

No. 134

**Home-based Workplaces and Workplace Domesticities:
A Socio-Spatial Analysis**

Kay Mohlman

Department of Sociology
National University of Singapore
10 Kent Ridge Crescent
Singapore 119260

E-mail: sockm@nus.edu.sg
Fax: 65-7779579

ISSN 0129-8186
ISBN 981-3033-23-1
All rights reserved

Home-based Workplaces and Workplace Domesticities: A Socio-Spatial Analysis

Kay Mohlman¹

Studies of home-based production in small-scale manufacturing and handicrafts offer competing images of the household-workplace relationship. Some researchers treat the home setting as a static backdrop to the dynamic story of how economic activities originate and grow in a home setting, and possibly outgrow the limits of household capacities (Andersen 1982; Strassman 1987; Staley and Morse 1965). Others assume that when work is located in the home, the household is an all-powerful regulator and organizer of production whereby the "logic" of kinship means that the labour process need only to be grafted onto what already exists (Lipton 1982; Portes and Walton 1981).

To assume the home is either a passive stage for production, or its overarching master blueprint, are contrasting views that in fact make up two sides of the same coin. Neither of these perspectives takes into account the possibility that there may be tremendous variability in how people and space of the home may overlap with, bisect, or stand completely apart from the home-based workplace. A survey of literature on home-based work from Mexico, Colombia, Hong Kong, Spain, Italy, and the Philippines, and from ethnic and immigrant enclaves of the United States, indicates notable differences in the social and spatial make-up of home-based workplaces.² Workforces may consist of single or multiple household members (often but not always female), their blood relations, ritual kin, friends and neighbors, or outsiders. Work may be limited to a single corner of a room, invade the entire house, or occur at the boundaries of the household in places such as garages, yards, or alleyways. Yet the social consequences of these permutations of people and space in home-based production remain largely unanalysed.

These differences matter because they allow for a more nuanced analysis of how the home and the home-based workplace reflexively shape one another. The variable placement of work areas vis-a-vis the home means that the organization of work is differentially constructed *through* the people and the space of the home. We can therefore study the home-based workplace comparatively to analyse the social consequences of variation from a sociology of work

perspective. However, the same variation in home-workplace organization has implications for the social construction of home life and the domestic sphere, thus also illuminating what could be called a sociology of domesticity. This paper first lays out a systematic account of how home-based workplaces vary in their social and spatial organization, then addresses the consequences of this variation from each kind of orientation--that pertaining to the sociology of work and economic life, and that related to a sociology of home and the domestic sphere.

The motivation for undertaking this analysis comes from trying to make sense of the work and home lives of small-scale producers encountered during this author's earlier research in the Philippines among small-scale shoemakers working out of their homes (see Mohlman 1994). Many of the examples discussed reflect the organizational possibilities of the particular conditions of production in *this* industry, in *this* place. For instance, in the district of Metropolitan Manila that was the research site of the earlier study, both men and women are directly involved in home-based footwear production: women typically make the upper part of the shoe, while men work on the sole and sew the shoe top and bottom together. Shoemaking businesses range from individual subcontracted family homeworkers, to small-scale home-based workshops located in front rooms and kitchens staffed by family and hired workers, to larger-scale workshops in yards or buildings directly adjacent to employers' homes with hired employees and family managers. Thus, the Philippine leather and synthetic shoemaking industry offers a wide range of variation by gender and by scale and location of production in relation to the home; variation not necessarily found in other types of home-based industry where the work might be limited to women only, or individual homeworkers only, or to the household interior only.

In the interest of exploring the more generalizable aspects of variation in home-based work, the analysis developed here is also built on examples taken from studies of other home-based industries in countries outside the Philippines. Together with the Philippine cases, the non-Philippine examples provide further evidence for how home-based workplaces of different social composition and physical layout shape the social and spatial organization of both the workplace and the home. The composite picture build up from these diverse examples suggests that the study of home-work overlap presents a common set of analytical issues across mostly urban, small-scale production settings under study here that vary by region and by craft or manufacturing specialty.

I. Typologizing Home-Based Production

The issues posed here stem from a mid-level organizational approach to the study of home-based industry and handicrafts that can enrich what we already know about the subject from recent studies combining macro- and micro-level approaches, particularly those that address homework and subcontracting networks (Allen and Wolkowitz 1987; Benería and Roldán 1987; Benton 1990; Boris and Daniels 1989; Fernandez-Kelly 1989; Liu 1994; Nash and Fernandez-Kelly 1983; Portes, et. al. 1989; Portes and Walton 1981; Ward 1990). Home-based production is analysed here as a residential phenomenon, meaning a work organization that includes the home (shelter), the household, and the socio-spatial environment that extends outward from the home. According to Kemeny, who advances the concept of residence as an alternative mode of theorizing housing and the household, residence "constitutes an intermediate, meso level between large-scale macro societal processes and individual level micro interaction" (1992: 11).

It is precisely the variability of the home-based workplace in its residential context that has not been sufficiently explored. Authors of recent work on home-based production treat variation in the socio-spatial organization of the home-based workplace only incidentally. Many study home production to engage in higher-level theorizing about how the home, as a concealed and non-regulated workspace, accords with the demands of a restructured global capitalist system that taps gender and kin relations in the family to lower production costs (Benton 1990; Fernandez-Kelly 1989; Nash and Fernandez-Kelly 1983; Portes et. al. 1989; Portes and Walton 1981; Ward 1990; Wilson 1993). Complementing this macro-approach is a micro-scale focus on how industrial homework in particular reinforces gender ideologies within the home when it is carried out by female outworkers who end up doing double duty as both producers and homemakers (Allen and Wolkowitz 1987; Benería and Roldán 1987; Boris and Daniels 1989; Dangler 1994; Fernandez-Kelly 1989; Liu 1994; Nash and Fernandez-Kelly 1983; Portes, et. al. 1989; Portes and Walton 1981; Ward 1990). When researchers study home-based workplaces to illuminate these macro-micro linkages, the key issues about the home are those that have to do with its status as a premier place of "insidership." All social consequences of home-based production for the household itself are posed in reference to the home as an inward-focused, self-contained unit. This leaves some compelling questions unasked that pertain to the mutual construction of work and home when outsiders to the home are involved in production, as well as when the location of production is adjacent to or near the home rather than directly inside it.

Conceptualizing Differences in the Organization of Home-based Production

To develop a comparative typology of the social organization of home-based production, we first need to think about why and how home-based workplaces vary in their organization at all. A single home-based workplace takes on different forms over time because it grows or shrinks. Thus, a household worksite routinely limited to the kitchen or living room may spread to auxiliary areas of the home, such as basements or patios, as production expands (Alonso 1983: 164; Benería 1989: 177; Fernandez-Kelly 1989: 262). Observing the layout of workshop-based knitwear production in a Mexican community, Wilson notes:

Most workshops began in backrooms of the old houses in the centre of town. As businesses expanded, sweater making activities spilled into the passageways and central patios. Later, an expanding workshop would either acquire property next door or construct new brick buildings at the back of the house. (1991: 90)

Benería and Roldán describe the changes in social relations of production from growth in industrial outwork in Mexico City as follows:

...some [homeworking] seamstresses who own their own machines tend to employ young women who are paid either time or piece wages. Thus the seamstresses can exercise direct control over their 'employees,' contrary to the indirect control held by the jobber. We then have a situation in which the worker who has semiproletarian status vis-a-vis the jobber, workshop, or factory establishes relations of production of a semicapitalistic character with other workers. (1987: 67)

Lipton uses the concept of "fungibility" to express the idea that poor rural dwellers use space in their homes flexibly to maximize their meagre resources, so that household residents use the same room for work at one time and for living space at another, as suits their needs (1980). One source of organizational diversity among home-based businesses, then, is developmental or spatial use cycles across the life span of a home-based business.

Complementing this dynamic picture, it is also possible to see organizational diversity within a cross-section of home-based workplaces at one point in time. Places with concentrations of small-scale industrial or handicraft enterprises are likely to include home-based businesses of contrasting sizes and spatial layouts, unless the activity is such that it cannot be located at the site of the home. Comparing the social organization of small-scale producers originates from the anthropological precedent of looking at the social organization of village-based handicrafts, many of which are home-based.

Littlefield (1979) and Cook (1984) examine the hammock, weaving, and brick industries

of rural Mexico to show how regional capitalist dynamics create new forms of workplace organization among household and family-based small-scale producers. Discussing the organization of industrial homework in Mexico City, Alonso finds some home-based workplaces with individual homeworker seamstresses, others with a primary seamstress assisted by members of her family, still others with a family workforce plus extra-household workers, and, finally, a few households where the seamstress-manager doesn't work herself but simply oversees her own hired workforce (Alonso 1983:163-164). Mohlman (1994: Chapter 5) documents the variable spatial as well as social composition of home-based workplaces in a Philippine community specializing in shoemaking.

Extrapolating from these examples, we can conceive of household-based industry varying by who is involved in it and where it takes place in relation to household living space. The social organization of home-based manufacturing or handicraft production is most accurately visualized as a range of possibilities rather than a fixed form. This idea is portrayed in the following schema:

Conceptual Schema of the Social and Spatial Organization of Household-based Production

family-household	extra-household &	mostly extra-household
workforce; production done in interior space of the home	household workers present, and/or workspace detached from house, either adjacent or near to it	workers; workspace separate from house and elements of home life and work life minimally overlap
I-----I		
home as total institution of production	home as partial institution of production	nearly complete separation of household and worksite

Referring to the text above the dotted line, the extreme left-hand side of the spectrum represents the conditions of most homeworking situations, where the workforce is made up of a resident individual or multiple household members, and work space overlaps with living space. The extreme right hand side signifies conditions under which production is almost completely detached from the home. In intermediate cases, the workforce may be enlarged, as when extra-household workers are present, or the work space may be extended, as when work areas occupy perimeter or threshold areas of the home.

The continuum reflects the organization of a home as well as a worksite. The text underneath the line signifies the degree to which social and spatial elements of home are institutionalized as aspects of the production process. The approach provides a way to think systematically about the relationship between the home as a social unit and as a spatial entity. In this regard, it underscores Kemeny's call for a sociology of housing that overcomes the limitations of having different social science disciplines address the physical and social aspects of home (1992: 155-156).

If our purpose is to understand small-scale production as the interaction of two social institutions--the workplace and the home--then we must allow for the possibility that home can still influence work, and vice versa, even when the two do not completely overlap. That home can be a partial, rather than total institution of production is the conceptual category advanced here to express that possibility. Having established the parameters of variation, we can now consider how differences in the social and spatial organization of home-based work illuminate a sociological analysis of both work and home.

II. Using Home-Workplace Arrangements to Better Understand the Social Organization of Work

Authors of recent literature on homework and home-based workshops describe work in home-based workplaces as structured by the ideology of family as a private domestic unit (Liu 1994: 153) or by gender and family ideologies that together make up a household model of labor relations (Wilson 1993: 68, 77). Blanket assertions like these may make sense when studying home-based workplaces that are organizationally similar, such as the work routines of individual homeworkers. However, when researchers include household workshops of different sizes and layouts involving different kinds of labour composition in their studies, to presume a homogenizing ideology across cases provides no justification for why one need bother investigating the social consequences of different types of social and spatial workplace organization. A starting point that does motivate investigation is to simply ask, how do home and work intersect? Possible answers include completely, somewhat, and minimally. Each of these possibilities, and their consequences for the organization of work, are explored in turn below.

Complete Home-Work Integration in Interior Living Space

Certain arrangements of home-based work demonstrate that the type of work people do and the way they do it are heavily determined by imperatives of what could be termed a "domestic regime," meaning a set of routines and beliefs closely associated with the home and women's role as homemaker. For instance, Liu quotes three female homeworkers from Hong Kong as follows:

I stop doing outwork at about 5:30pm and clean up the dirt. This is a problem of stitching garments. Threads coming out from clothes make the sitting room very 'dusty'...I clean up the mess and move the materials to the balcony...My husband does not like to see me doing outwork with piles of clothes in the sitting room when he comes back from work. He says that it doesn't look like a home. So I rarely work in the evening.

For woolen garment production, seasonal fluctuation is a serious problem. Its slack season is in winter and one factory sent me piles of materials to work for two weeks. I didn't work for them again after one order because the materials are too bulky. They occupy a lot of space in our small flat.

I've tried ribbon flower assembly for a short while. The chemicals smell. My kids get allergic and so I quit. (Liu 1994: 153, 157)

Here, informants make decisions about work by socially-negotiated reckonings of what impact it will have on their home. To these women, providing a liveable environment for children and ensuring adequate family space (as opposed to work space) and the order associated with home take priority over work requirements. Even informants' negotiations with other family members--and with their own consciences--about what kind of work they will take in and how they will do it demonstrate a kind of emotional labor given over to the concerns of home and family.

This is not the only work arrangement that may be structured by a domestic regime. People from outside the household may also participate in a work setting that overlaps with everyday living space. Most commonly, homeworkers or home-based employers mobilize the labor of neighbors, relatives, and friends (see Benton 1990: 107; Portes and Walton 1981: 98-99). Wilson describes how some Mexican employers who needed workers for their knitwear workshop, located in a family house, recruited extra workers via networks of "old school friends and former domestic workers--women who were accustomed to come to the [employers'] houses" (1991: 79). Prior social familiarity or household insidership makes it possible for employers to integrate extra-household workers into a domestically-regulated workplace.

More rarely, it is also possible for people with distant or no connections to the employer to work in settings where living space and production space overlap. Mohlman (1994: 326-331) describes the social dynamics of a home-based shoemaking workshop in Manila, situated in the employer's kitchen and downstairs living area, where two male employees who were unrelated to the employer actually lived with the family in the house. Other employees lived in their own homes but came to the household workplace daily. Work routines and household routines permeated one another completely: female employees cut out and decorated shoe uppers on the same kitchen table the family used for eating during mealtimes. The employing husband and wife alternated between working at the centrally-located sewing machine and carrying out household chores according to the daily rhythms of washing, eating, cleaning, and caring for their four school-aged children. The live-in employees slept in the upstairs sitting room and took meals with the family at the kitchen table. The workers' presence, especially that of the live-in workers, served only to enhance features of the domestic regime.

Partial Home-Work Integration in the Home or Household Periphery

When household production goes on in rooms separate from household living space, the potential exists for work to be less than fully regulated by domestic regimes. At the simplest level, when work is cordoned off into a separate room, householders can forego efforts to transform living space into production space to proceed with work, or production space into living space to end work. Benton reports that in a 1982 survey of 406 homeworkers in Spain, 25% allocated a separate room in their house for homework (1990: 117, 120). When work is carried out in a household space designated as work space *and* performed by people from outside the household, there is even more of a possibility that work and home will begin to comprise two separate domains:

By capitalizing on their scarce skills and experience, some Cuban women have even become subcontractors, employing neighbors and relatives and transforming so-called Florida rooms (the covered porches typical of Miami houses) into sewing shops

(Fernandez-Kelly 1989: 262)

At the time of fieldwork, the small unit of twenty workers (all women)...was managed by [one] woman. The enterprise was an underground workshop whose employees assembled electronic components on the patio of the woman's house

(Benería 1989: 177).

The authors who make these observations do not supply details of workplace-household dynamics. The somewhat makeshift nature of the household areas mentioned, porches and patios, indicates they may lack privacy and protection from the elements. We can surmise, then, that the employer's home in these instances would continue to serve as a kind of "mother ship" in the overall production process. With access to household living space only a few steps away, workers presumably enter the home to use facilities such as toilets or kitchens, get supplies, or store goods when they finish working. In contrast to the domestically-regulated workplaces mentioned previously, workers' forays into household living space in the present cases underscore the nascent differentiation of work life from home life.

Evidence from a Mexican case study suggests that segregated workspace in the home is not always regulated space:

Several workers...recalled their determination to find time during the day to stop sewing, relax and chat, which was still possible especially when the owner was frequently traveling and when they worked in several small rooms of the owners' house that could not be supervised. It had been a fairly conscious strategy of 'go slow' to demonstrate that they were people and not just workers, and to thwart the mounting demands that the owners were making on them to improve quality.

(Wilson 1991: 143)

When employers designate work areas as distinct from living areas in the home, they lose the ability to oversee the workplace simply in the course of carrying out everyday routines of family life. Although Becker notes that constant interruptions suffered by those working in combined living space and production space can undermine workers' commitment to the job (1981: 200), in another sense, combined home-work areas make it possible for participants to continuously monitor production by means of a double vision whereby the same people, and the same space, are the seat of home life and work life. Ironically, it may be when home-based workers or employers decide to "get serious" about the work and establish a specialized area for it that their ability to vigilantly observe it decreases. Production quartered in segregated areas of the home or household-periphery can lack grounding, being neither institutionalized in socio-spatial routines of the home, nor standing fully apart from the home within its own boundaries.

Residential Production: Separate but Potentially Connected Home and Workplace

A third type of work organization is typically overlooked as home-based production, yet deserves to be treated as such. Many authors think of production carried out in converted

garages, sheds, or small buildings separate from but adjacent to the home, which they term workshops or even small factories, as belonging to a classification of work organization that has nothing to do with the home. It is as if the existence of different structures for home and work--and the likelihood that they embody two distinct institutional forms--precludes researchers from analyzing any ongoing connection between the two, even if home and workplace are only a few steps away from each other. However, this kind of organization warrants consideration in because as long as worksite and household are close to each other, production in these cases can still be considered residential, in the sense that Kemeny defines it, even if it takes place beyond the strict confines of the home:

'Residence' as a concept directs attention to the dwelling as home, but within its locational context...[it] carries many social connotations, particularly concerning the ways in which individuals or households tie into wider circles of locality, and beyond...It embeds housing issues in their locational and wider social context, thereby shifting the emphasis away from the bricks and mortar implications of 'housing' towards social dimensions.*

(* Kemeny's emphasis)

(Kemeny 1992: 10-11)

Analyzing home-based production as a subset of residential production allows the observer to cast a larger net around the gamut of possible social and spatial dynamics that characterize small-scale work organization. The concept provides a basis for considering how and to what extent connections between home and work might exist when the two occupy distinct but proximate realms.

Household members alone may comprise the workforce of near-home, detached worksites. Niehoff describes such an example from research he carried out in the early 1970's on what he calls "household manufacturing" in rural Taiwan, where family members from individual households financed, built, and staffed detached workshops in activities such as plastic injection and plastic recycling (1987: 279). Much more typically, labor forces in structures separate from the home consist of people from outside the employer's household, with the variable addition of household members as fellow workers or managers. The fact that a separate structure for work exists is a good indication that the scale of the work in detached worksites exceeds the labor capacity of household members alone.

Connections between home and workplace in these cases vary from the regular to the haphazard. Some home-workplace connections occur as the product of conscious design. Blim, found that small-scale Italian shoemakers who acquired enough resources to construct new housing for themselves chose to retain links between home and the production site (1990: 132-

133). Other times the carry-over from home to work appears almost incidental, as in this Mexican example of a small knitwear workshop with eleven workers:

*Raul's workshop is in a two-storied brick building adjoining his house...On the ground floor are the looms...and on the first floor, reached by an outside staircase, is the sewing room...In the workshop Raul is not a strict taskmaster nor does he enforce a harsh work discipline. **His wife comes in now and again though [she] has not played a major role in management or production...****

*(my emphasis added)

(Wilson 1990: 130-131)

What distinguishes these two cases from ones mentioned in previous sections is that ties between work and home, whether extensive or tenuous, represent the relationship between two distinct spheres. While the two spheres do not necessarily reflect differences in order and identity that are as great as that between home and bureaucracy, as illustrated in the work of Dovey (1985: 56) the division here at least embodies the activities of an idiosyncratic order (home) on the one hand, and a routinized, in some cases proto-bureaucratic order (workplace) on the other.

Wilson interprets the social dynamics of residential workplaces as demonstrating what she calls the household model of workshop relations, where “gender and generational hierarchies are carried over from the household to organise workshop social relations” (1991: 197). Employers and employees in the small-scale Mexican workshops she studied replicated inequalities between male and female, young and old, that characterize the social relations of the family. For the purposes of the present essay, Wilson’s approach falls short because she is less interested in explaining the connections *between* home and workplace, than in using home as a template to explain particular features of work. Using household social relations as a model of workshop relations is not the same as looking at the actual, ongoing connections between home and workplace.

For instance, the concept of paternalism cannot account for differences in the spatial organization of home and workspace. This is illustrated by comparing two home-based workplaces of Philippine shoemakers that are run paternalistically. Each has highly personalized and gendered relations of production, and male heads of households as workshop managers. In one workshop, however, domestic space and workspace overlap completely while in another, the workers not only have their own workspace, but also their own toilets and other amenities. In an interview with the manager of the second workshop, he says,

...the things we provide for workers are theirs alone. We buy things for them. For instance, the glasses, the cups..We won't use them ourselves. We provide things for them, like the washbasins. They have their own separate ones, we had them made for the workers...

(Mohlman 1994: 322)

Although similar household-based ideologies of inequality pervade the two workshops, in one, paternalism is actually constructed through the domestic sphere of the employer's household, while in the other this is not the case. The sensory and tactile evidence of what difference this makes comes from the fact that in the workshop where workers live and labour in the employer's home, they are literally eating off the of same plates, drinking from the same cups, and using the same toilets as the employer and his family members. While paternalism may involve similar manifestations of status inequality by age and gender in the two workshops, there is no question that the social distance through which paternalistic relations are expressed between employers and workers in the two cases differs dramatically, as indicated by these examples.

As with the completely integrated and partially integrated home-workplaces, ties between home and work when production is done in detached workshops encompass both material and social aspects of production. Interior living space can house supplies or function as storage space, so that the home is an adjunct site for phases of production. In a detached, 45-employee shoemaking workshop in Manila, employees went to the employer's house to get rubber cement when stocks ran low (Mohlman 1994: Chapter 5).³ The home can also play a part in workers' sustenance. One employer offered home-based amenities to extra-household workers, such as access to the TV during breaks and cold water from the household refrigerator. In cases where employees might actually live in the detached workshop (not uncommon among small enterprises in the Philippine study), some workers' food supplies were provided for via the household. The employer collected money from each worker every week and had the household maid buy the requisite amount of food for the workers, which the workers themselves prepared in their own workshop-based kitchen.

Ties between home and workplace can also be based on commerce. In one workshop, workers bought popsicles from either the female manager of the workshop (who made the items in her household freezer), or from her maid, the one or other of them strolling through the workshop with the items in a bucket, calling out "ice candy for sale" in the style of a street vendor. And in another complex consisting of the employer's household-workshop-*sari-sari* (dry goods) store, workshop employees walked around the corner during their breaks to buy

snacks and cigarettes from the small shop fronting the employer's home and staffed by his niece (all examples from Mohlman 1994: Chapter 5).

Domestic servants may also cross over spatial and occupational boundaries separating household from workshop. Again referring to the Philippine shoemaking industry, some maids and houseboys proceeded from working as household servants to functioning as full-time employees in the household-based workshop. Others carried out alternating tasks of housekeeping and shoemaking across the two environments in the course of a workday (Mohlman 1994: Chapter 5). Thus the employer's home and the detached residential workplace were connected by household labour migration or labour circulation. The proximity of household and workplace facilitated this exchange.

That maids and houseboys laboured in the workshop as well as the home was a result of their own volition in some cases, while in others it happened at the behest of the employer. If a detached workshop is adjacent to the employer's home, domestic servants have easy access to the workshop in their off-hours, and may see it as desirable to socialize with others more like themselves and pick up new skills. Alternatively, they may put time in at the residential workshop because employers deem it fitting for "their" servant to take care of family property. Whatever the case, servants' presence in the residential workshop represent the continuing social connection of home and workplace even after the two spheres are no longer spatially integrated.⁴

Summary

Most social science literature on home-based production leaves a lingering impression that home functions as a total institution for workplace relations. Authority relations between employers and workers presumably flow through the same channels as do authority relations within the family. Work space is supposed to be regulated by an all-pervasive social control derived from the intimacy of the social space of family life. Production carried out at the site of the home is thought of as non-rationalized because the affective demands of family and kin come first. These characterizations hold true for some, but not all forms of household-based production. Given certain kinds of social composition and spatial layout, as well as managerial proclivities, home-based operations may also operate by means of relatively impersonal authority and more rationalized social control. They may be *at* the home, but not necessarily *of* it.

Moreover, home-based production is not necessarily a scaled-down, simplistic version of more complex social organization found in larger workshops or factories. Although there is a burgeoning literature on the complexities of subcontracting networks in industrial homework, we still lack adequate accounts of the possible complexities of the home-based worksite itself. The nested, adjacent, and separate home-work configurations outlined above are not mutually exclusive types of social organization. Production spaces can be half-inside, half outside a home; spread across multiple households belonging to the same family, or even across multiple worksites within the same large household (for examples see Mohlman 1994: Chapter 5). A comparative analysis of home-based production as it relates to the social organization of work demands a careful look at how the household and its attendant kinship ties, status and power relations within the family, interior spaces, surrounding environment, and extra-household labor, help to construct the way people organize themselves in a home-based workplace.

III. Using Home-Workplace Connections to Better Understand the Social Construction of Home

The above section discussed how the variable overlap of home and work shapes the workplace. We can now turn to how this overlap affects home, and take as our sociological issue how home-based work shapes the domestic sphere. Domesticity is not the home itself, but the practices and subjective experiences of occupying a living space--or, as some authors put it, of "living a room" (Wood and Beck 1994: xvii).

Recent literature on domesticity underscores the idea that there is nothing natural or given about the existence of home life. Domesticity must be actively defined, created, and maintained (Rybycinski 1986; Hansen 1992). Hence, we assume that the presence of home-based workplaces in or adjacent to household living spaces variably affects the social construction of domestic life. The following section examines the impact of work upon home as it shapes household cycles and boundaries, household identities, and the built environment of home.

Work and the Sensory Home

The first impact of work upon the home is a phenomenological one. Production located in interior living space is a vital part of the sensory and kinesthetic core that make up the intimate environment of home. Work carried on in the household interior imposes distinctive movements,

shapes, textures, sounds and smells upon an environment that, by definition, already evokes a heightened perceptual sensitivity among inhabitants because the experience of home is closely tied to the experience of identity (Bachelard 1994; Marcus 1995). Even a young child who lacks a conceptual understanding of work still apprehends its paraphernalia, such as florescent lighting, machine or hammering sounds, and smells of acrylic cloth, wood or glue, as part of the undifferentiated sensory reality of household space.

...it is the sequential and recurrent repetition of actions and meanings and the regular involvement of people, places, and processes that create a sense of rhythm, and the sense of regular rhythm that in turn gives one a sense of home. A number of authors have stressed that the home is a rhythmic place and that the development of rhythmic patterns contributes to the transformation from a house to a home...

(Werner, et. al. 1985: 15)

Work imposes distinctive rhythms on the home environment. These include sounds such as tapping or pounding, or abrupt starts and stops of a sewing machine. Repertoires of gestures and motions performed in the home emerge from repetitive, work-oriented tasks. The cumulative sensory impact of home-based work thus shapes household environments in ways that are obvious yet profound, because the sensory imprint of home itself is deep-rooted in human consciousness.

The Patterning of Work and Home Life: Interlocking or Dominating

One fruitful line of comparative analysis regarding home-based workplaces and domesticity is to consider how the temporal and spatial practices of work mesh with those of home. The home is composed of multilayered cyclical or spiralling rhythms (Werner et. al. 1985). Linear or cyclical models of time may be imposed on the home from the pace and rhythms of work life (for an overview of approaches related to the family and time, see Daly 1996, Chapter 1). When work takes place in the living space of the home, work activities may intersect with home life in a routine, cyclical way. Daily rhythms call forth images of predictable, manageable, intersecting routines of work and home life:

[Home] is the environment we inhabit day after day until it becomes taken for granted and is un-selfconscious. This sense of familiarity is rooted in bodily routines, a place where...space becomes a field of pre-reflective actions grounded in the body...Although when we are away from home we need to be alert and adaptable, at home we can relax within the stability of routine and experience

(Dovey 1985: 377)

How do householders mark the passing of space from the home to work, and then back again? For instance, a table is pulled out into the middle of the room for working during the day, then pushed back against the wall when work ends. Material is systematically gathered up and stored--or, perhaps, simply left as is and becomes part of the home environment when work is finished. The issue here is to tease out how the routinized order and disorder of work are imposed upon the order and disorder of home (Dovey 1985).

Work may also swamp the home environment in a more tidal fashion, usurping the home for a time and then receding. Rush order phases of product cycles or seasonal manufacturing bring the potential for extraordinary kinds of disorder to impinge upon the home. Export production cycles at their most intense can lead to a perceived invasion of privacy in middle-class households. A shoemaking employer in the Philippines recalls how she hired up to fifty workers during peak export periods who could not all be accommodated in the shoemaking workshop beside her home. Consequently her bedroom and household bathroom became the temporary quarters for “overspill” workers. After some time her husband could no longer put up with the situation and decided to invest in more machinery to cut back on the need for workers (Mohlman 1994: 188). Temporally, intensive phases of production can supersede the regular rhythms of the home, wreaking havoc on a household’s regular daily or nightly routines. Experiences of artisan and handicraft-producing households demonstrate that exporting is often too great a burden for household producers to bear, and the home suffers the consequences of work over-commitment.⁵

In the wake of intensive and possibly catastrophic work phases, householders resume some semblance of regular home life. This begins with the immediate after-effects such as picking up trash, salvaging useful materials, and putting away tools and equipment. Unused work space may be re-integrated into the home environment, or left to lie fallow until the next production cycle. Since household-based production is often of a stop-and-go character, with periodic or seasonal lulls in-between production cycles, we may think of householders’ efforts to reclaim living space from the sphere of work as a common cyclical phase of how work shapes domestic life (see Lipton 1982 on shifting uses of household space).

How Workers Socialize the Home Environment (and Vice Versa)

Work not only has the capacity to impose foreign rhythms on the home. Home-based worksites can also engage combinations of people that give distinctive social character to spaces

in the home. Citing an analysis of French householders' recollections about their attics and cellars, Werner, et. al., note that informants associated particular spaces in the home with social experiences, such as attics being sites for siblings or friends to play together (1985: 17). Similarly, home-based production can animate spaces in or around the house that might otherwise remain devoid of life.

Depending on their social composition and type of management, home-based worksites involving multiple workers have the potential for lively social life to take place among those involved through gossip, jokes, word games, singing along with the radio, budding romances, and collective snack or cigarette breaks. However, they can also be sites of imposed configurations of gender and new kinds of disciplined spaces within the home that can make the domestic environment a highly regulated and uneasy place.

If the home-based worksite is located in the household interior or is situated so that employees have easy access to interior space, then extra-household employees need some degree of familiarity with the social practices of the home as well as those of work.⁶ This especially holds true for any workers who actually live in the home of the employer. Workers operating in the living space of their employer's home need to at least learn to manoeuvre around it without causing excessive friction. A minimal degree of socialization is necessary about issues such as where to dump dirty water and throw trash, how much access to household amenities is allowed, and what areas of the house are off-limits, if any. In some home-based working environments, the home sphere is a dense web of rules and routines whereas in others it is almost obliterated by work. Typically, the better-off the household of the employer, the greater degree of workers' socialization to it is necessary because there are more household objects and routines to protect. The extent to which householders perceive outsiders' socialization to the home as necessary is influenced by the variable social construction of domesticity itself.⁷

How Work Shapes the Home Environment

The interior space of the home is not the only domain affected by locating production at the residence. Home-based production may also extend the boundaries of household space by opening up new peripheral areas for work--for instance, in shoemaking communities, by using the roof as a place for drying newly-made shoes. The movement of workers and products to and from the house creates new traffic flows, thus establishing new threshold boundaries. For

instance, locating work in the home may require that a front, side, or back door to the house is kept open, which creates public or semi-public spaces out of the home. In this way home-based production may offset social conventions that impose a strict public/private division on home space (see Dovey 1985; Rybickynski 1986).

Relevant for understanding the effect of work on peripheral areas of the home is Taylor and Brower's study of

...porches, steps, front yards, back yards, driveways, sidewalks, and alleys. These spaces are of crucial interest for two reasons. First, they immediately adjoin the home; consequently, what happens in these outside spaces strongly influences the quality of life in the home. Second, they represent spaces where the two major types of settings in residential life--the private, personal, and owned versus the public, shared, and open to the community--interpenetrate. Consequently, these settings are of considerable interest for understanding the dialectic between individuals and local society.

(1985: 113)

According to the authors, near-home areas have a key role to play in creating and defining home, since they are sites where household residents, neighbors, and outsiders tacitly or overtly negotiate who will enter and control them.

The presence of work areas in the household periphery or in near-home detached workshops adds additional meanings to the social control negotiations of near-home territories. Because worksites detached from the household take on formative institutional characteristics such as the need for regulating labor and materials, they can act to "de-neutralize" space in the household periphery, as illustrated in this Mexican example of residential workshop organisation:

Emphasis on the 'domestic' and a rigid gender division of labour have gone together with the rigid gendering of space inside workshops so that male and female wage workers remain segregated. Looms are placed inconveniently in passageways rather than occupy the women's sewing room. The male and female parts of the labour process may occupy different buildings, rooms, or floors.

(Wilson 1990: 90)

In another example from the Philippines, an interview with an employer of a home-based glass bottle-cleaning business reveals tensions over the control of near-home space. The employer had employed some neighbors to wash bottles, and storage areas for these bottles extended out from the employer's home along a narrow walkway that led to other houses:

Q: Have you ever had any problems because of your business?

A: The only problem is my other neighbors who complain that I occupy the entire alley. They want me to remove my things from the alley.

Q: The neighbors who say this are those who don't work for you?

A: No, [they don't]...My contention is that there's enough space for them to pass, my things aren't a hindrance because they're on the side of the alley. I say that in fact, there's a lot of benefit from my business because of the mothers whom I'm able to help.

(Mohlman and Baquirin, unpublished interview)

Near-home space is the turf upon which a struggle is played out over whether the bottles in the alley should be tolerated because the business contributes to the public good, or whether they should be cleared because they create public inconvenience for private gain. Here, near-home space not only represents social relations between occupants of different homes, but also competing interpretations of the nature of the relationship between the business and the surrounding neighborhood.

Home-based workplaces imbue near-home areas with additional uses of space that follow from the presence of those involved in the business. Home-based workplaces may commercialize near-home space, as when local vendors take up positions outside the home to cater to workers. Workers themselves open up new areas of leisure space around the home when they use near-home spaces for smoking, chatting, or eating during breaks. In one workshop in the Philippines that was detached from the owner's home but next to it, the end of the work week heralded workers' transformation of "neutral" space into "leisure" space. A group of male workers moved a table and chairs from inside the workshop out into the small driveway that divided the workshop from the home and proceeded to have their Saturday night drinking sessions there (Mohlman 1994: 309).

Near-home space can also be the site of workshop employees' living space. In one Philippine example, a group of extra-household workers lived in the detached workshop itself, so the workspace became the site of cooking, clothes-washing, bathing, and other domestic routines. In another case where extra-household workers lived in a workshop that was adjacent to the employer's home, it came to light that two of the workers were sleeping in the employer's delivery vehicle every night! These latter examples illustrate how near-home spaces such as yards, garages, and even cars parked in driveways may be converted into domestic niches of the workers themselves (Mohlman 1994: Chapter 5).

How Work Fashions the Structural and Symbolic Home

Home-based workplaces elaborate upon architectural and class identities of the home by the way they are fitted into residential space. Home-based worksites may enhance or deepen the

architectural personality of homes in vernacular style when they coincide with utility and storage areas that people have traditionally used as workspaces. Some Philippine shoemakers in two-story households have workshops in the downstairs utility area of their home known as the *silong*, reinforcing the longstanding use of that space as a work area (Mohlman 1994: 74). More commonly, home-based workplaces are grafted onto a hodge-podge of domestic architectural styles so that their presence represents an eclectic conversion of recreational space (porch, patio, interior space (sitting room or spare room), traditional domestic area (kitchen), or semi-public residential space (alleyway, garage, yard) to workspace.

For housing in general, social class and status distinctions are manifested in home exteriors, backyards, and interior arrangements of household space (Bordieu 1984; Halle 1993). For houses with home-based workshops, architectural expressions of class identity set some of the parameters determining how work can be fit into home by imposing limits on resources and space that can be allotted to workspace. Peattie observes this about home-based shoemaking in Bogota, Colombia:

The division of labor in...a small workshop is characteristically such that particular workers carry out particular stages of production--one cuts, one sews the uppers (seen usually as a woman's job), one joins and lasts...A workshop of this sort fits easily into the small, ordinary living room of the working-class dwelling. Even the next stage up in size--say to fifteen workers--can be accommodated in space organized for the purpose within a building meant originally for residence. Thus all through the low-rent areas of Bogota residential facades conceal a multitude of such small workshops.

(Peattie 1982: 213)

Yet whether activities, people, equipment, and materials associated with home-based workplaces fit inside the home is not only determined mechanistically by a household's class resources. Fit is also assessed by the discomfort index of possibly having to conceal activities to evade the law, if household-based workplaces operate illegally (Wilson 1993); local cultural norms that may mitigate against certain kinds and placements of home-based work deemed noisy, smelly, unsightly, or otherwise stigmatized; and finally, by householders' own variable perceptions of privacy, space, and acceptable versus unacceptable crowding and clutter (Halle 1993; Liu 1994; Wood and Beck 1994).

Any discussion of spatial character must not neglect the element of changing architectural identities over time (Kopytoff 1986: 66-67; Lawrence 1985: 119). Sometimes not just space in or around the home, but houses in their entirety are transformed into workshops. These

transformations raise questions about to what extent the converted space echoes or obliterates the characteristics of a pre-existing domestic sphere.

Two examples of converted homes illustrate possible outcomes. On the one hand, the memory of home can be completely wiped out in the transformation to a workspace, as is evident in this Mexican example:

The physical conditions in the Hernandez workshop are particularly bad. In converting an old family house, interior walls have been torn out and windows boarded up. There is no natural light; workers work by fluorescent strip the whole time. There is little ventilation and the whole workshop stinks with fumes from the motorized looms still occupying one half of the building...Nobody is allowed to leave their work during the day--not even to buy an aspirin.

(Wilson 1991: 135-136)

Here the sensory bundle of home--including lighting, textures, and smells that are comfortingly familiar--is completely dismantled. The changeover from home to workshop rescinds the original structure of its liveability through boarding up windows and taking away "nesting" functions of individual rooms (Bachelard 1994: 90-104). The strict regulation of workers evokes institutional housing at its most severe (Barbey 1993: 110; Higgens 1989). Affronts to workers' health and well-being seem especially cruel in this example because they violate the very qualities symbolized by the original structure.

On the other hand, former family homes used as workplaces can retain some of the functions and routines of what went before. In one converted house in the Philippines, the owners supervised workers at their former home, where they had previously lived and run a home-based shoemaking workshop. Income from the workshop allowed the owners to build a modern new home in a more upscale suburb nearby, and detach living from working space. However, the converted workshop still retained the original functions of the kitchen, where the workers cooked, and bedrooms, where some of the workers stayed. One female employee kept her baby in a crib in the front room. The employers occasionally took dinner or snacks at their old home during busy work periods, and along with workers on break, watched programs on an old TV set up in a corner (Mohlman 1994: Chapter 5). The workshop was thus a kind of domestic palimpsest, with the current domestic routines of the workers (and modified ones of the employers) superimposed upon the original domestic patterns of family life in the home, when the employers still occupied it full-time.⁸

Summary

Home-based workplaces bring to light some of domesticity's negotiable character, and allow us to recast the domestic sphere as more than the property of a fixed group of people (a family) in a fixed space (a house). Domesticity is a versatile, malleable, and sometimes mutable phenomenon.

Orientations toward home figure into how people design and participate in home-based workplaces, whether they use them consciously or not. Some householders treat their own living quarters expansively, allowing materials, equipment, activities, and possibly extra-household workers to mesh with home space and routines. Others hold more circumscribing attitudes, using ideas of what home should be as justification for constraining home-based work to particular spaces in the house or times of the day. Still others draw a protective circle around the whole of their home life so that domesticity becomes an exclusionary device to banish work-oriented activities and people to the household exterior.

Domesticity also figures into employers' managerial style and power relations between employers and workers. Some employers offer workers home-based amenities and household access as part of the public presentation of their management style. Yet not all domestic access is above board; workers themselves may claim space in and around the employer's residence for their own small comforts and private needs without necessarily having the employer's knowledge or permission (eg., sleeping in the delivery van). Employers sometimes supply workers who live at the site of home-based workshops with scaled-down versions of a domestic sphere (such as their own toilets, cooking facilities, or sleeping quarters), but they may also strip a domestic workplace of its homey character to enforce discipline and the idea that "work is not home."

The way domesticity is defined, maintained, and possibly redrawn at home-based worksites over time registers shifts in the balance of power between husbands and wives, householders and outsiders, and employers and workers, as well as different parties' changing conceptions of what makes for a liveable space. We should not forget that work and home occasionally engage in an interdependent dynamism: successful home-based businesses generate revenue that employers may put toward enlarging their current home, or constructing a new one, one that might stand completely apart from the workshop. Householders' aspirations for what they perceive as higher-status home life may thus underlie reorganization of the home-based workplace environment.

IV. Conclusion

This survey of how home and work intersect in manufacturing and handicraft production reveals home as neither the static backdrop for work, nor as the all-powerful regulator of it. Instead, the relationship between home and work in home-based production is reflexive and diverse. Diversities shape how householders organize themselves--and possibly others-- within distinctive spaces and architectural environments to carry out the business of home life and work life. The most cogent sociological rationale for studying variation in the organization of home-based production is to see how it leads those involved to provide different solutions to the problem of how to make and maintain a home at the same time they make and maintain a workplace. Thus, a comprehensive analysis of home-based production emerges when social scientists become as interested in explaining home as they are in explaining work.

Footnotes

1. I would like to thank Zaheer Baber, Maribeth Erb, and Angelique Chan for comments on earlier drafts of this essay.
2. The examples used throughout the paper are those in which manual labour is done in or around the home, as opposed to home-based technical or intellectual production made possible by the computer and telecommunications industries.
3. This item was not kept in the workshop for the probable reason that the glue was also a recreational drug, with the associated risks of theft to sell to local users.
4. See Rutten (1990: 43, 216) and Wilson (1990: 132) for other examples of maids being put to work in household businesses. Blim reports that he did not find any examples of household servants appearing in residential shoemaking workshops for his research in Italy (personal communication).
5. A fine example of how export production disrupts the pace of home and village life is in the film *Turumba*, about the handicraft-producing village of Pakil in the Philippines.
6. Socialization to a home for the case of one middle-class North American household is amply demonstrated in *Home Rules* (Wood and Beck: 1994), where the authors document the hundreds of rules about household behavior internalized by one of the author's children that apply only to space and objects in their living room. The book illustrates how labourious it is to raise the "pre-socialized" up to even a minimally acceptable degree of home decorum. Passing on these rules to one's children is a vital part of maintaining a family heritage, the authors contend, because home rules carry with them implicit orientations about social taste, judgement, and aesthetics shaped by parents' and grandparents' social class and family backgrounds.
After children, the next most important "pre-socialized" person in the household hierarchy to educate about home rules after the children is the domestic servant, if there is one, because the labor itself involves the daily making and re-making of the home. Servants are part of the social apparatus by which standards about domestic cleanliness, order, security, and well-being are made explicit and, to a greater or lesser extent, realized.
7. Socializing home-based workers to the domestic routines of the employer's home presents an array of problems similar to those of households taking in boarders and lodgers, a practice common in the 19th-century United States (Modell and Hareven 1977: 164-186).
8. The distinction between the utilitarian old home and the showy new one in this example mimics the Philippine practice in upper-class households of having so-called "clean" and "dirty" kitchens. Some well-off households have modern "clean" kitchens for display in visible areas of the home, replete with new appliances, cookware, and dishes. However, cooking is still done in the utilitarian "dirty" kitchen hidden away.
One author researching class distinctions among Philippine households reports "...the number of appliances in a room was not always consistent with the number of activities performed there...For instance, despite the higher number of appliances in the Clean Kitchen of the sample upper-income homes, more activities were spent (sic) in the Dirty Kitchen which usually contained only a four-burner stove and a kitchen sink" (Villaraza-Mayo 1991: 23).

References

- Allen, Graham. (1989). "Insiders and Outsiders: Boundaries around the Home." In Graham Allen and Graham Crow, eds., *Home and Family: Creating the Domestic Sphere*. London: Macmillan: 141-158.
- Allen, Sheila and Carol Wolkowitz. (1987). *Homeworking: Myths and Realities*. Hong Kong: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Alonso, Jose Antonio. (1983). "The Domestic Clothing Workers in the Mexican Metropolis and Their Relation to Dependent Capitalism." In June Nash and Maria Patricia Fernandez-Kelly, eds. *Women, Men, and the International Division of Labor*. Albany: State University of New York Press: 161-172.
- Altman, Irwin and Mary Gauvain. (1981). "A Cross-Cultural and Dialectic Analysis of Homes." In L.S. Liben, ed., *Spatial Representation and Behavior Across the Life Span*. New York: Academic Press: 283-320.
- Anderson, Dennis. (1982). "Small Industry in Developing Countries: A Discussion of Issues." *World Development* 10 (11): 913-948.
- Bachelard, Gaston. (1994). *The Poetics of Space: The Classic Look at How We Experience Intimate Places*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Barbey, Gilles. (1993). "Spatial Archetypes and the Experience of Time: Identifying the Dimensions of Home." In Ernesto G. Arias, ed., *The Meaning and Use of Housing: International Perspectives, Approaches, and their Applications*. Aldershot, England: Avebury: 103-116.
- Becker, Franklin D. (1981). *Workspace: Creating Environments in Organizations*. New York: Praeger.
- Becker, Howard S. (1998). *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Benería, Lourdes. (1989). "Subcontracting and Employment Dynamics in Mexico City." In Alejandro Portes, Manuel Castells, and Lauren A. Benton, eds. *The Informal Economy: Studies in Advanced and Less Developed Countries*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 173-188.
- Benería, Lourdes and Marta Roldán. (1987). *The Crossroads of Class and Gender: Industrial Homework, Subcontracting, and Household Dynamics in Mexico City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Benton, Lauren. (1990). *Invisible Factories: The Informal Economy and Economic Development in Spain*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Blim, Michael L. (1990). *Made in Italy: Small-Scale Industrialization and its Consequences*.

New York: Praeger.

Blim, Michael L. (1992). "Introduction: The Emerging Global Factory and Anthropology." In Frances Abrahamer Rothstein and Michael L. Blim, eds. *Anthropology and the Global Factory: Studies of the New Industrialization in the Late Twentieth Century*. New York: Bergin and Garvey: 1-32.

Bordieu, Pierre. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Boris, Eileen and Cynthia R. Daniels. (1989). *Homework: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Paid Labor at Home*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Cook, Scott. (1984). *Peasant Capitalist Industry: Piecework and Enterprise in Southern Mexican Brickyards*. Lanham, New York: University Press of America.

Daly, Kerry J. (1996). *Families and Time: Keeping Pace in a Hurried Culture*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Dangler, Jamie F. (1994). *Hidden in the Home: The Role of Waged homework in the Modern World Economy*. Albany: State University Press of Albany.

Dovey, Kimberly. (1985). "Home and Homelessness." In Irwin Altman and Carol M. Werner, eds., *Human Behavior and Environment: Advances in Theory and Research, Volume 8: Home Environments*. New York: Plenum Press: 33-64.

Fernandez-Kelly, Maria Patricia. (1989). "Informalization at the Core: Hispanic Women, Homework, and the Advanced Capitalist State." In Alejandro Portes, Manuel Castells, and

Lauren A. Benton, eds. *The Informal Economy: Studies in Advanced and Less Developed Countries*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 247-264.

Halle, David. (1993). *Inside Culture: Art and Class in the American Home*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hansen, Karen Tranberg, ed. (1992). *African Encounters with Domesticity*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Higgins, Joan. (1989). "Homes and Institutions." In Graham Allen and Graham Crow, eds., *Home and Family: Creating the Domestic Sphere*. London: MacMillan: 159-173.

Kemeny, Jim. (1992). *Housing and Social Theory*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kopytoff, Igor. (1986). "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process." In Arjun Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things : Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. New York : Cambridge University Press: 64-91.

- Lawrence, Roderick J. (1985). "A More Humane History of Homes: Research Method and Application." In Irwin Altman and Carol M. Werner, eds., *Human Behavior and Environment: Advances in Theory and Research, Volume 8: Home Environments*. New York: Plenum Press: 113-132.
- Lipton, Michael. (1981). "Family, Fungibility, and Formality: Rural Advantages of Informal Non-Farm Enterprises vs. the Urban-formal State." *Human Resources Employment and Development, Vol. 5, Developing Countries*. Proceedings of the 6th World Congress of the International Economic Association, 1980. London: Macmillan.
- Littlefield, Alice. (1979). "The Expansion of Capitalist Relations of Production in Mexican Crafts." *Journal of Peasant Studies*. 6 (4): 471-488.
- Lui, Tai-Lok. (1994). *Waged Work at Home: The Social Organization of Industrial Outwork in Hong Kong*. Brookfield, Vermont: Avebury.
- Marcus, Claire Cooper. (1995). *House as a Mirror of Self: Exploring the Deeper Meaning of Home*. Berkeley: Conari Press.
- Modell, John and Tamara K. Hareven (1977). "Urbanization and the Malleable Household: An Examination of Boarding and Lodging in American Families." In T. Hareven, ed., *Family and Kin in Urban Communities, 1700-1930*. New York: New Viewpoints (164-186).
- Mohlman, Kay. (1994). *Production in a Residential Domain: A Philippine Case Study of Family, Household, and Hired Workers in Small-Scale Manufacturing*. PhD. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Nash, June and Maria Patricia Fernandez-Kelly, eds. (1983). *Women, Men, and the International Division of Labor*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Niehoff, Justin. (1987). "The Villager as Industrialist: Ideologies of Household Manufacturing in Rural Taiwan." *Modern China* 13 (3): 59-73.
- Peattie, Lisa. (1982). "What is to be Done with the Informal Sector? A Case Study of Shoe Manufacturers in Columbia." H. Safa, ed., *Towards a Political Economy of Urbanization in Third World Countries*. Delhi: Oxford University Press: 208-232.
- Portes, Alejandro, Manuel Castells, and Lauren A. Benton, eds. (1989). *The Informal Economy: Studies in Advanced and Less Developed Countries*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, and John Walton. (1981). *Labor, Class, and the International System*. New York: Academic Press.
- Rutten, Rosanne. (1990). *Artisans and Entrepreneurs in the Rural Philippines: Making a Living and Gaining Wealth in Two Commercialized Crafts*. Amsterdam: Center for Asian Studies, VU University Press.

- Rybczynski, Witold. (1986). *Home: A Short History of an Idea*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Staley, Eugene and Richard Morse. (1965). *Modern Small Industry for Developing Countries*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Strassmann, W. Paul. (1987). "Home-Based Enterprises in Cities of Developing Countries." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. 36 (1), Oct.: 121-144.
- Taylor, Ralph B. and Sidney Brower. (1985). "Home and Near-Home Territories." In Irwin Altman and Carol M. Werner, eds., *Home Environments*. Human Behavior and Environment: Advances in Theory and Research, Volume 8. New York: Plenum Press: 183-212.
- Villaraza-Mayo, Adelaida. *A Comparative Analysis of Residential Interior Space Utilization Among the Lower, Middle and Upper-Class Filipino Families*. Diliman, Quezon City: College of Home Economics, Monograph Series No. 1, University of the Philippines.
- Ward, Kathryn. (1990). *Women Workers and Global Restructuring*. Ithaca: ILR Press, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.
- Werner, Carol M., Irwin Altman, and Diana Oxley. (1985). "Temporal Aspects of Homes: A Transactional Perspective." In Irwin Altman and Carol M. Werner, eds., *Home Environments*. Human Behavior and Environment: Advances in Theory and Research, Volume 8. New York: Plenum Press: 1-32.
- Wilson, Fiona. (1993). "Workshops as Domestic Domains: Reflections on Small-Scale Industry in Mexico." In *World Development* 21 (1): 67-80.
- Wilson, Fiona. (1991). *Sweaters: Gender, Class and Workshop-based Industry in Mexico*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Wood, Dennis and Robert J. Beck. (1994). *Home Rules*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Films

- Turumba*. (1984) Produced and directed by Kidlat Tahimik. El Cerrito, California: Flower Films.

Department of Sociology

Working Papers Series

The *Working Papers Series* of the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore, under the editorship of Chan Kwok Bun, Maribeth Erb and Angelique Chan, publishes reports of on-going research by staff members, postgraduate students and visitors to the Department. Views expressed are the authors', so is the copyright.

Note: To order *Working Papers* nos.1–89 and those denoted by an asterisk write directly to the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore, 10 Kent Ridge Crescent, Singapore 119260, E-mail: socgen3@nus.edu.sg or Fax: 65 7779579. For all other working papers please direct orders to:

Select Books
19 Tanglin Road, #03-15
Tanglin Shopping Centre
Singapore 247909
Tel: 65 732 1515
Fax: 65 736 0855
e-mail: selectbk@syberway.com.sg

-
1. Riaz Hassan and Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Ethnic Outmarriage Rates in Singapore: The Influence of Traditional Socio-Cultural Organisation"*, 1972, 26pp.
 2. Hans-Dieter Evers, *"Urban Involution: The Social Structure of Southeast Asian Towns"*, 1972, 19pp.
 3. Erik Cohen, *"Social Ecology -- A Multidimensional Approach"*, 1972, 97pp.
 4. Noeleen Heyzer and Wee Gek Sim, *"Trade Union Leaders in Singapore"*, 1972, 92pp.
 5. Peter S.J. Chen, *"The Political Course of Singapore"*, (in English and Chinese), 1972, 23pp.
 6. Chan Heng Chee and Hans-Dieter Evers, *"National Identity and Nation Building in S.E. Asia"*, 1972, 29pp.
 7. Peter Weldon, *"Indonesian and Chinese Status Differences in Urban Java"*, 1972, 41pp.
 8. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Austroasiatic Subgroupings and Prehistory in the Malay Peninsula"*, 1972, 63pp.
 9. Aline Wong, *"Job Satisfaction among Higher Non-Expatriate Civil Servants in Hong Kong"*, 1972, 64pp.
 10. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Modernisation in Singapore: Changing Values and the Individual"*, 1972, 16pp.
 11. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"An Outline of Temiar Grammar"*, 1972, 41pp.
 12. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Social Stratification in Singapore"*, 1973, 99pp.
 13. Peter D. Weldon, John S. Western and Tan Tsu Haung, *"Housing and Satisfaction with Environment in Singapore"*, 1973, 30pp.
 14. Mochtar Naim, *"Penghulu di Minangkabau (Penghulu as Traditional Elite in Minangkabau)"*, 1973, 31pp.
 15. Michael A.H. Walter, *"A Comparative Examination of Systems of Kinship and Marriage in Fiji"*, 1973, 41pp.
 16. Hans Dieter-Evers and Daniel Regan, *"Specialisation and Involvement: The Modernising Role of Doctors in Malaysia and Indonesia"*, 1973, 33pp.

17. Myrna L. Blake, *"Kampong Eurasians in Singapore"*, 1973, 45pp.
18. Mak Lau Fong, *"The Forgotten and the Rejected Community -- A Sociological Study of Chinese Secret Societies in Singapore and West Malaysia"*, 1973, 150pp.
19. Erik Cohen, *"Southeast Asian Urban Sociology -- A Review and a Selected Bibliography"*, 1973, 53pp.
20. Thelma Kay, *"Group Cohesion and Productivity among Dockworkers -- A Study of Stevedores in Singapore"*, 1973, 28pp.
21. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, *"Industrialisation and the Family Type: An Overview"*, 1974, 45pp.
22. Hans-Dieter Evers, *"Changing Patterns of Minangkabau Urban Landownership"*, 1974, 45pp.
23. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Social and Psychological Aspects of Fertility: Findings from Family Planning Research in Singapore"*, 1974, 27pp.
24. Hans-Dieter Evers, *"The Role of Professionals in Social and Political Change"*, 1974, 28pp.
25. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Prehistory and Ethnology in Southeast Asia: Some New Ideas"*, 1974, 32pp.
26. Mochtar Naim, *"Voluntary Migration in Indonesia"*, 1974, 41pp.
27. Lawrence Babb, *"Walking on Flowers in Singapore -- A Hindu Festival Cycle in Aram Yengoyan and Alton L. Cycle"*, 1974, 46pp.
28. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Indigenous Religious Systems of the Malay Peninsula"*, 1974, 27pp.
29. Aline K. Wong, *"Women as a Minority Group in Singapore"*, 1974,
30. Michael A.H.B. Walter, *"Co-operation in East Fiji: A New Traditionalism?"*, 1974, 30pp.
31. Aline K. Wong, *"The Continuous Family Revolution in China -- Ideology and Changing Family Patterns"*, 1974, 28pp.
32. Eddie C.Y. Kuo and Riaz Hassan, *"Some Social Concomitants of Interethnic Marriage in Singapore"*, 1974, 28pp.
33. Riaz Hassan, *"Symptoms and Syndromes of the Developmental Process in Singapore"*, 1974, 11pp.
34. Hans-Dieter Evers and Riaz Hassan, *"Studies on Social Stratification in Southeast Asia"*, 1974, 141pp.
35. Pang Eng Fong and Thelma Kay, *"Change and Continuity in Singapore's Industrial Relations System"*, 1974, 27pp.
36. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, *"Field Theory as a Conceptual Framework for Divorce Study"*, 1974, 25pp.
37. Riaz Hassan, *"International Tourism and Intercultural Communication: The Case of Japanese Tourists in Singapore"*, 1974, 23pp.
38. Riaz Hassan, *"Towards a Dialectic Anthropology -- A Comment on Professor M. Freedman's Paper, Social and Cultural Anthropology"*, 1974, 7pp.
39. Hans-Dieter Evers, *"Urbanisation and Urban Conflict in Southeast Asia"*, 1974, 16pp.
40. Michael A.H.B. Walter, *"The Gardening Game"*, 1975, 15pp.
41. Frederic C. Deyo, *"Organisation and Its Socio-Cultural Setting: A Case Study of Structural Compensation in an Atomistic Society"*, 1975, 31pp.
42. Mak Lau Fong, *"Chinese Secret Societies in Ipoh Town, 1945-1969"*, 1975, 17pp.
43. Vivienne Wee, *"A Preliminary Account of 'Buddhism' in Singapore"*, 1975, 56pp.
44. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"The Cultural Logic of Singapore's 'Multiracialism'"*, 1975, 34pp.
45. Eckehard Kulke, *"Social Class and Primordial Loyalty in Rural India -- An Approach to the Study of Indian Untouchables"*, 1975, 31pp.
46. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Elites and National Development in Singapore"*, 1975, 15pp.

47. Riaz Hassan, *"Social and Psychological Implications of High Population Density"*, 1975, 30pp.
48. Rory Fonseca, *"Planning and Land-use in Singapore"*, 1975, 26pp.
49. Lawrence A. Babb, *"Thaipusam in Singapore: Religious Individualism in a Hierarchical Culture"*, 1976, 19pp.
50. Rory Fonseca, *"Growth, Transition and the Urban Environment; A Reference Frame for Singapore"*, 1976, 19pp.
51. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Asian Values in Modernising Society: A Sociological Perspective"*, 1976, 17pp.
52. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, *"A Sociolinguistic Profile of Singapore"*, 1976, 20pp.
53. Michael A.H.B. Walter, *"On Transitional Society"*, 1976, 20pp.
54. Frederic C. Deyo, *"Marital Status, Job Orientation and Work Commitment among Semi-Skilled Female Workers in Singapore"*, 1976, 20pp.
55. Frederic C. Deyo, *"Decision-Making and Supervisory Authority in Cross-Cultural Perspective: An Exploratory Study of Chinese and Western Management Practices in Singapore"*, 1976, 24pp.
56. John R. Clammer, *"Sociological Approaches to the Study of Language and Literacy in Southeast Asia"*, 1976, 28pp.
57. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Ecological Distribution of Social Pathology in Singapore"*, 1977, 28pp.
58. Aline K. Wong, *"The Value of Children and the Household Economy -- A Review of Current VOC Studies in the Developing World"*, 1977, 24pp.
59. Chiew Seen Kong, *"Educational and Occupational Attainment of Singapore's Chinese Women and Men"*, 1977, 24pp.
60. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Population Policy and Social Science Research on Population in Singapore"*, 1977, 28pp.
61. Michael A.H.B. Walter and Riaz Hassan, *"An Island Community in Singapore: A Characterisation of a Marginal Society"*, 1977, 44pp.
62. Stella R. Quah, *"The Unplanned Dimensions of Health Care in Singapore: Traditional Healers and Self-Medication"*, 1977, 22pp.
63. John R. Clammer, *"Islam and Capitalism in Southeast Asia"*, 1978, 22pp.
64. Robert G. Cooper, *"Second World First: The Study of Films and the Use of Film in Social Studies"*, 1978, 20pp.
65. Peter S.J. Chen, *"Ethnicity and Fertility: The Case of Singapore"*, 1978, 25pp.
66. Rolf E. Vente, *"Urban Planning and High-Density Living. Some Reflections on their Interrelationship"*, 1979, 13pp.
67. William S.W. Lim, *"A Case for Low-Rise High-Density Living in Singapore"*, 1979, 13pp.
68. Mak Lau Fong, *"Subcommunal Participation and Leadership Cohesiveness of the Chinese in 19th Century Singapore"*, 1984, 23pp.
69. Eddie C.Y. Kuo and Huey Tsyh Chen, *"Towards an Information Society: Changing Occupational Structure in Singapore"*, 1985, 29pp.
70. Ko Yiu Chung, *"Industrial Workers and Class Formation: A Study of Chinese Industrial Workers in North China, 1900-1937"*, 1986, 31pp.
71. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Between Isthmus and Islands: Reflection on Malayan Palaeo-Sociology"*, 1986, 43pp.
72. Habibul H. Khondker, *"Is There a Dependency Paradigm?"*, 1986, 55pp.
73. Mak Lau Fong, *"The Locality and Non-Locality Organising Principles: A Technical Report on the Taxonomy of Chinese Voluntary Associations in the 19th Century Straits Settlements"*, 1986, 33pp.
74. Chua Beng Huat, *"Reading Foucault as a Conservative"*, 1986, 40pp.
75. Vivienne Wee, *"Material Dependence and Symbolic Independence: Constructions of Melayu Ethnicity in Island Riau, Indonesia"*, 1986, 46pp.

76. Habibul Haque Khondker, *"Famine Response: The 1984-85 Ethiopian Famine"*, 1986, 38pp.
77. Allen J. Chun, *"Conceptions of Kinship and Kingship in Classical Chou China"*, 1986, 50pp.
78. V. Selvaratnam, *"Ethnicity, Inequality and Higher Education in Peninsular Malaysia: The Sociological Implications"*, 1987, 44pp.
79. Trevor O Ling, *"Buddhism, Confucianism and the Secular State in Singapore"*, 1987, 42pp.
80. Mak Lau Fong, *"The Social Alignment Patterns of the Chinese in 19th-century Penang"*, 1987, 32pp.
81. Allen J. Chun, *"Durkheim Reconsidered: A Critique of Primitive Structuralism"*, 1987, 30pp.
82. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Process and Structure in Temiar Social Organization"*, 1987, 46pp.
83. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, *"Confucianism and the Chinese Family in Singapore: Continuities and Changes"*, 1987, 32pp.
84. Tatsuko Takizawa, *"Facets of Musical Activities in Singapore"*, 1987, 35pp.
85. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Notes on the Deep Sociology of Religion"*, 1987, 37pp.
86. Habibul Haque Khondker, *"The World According to Wallerstein"*, 1987, 48pp.
87. Mak Lau Fong, *"Solidarity Models: A Sociological Framework For Comparative Criminal Organization"*, 1988, 29pp.
88. Geoffrey Benjamin, *"Grammar and Polity: The Cultural and Political Background to Standard Malay"*, 1988, 51pp.
89. Viswanathan Selvaratnam, *"Limits to Vocationally-Oriented Education in the Third World"*, 1988, 36pp.
90. Vivienne Wee, *What does 'Chinese' mean?: an exploratory essay*, 1988, 41pp.
91. Geoffrey Benjamin, *The unseen presence: a theory of the nation-state and its mystifications*, 1988, 55pp.
92. Tong Chee Kiong, *Perceptions and boundaries: problematics in the assimilation of the Chinese in Thailand*, 1988, 30pp.
- *93. Alan J Chun, *Toward a political economy of the sojourning experience: the Chinese in 19th century Malaya*, 1988, 39pp.
- *94. Chua Beng Huat, *Public housing policies compared: US, Socialist countries and Singapore*, 1988, 41pp.
- *95. Eddie C. Y. Kuo and Bjorn H. Jernudd, *Language management in a multilingual state: the case of planning in Singapore*, 1988, 45pp.
96. Ho Kong Chong, *The community study: a discussion of the method with modifications for research in Singapore*, 1988, 44pp.
97. Tan Ern Ser, *Employing organizations and the dynamics of social mobility in Singapore: an analytical framework and empirical analysis*, 1988, 43pp.
98. Mak Lau Fong, *Singapore Chinese traditional voluntary associations: convergence vs divergence*, 1989, 36pp.
99. Tong Chee Kiong, *Centripetal authority, differentiated networks: the social organization of Chinese firms in Singapore*, 1989, 36pp.
100. Chan Kwok Bun and Ho Kong Chong (eds), *Explorations in Asian sociology. 100th special issue*, Singapore: Chopmen Publishers 1991, 54pp.
101. Eddie C. Y. Kuo, *Ethnicity, polity and economy: a case study of Mandarin trade and the Chinese connection*, 1990, 36pp.
102. Chua Beng Huat, *Fashion shopping: programs, stages and audience*, 1990, 29pp.
103. Georg Stauth, *Revolution in spiritless times: an essay on the inquiries of Michel Foucault on the Iranian Revolution*, 1991, 54pp.
104. Chua Beng Huat & Eddie C. Y. Kuo, *The making of a new nation: cultural construction and national identity in Singapore*, 1991, 43pp.

105. Alfred Choi, *Policing domestic disturbances: a research review of police response*, 1991, 40pp.
106. Vineeta Sinha, *Some notes on 'temple'-building and image-worship in Indian religion, in historical perspective*, 1991, 50pp.
107. Ho Kong Chong, *Studying the city in the new international division of labour*, 1991, 43pp.
108. Georg Stauth, *Critical theory and pre-Fascist social thought*, 1991, 35pp.
109. Zhang Xin-Xiang, *A methodological critique of Marx's theory of surplus value*, 1991, 37pp.
110. Lee Siew Peng, *Class and noise tolerance: some ruminations*, 1991, 39pp.
111. Paulin Tay Straughan, *Screening for early detection of cervical cancer: the relationship between social integration and preventive health*, 1992, 34pp.
112. Lian Kwen Fee, *Stratification in Maori society in the 19th century*, 1992, 40pp.
113. Eddie C. Y. Kuo, *Confucianism as political discourse in Singapore: the case of an incomplete revitalization movement*, 1992, 29pp.
114. Syed Farid Alatas, *Some problems of indigenization*, 1992, 46pp.
115. Zhang Xin-Xiang, *Crime and control: a neo-rational choice approach*, 1993, 43pp.
116. Tan Ern Ser, *Theorising the dynamics of industrial relations and trade unionism: lessons from the Singapore case*, 1993, 31pp.
117. Roxana Waterson, *What to celebrate in the United Nations Year of Indigenous Peoples?*, 1993, 55pp.
118. Zhang Xin Xiang, *Education as a vehicle for social stratificational change: the case of Singapore*, 1993, 38pp.
119. James V. Jesudason, *Statist democracy and the limits of civil society in Malaysia*, 1993, 40pp.
120. Filomeno V. Aguilar Jr, *Nouns that sail through history: reified categories and their transcendence in Marx's social theory*, 1994, 50pp.
121. Syed Farid Alatas, *Post-colonial state: dual functions in the public sphere*, 1994, 45pp.
122. Chua Beng Huat, *That imagined space: nostalgia for the kampung in Singapore*, 1994, 39pp.
123. Habibul H Khondker, *Globalization theory: a critical appraisal*, 1994, 42pp.
124. Kwok Kian Woon, *Social transformation and the problem of social coherence: Chinese Singaporeans at century's end*, 1994, 39pp.
125. Chua Beng Huat, *Culture, multiracialism and national identity in Singapore*, 1995, 36pp.
126. Nirmala Purushotam, *Disciplining differences: 'race' in Singapore*, 1995, 33pp.
127. Chua Beng Huat and Tan Joo Ean, *Singapore: new configuration of a socially stratified culture*, 1995, 40pp.
128. Paulin Tay Straughan and Tan Ern Ser, *Shiftwork, job satisfaction, and turnover propensity: nurses in a Singapore hospital*, 1996, 26pp.
129. Habibul Haque Khondker, *Competing paradigms and conflicting theories in the studies of the development of Asian NICS*, 1996, 37pp.
130. Geoffrey Benjamin, *Rationalisation and re-enchantment in Malaysia: Temiar religion 1964-1995*, 1996, 52pp.
131. Selina Ching Chan, *Negotiating and tradition: the identity of indigenous inhabitants in Hong Kong*, 1996, 43pp.
132. Geoffrey Benjamin, *Affixes, Austronesian and iconicity in Malay*, 1997, 31 pp.
133. Chua Beng Huat and Ananda Rahah, *Hybridity, Ethnicity and Food in Singapore*, 1997, 24 pp.
134. Kay Mohlman, *Home-base Workplaces and Workplace Domesticities: A Socio-Spatial Analysis*, 1998, 28pp.