HC-04 Industrialisation and the separation of home and work

The transition from agrarian and artisanal economies to industrial capitalism profoundly reconfigured the spatial, economic, and social relations between the sexes. In the pre-industrial era, the household functioned as a joint productive enterprise, where peasant and artisan families integrated subsistence, market production, and biological reproduction within a single geographical locus. Industrialisation ruptured this unity, instigating the spatial separation of home and work. This bifurcation precipitated the emergence of the male breadwinner model, the ideological construction of domesticity, and the systemic devaluation of unpaid reproductive labour.

To rigorously analyse this transformation, this report deconstructs the historical and sociological evidence across three distinct analytical layers: physiology (measurable biological constraints and capacities), behaviour (statistical distributions of labour, time use, and market participation), and culture (variable ideological, legal, and institutional frameworks).

Layer 1: Physiology (Measurable)

The physiological layer examines the measurable biological parameters that constrained or influenced the division of labour before and during industrialisation. In organic, muscle-powered economies, the sexual dimorphism of the human species exerted a tangible influence on labour allocation, though the interpretation of this influence remains highly contested in economic history.

Sexual Dimorphism and Ergonomic Capacity

Humans exhibit moderate sexual dimorphism, which becomes particularly pronounced in metrics of upper-body strength and muscle mass. In the *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, Leyk et al. (2007) conducted a comprehensive physiological study measuring the maximum hand-grip strength of a large sample to quantify these differences[1]. The sample size consisted of 2,187 subjects (1,654 men and 533 women)[1]. The researchers reported a stark overlapping distributional asymmetry: mean maximal hand-grip strength was 541 Newtons (N) for men and 329 N for women[1]. Crucially, the distribution revealed that 90 percent of the female subjects produced less maximal grip force than 95 percent of the male subjects[1]. Furthermore, highly trained female national elite athletes achieved a mean grip strength (444 N) that corresponded only to the 25th percentile of the untrained male subjects[1]. Hand-grip strength was linearly correlated with lean body mass (LBM), but significant differences remained even when adjusting for body weight and LBM[1].

When examining populations, it is vital to distinguish what is known about averages from what can be said about individuals. The statistical distributions of male and female strength overlap; there are individual women who possess greater physical strength and anaerobic capacity than individual men, particularly in the lower quartiles of male physical fitness[1]. However, at the aggregate level of statistical averages, the divergence is highly significant and has a genetic basis. In *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, Isen et al. (2014) analyzed a sample of 2,513

same-sex twins over a six-year period, demonstrating that variance in hand-grip strength is highly heritable (88 percent in males, 79 percent in females), with absolute genetic variance around the developmental slope being nearly nine-fold higher in males due to the introduction of novel genetic effects at puberty[2].

Subject Category	Sample Size (N)	Mean Maximal Grip Force (Newtons)	Standard Deviation Range (Newtons)
Untrained Males	1,654	541 N	74 - 133 N
Untrained Females	533	329 N	47 - 72 N
Elite Female Athletes	N/A	444 N	N/A

Table 1: Sexual Dimorphism in Hand-Grip Strength (Data derived from Leyk et al., 2007, European Journal of Applied Physiology)[1].

In *Gender, Work and Wages in Industrial Revolution Britain* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), economic historian Joyce Burnette argues that this measurable biological reality was the primary driver of occupational segregation during the Industrial Revolution[3]. Burnette posits a controversial thesis: the gender wage gap and the separation of tasks were not primarily products of patriarchal custom, but rather a rational market response to physiological differences in strength-intensive labour[3]. According to Burnette, competitive markets minimised the penalty of biological differences by sorting women into occupations where physical strength yielded lower marginal returns, thereby maximising female incomes within biological constraints[3]. Burnette tested for wage discrimination by estimating the female-male productivity ratio from samples of manufacturing firms and comparing it to the wage ratio, concluding that women were generally paid wages commensurate with their productivity[6].

Burnette's thesis is heavily criticised by feminist and institutional historians. Critics argue that technological innovation—such as steam and water power—diminished the premium on human physical strength, yet occupational segregation persisted and even hardened. In *Continuity and Change*, Galley (2013) uses data from the 1833 Factory Inquiry to highlight that women were systematically excluded from high-paying overseer roles despite possessing the requisite human capital and experience, suggesting that 'strength' was often a socially constructed metric used to reserve high-status, high-paying jobs for men regardless of actual physiological requirements[7].

Reproductive Energetics

A second measurable physiological constraint is the energetic cost of human reproduction. In the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, Dufour and Sauther (2002) detail the

exceptional metabolic burden placed on human females by gestation and lactation[8]. Because human infants are born highly altricial and require prolonged maternal care, the combined duration of gestation and lactation in humans is uniquely energetically demanding compared to other mammals of similar body mass[8].

During the pre-industrial and early industrial eras, high fertility rates were the norm. This frequent cycling through pregnancy and lactation imposed severe constraints on female mobility and caloric expenditure. In *Reproductive Health*, Urlacher et al. (2023) note that the daily energy expenditure of humans is constrained, leading to direct trade-offs between physical activity workloads and reproductive expenditures[9]. When the locus of production moved from the home—where childcare and productive labour could be simultaneously managed—to the factory, these physiological constraints made continuous participation in the formal, industrialised labour market exceedingly difficult for mothers. This physiological reality contributed mechanically to the spatial separation of the sexes, as women with high parity were biologically compelled to remain closer to the domestic sphere to manage the intense metabolic demands of infant care[5].

Layer 2: Behaviour (Statistical, Overlapping Distributions)

The behavioural layer captures the statistical reality of how men and women allocated their time, labour, and resources. Extensive cliometric research utilising historical household budgets, census data, and modern time-use surveys reveals overlapping behavioural distributions that defy simplistic historical narratives of male provision and female domesticity.

The Pre-Industrial Baseline: The Joint Enterprise

Before industrialisation, the standard unit of economic production was the household. De Pleijt and van Zanden (2021) in *The Economic History Review* examined wage inequality in Western Europe from 1300 to 1800, finding "two worlds of female labour"[11]. In the North Sea region (including England and the Low Countries), the European Marriage Pattern (EMP) prevailed: women married late, there was a small spousal age gap, and a high share of women entered the labour market as servants or agricultural workers, achieving a degree of economic independence[11]. This demographic regime is widely considered a precursor to the economic dynamism that sparked the Industrial Revolution[13]. Conversely, in Southern Europe, women's wages remained anchored at roughly 50 percent of male unskilled wages[11]. Despite these regional variations, the overarching reality was that both peasant and artisan households operated as joint enterprises where the labour of husbands, wives, and children was statistically inseparable from the family's economic survival.

The U-Shaped Curve of Female Labour Force Participation

The transition to industrial capitalism did not linearly liberate women into the workforce; statistically, it initially depressed female labour market participation. In a seminal macro-economic analysis published in *World Development*, Goldin (1995) established the existence of a U-shaped female labour supply function across the process of economic development, using a cross-sectional sample of 162 countries and historical time-series data

from the US Census (1890–2005)[14].

In her comprehensive work *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women* (Oxford University Press, 1990), Goldin demonstrated that women's participation was high in agrarian economies where they functioned as unpaid family workers[14]. Participation then declined during early industrialisation[14]. This trough occurred because work moved out of the home into factories, making it incompatible with child-rearing, and because rising male incomes initially produced an "income effect" where families "purchased" female leisure or domesticity[14]. Subsequently, participation rose as the service and white-collar sectors expanded, shifting the demand toward education and away from brawn[14].

Economic Phase	**Historical Period (US Context)**	**Female Labour Force Participation**	**Primary Driver of Behaviour**
Phase I (Evolutionary)	Late 19th Century to 1920s	Declining / Trough	Transition from agriculture to factory; stigma against married women working.
Phase II (Evolutionary)	1930 to 1950	Slowly Rising	Emergence of white-collar and clerical jobs; increased high school education.
Phase III (Evolutionary)	1950 to late 1970s	Rising	Increased part-time work; women as secondary earners responding to demand.
Phase IV (Revolutionary)	Late 1970s to Present	Rapidly Rising (Continuous)	The "Quiet Revolution": shift to career identity, continuous employment, delayed marriage.

Table 2: The Four Phases of Women's Economic Role (Synthesised from Goldin, 2006, American

Economic Review)[19].

Goldin further expanded on this in the *American Economic Review* (2006), identifying a "Quiet Revolution" that transformed women's employment from the 1970s onward[19]. During this revolutionary phase, women shifted their horizons from viewing employment as a temporary "job" before marriage to anticipating a lifelong "career," leading to massive investments in human capital and a shift toward continuous, rather than intermittent, labour force participation[19].

Deconstructing the Male Breadwinner Myth: Household Budgets

While the spatial separation of home and work generated the *ideal* of the male breadwinner, statistical analysis proves that the reality was far messier. In the *European Economic Review*, Horrell, Humphries, and Weisdorf (2020) challenged classic Malthusian models of economic history by integrating the "missing women and children" into the data[24]. Previous economic historians had relied almost exclusively on male day-wage rates to estimate historical living standards, implicitly assuming a universally functioning male breadwinner model[25].

By constructing an innovative dataset of 1,350 household budgets from Britain covering the years 1787 to 1865 (first introduced by Horrell and Humphries in 1992 in the *Journal of Economic History*), researchers revealed that the male breadwinner family frequently broke down[26]. Men died, abandoned their families, fell ill, or spent their wages on alcohol—a phenomenon Wally Seccombe termed 'breadwinner abuse'[18]. The data demonstrate that working-class families survived only through the supplementary wages and shadow economy contributions of women and children[18].

Averages obscure individual desperation. While the *average* male wage grew over the 19th century, Horrell and Oxley (2013) in the *European Review of Economic History* used historical anthropometric data (human stature and heights) to show that in highly constrained households, bargaining power dictated caloric allocation[29]. The researchers found that gender bias left nutritional scars in very poor families; female height was systematically suppressed relative to male height when resources were strictly limited and the male breadwinner's caloric needs were prioritised[18].

Modern Behavioural Legacy: Time-Use and the Motherhood Penalty

The long-term behavioural consequences of the separation of home and work are captured in modern time-use data. In *Demography*, Gershuny and Robinson (1988) and later Gershuny (2018) analysed the Multinational Time Use Study (MTUS), containing 1.3 million randomly sampled whole-day diaries across 24 countries[31]. The robust, highly replicated finding is that total work time (paid employment plus unpaid domestic labour) is remarkably consistent across genders, clustering tightly around 450 to 500 minutes (approximately eight hours) per day for working-age adults across the developed world[31].

However, the composition of that time remains deeply segregated. Women continue to perform roughly 60 percent of unpaid domestic work and less than 40 percent of paid work[31]. Furthermore, statistical averages reveal a phenomenon of "gender deviance neutralization"[33]. In the *European Sociological Review*, Kan and Gershuny (2016) discuss studies (such as Bittman et al., 2003) showing that when women earn substantially more than their husbands—breaking

the cultural norm of the male breadwinner—husbands often reduce their share of housework to assert traditional masculinity, and women increase theirs to compensate for their "deviant" economic success[33].

This behavioural division results in severe market penalties. In the *American Journal of Sociology*, Correll, Benard, and Paik (2007) investigated the "motherhood penalty"[34]. Utilising a laboratory experiment (N=188) and a real-world audit study of actual employers, they demonstrated a massive causal penalty[34]. Controlling for identical qualifications on resumes, mothers were judged significantly less competent and less committed than childless women, resulting in significantly lower recommended starting salaries and a lower probability of being called back for an interview[34]. Conversely, men faced no fatherhood penalty and frequently received a "fatherhood bonus," being viewed as more stable and committed providers[34]. Survey research confirms this translates to a replicated wage penalty of approximately 5 percent per child for women across OECD nations, persisting even after controlling for human capital and occupational factors[35].

Layer 3: Culture (Variable)

The cultural layer encompasses the ideological, legal, and institutional frameworks that societies built upon the physiological constraints and behavioural shifts of industrialisation. Unlike physical grip strength or time-use statistics, these cultural phenomena are highly variable, socially constructed, and fiercely contested.

The Domestic Ideology and Separate Spheres

As production left the household, a new bourgeois ideology emerged to rationalise the resultant spatial divide. In their seminal 1987 book *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850*, historians Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall documented the cultural construction of "separate spheres"[38]. Analysing a vast array of architectural designs, wills, diaries, and sermons across case studies in Birmingham and Essex, Davidoff and Hall demonstrated how Evangelical Protestantism framed the public sphere of business, politics, and commerce as inherently corrupting and masculine[39]. Conversely, the private sphere—the home, increasingly relocated to newly built suburbs separated from the smoke of industry—was sanctified as a "nursery of virtue" managed by the moral, domestic woman[39].

This cultural shift fundamentally redefined the concept of "work." Middle-class women were systematically removed from enterprise management and property ownership (enforced by coverture laws which transferred a woman's legal rights to her husband upon marriage), becoming entirely dependent on the male breadwinner[41]. The cultural marker of a successful bourgeois man became his ability to keep his wife out of the paid labour force, transforming her idleness into a status symbol[41].

The Controversy of the 'Family Wage'

The ideology of the male breadwinner was not confined to the middle class; it became a central demand of the working-class labour movement in the form of the 'family wage'—a male wage sufficient to support a dependent wife and children. The origins and implications of the family wage represent one of the deepest controversies in feminist economic history.

On one side, Marxist-feminist scholars, led by Heidi Hartmann in her 1976 work published in *Signs*, argue that the family wage was a deliberate pact between capitalism and patriarchy[43]. Hartmann posits that male trade unionists viewed women as a threat because employers used them to undercut wages. Instead of unionising women as co-workers, male workers colluded with capitalists to expel women from the formal labour market through exclusionary union rules and "protective legislation" (such as the 1842 Mines Act in Britain, which banned women from underground work)[43]. This alliance secured higher wages for men while guaranteeing them the unpaid domestic servitude of their wives at home, maintaining patriarchal control over female labour[43].

On the opposing side, Jane Humphries (1977) in the *Cambridge Journal of Economics* offers a class-based defence of the family wage[43]. Humphries argues that the male breadwinner model was not merely a patriarchal conspiracy, but a rational, defensive strategy by the entire working class against the horrific exploitation of early industrial capitalism[43]. Capitalists sought to commodify every member of the family, including young children. By fighting for a family wage and restricting female and child labour, the working class managed to claw back a sphere of autonomy—the home—where the next generation could be raised free from the brutal conditions of the factory floor[43]. In this view, the family wage was a mechanism of class survival, even if it inadvertently entrenched women's economic dependency[43].

Guilds and Institutional Exclusion

The cultural enforcement of male dominance in the labour market predates the factory system. In *A Bitter Living: Women, Markets, and Social Capital in Early Modern Germany* (Oxford University Press, 2003), Sheilagh Ogilvie demonstrates that the exclusion of women was driven by institutional rent-seeking[4]. Analysing extensive guild records from Württemberg, Ogilvie refutes the notion that guilds were benign institutions correcting market failures regarding training and quality[50]. Instead, they were powerful cartels that actively suppressed female labour to eliminate competition and protect male incomes[50]. The fact that guilds had to pass continuous, draconian regulations to prevent women from weaving, brewing, and trading proves that women were eager and physically capable of participating in these markets; cultural and legal force, not biological inadequacy, restricted them[52].

Ivan Illich: Vernacular Gender vs. Economic Sex

The most profound philosophical critique of how industrialisation transformed the sexes comes from philosopher Ivan Illich in his books *Shadow Work* (1981) and *Gender* (1982)[53]. Illich argues that pre-industrial societies were structured around "vernacular gender"—a system of deeply entrenched, culturally specific, but complementary roles[53]. In a subsistence economy, men and women performed entirely different tasks (e.g., men ploughing, women dairying), and the tools, spaces, and language they used were strictly gendered[56]. However, neither could survive without the other; they were interdependent halves of a productive whole[53].

Industrialisation, Illich argues, destroyed vernacular gender and replaced it with "economic sex"[53]. The capitalist economy created the myth of the generic, genderless human being who competes in the labour market as an isolated individual[53]. In a regime of "economic sex," men

and women are ostensibly interchangeable units of labour, yet women are systemically positioned as the "second sex," forced to compete in a hierarchy designed around male biology and unencumbered male time[53].

Crucially, industrialisation required the creation of what Illich termed "shadow work"[54]. Shadow work comprises the unpaid activities necessary to sustain a wage-based economy but which do not contribute directly to personal subsistence: commuting, consumer shopping, bureaucratic compliance, and, most importantly, the modern iteration of housework required to reproduce the wage-labourer[54]. Unlike pre-industrial subsistence work (which granted autonomy and directly sustained life), shadow work feeds the formal economy without compensation[54]. Illich notes that industrial society forced this unpaid shadow work predominantly onto women, creating a unique form of modern economic bondage masked by the ideology of domesticity[54].

The Devaluation of Social Reproduction and Comparative Welfare States

This devaluation of unpaid labour is not merely a philosophical concern but a profound macroeconomic distortion. In *If Women Counted* (1988), Marilyn Waring demonstrated how the United Nations System of National Accounts (UNSNA) deliberately excluded unpaid domestic and care work from the calculation of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)[58]. This accounting framework treats the reproduction of labour power as economically valueless, heavily skewing public policy[59]. Nancy Folbre expands on this in *Valuing Children* (2008), arguing that patriarchal capitalism socialises the benefits of children (who become future taxpayers and workers) while privatising the immense costs of care onto mothers, creating massive externalities that penalise women economically[61].

The cultural legacy of the male breadwinner model was eventually codified into the social policy of modern nations, though the timing and extent varied. In the *Journal of European Social Policy*, Jane Lewis (1992) formulated a highly influential typology of welfare states based on their historical adherence to the male breadwinner model[64].

Welfare State Typology	Characteristics	Country Examples
Strong Male Breadwinner	Social security, taxation, and childcare policies implicitly assume women are dependents. Care work is unpaid and private. High part-time female employment.	United Kingdom, Germany[66]
Modified Male	State recognises women's employment but still	France[69]

Breadwinner	incentivises familial care. Maternalist policies provide long, paid leaves but reinforce women's role as primary caregivers.	
Weak Male Breadwinner	State policies view both men and women as citizen-workers. Extensive public childcare and dual-earner tax incentives actively dismantle dependency.	Sweden, Denmark[66]

Table 3: Typologies of the Male Breadwinner Model in Welfare States (adapted from Lewis, 1992)[64].

Lewis's framework highlights that the separation of home and work was not just an organic economic outcome but a legally engineered reality that varied greatly depending on national culture and political contestation[64]. While Germany reinforced the male breadwinner through joint taxation, Scandinavian countries actively moved to dismantle it by individualising taxation and expanding public care[66].

Summary of Robust Findings

Industrialisation structurally separated the locus of economic production from biological reproduction, dismantling the peasant and artisan household as a joint enterprise. Female labour force participation across economic development reliably follows a U-shaped curve, dropping precipitously during early industrialisation as work moved to factories, and rising subsequently with the expansion of the white-collar service sector. The "male breadwinner" model, while culturally dominant, was frequently an ideological ideal that failed in reality; historical budgets prove that working-class families consistently required the supplementary, often invisible, labour of women and children to avoid destitution. Modern time-use data demonstrate that total work time (paid plus unpaid) is roughly equal between men and women (450–500 minutes daily) across developed nations, yet the division of tasks remains highly gender-segregated. This behavioural division results in a replicated, causal "motherhood penalty" in the labour market, suppressing female wages and hiring prospects while rewarding fathers. Concurrently, industrial capitalism replaced pre-industrial "subsistence work" with unpaid "shadow work" (e.g., commuting, domestic management for wage-earners), disproportionately assigning this uncompensated burden to women.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Drivers of the Historical Wage Gap:** Was the historical gender wage gap primarily a rational market response to objective physiological differences in strength and reproductive energetics (as argued by Burnette), or was it the result of rent-seeking,

guild exclusion, and patriarchal ideology (as argued by Ogilvie and Hartmann)?

- **The Intent of the Family Wage:** Did the working-class demand for a 'family wage' represent male collusion with capital to subjugate women in the home, or was it a genuine, progressive class strategy to save working-class families from total market commodification?
- **Gender Deviance Neutralization:** Will the phenomenon of "gender deviance neutralization"—where high-earning women perform more housework to compensate for breaking gender norms—persist in future cohorts, or is it a transient generational lag in the shift toward total egalitarianism?
- **The Value of Shadow Work:** Can macroeconomic indicators like GDP be successfully reformed to accurately quantify and value "shadow work" and social reproduction without inadvertently dragging the private sphere entirely into market logic?

5 to 10 Most Important Sources to Read in Full

1. **Goldin, C. (1990).** *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women*. Oxford University Press.
2. **Illich, I. (1981).** *Shadow Work*. Marion Boyars Publishers.
3. **Davidoff, L., & Hall, C. (1987).** *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850*. University of Chicago Press.
4. **Horrell, S., Humphries, J., & Weisdorf, J. (2020).** "Malthus's missing women and children: demography and wages in historical perspective, England 1280-1850." *European Economic Review*.
5. **Burnette, J. (2008).** *Gender, Work and Wages in Industrial Revolution Britain*. Cambridge University Press.
6. **Ogilvie, S. (2003).** *A Bitter Living: Women, Markets, and Social Capital in Early Modern Germany*. Oxford University Press.
7. **Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007).** "Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?" *American Journal of Sociology*.
8. **Lewis, J. (1992).** "Gender and the development of welfare regimes." *Journal of European Social Policy*.
9. **Folbre, N. (2008).** *Valuing Children: Rethinking the Economics of the Family*. Harvard University Press.
10. **Gershuny, J., & Robinson, J. P. (1988).** "Historical changes in the household division of labor." *Demography*.

Implications for living together

To deduce normative prescriptions for modern couples, families, and organisations from the history of industrialisation, one must strictly avoid the naturalistic fallacy: the fact that humans evolved with physiological dimorphism, or operated for a century under a male breadwinner model, does not render such arrangements morally "good" or socially optimal for the present. The historical data demonstrate that the absolute separation of the private home and the public workplace is neither a timeless human universal nor a biological imperative; rather, it is a specific artefact of early industrial capitalism. Prior to this, the family unit survived as a

cooperative, productive joint enterprise. For modern couples and families, the lingering cultural ghost of the "separate spheres" ideology continues to manifest in the motherhood penalty, unequal nutritional/resource bargaining in constrained households, and the asymmetrical distribution of "shadow work." Therefore, conscious, explicit negotiation regarding the division of unpaid domestic labour is essential to prevent default cultural scripts from sabotaging economic equality and relationship stability.

For organisations and societies, the evidence indicates that the "ideal worker" model—which assumes an employee has a spouse at home handling all reproductive labour and shadow work—is fundamentally incompatible with a dual-earner society. Structuring modern living arrangements effectively requires integrating flexible work, dismantling the systemic wage penalties associated with caregiving, and recognising that the economic survival and flourishing of the household has almost always required a joint, cooperative enterprise, rather than the isolated dependence of one sex upon the other.

Works cited

1. Hand-grip strength of young men, women and highly trained female, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/6614766_Hand-grip_strength_of_young_men_women_and_highly_trained_female_athletes
2. Genetic Influences on the Development of Grip Strength in ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4061497/
3. (PDF) Gender, Work and Wages in Industrial Revolution Britain, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227390433_Gender_Work_and_Wages_in_Industrial_Revolution_Britain
4. The Problems with Labor Force Participation as a Measure of, https://muse.jhu.edu/article/963190
5. the shift to factory production and its effect on women's employment, https://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/doi/pdf/10.1017/S026841601300012X?download=true
6. Joyce BURNETTE | Wabash College, Crawfordsville | Research profile, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Joyce-Burnette
7. The importance of ideology: the shift to factory production and its, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/continuity-and-change/article/importance-of-ideology-the-shift-to-factory-production-and-its-effect-on-womens-employment-opportunities-in-the-english-textile-industries-17601850/F8FFF813D6E6F9291D090C933B560B21
8. Bonobo mothers have elevated urinary cortisol levels during early, https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_3479332_7/component/file_3485057/content
9. Impact of energy availability and physical activity on variation in, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9951524/
10. Comparative Reproductive Energetics of Human and Nonhuman, https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-anthro-092412-155530
11. (PDF) Two worlds of female labour: gender wage inequality in, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348314767_Two_worlds_of_female_labour_gender_wage_inequality_in_western_Europe_1300-1800

12. Gender and the long-run development process. A survey of the, https://academic.oup.com/ereh/article/26/4/612/6725763
13. Gender Wage Inequality in Western Europe, 1300-1800, https://ehes.org/wp/EHES_138.pdf
14. The Female Labor Force and Long-Run Development - NBER, https://www.nber.org/system/files/chapters/c12892/c12892.pdf
15. Female labor force participation and economic growth - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261250707_Female_labor_force_participation_and_economic_growth_-_re-examination_of_U-shaped_curve_New_evidence_for_162_countries_over_the_period_1990-2012
16. Women's Work in US Historical Data | ICPSR - University of Michigan, https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/sites/icpsr/posts/shared/womens-historical-data
17. advanced-economicsciencesprize2023.pdf - Nobel Prize, https://www.nobelprize.org/uploads/2023/10/advanced-economicsciencesprize2023.pdf
18. Bread Winner - Emma Griffin - recensio.net, https://www.recensio.net/rezensionen/zeitschriften/rih/2020/november/bread-winner
19. The Quiet Revolution that Transformed Women's Employment, https://www.nber.org/papers/w11953
20. The Quiet Revolution That Transformed Women's Employment, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4728654_The_Quiet_Revolution_That_Transformed_Women's_Employment_Education_and_Family
21. The Quiet Revolution That Transformed Women's Employment, https://ideas.repec.org/a/aea/aecrev/v96y2006i2p1-21.html
22. Closing the Gender Gap in Education - Harvard Kennedy School, https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/cid/files/publications/faculty-working-papers/220.pdf
23. The Quiet Revolution and the Decline of Routine Jobs, https://www.frbsf.org/wp-content/uploads/wp2026-01.pdf
24. Malthus's missing women and children: demography and wages i, https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/eecrev/v129y2020ics0014292120301653.html
25. Beyond the male breadwinner: Life-cycle living standards of intact, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354218819_Beyond_the_male_breadwinner_Life-cycle_living_standards_of_intact_and_disrupted_English_working_families_1260-1850
26. The Origins and Expansion of the Male Breadwinner Family, https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/C5D42E9BA2C056B5BF2CD074A26A2D8A/S0020859000114786a.pdf/the-origins-and-expansion-of-the-male-breadwinner-family-the-case-of-nineteenth-century-britain.pdf
27. Horrell & Humphries 1992 Old Questions New Data - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/464241476/horrell-humphries-1992-Old-questions-new-data
28. off the record: reconstructing women's labor force participation in,

https://www.carmensarasua.es/descargas/articuloscientificos_scientificarticles/Humphries%20_%20Sarasua%202012%20Feminist%20Economics%2018.pdf
29. Bargaining for basics? Inferring decision making in nineteenth, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273367403_Bargaining_for_basics_Inferring_decision_making_in_nineteenth-century_British_households_from_expenditure_diet_stature_and_death
30. Gender inequality in a transition economy: heights and sexual, https://usiena-air.unisi.it/bitstream/11365/1228099/5/s11698-023-00264-1.pdf
31. Gender Symmetry, Gender Convergence and Historical Work-time, https://www.timeuse.org/sites/default/files/2018-02/CTUR%20WP%202%202018_0.pdf
32. [PDF] Historical changes in the household division of labor, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Historical-changes-in-the-household-division-of-Gershuny-Robinson/6a9addd9c64f007240cb78f43cc33eebe648df54
33. Change in Spousal Human Capital and Housework: A Longitudinal, https://academic.oup.com/esr/article/32/6/864/2953243
34. Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty? - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5023056_Getting_a_Job_Is_There_a_Motherhood_Penalty
35. Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?, http://iaucc1.frm.utn.edu.ar/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/motherhoodpenalty1.pdf
36. Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?, https://academicweb.nd.edu/~rwilliam/ndonly/readings/Methods/01-Experimentation/M24.pdf
37. Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty? - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345050194_Getting_a_Job_Is_There_a_Motherhood_Penalty
38. Family Fortunes - Leonore Davidoff, Catherine Hall - Google Books, https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=_5_tDxNQB7sC
39. Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780, https://www.routledge.com/Family-Fortunes-Men-and-Women-of-the-English-Middle-Class-1780-1850/Davidoff-Hall/p/book/9781138068810
40. Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780, https://www.bibliovault.org/BV.book.epl?ISBN=9780226137339
41. 1987 Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, https://ia601407.us.archive.org/19/items/in.ernet.dli.2015.213886/2015.213886.Family-Fortunes.pdf
42. 'Family Fortunes' by Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, https://residentjudge.com/2009/06/21/family-fortunes-by-leonore-davidoff-and-catherine-hall/
43. Gender antagonism and class conflict : exclusionary strategies of, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03071028808567710
44. City Spatial Structure, Women's Household Work, and National, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/495709

45. Hegel Marx & the English State 9781442675681 - DOKUMEN.PUB, https://dokumen.pub/hegel-marx-amp-the-english-state-9781442675681.html
46. Prof Joanna Bourke, Joanna Bourke - Working Class Cultures in, https://www.scribd.com/document/574557075/Prof-Joanna-Bourke-Joanna-Bourke-Working-Class-Cultures-in-Britain-1890-1960-Gender-Class-and-Ethnicity-Routledge-1993
47. The Rise and Decline of the Male Breadwinner Family? An, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-review-of-social-history/article/rise-and-decline-of-the-male-breadwinner-family-an-overview-of-the-debate/9351BC36461202BC5965656902C31C31
48. (PDF) How (un)productive is reproductive labour? Feminist political, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388452432_HOW_UNPRODUCTIVE_IS_REPRODUCTIVE_LABOUR_FEMINIST_POLITICAL_ECONOMISTS_ON_CAPITALISM'S_HOUSEHOLD_ECONOMY
49. Comparing the gender division of labour in early modern Sweden, https://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/doi/full/10.1017/S0268416025000104
50. The Dark Side of Human Institutions: A Conversation with Sheilagh, https://csgs.kcl.ac.uk/podcast/the-dark-side-of-human-institutions-a-conversation-with-sheilagh-ogilvie-on-the-european-guilds/
51. Guilds, efficiency, and social capital - Sheilagh Ogilvie, https://sheilaghogilvie.com/wp-content/uploads/publications/EcHR-2004-guilds.pdf
52. Sheilagh OGILVIE - University of Oxford - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sheilagh-Ogilvie
53. Gender | The Ted K Archive, https://www.thetedkarchive.com/library/ivan-illich-gender
54. Excerpts from Ivan Illich's essay, "Shadow Work" (1981). (Part 1)., https://www.reddit.com/r/theideologyofwork/comments/c95x0k/excerpts_from_ivan_illichs_essay_shadow_work_1981/
55. Ivan Illich - Shadow work - Nurture Development, https://www.nurturedevelopment.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Illich-Shadow-work.pdf
56. Shadow Work and Subsistence Works: Understanding Unpaid, https://gandhi.study/gandhis-economic-thought/shadow-work-subsistence-unpaid-labor/
57. shadow work - The Operations Room - WordPress.com, https://operationsroom.wordpress.com/tag/shadow-work/
58. 'HOUSEWIVES as NATION-BUILDERS' - Global Women's Strike, https://globalwomenstrike.net/housewives-as-nation-builders/
59. Marilyn Waring - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marilyn_Waring
60. Our place in ,me: Making unpaid work count - The McKell Institute, https://mckellinstitute.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Sept23-Our-Place-in-Time.pdf
61. The Rise and Decline of Patriarchal Capitalism - PERI UMASS, https://peri.umass.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/WP298.pdf

62. Who Cares? A Feminist Critique of the Care Economy, https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/sonst_publikationen/folbre_whocares.pdf
63. Investment, consumption, or public good? Unpaid work and intra, https://www.euskadi.eus/web01-a2reveko/es/k86aEkonomiazWar/ekonomiaz/downloadPDF?R01HNoPortal=true&idpubl=87®istro=11
64. Gendering Welfare State Analysis: Tensions between Care and Paid, https://pure.qub.ac.uk/files/153165997/Gendering.pdf
65. (PDF) Gender and the Welfare State: New Research on the Origins, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271217721_Gender_and_the_Welfare_State_New_Research_on_the_Origins_and_Consequences_of_Social_Policy_Regimes
66. "The Most Unbreakable Right of Man": Women and Economic, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242165390_The_Most_Unbreakable_Right_of_Man_Women_and_Economic_Citizenship
67. Household Bargaining and Risk of Divorce in Germany ... - UQ eSpace, https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:79076/UQ79076_OA.pdf
68. Christiane Kuller - Soziale Sicherung von Frauen, https://library.fes.de/pdf-files/afs/bd47/10_kuller.pdf
69. Le genre des politiques sociales. L'apport théorique des "gender, https://journals.openedition.org/sdt/22385?lang=fr