the customers/clients?
2. Do you prefer customers/clients being or not being there when you clean?:
3. Do you give some customers/clients special treatment? Why or why not?:
4. Tips from customers/clients?:
5. Praise and compliments:
6. Customer complaints:
7. Tips to customers/clients?:
8. Seen as cleaning expert?:

I. Ideal living spaces
1. Describe the ideal house to live in:
2. Does your own home have these features:
3. Is there a particular house that you clean that you would like to live in:
4. Like the houses you clean?:
5. Take decorating ideas and use them in your home?:

J. Resistance strategies
1. Do you always follow the rules?:
2. Do you bend them?:
3. Do you ever get around them?:
4. Challenges?:
5. Question manager's authority:
6. "Get back" at manager:
7. "Get back" at co-worker:
8. "Get back" at customer/client:
9. What do you do when you don't want to be doing what you are doing?:
10. Differences in work according to how you are paid:
11. How do you deal with customers/clients when they are in the house when you are cleaning?:

K. Changes to the structure
1. Changes would like to see:

L. Notes while transcribing

(F.2) SECOND MULTIPLE-DEPTH CONVERSATION

Transcribed [date]

Conversation number 2: Interface of home and the workplace(s)

Name:
Franchise:
Position:

III. Domestic labour

1. Household tasks carried out by woman:
2. Determination of the division of tasks:
3. Comparison of work at the franchise and work at home:

IV. Familial relations and personal history

1. Family growing up:
   a. Mother:
   b. Father:
   c. Siblings:
   d. Family household:
2. People as influences:
3. Self-perception within family:
4. Affects of family on choice of employment:
5. Affects of nuclear family on choice of employment:
6. Encouragement of daughters and sons in career choice:
7. Health:
8. Thoughts about the job and your health:
V. Coping strategies and balancing acts

1. Situations causing stress at home:
2. Situations causing stress at work:
3. Coping at work with stress from home:
4. Coping at home with stress from work:
5. Sympathetic family with stress from work:
6. Sympathetic co-workers with stress from home:
7. Place causing more stress:
8. Overwhelming feelings:
9. How to manage home and work:
10. Benefits from working to maintaining household:
11. Drawbacks from working to maintaining household:

VI. Leisure

1. Activities for fun:
2. Hobbies:
3. Money spent on leisure for self, spouse and children:
4. Time spent on leisure:
5. Friends:
6. Time with family:
7. Most satisfaction:

VII. Economics of the household

1. Why employed:
2. Contributors to the household income:
3. Expenses covered by your income:
4. Amounts of incomes or percentages:
5. Manager of finances:
6. Cutbacks when money gets 'tight':

Notes while transcribing:

(F.3) THIRD MULTIPLE-DEPTH CONVERSATION

Transcribed [date]

Conversation number 3: Synthesis of discussion topics in the context of gender and class

Name:
Franchise:
VIII. Gender

1. Difference between being female (male) and being a woman (man):
2. Definition of gender:
3. Acceptance of my differentiation with comment:
4. Inconsistencies in gender:
5. Constraints because of gender:
6. Benefits because of gender:
7. Choice of woman or man:
8. Affects of family growing up on being a woman:
9. Relations between being a woman and:
   labour at work:
   management:
   co-workers:
   leisure:
   family:
   spouse:
   economics in the household:
   houses:
   domestic labour at home:
   attitudes:
   customers/clients:
10. Differences in gender in daily life:
11. Possible changes at home regarding being a woman for easier life:
12. Possible changes at work regarding being a woman for easier life:
13. Strategies for making changes at home:
14. Strategies for making changes at work:
15. Ideal gender:

IX. Class

1. Definition of class:
2. Class structure:
3. Member of class:
4. Inconsistencies in class:
5. Satisfaction with class:
6. Constraints because of class:
7. Benefits because of class:
8. Choice of class:
9. Affects of family growing up on class:
10. Relations between class and:
    labour at work:
    management:
    co-workers:
    leisure:
    family:
    spouse:
economics in the household:
houses:
domestic labour at home:
attitudes:
customers/clients:
11. Differences in class in daily life:
12. Possible changes at home regarding class for easier life:
13. Possible changes at work regarding class for easier life:
14. Strategies for making changes at home:
15. Strategies for making changes at work:
16. Ideal classes:

X. Class and gender

1. Relations between gender and class:
2. The more important:
3. More in common with men of same class or women of different class:
4. Closest friends:
5. Most influential life experiences shaping gender:
6. Most influential life experiences shaping class:
7. Links between gender and class with choice of housework and paid labour:
8. Alternatives for future:

(F.4) INTERVIEWS OF MANAGERS AND HEAD OFFICE PERSONNEL

Transcribed [date]

Manager and Head Office Personnel Interview:

Name:
Franchise:
Position:

1. History

A. Employment record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Wage</th>
<th>Reason for employment</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Reason for leaving</th>
<th>Length of employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.    |      |                       |          |                    |                     |
2.    |      |                       |          |                    |                     |
3.    |      |                       |          |                    |                     |

Comments:
1. 
2. 
3.

Likes and dislikes of job:
1.
2.
3.

Responsibilities:
1.
2.
3.

B. Training and background
1. Training:
2. Other experiences:
3. Franchise/Firm history:

C. Personal
1. Skills Transferable:
2. Skills and preparation:

II. Particulars about franchise

A. Franchise structure
1. Description of firm:
2. Choice to buy franchise/take firm position:
3. Capital generation:
4. Training for management/position:
5. Wished had known in advance:
6. Size of the business:

The following questions are for franchise owners:

7. Commitment to head office:
8. Restrictions:
9. Expenses picked up by head office:
10. Changes would like to see:

The following questions are for head office personnel:

11. Commitment to franchisees:
12. Revocation of franchises:

B. Tasks
1. Specific tasks:
daily:
weekly:
bi-weekly:
monthly:
quarterly:
yearly:
2. Clean or have you cleaned houses:

C. Hiring practices
1. Ideal worker:
2. Typical worker now working:
3. Ideal franchisee/franchiser:
4. Worker benefits:
5. Bonuses or incentives:
6. Wage levels/scales:
7. Working relationship with employee:

D. Housekeeping service and expectations of individuals as workers
1. Identification of workplace:
2. Tasks to be performed inside the home:
3. Workload allocation:
4. Rules to follow:
5. Rules outside workplace:

E. Economic aspects
1. Setting rates:
2. Salary or wage:
3. Expenses:
4. Labour ratio:
5. Worker turnover rate:
6. Profit rate:
7. Income:
8. Slump year profit maintenance strategy:

III. Relations between management and workers

A. Interpersonal relations
1. Worker happiness:
2. Friendships:
3. Worker friendship outside workplace:

B. Managerial techniques
1. Importance of pleasant work environment:
2. Pairing workers:
3. Motivating workers:
4. Staff meetings:
5. Importances of worker input:
6. Reprimands:

C. Health and Safety
1. Precautions to ensure safety:
2. Worker compensation cases:
3. Most common injuries:
4. Policy regarding injuries:

D. Problem-solving
1. Guidelines:
2. Policy on conflict between:
   client/customer and one of the workers:
   workers:
   yourself and a client/customer:
   yourself and a worker:
   yourself and [the head office/franchisee]:
3. Maintain quality:
4. Implications of union organising:

EXTRA:
APPENDIX G

WOMEN WORKER’S LETTERS OF CONSENT

The following is the letter of consent used for women workers participating in the study. The originals were on McMaster University, Department of Geography letterhead; my signed copies were on plain paper.

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student in the Geography Department at McMaster University. I am investigating housekeeping services in the Hamilton area. The general area of my studies is women and work. I would like for you to participate in this study. If you agree to participate, I would like for you to sign and date the bottom of the enclosed copy in order to record that you have read this letter and agreed to participate in the study.

If at any time you wish to withdraw from the study, feel free to do so. Any information obtained from you through the interviews will be deleted from the project research files.

My contact with you entails at least three interview sessions, conveniently spaced throughout the period from September 07, 1990, to April 30, 1991. The first interview centers on your employment and training history and the work you do at the housekeeping service. The second one focuses on your feelings toward work at home and at the housekeeping service as well as your personal life, e.g. marriage, children, leisure activities. The final interview deals with your thoughts about women and work. The first interview will be the longest and probably will last at least an hour and a half and possibly two hours. The subsequent interviews will be less than ninety minutes. Tape recorders will be used to record the conversation, but only with your approval.

Confidentiality of the information you provide is guaranteed. All data gathered will be kept under lock in my home or in my office at the university. A summary of the findings will be made available upon completion of analysis. The estimated date of completion is August, 1992.

Thank you for your time. I am looking forward to working with you on this project.

Yours truly,

Pamela J. Moss
APPENDIX H

MANAGER AND HEAD OFFICE PERSONNEL LETTERS OF CONSENT

Two versions of the manager/head office permission letter consent were used. The December, 1990, version was for managers and the February, 1991, version was for head office personnel. The reason for the difference involves the legality of divulging information raised by one of the head office personnel. The later version is more restrictive on both sides.

(H.1) VERSION 1, FOR MANAGERS

December 1990

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student in the Geography Department at McMaster University. I am investigating housekeeping services in the Hamilton area. The general area of my studies is women and work. I would like for you to participate in this study. If you agree to participate, I would like for you to sign and date the bottom of the enclosed copy in order to record that you have read this letter and agreed to participate in the study.

If at any time you wish to withdraw from the study, feel free to do so. Any information obtained from you through the interviews will be deleted from the project research files.

My contact with you entails one interview with subsequent follow up clarifications. Tape recorders will be used to record the conversation, but only with your approval.

Confidentiality of the information you provide is guaranteed. All data gathered will be kept under lock in my home or in my office at the university. A summary of the findings will be made available upon completion of analysis. The estimated date of completion is August, 1992.
Thank you for your time. I am looking forward to working with you on this project.

Yours truly,

Pamela J. Moss

(H.2) VERSION 2, FOR HEAD OFFICE PERSONNEL

February 1991

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student in the Geography Department at McMaster University investigating housekeeping services in southern Ontario. The general area of my studies is women and work.

I would like for you to participate in this study. In order to get a full picture I want to talk with head office personnel and managers/owners of housekeeping service franchises. My contact with you entails one interview with subsequent follow up clarifications. Tape recorders will be used to record the conversation, but only with your approval.

If you agree to participate, I would like for you to sign and date the bottom of the enclosed copy in order to record that you have read this letter and agreed to participate in the study. If at any time you wish to withdraw from the study prior to the end of the data collection phase, May 1, 1991, feel free to do so. Any information obtained from you through the interviews will be deleted from the project research files.

Confidentiality of the information you provide is guaranteed. All data gathered will be kept under lock in my home or in my office at the university. A summary of the findings will be made available upon completion of analysis. The estimated date of completion is August, 1992.

Thank you for your time. I am looking forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,

Pamela Moss
APPENDIX I

PRODUCTION REGIME FORMATS OF WAGED DOMESTIC LABOUR

(I.1) DEFINITION

Like other waged labour processes, waged domestic is not monolithic. In the organisation of waged domestic labour, at present, there are three formats.\(^1\) A format is a specific production regime characterised primarily by the type of employment, formality of employment relations, and extent of firm regulation. For waged domestic labour in the post-1973 era, there are three formats: foreign domestic workers, privately employed domestic labourers, and domestic labour firms.

(I.2) PRODUCTION REGIME FORMATS OF WAGED DOMESTIC LABOUR, POST-1973

The first format is characterised by the employment of foreign domestic workers. During the post-1973 era, foreign domestics are responsible primarily for childcare and housekeeping as live-ins, nannies, and au pairs. They live in the household of their employer, and are closely supervised. The tasks comprising the labour process and the technical division of labour varies from household to household, as does abuse and exploitation within the relations of domination (Silvera 1983/1989). One key issue in this production regime format is the labourer's access to permanent residency, which is directly regulated by the state. (For additional information on the regulatory history of foreign domestic labour see Chapter 6, Section 6.4.1).

---

1. Here, I am adapting the use of 'format' from Lewis (1992). In a discussion of the ways in which production was organised in Montréal during the late nineteenth century, Lewis uses 'format' to distinguish specific intra-firm organisations. I use format as a specific type of production regime.
The second format comprises privately employed domestic labourers who are hired through personal contacts and private networks, for example, baby-sitters, cleaning ladies, and housesitters. They clean, provide daycare, or act as companions on a set schedule. Payment is usually informal and not reported to the government. Because of the fairly 'loose' employment bonds between the labourer and employer, the specific tasks as well as their organisation are variable and flexible. Under the Ontario labour code, privately employed domestic labourers are technically, but not necessarily, guaranteed minimum wage. Day-work can give the domestic labourer a freedom to set her own style of housekeeping or childcare while bringing money into her own household (see Glenn's 1988 work with Japanese-American domestics). If experienced enough, the domestic labourer can negotiate her own wage and refuse particular jobs (see Romero's account (1988a, 1988b and 1992) of Chicana housekeepers in Colorado).

The third format for the organisation of waged domestic labour is domestic labour firms. There are two types: brokerage firms and service firms. The former are long-standing types of firms that connect domestic labourers with prospective employers. The kind of domestic labour is usually specialized as in cooks, nannies, au pairs, housekeepers, maids, gardeners, and even brides. Because the end set of labour relations is between persons privately employing specialized workers, once the brokerage firm has collected its fee, the production format is the same as privately employed domestic labourers.

Service domestic labour firms are firms that employ workers to perform services that a manager or owner has secured through other means. The person needing the domestic labour service (e.g. catering, lawncare, housesitting, and housekeeping) phones the firm and sets up the service. Employees that perform the
labour receive wages from the firm, not the client. In the case of housekeeping services, the traditional "mistress and maid" relation is transformed into a combination of "mistress and manager" and "manager and maid" relations (see Appendix C, Figure C.1, p. 303).

This type of domestic labour firm is organised one of three ways: as a small business with an owner/manager; as a head office with a general manager directing several businesses; or as a franchising firm with one head office. Numerically, the small business firm dominates the home and office cleaning industry. They tend to be small with between one and four employees, and focus either on home or office cleaning, not both. Only one housekeeping firm in southern Ontario operates as a head office vertically integrated with three regional offices. Each of the offices is responsible for several teams of home and office cleaners. Franchises tend to be more well known¹ and at least one of the four firms are available nearly everywhere across southern Ontario. This organisation of services franchises meets the North American ideal of uniformity and familiarity in quality and service.

¹ I note this because nearly everyone I talked with about this project, both participants and non-participants, mentioned or discussed to some extent one of the four franchising firms. They were more likely to talk about one of the corporate firms rather than one of the parental firms.
APPENDIX J

FERGUSON’S (1989) ANALYSIS OF ‘SEX-AFFECTIVE’ SYSTEMS

Ferguson’s (1989, 1990) analysis deserves a more thorough review for two reasons. First, her work inspires a new understanding of reproductive labour in that she develops an a theory based on the premise that social relations are processes. Second, Ferguson actually uses the term gender formation in her analysis. She uses it to distinguish a set of relations in a social system, akin to social formation. My use of the term differs significantly. In order to show the strength of her analysis and to differentiate her approach from my own, I review her work and then point to three ways in which our analyses differ.

From a socialist feminist perspective, Ferguson (1989) develops the concepts of ‘sex-affective systems’:

which socially construct ‘sex/affective energy’, the human physical and social interaction which is common to human sexuality, parenting, kin and family relations, nurturance and social bonding (pp. 7-8);

and, the ‘sex/affective production system’ which

organises all material work and services by defining what is culturally acceptable as man’s and woman’s work. It also organises nurturance, sexuality and procreation by directing sexual urges (in most societies toward heterosexual relations and non-incestuous ties), by indicating possible friendships and by defining parenthood roles and/or kinship ties and responsibilities (Ferguson 1989, p. 84).

Ferguson (1990) extends her analysis by including race in her framework:

If we adopt a tri-systems approach, we can understand class, race, and male dominance as effects of economic, political, and cultural structures that historically develop a semi-autonomous effectivity while they mutually articulate each other. All three systems can be understood by reference to the more general concept of a social formation as a historically specific set of structures and practices which allow certain social groups more power than other groups (p. 46).
From this framework, Ferguson extracts formations based on the three systems: racial formation, class formation, and gender formation:

a racial formation is a historically specific set of economic, political, social, and cultural practices in a society that define and enforce the social "rules of the game" for that society, allowing dominant races more power and options than subordinate races. Similarly, a class formation is a historically specific articulation of economic classes organized by a particular mode or modes of economic production, and a gender formation is an articulation of gender roles and powers created by a particular mode or modes of organizing the production and distribution of sexuality, parenting, and nurturance (or sex/affective production) [my emphasis] (Ferguson 1990, p. 46).

The processes implicated in the formation of these specified sets of social relations are exploitation, "genderisation", "sexualisation", "racialisation", and "ethnicisation", comprising relations of class, gender, sexuality, race, and ethnicity, respectively (Ferguson 1990, pp. 46, 48, and 52).

Ferguson makes the explanation of race, gender, and class more sophisticated by including a multiplicity of influences in their formation. She argues that taking into account the ways in which particularised sets of social relations become historically constituted is paramount in building explanations of the interconnections between and amongst multiple sets of materially and historically constituted social relations. Yet, her analysis does not maintain a process-oriented analysis of social relations because of the emphasis on multiple social systems.

Three points distinguish her approach from mine. First, tri- and multiple-systems theories are subject to similar criticisms as dual systems theories regarding systems articulation, impact of a worker's experience of labour, and formation as process. Even though changes in one system affects the relations in another, each system has its own logic. Entwinement of the processes that form class, gender, race, and ethnic relations is not emphasised. Also, theories of multiple sets of historically

1. See Chapter 5, Footnote 4, p. 86, for a discussion of dual systems theories.
constituted relations do not necessarily take into account experience and strategies of resistance because the logic of the system is central in the analysis, not the tension between the system's logic and the workers experiences of the changing capitalist labour relations.

Following from this, second, Ferguson subordinates subjectivity and experience to a prescribed set of behavioural norms. This becomes a problem in the explanation of an organisation of a labour process or in the interpretation of workers' experiences of a labour process because the mediation of that organisation of labour relations via experience shapes workers' consciousness and actions. Obviously people engage in social relations that produce 'sex/affective systems'. What is not clear is the role and impact individuals, especially those dominated, have in their production and reproduction. For example, how does experience of domination shape the structure of each system? Historically, collective challenges to the dominating 'sex/affective production system' have made an impact can be identified, for example, the Civil Rights movement in the US and the women's movement. However, the complexity and richness of experiences has been collapsed into a set of historical acts like in Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech, the assassinations of the John F. and Robert Kennedy and Dr. King, and the march on Washington. Recovering the experiences of the people whose lives were ruptured during this turbulent time is part of the liberation of subjugated knowledge. And not just those of Malcolm X, Rosa Parks, and Ralph Ellison. Liberation of the knowledges would involve recovering the experiences of the people who lived black cultural nationalism, of black women living in Alabama, and of other 'invisible' women and men.²

² For me, as a white woman, recovering black women's lived cultural nationalism would be exploitative. See the discussion on exploitation of the 'researched', Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2, pp. 47-49.
Third, Ferguson’s theoretical simplicity of the abstraction ‘formation’
cannot address the means through which the relations comprising the systems reproduce
themselves. For example, how is it that people engage in social relations that lead to
their own domination? Formation in Ferguson’s account is a ‘slice of reality’, rather
than a materially and historically mediated set of processes, that is, it is a simple rather
than a complex abstraction. I think theorists need not only to conceptualise the
framework within which power is distributed within class, gender, and race relations
(formation as a set of relations, i.e. a simple abstraction), but also to figure out how
those workers who are dominated engage seemingly willingly in oppressive relations
(formation as process, i.e. a complex abstraction).³

³ Burawoy (1979) makes this point quite clear in his Manufacturing
Consent.
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