

The body within home and domesticity: Gendered diversity

ORNA BLUMEN, TOVI FENSTER and CHEN MISGAV

Abstract

This article looks at some aspects of the patriarchal relations surrounding the body, the home and domesticity. It sheds light on the body as the home of the self and on the home as the place of the body. Although ostensibly separate, the self, body and home are linked by domesticity that connotes the “right” (i.e., the dominant) way of living. Since each is invested with emotions and contextualizes the sense of belonging and the essential emotion of “feeling at home,” all three together imply sexed/gendered being and living.

Introduction

This article offers a review and interpretations of some of the connections between the body, home and domesticity as representing gendered relations. The body is both a physical and a social entity. It is always changing biologically and mentally, and, indeed, it is a moving space that inhabits the self. By the meaning of its body, the self is afforded or denied the ability to travel across territories, enter areas, stay on provinces and settle in places. Bodies can be defined only if located—namely, contextualized spatially (Longhurst, 2001:3). The meaning of the body affects one’s types of activities and the beneficiaries of bodily (physical and mental) endeavors. Hence, the body is an important determinant that structures life opportunities, limiting or expanding the experiences of groups and individuals; it implies a space, a boundary, a politicized project, a site and a location (Valentine, 2001).

Bodies are intimate homes, and although they may be contained within various spaces, only in-home location meets the self’s primordial need for belonging, so as to provide an orientation for one’s actuality. It is often said that, in Western tradition,

the house—the space where one lives and stations one’s body—embodies the home. The place of living is converted into a home by becoming an imagined idealization of notions such as privacy, intimacy, exclusiveness, secrecy, sheltering and even sanctity. Rather than a space of a fixed functional characterization, the home is a space of relationships and experiences of many, often contested options, and a meaningful nucleus for the living self (Blunt and Dowling, 2006; Fenster, Forthcoming; Massey, 1996; Valentine, 2001).

Thus, the body is a geography shaped by all other geographies. Places of living, where the self lives and where the body lives, are gendered. The body and the home are important sites for women, who are often situated in places and conduct themselves as a result of the meanings attached to their bodies and identities. The body and home are departure places from which the sexed/gendered self meets the world. Our aim here is to highlight some gendered perspectives of the body within home and domesticity.

Where the self lives: The body

Entwining biological strength and social vitality, the body is the most basic constituent of human life. People are contained by their bodies; their interactions with the world around them, which facilitate an ongoing process of identity making, are largely patterned by the social meanings of their body and its parts (e.g., size, skin color, eye shape). Thus, the body is where one’s sense of self dwells, develops and is negotiated; it is the prime site where the meaning of “feeling at home” is sensed and comprehended. Feminists have shown great interest in the body. In *The Second Sex*, Simone de Beauvoir (1989) argued that biology has little significance for the social construction of gender and the status of women as men’s Other. However, others, such as Shulamith Firestone (1970), have recognized biological differences as the reason underlying the different positions of women and men all over the social spectrum. More recent, post-modern scholarship tends to focus on the cultural meaning of the body, suggesting it can be read as text and construed as a representation of power relations (Davis, 2007).

Historically, geographers have tended to prioritize concerns such as the mind, masculinity, rationality and sameness over references to the body, femininity, irrationality and Otherness (Longhurst, 1997:492). A rather intense interest in the body as a focus of research has emerged since the 1990s and has been developed mostly by feminist geographers. Largely (but not exclusively) leaning on Butler’s (1990) theory of performativity, one strand of research on the body considers how power relations, resistance and struggle over issues such as gender, sexuality, work and nationhood are communicated in various places and spaces through bodily practices (e.g., Bell et al., 1994; Blumen, 2007; Gibson-Graham, 1996b; McDowell

and Court, 1994; Sharp, 1996). Lise Nelson (1999), however, critiqued the uncritical leaning on Butler's performativity for overlooking connections between identity making and intentional acts, and between planned social change and lived spaces.

Another strand of geographical research combines post-structural and post-colonial influences, emphasizing the corporal embodiment of Otherness. Typical bodily features of disadvantaged groups, such as sex, race, age, ethnicity, disability and attire, which to a varied extent entail degradation (Datta, 2008), lock people in their bodies as a hegemonic practice of power relations, hence manipulating their sense of "feeling at home" in their own bodies. When such features are used to limit and compartmentalize people into specific areas and places, bodily features become an exclusionary spatial tool (Sibley, 1995). In this fashion, Nast and Pile (1998) show how bodily characteristics are crucial to the construction of masculinity and femininity in space. Exclusionary practices are largely researched in queer studies that report contestations and negotiation over material and symbolic spaces. For example, Weightman's pioneering work (1980, 1981) illustrates the role of gay bars in the public-private division of space and the maintenance of community life. Johnston and Longhurst (2010) point out the fluid geography ingrained in material and symbolic spaces, from the closet and the body to the public space of streets and cities, and to global and virtual spaces (see also Binnie and Valentine, 1999; Knopp, 2007).

These two research strands—performativity and post-structuralist/post-colonialist—indicate how social systems and discourses orchestrate the meaning of bodies as constructed and construed entities. In geography, Robyn Longhurst has propelled a third strand that copes with the dualism of the body by directly tackling its fleshy corporality. In particular, her work on pregnant bodies, which relies on Grosz's (1994) notion of the volatile body, illuminates the spatiality of the body with regard to the changing nature of its materiality and the fluidity of its boundaries, bearing the consequential connotations of contamination and abjection (Longhurst, 2000, 2001). This choice corresponds with and challenges the imprisonment of women by their physicality, highlighting the gendered construction of biological reproduction (see Bordo, 1993). Finally, unpacking the dualism of the body and how identities are inscribed into the flesh generates an understanding that, much like their respondents, researchers, too, are embodied by their disciplines and the topics they choose to study, often relying on their own bodies as an instrument of research (Longhurst, Ho and Johnston, 2007). Thus, what deserves epistemological (and ontological) attention is how the inseparability of our own bodies and mind, defined and framed within our physicality, inspires our interest in gender and feminist research. Do we consider our bodily being as "ghostly" (Crang, 2003:499), extraneous to the entire process of research making? To what degree do we feel at home when researching the lives of our respondents in the field as reflections of our sexed and gendered materiality/selves?

Where the body lives: The home

Similar to the body, home constitutes an intrinsic locus of meanings from which one's self develops and stretches out to the immediate and furthestmost physical and human environments. Home is a concept that inseparably entwines the materiality of location and space with the abstraction of domesticity. It is a fundamental element of human life foremost in the sense of shelter, security and safety, and it is imbued with connotations of enculturation as how to encounter the world. Most prominently, definitions of the home refer to identity, memory and emotions: the home is a material and an affective space, real or imagined, that is formative of personal and national identity and shaped by everyday practices, lived experiences, social relations, memories and emotions (Peil, 2009:180). It is also a space of paradoxical experiences and relationships, such as belonging and alienation, intimacy and violence, desire and fear, that lie at the heart of human life (Blunt and Varley, 2004:3). The negative experiences of home are useful stimuli for critical geographies of home because they seem to suggest opportunities for transformation and alternative domestic arrangements (Brickell, 2012). Following the changes in gender relations that second-wave feminism has impelled, we discuss the immensely significant transformation that has taken place within the home and in places beyond.

Home is a key issue for feminists, especially feminist geographers. In the Western context, home is considered one of "the most emotive geographical concepts," and geographers have tended to cling to its positive connotations (Duncan and Lambert, 2003:395). The home typically connotes family relations and is recognized as "a woman's place." This well-known slogan indicates that what it means to have a home, to feel at home, to be at home and the like differs between women and men, incorporating a series of attitudes, responsibilities, tasks, feelings and understandings that structure the experiences of home as gendered. It is, therefore, not surprising that the home has become a focus of attention for feminist research.

Feminist critique of the traditional view of the home as "a woman's place" is most commonly associated with Betty Friedan's (1963) seminal analysis of "the problem that has no name," namely, placing wifehood, motherhood and domesticity as the pivots of femininity and the idealized core of women's life. Much of second-wave feminism that followed Friedan's analysis focused on the need to unpack the social construction of this domesticated femininity and to endorse women's autonomy by facilitating equality in the public sphere, mostly in the world of paid work and welfare policy. Although largely influential, her understanding of the underlying geography of women's social disadvantage was hardly acknowledged. Friedan traced the obstructions for more meaningful lives for women to their being distanced and isolated as women, as a result of their location in detached suburban houses. In the

private sphere of their homes, women were expected to focus on reproductive and domestic work as the prime constituents of their identity. Although responsible for the functioning of the family and in charge of domestic consumption for the benefit of all members of the household, their financial power was limited, their domestic authority was restricted, and the needs of their husbands and children were normally prioritized. As isolated homemakers, they had limited access to social, economic and political resources, whereas opportunities to access such resources and the potential benefits they entail were naturally embedded in the life course of their male partners, who were usually engaged in paid work and additional activities in the public sphere. For these men, home was a refuge from the roughness of the outside world, even a site of leisure and recreation. While home and family life no doubt enhanced men's status and image, paid work and other public sphere activities equipped them with alternative, highly valued ways to structure their identity and standardize their masculinity (Madigan, Munro and Smith, 1990; Munro and Madigan, 1999; Oakley, 1974).

Women's participation in the public sphere was primarily (but not exclusively) conceived in terms of economic independence, and within less than two decades after the crisis that Friedan analyzed, women all across the Western world had joined the labor market. This move was hardly balanced by men, who remained reluctant to increase their involvement in unpaid domestic and family work, and the need to combine unpaid work with paid work became a distinctive brand of women's lives. In geography and in neighboring disciplines, feminists paid considerable attention to the confinement of women to the privacy of the home (and residential spaces in isolated suburbs), the resultant limiting pattern of their home-work relations, and their dependence on the provision and finance of adequate parental and domestic services in various locations (England and Lawson, 2005). This imbalance resonates Marxist theories of surplus value, with women's unpaid domestic work being recognized as the facilitator of urban decentralization and the suburban way of life (McDowell, 1983; Miller, 1983). It has become apparent that for women, the family home is primarily a place of work for which they are not paid, and hence it is where the impression of the totality of capitalism loses its color as it intersects with patriarchy (Gibson-Graham, 1996a:260). Accordingly, the home has been conceptualized as a site of women's oppression, where patriarchy takes a variety of forms, from direct domestic violence through economic dependence to socio-cultural vulnerability. Moreover, women's abilities to fulfill their (public) right to the city (to appropriate and to participate in urban creation) was found to largely depend on their right (to appropriate and participate) in their home; that is, their power to share responsibilities and to dictate family life is connected to their freedom to use public spaces (Fenster, 2005).

While the notion of separated spheres is a powerful tool for a gendered analysis, feminists have also criticized this imaginary "separation" on two central grounds.

First, this image reflects the ideal of the dominant white, middle-class, heterosexual, nuclear family, and it is historically and geographically specific. Second, empirical evidence from across the world has shown that the private and public spheres and their epitome of home–work relations are linked and interdependent. It was noted that the two spheres represent fluid entities which are mutually defined, and the delineation of one relies on the omission of activities, duties, privileges and people that typically mark the other (Hanson and Pratt, 1995; Kerber, 1988). It is, however, not insignificant that the rhetoric of the spheres, whether separated or linked, presents them as seemingly equivalent. Yet, the tendency to prioritize public sphere interests and promote profit-making, productive, capitalist concerns (as opposed to reproductive, domestic ones) is most apparent among individuals and institutions in family settings, workplace arrangements, policy-making contexts, political situations and other circumstances (e.g., Biggarta and O’Brien, 2010; Catlett and McKenry, 2004; Perlow, 1998). This hierarchy heavily relies on the power of the gendered identification of the private, domestic sphere as feminine and the public sphere as masculine, which is a deep-seated cultural code whose self-evident risks are being overlooked (see Pratt, 1997). However, the transformation of the home that followed second-wave feminism has not only propelled out women and brought in auxiliary labor; its effect has challenged the one-dimensional, authoritarian meaning of home.

The multiplicity of places we live in

Whereas the analytical view of the gendered nature of home life and its negative implications for women’s autonomy is widely accepted, empirical research has indicated that women’s attitudes toward their homes are positive and warmhearted (Blumen, 2000; Fenster, Forthcoming; Gurney, 1997; Saunders, 1990). Historical analyses show how public-sphere innovations and ideas, such as refrigerators, vacuum cleaners and efficient production, were imported and adopted enthusiastically into middle-class homes, transforming women’s daily performances of homemaking in a capitalist spirit (Marston, 2000, 2004; Miller, 1983). This suggests that the meaning of home is mixed and complicated in ways that go beyond gender hierarchy. This complexity is best exemplified by bell hook’s well-known work (1991) that unfolds the meaning of home for African-American women. The home is where women and men can share their public-sphere experiences of racial marginalization and unjustness, put themselves in the center, apply forms of resistance and develop solidarity that moderates and transcends, but does not wipe out, the power of patriarchy (hooks, 1991).

Class also disrupts the meaning of home for women (e.g., Gurney, 1997; Miller, 1983), especially when considering the effect of hired help, the majority of whom

are disadvantaged women who take the edge off the patriarchal burden for their more privileged counterpart employers. When hired help relocates to the employer's home, the meaning of the same home space is seriously fragmented and the attributes of privacy, family ties and un/paid work are mixed up (e.g., Gregson, 1994). The home becomes even more fractured and complex when domestic workers are from different races, non-citizens or illegal migrants.

The home can also serve as a working-place for its permanent residents who work for money at home. Examples includes rural women in peripheral areas who sew and quilt (Baylina and Garcia-Ramon, 2004; Oberhauser, 1995, 1997), women who combine their contesting domestic and work duties by locating both at home, and men and women in various locations who rely on communication technologies to generate income from within the home (e.g., Halford, 2006; Johnson, Andrey and Shaw, 2007; Sullivan and Lewis, 2001). This raises the issue of the division of domestic space itself and how the gendered meaning of some domestic parts (such as dens and kitchens) changes at the intersection of the performers and the type of performed activity (Bowlby, Gregory and McKie, 1997; Buckley, 1996; Massey, 1996; Munro and Madigan, 1999).

Maintaining the centrality of work, such contexts demonstrate the multiplicity that surrounds the home as a place and a concept, and explains why home is invested with so many, often controversial, feelings. However, it is worth mentioning that the focus on home as a feminine realm should not obscure how home is linked to different masculinities. The brief account above, that describes the home as a refuge from the roughness of the outside world, most clearly proclaims hegemonic masculinity in a Western fashion. Although men who abide by the ideal of hegemonic masculinity are not as closely engaged with their domestic life as are women, they nevertheless depend on the family home as a powerful icon of their successful performance as breadwinners, which indicates that they are much more likely than women to exercise home-work relations that validate the model of the separated spheres (Blumen, 2012). By the same token, the family home also implies that men who strive to facilitate such an icon are vulnerable to unemployment and susceptible to economic restructuring (e.g., Massey, 1996; McDowell, 2000; McDowell and Massey, 1984).

The domesticity of single men is designed to emphasize masculinity by moving away from the feminine and familial connotations and articulating technological skills and passion, involvement in leisure and partying, and interest in seducing women (Osgerby, 2005). For LGBT people, as Duncan (1996) claims, home and domesticity have been very significant as a "private" space that facilitates the construction of sexual identity and attachment, a heaven of privacy and self-identification. Valentine and Johnston (1995) discuss the experience of lesbian women in the UK and New Zealand to show how the inner space of the home allows them to create a sense of

sexual identity and to control their life within heterosexual society. But at the same time, the home space might be conceived as exclusionary and oppressive, especially for teenagers, young LGBT who still live with their parents or people who have not come out of the closet (at least in the more formal sense).¹ Valentine (1995) clarifies that home and domesticity are constructs of the heterosexual culture, reflecting heteronormative values to which young LGBT people cannot feel attached. Gorman-Murray (2007) adds to these insights the struggle of young gay men in Australia to create their domestic spaces in a way that reflects their own identity and values. The domesticity of gay men seems to be socially approved when reflecting a feminized and familial space, i.e., designed as heteronormative, but less favorable when inclining towards the bachelor style (Gorman-Murray, 2011). This point highlights the intersection of sexual identity with age and aging and the ways it reflects the attachments of old gay men (or other LGBT people) to the home and domestic spaces (Gorman-Murray, *Forthcoming*; Waitt and Gorman-Murray, 2007). In other research (Fenster, *Forthcoming*), Jewish Israeli immigrant women over the age of 70 identified the image of the home as a personified family dwelling, while Palestinian indigenous women of the same age perceived it as a homeland, highlighting its national context.

Whereas these various circumstances suggest that the home and domestic relations are politicized in ways that involve identity performances, they also draw attention to the typical sense of attachment and belonging embedded in the experience of “feeling at home.” Here, domesticity, i.e., home life in its more positive connotations, seems to link the self, the body and the home, as it is recognized that all three imply being and living in the world (Jamal, 2010). From the body—the home of the self, to the home—the place of the body, and to homish places and spaces beyond the home—the neighborhood, the city, the homeland and the planet, the environments that support human (and non-human) life are reshaped by human efforts, i.e., homemaking. These homes/environments are invested with emotions and hence contextualize the sense of belonging and the significance of “feeling at home” as an essential emotion. Such sites that extract emotions are representations of meaning that authenticate the concept of home as rich and multi-scalar, unrestricted to the place of dwelling or to family ties. It is noteworthy that such multiplicity is not predestined, but rather socially constructed and hierarchically ordered into categories of homes as containers of the self, helping to systemize the world and order reality on a daily basis (see also Marston, Jones and Woodward, 2005). This imaginary, multi-scalar order imposes a powerful hierarchy, with the home and the body at the bottom. Yet their un/enabling significance, both biologically and socially, facilitates the construction of spaces higher up in the hierarchy. Recent (mostly) feminist interest seems to do some justice to these two basic constituents of human life.

Note

1. See Sedgwick (1990) on coming out of the closet as a life process and Brown (2000) on later developments on closet spaces.

References

- Baylina, Mireia, and Garcia-Ramon, Maria Dolors. (2004). "Rural gender studies in Spain between 1975 and the present." In Henri Goverde, Henk de Haan and Mireia Baylina (eds.), *Power and Gender in European Rural Development* (pp. 160–170). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. (1989 c1949) *The Second Sex*. Translated by H. M. Parshley. New York: Vintage Books.
- Bell, David, Binnie, Jon, Cream, Julia, and Valentine, Gill. (1994). "All hyped up and no place to go." *Gender, Place and Culture* 1:31–47.
- Biggarta, Laura, and O'Brien, Margaret. (2010). "UK fathers' long work hours: Career stage or fatherhood?" *Fathering* 8:341–361.
- Binnie, Jon, and Valentine, Gill. (1999). "Geographies of sexuality: A review of progress." *Progress in Human Geography* 23,2:175–187.
- Blumen, Orna. (2000). "Dissonance in women's commuting? The experience of exurban employed mothers in Israel." *Urban Studies* 37:731–748.
- _____. (2007). "The performative landscape of going-to-work: On the edge of a Jewish ultraorthodox neighborhood." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25:803–831.
- _____. (2012). "Home–work relations and the spatialization of care: Wives on the margins of the Israeli high-tech industry." *Gender, Place and Culture* 19,1:102–117.
- Blunt, Alison, and Dowling, Robyn. (2006). *Home*. New York: Routledge.
- Blunt, Alison, and Varley, Ann. (2004). "Introduction: Geographies of home." *Cultural Geographies* 11:3–6.
- Bordo, Susan. (1993). *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture and the Body*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bowlby, Sophie, Gregory, Susan, and McKie, Linda. (1997). "'Doing home': Patriarchy, caring, and space." *Women's Studies International Forum* 20,3:343–350.

- Brickell, Katherine. (2012). "'Mapping' and 'doing' critical geographies of home." *Progress in Human Geography* 36,2:225–244.
- Brown, Michael. (2000). *Closet Space: Geographies of Metaphor from the Body to the Globe*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Buckley, Sandra. (1996). "A guided tour of the kitchen: Seven Japanese domestic tales." *Society and Space* 14:441–462.
- Butler, Judith. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Catlett, Beth Skilken, and McKenry, Patrick. (2004). "Class-based masculinities: Divorce, fatherhood, and the hegemonic ideal." *Fathering* 2:165–190.
- Crang, Mike. (2003). "Qualitative methods: Touchy, feely, look-see?" *Progress in Human Geography* 27:494–504.
- Datta, Ayona. (2008). "Spatialising performance: Masculinities and femininities in a 'fragmented' field." *Gender, Place and Culture* 15,2:189–204.
- Davis, Kathy. (2007). *The Making of Our Bodies, Ourselves: How Feminism Travels Across Borders*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Duncan, James S., and Lambert, David. (2003). "Landscapes of home." In J. S. Duncan, N. C. Johnson and R. H. Schein (eds.), *A Companion to Cultural Geography* (pp. 382–403). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Duncan, Nancy. (1996). "Renegotiating gender and sexuality in public and private spaces." In Nancy Duncan (ed.), *Bodyspace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality* (pp. 127–145). London: Routledge.
- England, Kim, and Lawson, Victoria. (2005). "Feminist analyses of work: Rethinking the boundaries, gendering, and spatiality of work." In Lise Nelson and Joni Seager (eds.), *A Companion to Feminist Geography* (pp. 77–92). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Fenster, Tovi. (2005). "The right to the gendered city: Different formations of belonging in everyday life." *Journal of Gender Studies* 14,3:217–231.
- _____. (Forthcoming). "Moving between addresses: Home and belonging for Jewish migrant and indigenous Palestinian women over 70 in Israel." *Home Culture*.
- Firestone, Shulamith. (1970). *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case of Feminist Revolution*. New York: William Morrow.
- Friedan, Betty. (1963). *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Norton.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. (1996a). *The End of Capitalism (As we Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

- _____. (1996b). "Reactions on postmodern feminist social research." In Nancy Duncan (ed.), *BodySpace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality* (pp. 234–244). London: Routledge.
- Gorman-Murray, Andrew. (2007). "Reconfiguring domestic values: Meaning of home for gay men and lesbians." *Housing, Theory and Society* 24,3:229–246.
- _____. (2011). "'This is disco-wonderland!' Gender, sexuality and the limits of gay domesticity on the block." *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12:5, 435-453.
- Gorman-Murray, Andrew (2013). "Liminal Subjects, Marginal Spaces and Material Legacies: Older Gay Men, Home and Belonging". In: Yvette Taylor and Michelle Addison (eds), *Queer Presence and Absences*, Hampshire and New-York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 93-117.
- Gregson, Nicky. (1994). *Servicing the Middle Classes: Class, Gender and Waged Domestic Labour in Contemporary Britain*. London: Routledge.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. (1994). *Volatile Bodies, Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gurney, C. M. (1997). "'Half of me was satisfied': Making sense of home through episodic ethnographies." *Women's Studies International Forum* 20,3:373–386.
- Halford, Susan. (2006). "Collapsing the boundaries? Fatherhood, organization and home-working." *Gender, Work & Organization* 13:383–402.
- Hanson, Susan, and Pratt, Geraldine. (1995). *Gender, Work, and Space*. London: Routledge.
- hooks, bell. (1991). *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. London: Turnaround.
- Jamal, Amal. (2010). "Place, home and being: The dialectics of the real and the imagined in the conception of Palestinian domesticity." In Ariela Azoulay (ed.), *Homeless Home* (pp. 338–364). Jerusalem: Museum on the Seam.
- Johnson, Laura C., Andrey, Jean, and Shaw, Susan M. (2007). "Mr. Dithers comes to dinner: Telework and the merging of women's work and home domains in Canada." *Gender, Place and Culture* 14:141–161.
- Johnston, Lynda, and Longhurst, Robyn. (2010). *Space, Place and Sex, Geographies of Sexualities*. Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kerber, Linda K. (1988). "Separate spheres, female worlds, woman's place: The rhetoric of women's history." *The Journal of American History* 229:9–39.
- Knopp, Larry. (2007). "On the relationship between queer and feminist geographies." *The Professional Geographer* 59,1:47–55.
- Longhurst, Robyn. (1997). "(Dis)embodied geographies." *Progress in Human Geography* 21,4:486–501.

- _____. (2000). "'Corporeographies' of pregnancy: 'Bikini babes'." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18:453–472.
- _____. (2001). *Bodies. Exploring Fluid Boundaries*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Longhurst, Robyn, Ho, Elsie, and Johnston, Lynda. (2007). "Using 'the body' as an 'instrument of research': Kimch'i and pavlova." *Area* 40,2:208–217.
- Madigan, Ruth, Munro, Moira, and Smith, Susan J. (1990). "Gender and the meaning of the home." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 14,4:625–647.
- Marston, Sallie. (2000). "The social construction of scale." *Progress in Human Geography* 24:219–242.
- _____. (2004). "A long way from home: Domesticating the social production of scale." In Eric Sheppard and Robert B. McMaster (eds.), *Scale and Geographic Inquiry: Nature, Society, and Method* (pp.170–191). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Marston, Sallie A., Jones III, John Paul and Woodward, Keith. (2005). "Human geography without scale." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30:416–432.
- Massey, Doreen. (1996). "Masculinity, dualisms and high technology." In Nancy Duncan (ed.), *BodySpace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality* (pp. 109–126). London: Routledge.
- McDowell, Linda. (1983) "Toward an understanding of the gender division of urban space." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 1:15–30.
- _____. (2000). "The trouble with men? Young people, gender transformation and the crisis of masculinity." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24:201–209.
- McDowell, Linda, and Court, Gill. (1994). "Performing work: Bodily representations in merchant banks." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12:727–750.
- McDowell, Linda, and Massey, Doreen. (1984). "Woman's place?" In Doreen Massey and John Allen (eds.), *Geography Matters! A Reader* (pp. 124–147). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, in association with the Open University.
- Miller, Roger. (1983) "The Hoover in the garden: Middle-class women and suburbanization, 1850–1920." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 1:73–87.
- Munro, Moira, and Madigan, Ruth. (1999). "Negotiating space in the family home." In Irene Cieraad (ed.), *At Home: An Anthropology of Domestic Space* (pp. 107–117). Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Nast, Heidi, and Pile, Steve (eds.). (1998). *Places Through the Body*. London: Routledge.
- Nelson, Lise. (1999). "Bodies (and spaces) do matter: The limits of performativity." *Gender, Place and Culture* 6:331–353.
- Oakley, Ann. (1974). *The Sociology of Housework*. London: Martin Robertson.

- Oberhauser, Ann M. (1995). "Gender and household economic strategies in rural Appalachia." *Gender, Place and Culture* 2:51–70.
- _____. (1997). "The home as 'field': Households and homework in rural Appalachia." In John Paul Jones III, Heidi J. Nast and Susan M. Roberts (eds.), *Thresholds in Feminist Geography* (pp. 165–182). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Osgerby, Bill. (2005). "The bachelor pad as cultural icon: Masculinity, consumption and interior design in American men's magazines, 1930–65." *Journal of Design History* 18:99–113.
- Peil, Tina. (2009). "Home." In Nigel Thrift and Rob Kitchin (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography* (pp. 180–184). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Perlow, Leslie A. (1998). "Boundary control: The social ordering of work and family time in a high-tech corporation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43:328–357.
- Pratt, Geraldine. (1997). "Geographic metaphors in feminist theory." In Susan Hardy Aiken, Ann E. Brigham, Sallie A. Marston and Penny M. Waterstone (eds.), *Making Worlds: Gender, Metaphor, Materiality* (pp. 13–30). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Saunders, Peter. (1990). *A Nation of Home Owners*. London: Unwin-Hyman.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. (1990). *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sharp, Joanne P. (1996). "Gendering nationhood: A feminist engagement with national identity." In Nancy Duncan (ed.), *Bodyspace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality* (pp. 97–108). London: Routledge.
- Sibley, David. (1995). *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*. London: Routledge.
- Sullivan, Cath, and Lewis, Suzan. (2001). "Home-based telework, gender and the synchronization of work and family: Perspective of teleworkers and their co-residents." *Gender, Work & Organization* 8:123–145.
- Valentine, Gill. (1995). "Out and about: Geographies of lesbian landscapes." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 19,1:96–111.
- _____. (2001). *Social Geographies: Space and Society*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.
- Valentine, Gill, and Johnston, Lynda. (1995). "Wherever I lay my girlfriend, that's my home: The performance and surveillance of lesbian identities in domestic environments." In David Bell and Gill Valentine (eds.), *Mapping Desire* (pp. 76–99). London: Routledge.
- Waite, Gordon, and Gorman-Murray, Andrew. (2007). "Homemaking, spatialities and scale." *Gender, Place and Culture* 14:569–584.

The body within home and domesticity

- Weightman, Barbara. (1980). "Gay bars as private places." *Landscape Research* 23:9–16.
- _____. (1981). "Community: Towards a geography of the gay community." *Journal of Cultural Geography* 1:106–112.