White Rose Research Online

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York

Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/95616/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:
Meah, A. and Jackson, P. (2013) Crowded kitchens: the 'democratisation' of domesticity? Gender, Place and Culture , 20 (5). pp. 578-596. ISSN: 0966-369X

https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2012.701202

Reuse
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

To cite this article: Angela Meah & Peter Jackson (2013) Crowded kitchens: the 'democratisation' of domesticity?, *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, 20:5, 578-596, DOI:10.1080/0966369X.2012.701202

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2012.701202

Crowded kitchens: the 'democratisation' of domesticity?*

Dr Angela Meah & Prof Peter Jackson

Department of Geography
University of Sheffield
Sheffield, UK
S10 2TU
a.meah@sheffield.ac.uk

* Accepted version

Crowded kitchens: the 'democratisation' of domesticity?

Abstract

Building on previous work concerning the gendered nature of domestic space, this paper focuses on the kitchen as a key site in which gendered roles and responsibilities are experienced and contested. As men have begun to engage more frequently in cooking and other domestic practices (albeit selectively and often on their own terms), the paper argues that kitchens have become 'crowded' spaces for women. Drawing on evidence from focus groups, interviews and ethnographic observation of kitchen practices in South Yorkshire (UK), we suggest that men's entry into the kitchen has facilitated the expression of a more diverse range of masculine subjectivities, while also creating new anxieties for women. Specifically, our evidence suggests that family meals may be experienced as a site of domestic conflict as well as a celebration of family life; that convenience and shortcuts can be embraced by women without incurring feelings of guilt and imperfection; that cooking is being embraced as a lifestyle choice by increasing numbers of men who use it as an opportunity to demonstrate competence and skill, while women are more pragmatic; ; and that kitchens may be experienced as 'uncanny' spaces by women as men increasingly assert their presence in this domain. Our analysis confirms that while the relationship between domestic practices and gendered subjectivities *is* changing, this does not amount to a fundamental 'democratisation' of domesticity with significantly greater equality between men and women.

Keywords: kitchens; gender; domesticity; masculinity; UK; ethnography

Introduction

'Home', and the spaces which constitute it, cannot be isolated from the subjectivities that are produced within it. Indeed, home can be said to produce, and reproduce, particular gender-based subjectivities, as well as being a principal source of self-identity for both women and men (Munro and Madigan 1999; Blunt and Dowling 2006). Perhaps not surprisingly, feminist scholarship undertaken in the 1960s and 1970s drew attention to the condition of the 'captive wives' and 'housebound mothers' who would never realise their full potential until they shrugged off the shackles of domestic oppression (Friedan 1963; Gavron 1966; Greer 1970; Oakley 1974). For these scholars and many who followed, rather than providing a 'haven in a heartless world', the family home could also be represented as 'the locus of oppression, ranging from the frustration of women who find themselves tied to a narrow domestic role, to those who are victims of sustained violence' (Munro and Madigan 1999: 108).

Within the home, the kitchen emerges as a key site in which power is deployed, either in constraining women or – conversely – in affording women power which they may be unable to exercise in other domains.[1] It is a space which has become associated with routine and ritual, one which both inscribes and reinforces particular gendered roles and responsibilities, and one in which 'status is confirmed and exclusion practiced' (Floyd 2004: 62). Indeed, sociologically-based accounts of families and food provided by Murcott (1983a), Charles and Kerr (1988), DeVault (1991) and Giard (1998) highlight the denigration of cooking as part of the routine, taken-for-granted work of 'feeding the family'.[2] The clear demarcation of certain spaces within the home as 'masculine' and 'feminine' has been subject to change in

[1] See *Gender, Place and Culture* special issue (2006), including articles by Bennet, Christie, Robson and Schroeder.

[2] That this process persists is suggested by Frances Short's (2006) discussion of the alleged 'deskilling' of cooking and other domestic practices.

recent years with the dismantling – in industrialised societies - of the 'standardised biographies' that once traced our progression through life (Giddens 1992). Sex, parenthood and cohabitation have increasingly been uncoupled from marriage and more diverse family forms have emerged, resulting in an increase in the number of reconstituted families, solo living and house-sharing (Smart & Neale 1999; Allan et al. 2011). In the UK, for example, the 'nuclear' household with two parents and their dependent children living under the same roof is no longer the norm and domestic roles have subsequently required reconceptualization (Jackson 2009). At the same time, however, individuals' engagement with physical and emotional spaces outside the home (work, leisure etc.) has also facilitated a reconstitution of our relationship to activities which take place within it. While the 'Superwoman' figure envisaged by Shirley Conran juggled the 'double burden' of career and family life (see Murcott 1983b), Smith and Winchester (1998) suggest that men may negotiate their domestic roles as a means through which to escape more oppressive masculinities, associated with the workplace and other competitive spaces.

In tandem with these changes has been the advent of consumer-based lifestyles, which have provided grounds for a shift in the way that cooking has been conceptualised. This shift has provided fertile ground wherein cooking has been reconstituted as a recreational, *leisure* activity (Roos et al. 2001; Holden 2005; Short 2006; Aarseth 2009; Swenson 2009; Cairns et al. 2010), and one with increasing appeal to men. Indeed, Hollows suggests that cooking has become a 'cool' *masculine* lifestyle activity (2003: 230), with Swenson suggesting that television has been particularly instrumental in invoking a sense of 'masculine domesticity' which has given men a place at the stove (2009: 47). Time-use data from Jonathan Gershuny's research group suggest that, in the UK, men's total domestic work time has increased from 90 minutes per day in the 1960s to 148 minutes per day in the early 2000s,

with time spent on cooking, cleaning and laundry increasing from around 20 minutes per day to more than 50 minutes per day over the same period (Kan et al. 2011). As men have begun to engage more frequently in cooking and other domestic practices, we argue, kitchens have become 'crowded' spaces for women.

In this paper, we will explore the extent to which changes in kitchen practices have led to a 'democratisation' of domesticity, signalling greater gender equality. We contend that men's engagement with the domestic has, in some circumstances, done little more than create new anxieties for the women who share these spaces, while men's entry into the kitchen has facilitated the expression of a more diverse range of (creative, caring) masculinities among some men, along with the reinscription of traditional gender roles for others where, even in all-male households, some men find themselves in the role of wife/mother.

Kitchen design and the negotiation of domestic space

Much has been written about the design of kitchens in industrialised countries, not least by those concerned with its role in re/constituting gendered subjectivities. That this concern is not a recent one is reflected by feminist utopians in the US calling for the 'socialisation of domestic work' and the creation of 'kitchenless' houses as early as the mid-nineteenth century (Hayden 1978: 275). Also taking a historical perspective, Llewellyn (2004), Saarikangas (2006) and Lloyd and Johnson (2004) highlight the emphasis placed on functionality and how this was translated in practical terms. Although the domestic would remain, unchallenged, as women's domain, the application of time-and-motion principles, the prioritisation of the working triangle (see Johnson 2006 for variations on this) and masculine

values associated with industrialisation infiltrated the way in which kitchens were designed. For example, Llewellyn points out that designer Elizabeth Denby envisaged: 'an efficient worker-housewife, whose role in the kitchen was paralleled with that of the factory worker. Her routinized tasks and ruthlessly efficient working space left no room for feminine qualities of nurture and care. The scientific management of this space had created a value-free laboratory wherein women were masculinised' (2004: 53). This theme is echoed in Saarikangas' observations of the Finnish case where: 'the repetitive and monotonous model of factory work performed alone on the assembly line was transferred to the modern kitchen. With superfluous movements reduced, household work could be performed standing in one place' (2006: 164).[3]

The inter-war period witnessed a relocation of the kitchen from the margins of the household to a more central location within it, albeit still closeted from other spaces in the house. Saarikangas, for example, depicts early modern Finnish kitchens as tiny spaces within which was confined the messy business of 'sanitary labour' along with the person who performed it (p.165). This, however, would give way to more open designs, which facilitated greater fluidity between the kitchen, eating and leisure spaces. But in opening up kitchens and putting housework on show, this spatial openness also increased the pressure on women to achieve and maintain particular standards of hygiene and cleanliness (see also Mennell et al. 1992). Moreover, the creation of more open-plan spaces also transformed kitchens into a panoptican-like space of surveillance (Johnson 2006: 128), enabling mothers to keep an eye on the children while preparing a meal but, as Llewellyn observes, further reinforcing women's feminine subjectivity as mothers with principal responsibility for childcare.

[3] The application of time-and-motion techniques to the analysis of kitchen practices is deftly satirized in the Nordic film *Kitchen Stories* (Salmer fra Kjøkkenet, 2003).

But gender was not just designed into domestic spaces; it was also relentlessly reinforced (Chapman 1999: 163) through processes of socialisation from early childhood. Here, the wider media including advertising and cookery literature were prominent. Writing about the US, Inness catalogues the extent to which cookbooks represent a 'barometer of changing gender roles' (2005: 10), exploring how particular foods and forms of cooking have been reinforced as gendered, along with the shifting nature of women's 'responsibility' for foodwork across decades of challenge during, between and following the two World Wars. This is particularly evident in the post-Second World war period when the resilience and thrift of wartime cooks was 'rewarded' with a kitchen 'pleasure palace' (p.125), well-stocked with appliances, cans and other convenience foods. However, as Murcott (1983b) points out, while the nature of work required within the kitchen may have changed, it was – nonetheless - still women who were doing it.

Alternative narratives of the social significance of the home have been provided by African-American critics such as bell hooks (1991) who says of her own memories of 'homeplace' that 'houses belonged to women, were their special domain, not as property, but as places where all that truly mattered in life took place - the warmth and comfort of shelter, the feeding of our bodies, the nurturing of our souls' (1991: 41). Similarly, Marvalene Hughes (1997) writes that for African-American women, cooking is not coterminous with oppression, routine or drudgery, but is an expression of love, nurturance, creativity and sharing, which became a route through which to *escape* the painful realities of racist oppression. However, as Counihan (2005: 210-11) observes, this is not to suggest that food cannot also provide a forum through which domestic discontent and violence is played out.[4]

[4] See also Supski (2006) on the experience of ethnically Othered women in post-colonial Australia.

Alongside work on the space of the kitchen has been scholarship concerned specifically with the distribution of roles and responsibilities for activities taking place within it. In the UK, for example, Anne Murcott (1983a) depicts a world in which women were subject to the demands of male 'breadwinners' and expected to take pleasure in cooking and caring for them. A little later, Charles and Kerr (1988) highlight how food practices (cooking, eating, sharing) are inscribed in ideologies of the family within which food preparation is perceived as an expression of care performed by women. Meanwhile in the US, Marjorie DeVault's (1991) work with a more socially and culturally diverse group of participants, including single-parent households, highlights the persistence of inequalities concerning the overall distribution of activities which constitute the work of 'feeding the family'. With the exception of DeVault's study, men's involvement in the kitchen is marked by their absence, and even then, only three of DeVault's 30 households included men who regularly contribute to cooking or provisioning, and here too, it was acknowledged that they did so with their partner as "supervisor" since it was "not my domain" (DeVault 1991: 139). A more recent study of men with children, undertaken in the UK by Metcalfe et al. (2009), reports that a third of the study's participants were cooking at least some of the time.

Murcott (2000) has drawn attention to important epistemological issues concerning the nature of research undertaken into domestic kitchen practices. She points out that many studies are based largely on interview data, questionnaires and/or diaries, which rely on *reports* of what takes place; however she observes that these have tended to be 'used as proxy for studies of what actually *does*' happen (p. 78 [*emphasis added*]). A further factor highlighted by Murcott is the need to distinguish between historical and biographical time, and to acknowledge how memories of the past are always shaped by present-day concerns. Pursuing these epistemological and methodological issues, we might ask whether the findings of these

previous studies would have been different had they also included direct observation or recording of individuals' practices and routine activities as well as their reported behaviour? And would the questions which are pertinent now be the same as those being asked in the early 1980s?

Methods

The study reported here attempts to address some of the methodological and epistemological issues highlighted by Murcott.[5] It does so by drawing upon a combination of life history interviews along with direct observational and recorded data from at least two generations of participants from eight families based largely in the South Yorkshire area of the UK.[6] These data are supplemented by focus group evidence from a wider group of respondents (n=37). Seven of the eight families were White, one of which was Irish. The eighth family was Pakistani, the younger generation being British-born. All but the Irish and Pakistani families identified as middle class, although social mobility within the middle class families, particularly among the older generations, is significant.[7] Interviews were completed with representatives of at least two generations (one of which had to be in their mid-50s or older). The age of participants ranged from 17 to 92. Of the 23 interviewees, seven are men. Observations were carried out with 13 participants, five of which were men.[8] These ranged from making up a shopping list for an online shop, to a whole day spent with one participant. During this visit, the first author accompanied the participant during her weekly trip to the

---

5 The project is part of a programme of research on *Consumer Culture in an 'Age of Anxiety'*, funded by the European Research Council. For further details, see: http://www.sheffield.ac.uk/conanx.

6 One family included members of four generations.

7 While it is recognised that the social and ethnic composition of these households has an impact in biasing the data toward a particular range of perspectives, the focus groups reflect a broader social constituency, including Muslim Somali women and areas of social disadvantage.

8 In addition to video-recording, the kitchen tours were also photographed. Selected images can be accessed via the project's online photo-gallery http://www.flickr.com/photos/52548860@N08/

supermarket, observed the unpacking of groceries, carried out an interview and then observed and videoed the preparation of the evening meal, joining the participant for all her meals during the course of the day. In other cases, the interviews and ethnographic observation were spread over a period of up to 12 months (including periods of illness and bereavement), allowing insights into the way that shifting biographical circumstances can lead to changed priorities and practices (see Meah and Watson 2011).

Analysis of the data has been facilitated by the development of a broad coding framework, enabling interaction between our research questions and the data. The framework was designed to accommodate emergent themes which were important to our participants, as well as those pertinent to our research questions. In the discussion which follows, we take a 'ground-up' approach, drawing upon our respondents' *sayings and doings* (Schatzki 2002), exploring issues that emerged as important within our participants' 'stream of experiences and practices as they move through, and interact with, their physical and social environment' (Kusenbach 2003: 463). The originality of our study lies in our ability to explore issues emerging from the existing literature in a more direct manner by making visible the perspectives of men as well as women and by observing participants' actual practices as well as their reported behaviour. Our empirical findings are organised into four main sections focusing on conflict and the family meal; shortcuts, convenience and imperfection; skill and choice; and the uncanniness of contemporary kitchens.

"I'm not your dinner-bitch": conflict and the family meal

We have already shown how domestic reality can be far from the idealised image of home as 'haven'. While meal preparation can be seen as an expression of love, care and gift-giving, and mealtimes can be a space in which 'family' is celebrated and reproduced, these practices can also be experienced as sites of contestation and anxiety for women, men and children. Charles (1995) observes that mealtimes can become a 'battleground' particularly where the dining table is regarded as a site for the socialisation of children, while tension over the choice of food can – in some circumstances – only be avoided by the deference of women to the tastes and preferences of their partners and/or children (see Charles and Kerr 1988; DeVault 1991; Kemmer et al. 1998). Everyday meal preparation can be seen as an illustration of how the mundane can be used as 'an interpretive framework for the extreme' (Hockey et al. 2007: 140), with mundane memories of food providing a lens through which to recall acts of violence. For example, one of Counihan's participants talks about having *"learned to make rice the hard way"* (2005: 210), while Hockey et al. (2007) report a participant who had been forced, by her husband, to eat an entire pan of Spaghetti Bolognese having *"got it wrong"* (p.139).

Our interview and ethnographic data confirm the presence of a range of anxieties among many of our participants during the preparation of family meals (see also Meah and Watson 2011). Here, however, we focus on one participant, Joe Green, who demonstrates that conflict over food is not an experience entirely owned by women and can also be experienced in all-male households. Joe (45) was born in the Midlands to working-class Irish parents.[9] He had made a career in IT before enrolling on a Masters' programme; prior to this, he had had no

[9] All names are pseudonyms and data are reproduced with participants' consent.

formal educational qualifications. At the time of interview, he was living in rented accommodation, which he shared with his 19 year old son and another male lodger. Joe had been married twice and was going through his second divorce. His own parents had separated, and subsequently divorced, when he was 4. Although this was something he avoided discussing during the interview, he reported memories of his father throwing dinners across the room, and his mother, Mary (67) describes these mealtimes as having been *"an ordeal".* However, the mealtime experience was transformed for both Joe and his mother after she repartnered. This relationship is characterised as having been egalitarian, with mother, step-father and son sharing the responsibilities that went into the production of a meal. If Mary cooked, Joe and his step-father would clear up afterwards. Although somewhat begrudging of these tasks as a teenager, in later life he learned to appreciate what he learned about fairness through the distribution of mealtime responsibilities and how each task contributed to a successful outcome both in practical terms, and for the person who had done the cooking:

"I still remember there being a fairness, that although was forced upon me, the fairness was that all three of us were involved in the kitchen and the preparation of our food. And it was an equal contribution, maybe not in terms or in effort, but in functionality. The drying of the dishes isn't a great job, but someone's got to dry the dishes and put them away or, guess what, the next day they're still gonna be dirty on the side and, what, is it the person that's prepared the food that's got to wash those up?"

Joe reports having had an expectation that the principle of 'fairness' would be something that could be replicated in both his marriages. However, this was apparently not the case and he recalls someone having expressed surprise that he could cook, to which he responded: *"Jesus, if I couldn't cook after the 20 years I've had with those two women I would've starved to death".* Invoking ideas about the elision of food and sex (see Probyn 2000), Joe

goes on to explain how both his ex-wives had used *"food and the kitchen as if it were some sort of (.) tool, as if they're (.) some people use sex in that way, you know, it's almost as a reward".*[10] Although he says that he had no expectation that his dinner should be on the table when he arrived home on a Friday night after working away all week, he objected to the fact that there would not even be enough food in the cupboards to make a sandwich with. Consequently, *"even the thought of my evening meal (.) became an onerous task because I knew that before I could even get fed, if I <u>was</u> to get fed, I would have to get some stuff in for it… food lost its appeal".*

Now living in a 'womanless' household (Coxon 1983) with his son and one of his friends, also aged in his forties, Joe continues to find cause for complaint regarding the lack of equity in the household's tiny kitchen. Echoing Natalier's (2003) findings concerning the distribution of domestic responsibilities in all male-households, Joe's complaints about both his housemates' failure to do their 'fair-share' in keeping the kitchen clean, but also in deferring kitchen responsibilities to him, apparently reflect an assumption that some men 'behave as though they were husbands even in the absence of women who might act as wives' (Natalier 2003: 265). In conditions where 'everybody is doing masculinity, and masculinity is linked to dominance', Natalier asks, 'is anyone oppressed?' (p. 263). Ethnographic and observational work with Joe Green suggests that the answer is 'yes'. While he had previously been happy to take responsibility for the majority of the provisioning and cooking, the pressure of studying full-time and continuing to try to do freelance IT work meant that he was time-poor and felt stressed with the challenge of studying for the first time in almost 30 years. Under the conditions of a 'double burden', relationships in the household

[10] (.) indicates a short pause or hesitation; (…) indicates a longer pause; ( ) indicates an indistinguishable utterance or uncertain reading.

became strained and the first author witnessed a succession of occasions where Joe angrily refused to undertake the washing of dishes and pans which had clearly been accumulating on the limited workspace over a period of days, meaning that he was unable to prepare food for himself. *"I'm not asking them to do anything more than clean up after themselves",* was a statement repeatedly made and numerous exchanges were witnessed between father and son where anger was expressed through sarcasm, the more heated discussions reportedly taking place behind closed doors:

"...we were sat down one day having a big argument and I said 'You think I'm your dinner-bitch or something? That you can click your fingers and I'm going to cook you your dinner?'. Well, he's a 19 year old man, and I may be his dad, but I'm not his fucking dinner-bitch, nor anyone else's".

In spite of Joe's insistence that he is no-one's *"dinner-bitch",* he was observed continuing to play the role of 'mother' after the lodger moved out, leaving him and his son in the house. Initial arrangements to film Joe cooking had to be aborted at the last minute since he was still waiting for his son to clean the kitchen and Joe lacked confidence in his son's ability to perform this task to a level that he either felt would be presentable on film or would feel relaxed preparing food in. When the cooking observation *did* finally take place, the whole house had been subjected to a 'spring-clean', the kitchen itself was spotlessly clean and grease-free, while the fridge was devoid of any of the decomposing vegetables which it had previously accommodated. From our ethnographically-based understanding of this family, it is unlikely that this was attributable to the efforts of anyone other than Joe.

"I'm sorry, but…": embracing shortcuts, convenience and 'imperfection'

As observed elsewhere, it has been suggested that the industrialisation of food production has been responsible for deskilling housewives (see Mennell et al. 1992; Short 2006; Jackson et al. 2010; Meah and Watson 2011). Shapiro (2009) suggests that, by the 1950s, the embrace of 'domestic science' in the US had not only brought with it culinary regimentation, but also intellectual and imaginative collapse, and Inness' (2005) work on cookbooks emphasises how canned foods, for example, became a central component in the ubiquitous 'casserole' of that era. While such practices are at odds with current debates concerning 'Slow Food' and the desirability of fresh ingredients, Inness notes the importance of not viewing foods in the 1950s though contemporary eyes: 'canned foods were generally seen as expanding a cook's repertoire, rather than narrowing it' (p. 159). Our women participants who were raising families during the 1960s and 1970s report that in the UK, Vesta curries and Angel Delight[11] became regular novelties, along with Spam, corned beef and tinned mince.

Claims made regarding the loss of 'traditional' cooking skills and a knowledge of the storage and spoilage properties of food (Shaw 1999) - assumed to have been characteristic of earlier generations who were 'paragons of virtue in the kitchen' (Meah and Watson 2011) - are clearly challenged via the ubiquity of 'convenience' or 'shortcut' foods among the older generation of our interviewees. While it was, apparently, acceptable to use these items between the 1950s and 1970s, a shift appears to have occurred since then which is reflected in the pride with which women reported by Charles and Kerr (1988) and Murcott (1982; 1983a) conceptualised their efforts in producing 'proper' meals prepared from 'scratch'. For

[11] Vesta was one of the brands which introduced Indian and Chinese food, in the form of ready-meals, in the UK. Angel Delight is a powdered custard product which, when whisked with milk, produces a mousse-like dessert.

participants in Charles and Kerr's study, being able to cook was a prerequisite for being a 'proper wife' in the male-breadwinner family, where women's activities were rationalised in relation to their husbands' waged work and interpreted as demonstrations of love and care. Reporting data collected during a comparable period, DeVault highlights that while her women participants spoke judgmentally of their own *"laziness"* and *"bad habits",* one of her few male participants is characterised by his 'lack of shame' and freedom from 'guilt' in speaking of his own domestic shortcomings (p.150). We were, therefore, particularly interested in how *our* participants would respond to the 'deskilling' debate which had partially informed this study, along with the distribution of roles and responsibilities in households where the male-breadwinner model is no longer the norm.

Some of our participants made what we call 'unapologetic apologies' in relation to their domestic foodwork practices, and this was particularly apparent during the observational work undertaken with these households. Jonathan Anderson was 38 at the time of observation. He is an operations manager in a travel business and lives with his partner, Polly (37), whom he met at university. Polly also worked as an operations manager until she went on maternity leave to have their second child. The couple have a three year old son, William, and their daughter was born five months after their participation in the fieldwork. Jonathan was the principal cook in the household and claimed to share responsibility for provisioning with Polly although, in reality, this was something *she* appeared to take responsibility for. In different ways, both Polly and Jonathan demonstrated a capacity to eschew the kind of guilt that may have characterised their parents' generation. For example, in speaking about their provisioning practices and how these are implicated in food waste, during his interview Jonathan explained: *"I think we're hopeless shoppers"* since poor fridge-management and planning frequently led to fresh ingredients being forgotten at the bottom of the fridge.

Indeed, when carrying out the cooking observation, apparently imagining judgment from the first author, Jonathan unashamedly drew attention to numerous jars of food which he removed from the fridge and deposited directly into the bin. Coming from a family in which food waste was avoided at all costs, this would have been anathema to Jonathan's parents. On speaking with Polly, she is quite open in admitting that much of the food waste incurred by the household resulted from what, she says, Jonathan would describe as her *"very haphazard"* approach to shopping*: "I buy things that erm, I just throw in the trolley and then we end up throwing out"*. Polly demonstrates no embarrassment in relation to her provisioning practices (although she does admit that she has tried to become more structured in her approach and was, indeed, demonstrably so when accompanied on a provisioning go-along). She was even less apologetic in relation to her 'one-pot' mince and onion-based approach to cooking, which has been the subject of teasing by both Jonathan and his 'foodie' father (Ted). Rather than feeling intimidated by this family of 'food adventurers' (Heldke 2003), Polly has learned to stand her ground and now, feeling fully accepted into the family, is able to proudly assert that *"I can hold my own with the Andersons, so to speak"*.

Another participant who demonstrated a devil-may-care approach to those whom she perhaps imagined might judge her practices was Liz Elland (37). Liz and husband, John (41), were both interviewed as part of the study. The couple have no children. At the time of interview, Liz was a health professional but by the time of the ethnographic observation 12 months later, had given this up and was working part-time in a coffee shop while she decided what direction she wanted to pursue with her career. Liz is a woman of very strong opinions and her unapologetic approach was initially observed during a focus group discussion in which she and John took part before being enrolled to the household study. In justifying her decision to do the household shopping at a particular supermarket she says:

"I'm not going to go to work and then start fucking trawling all the groceries or whatever. Whereas if I can go to [Store], *I'm sorry everybody, and then buy everything, then I do do. I also use the butchers and the greengrocers as well, but if I'm doing a big food shop I'm not going to trawl around Crookes and Crosspool to get your* [husband] *shopping".*

Liz demonstrates a range of contradictions in her attitudes and practices. Born to a Protestant Northern Irish mother, she grew up observing a very traditional gendered division of labour since her mother gave up work to care for Liz's seriously disabled older sister. For Liz, doing the shopping – and *enjoying* it – is part of keeping a *"good house"*, a skill she learned from her mother. During the provisioning go-along, Liz demonstrated ruthless efficiency in searching for bargains and the best quality produce, deviating as little as possible from her list. The stock in the fridge and cupboards had been *"run-down"* in anticipation of the shop and space created for the fresh shopping. Liz appears the proud, model housewife, confident and self-assured in her skills as both a 'home manager' and as a cook. While she is quite happy to cook 'from scratch', Liz is also unashamed in her use of *"cheats"* when it suits her to do so. For example, she picks up some ready-made quiches and explains that: *"These are for John when 'I can't be arsed cooking. These are really light and tasty and if I feel like it I might stab it, put more egg in and put stuff on the top".* On the one hand she admits that sometimes she *"can't be arsed"* to cook, but at the same time she will 'improve' a shop-bought item by adding to it. Likewise, while cooking, she tells the first author: *"I'm not a 'chefy' cook. I'm more of a Delia* [Smith] *cheat cook' I don't mind using the odd shop bought"*. Previously, she had explained that her mother had taught her 'economy' by showing her how to bulk out a shop-bought sauce by looking at and then adding to the ingredients listed on the jar. In spite of the currency of ideas about avoiding tinned and processed foods which are high in salt and sugar, a number of our 'foodie' participants were not averse to their use. Jonathan Anderson, for example, added a jar of sauce to a stir-fried dish in which

all the ingredients had been fried separately to ensure that they did not all *"taste of the same thing"*. When the first author expressed surprise at this, he light-heartedly apologised: *"I'm sorry but I'm going to have to disappoint you"*.

The use of 'cheats' was also observed in other households. Nazra Habib (55), who was born in Pakistan but moved to the UK aged 6, shares her home with her husband, daughter, son-in-law and their two children, aged four weeks and two and half years. Now in poor health but still responsible for feeding her family (and also friends and neighbours as part of her mission to receive *"blessings from Allah"*), she admits to using shop-bought or takeaway chapattis and ready-made pastry for her samosas. While these goods are labour-saving in later life, she points out that when she was raising five children on her own, running a home and *"working for a living"*, she learned to identify a range of 'short-cuts' which facilitated speed and efficiency. For example, when preparing a curry, Nazra pulled some chillies out of the freezer and proceeded to bash these up in a mortar and pestle. She did the same with a head of garlic, removing the loosened skin as she went along, rather than carefully removing these before crushing. Again, without the reservation or embarrassment identified among DeVault's women participants, she said: *"I can't be bothered… I find it easier and it's time-saving as well… This is the easy way out. Thank God for these gadgets"*.

Our evidence therefore suggests that while men and women do embrace the use of shortcuts, convenience foods and labour-saving devices, women are more likely than men to recognise that these practices might be viewed as a shortcoming in the fulfilment of their idealised domestic roles. However, while DeVault's participants are reported as feeling the need to

apologise for or excuse their perceived imperfections, this is not always the case among our participants.

Gender, 'skill' and choice

Changing household structures, women's increased labour market participation and the reconstitution of cooking as a recreational lifestyle activity – and a 'cool' masculine one (Hollows 2003) – have paved the way for men's increased engagement with cooking in more recent years. Inness (2005) writes of a long-standing existence of a 'male cooking mystique' which reinforces traditional gendered roles, cooking and eating practices and the 'naturalness' of women as domestic cooks, along with the reminder that if men *choose* to cook, they must do so in ways which do not diminish their masculinity. While men may, in the past, have been able to restrict their engagement with cooking by establishing 'sovereignty' over a given weekend meal or type of meal event - typically the cooked weekend breakfast, the Sunday roast, or barbecue cooking (Adler 1981) - this is no longer the case in many households.

As Swenson (2009) notes, television has played an important role in reconstituting how cooking has been perceived, the competitive approach of many programmes in Australia, the UK and the US recasting food preparation as 'sport', with chefs as 'athletes' (p. 36), rather than 'cooks'. Seen in this light, the kitchen is no longer women's 'homely', feminised domestic space, but a 'stadium' in which culinary battles are fought, with specialised knives, gadgets and tools serving as equipment to aid 'performance'. Through the observational work, it proved interesting to compare how women and men set about the task of preparing

garlic, for example. Men's displays took place amidst much 'bashing' and engagement with pseudo-professional knife skills, while women tended to be more understated in their performances, gently peeling away the skin and finely slicing, crushing or grating, as was the case with Liz Elland, who had decided that garlic presses both create waste and are difficult to clean. Liz was not averse to using her hands to break food up and, like other women that were observed, she tended to be very cavalier in the way she roughly chopped vegetables, which contrasted with the very neat and 'precise' knife-skills demonstrated by male participants. The first author commented on this and Liz responded: *"you can use your hands – you've got tools on the end of your arms!"* Indeed, while women participants appeared to be discretely getting on with the everyday business of preparing a household meal, our male participants seemed to be engaged in culinary displays which reinforced their flair and skill. Figure 1 illustrates the meticulous knife-skills employed by Joe Green, while figure 2 shows Nazra Habib literally using her hand as a 'tool' to mix vegetables in pakora batter.

Figure 1: Joe Green demonstrating his knife skills

Figure 2: Nazra Habib using the *'tool on the end of [her] arm'*

In our study, we were fortunate to have recruited two families in which men of both generations had primary responsibility for everyday cooking, and observations were undertaken with three of these four men, one involving a succession of opportunistic observations over several months. These included Jonathan Anderson (see above), his father, Ted (65), and Stuart Charles (42). Ted and his wife Laura (63) are semi-retired academics, both volunteering to take part in the study. Stuart worked in IT, he and wife, Sally (40), an administrator in the National Health Service (NHS), agreed to take part alongside Stuart's parents.

In each household, men's engagement in cooking occurred under different circumstances. While Laura Anderson had endured, rather than enjoyed, her primary responsibility for

cooking while her children lived at home, Ted was always a more willing cook, enthused by a passion for feeding people inherited from his mother. Ted assumed the role of principal cook in the Anderson household during the 1980s, when Laura took up an appointment in another part of the country, requiring Ted and teenage son, Jonathan, to fend for themselves on weekdays. Both men describe having learnt to cook by surreptitiously observing the Chinese lodgers that the family had taken in to help them make ends meet. Intrigued by the *"simple way of cooking"* used by their house-guests, father and son attempted to replicate this approach, techniques which Jonathan demonstrated during the ethnographic work.

In *"stepping up to the plate"*, Ted has relieved his wife of the anxieties which she associates with cooking. Here, Laura explains that not only is cooking a 'chore', but is something about which she feels insufficiently skilled and under-confident:

"... it's one of those chores that you have to do and I like, you know, I enjoy the food but, I've never enjoyed cooking really, I always feel quite anxious that you know, I find timing things and you know, and I get pissed off when it goes wrong, you know, I, yeah it's not (...) I don't really enjoy it very much, it's just something I've got to do".

For Laura, awareness of her own limitations in relation to cooking is compounded by the skills and competence demonstrated by her husband, of whom she says: "*I mean, in a sense, he took cooking to a higher, a much higher level than I ever did"*, making her more conscious of her own skills deficit and potential 'failure'. Having retreated from anything more taxing than the preparation of porridge and salads, Laura's role within the kitchen has become that of *"deputy"*, responsible for the (on-line) weekly shop and clearing up after the evening meal, something which she feels obliged to do since Ted has prepared it. Laura's role, it

could be said, is largely invisible and taken-for-granted. Since their semi-retirement, the couple have experimented with redistributing certain activities to free up more of Laura's time. However, Laura reports that Ted has been *"disqualified"* from doing the laundry since *"I would leave the sheets and towels a week longer"*, and also the on-line shopping as he had *"got it wrong"* (Ted's admissions). Consequently, he has decided that he will also clear up after the evening meal, but this sometimes does not happen until the following day, which is unacceptable to Laura.

Among the younger generation, there is a shared enthusiasm for cooking among the two sons. It was during Sally's contribution to the rural focus group that we were first alerted to Stuart's somewhat unusual responsibility for *all* aspects of food management and preparation in their household: *"he's sort of in charge of the food"*. While Sally is loath to waste her time standing in queues at the butcher's, for example, Stuart will go to great lengths to source fresh, good quality food within the family's strict budget. At 0530 on a Monday morning in June 2010, Stuart and the first author drove 20 minutes to the nearest sizable supermarket and, armed with a shopping list on his mobile telephone, made short work of the weekly shop. From here, he drove to the local outdoor market to stock up on fruit and vegetables, before dropping the shopping off at home, unpacking those items which required cold storage and then walking the dog, with the intention of being at work by 0800.

Observing this routine, and - on another occasion - watching the flurry of activity surrounding the preparation of an evening meal and the batch-baking of several loaves of bread (to accommodate the differing tastes of each family member) was exhausting. Stuart's efficiency in completing these tasks, as well as spending time with his family, reminds us of

Chapman's point regarding the impact of men's activities in the kitchen which might serve to 'humiliate' women (1999: 173) by highlighting their lack of competence. It also begs the question, has being 'in charge' of the food marginalised his wife from the process of feeding the family? Stuart's efficiency is facilitated by the application of his work-based IT skills through the setting up of meal planning databases with which the family's meals are mapped out for the week ahead, with the required shopping list being made simultaneously, thus highlighting the slippage which can occur between the identities associated with the spaces we occupy, in public and in private. However, what he does *not* take into consideration is the nutritional properties of the food his children are eating. This, Sally asserts, firmly remains her responsibility. Sally also draws upon knowledge acquired through her work on a diet-related NHS programme to ensure that her children are receiving a balanced diet. Thus, while she reports that Stuart is happy to let the children have crisps every day, since he perceives them to be 'potatoes', for her, this is unacceptable and should only be given as a treat. It is Sally as *mother* who acts as dietary custodian, responsible for instilling good eating habits in her children. While she devolves responsibility for most other food-related matters to her husband, the children's packed lunches remain her sole responsibility. Of this, she says:

"I feel it's my goal, my aim to make the packed lunches as healthy as they can be, and as exciting as they can be so that...I think that presentation and, you know, so that each night I sort of sit down [laughs] *and sometimes it's easy and sometimes it's (not)".*

A frequent claim made of men who engage with cooking is that they do so out of *choice,* rather through a sense of duty and obligation (Swinbank 2002). While this is confirmed by the Anderson and Charles men, it is Jonathan Anderson who makes conscious the luxury of men's ability to be selective about which aspects of cooking they engage in. For example, he explains that, as a 'foodie', he had anticipated that son, William (3), would have an appetite

and palate which would 'amaze' all. Unfortunately, William is the opposite, and it is in this instance that Polly's uncomplicated approach to food is relied upon. For Jonathan, there is no incentive to make sausage and chips; it simply is not 'challenging' enough:

"I thought I would have done more (.) I thought I was going to be more adventurous… You know the challenge of (.) cooking well because it, I suppose (..) in the first year or two years it was such basic cooking that it almost wasn't very interesting for me".

These examples illustrate that stereotyped gender roles and responsibilities are not fixed and can change over the life-course as well as inter-generationally. While the household division of labour is more egalitarian than in many other cases, inequalities remain concerning the distribution of some domestic and childcare responsibilities.

"When it's more his domain than your domain, you rebel": **uncanny kitchens**

While increased numbers of men have entered the kitchen in recent years, the effect can be to make this space 'uncanny' for women, particularly if the practices associated with professional kitchens are transferred into the domestic context. Drawing on Freudian psychoanalysis Gelder and Jacobs (1995) suggest that 'the uncanny' is a process by which the familiar becomes unfamiliar (*Unheimlich*): it is an 'estranging experience' (1995: 182) where space works on place to make it un-homely. They explain that:

'An 'uncanny' experience may occur when one's home is rendered somehow ... unfamiliar; [when] one has the experience… of being in place and 'out of place' simultaneously. This simultaneity is important to stress since, in Freud's terms, it is not simply the unfamiliar in itself which generates the anxiety of the uncanny; it is specifically the combination of the familiar and the unfamiliar – the way the one seems always to inhabit the other' (p. 171).

Consequently, the familiar, albeit 'oppressive' domain in which women had undertaken the routine business of feeding the family – begrudgingly or otherwise – can become a domain in which they feel alienated and marginalised. Thus, as Arvakian and Haber (2005) observe, women are not only engaged in a public struggle for equal power with men, but have simultaneously lost influence in the private domain.

Our kitchen tours revealed the extent to which participants' kitchens had become both 'crowded' and 'uncanny'. We have already described how Ted Anderson's flair and competence have increased Laura's awareness of - and anxiety about - her own skills deficit. However, in speaking of the design of the kitchen, she highlights that it was ergonomically designed with Ted's needs in mind. Regarding the cooker, for example, she explains that "*it's his cooker really, I mean, I, I don't find it very easy to use and I don't really understand how it works and, all of that".* Demonstrating the capacity of the cooker, Ted explained that some of the detachable griddles are too heavy for Laura to lift, literally *excluding* Laura from its use. The *Lacanche* appliance is an industrial-quality French cooker of which Ted says: *"it just makes me feel really good about using it … it's not like a toy, it's a proper bit of kit".* Here, we are reminded of Shove et al's observation that things are 'consumed not for their own sake, but for what they make possible' (2007: 22). Ted's cooker allows him to demonstrate flair and competence, enabling us to understand how material objects can actively configure their users (ibid.: 23). As Adler observes: 'special cooking gadgets proclaim the special cook' (1981: 48).

Designing kitchens to accommodate the needs and desires of both male and female users reveals a number of conflicts and even where traditional divisions of labour persist, conflicts

still emerge. For example, Hannah Faulkner (35), a part-time working mother of two children under the age of five, has primary responsibility for feeding her family. Where her husband Ian (42) is involved, it is under instruction, requiring only the simplest of tasks. However, Ian is a chartered surveyor with architectural design knowledge which could easily be applied when the couple came to have a new kitchen fitted. During their kitchen tour, Hannah and Ian demonstrated the *"constructive process"* of negotiation which occurred. Being a surveyor, as opposed to a user of the kitchen, Hannah says that Ian *"thought he knew better about how to design a kitchen, so we had a bit of conflict about how to design it"*. Thus, even where men are not primary users of the kitchen, we see an attempt to 'crowd' it with their views and opinions.[12] Ian explained that*: "Hannah drew out her needs and I then made the cupboards to fit the needs"*; for example, she wanted deep, strong drawers in which she could place baskets of pasta, rice and bread which could just be lifted out, rather than having to bend down and move things about. While Ian was concerned with the aesthetics of the design, for Hannah: *it's all about function. I want it to look nice, but it has to work"*. Hannah would have preferred wood or laminate work surfaces rather than the black granite worktops Ian wanted, however, appealing to Hannah's desire for utility, Ian points out that these can take knives and hot pans and could be pre-formed with a drainer and any softer angles that might be required, which is not possible with other types of surface. In the end, Hannah compromised because the practicality of being able to put hot pans down on them if she is distracted by one of the children is such an important factor, meaning she does not have to think about scorching surfaces.

[12] This is something which DeVault also reports of men who express opinions regarding domestic provisioning while not being prepared to get involved in it.

There were many other examples where tensions arose between couples over the design and use of the kitchen. One area which consistently evoked comment was the additional mess that men's culinary activities produced, leading us to question whether, as with the advent of technologies intended to reduce women's domestic labour (Murcott 1983b), the irony of men's involvement in cooking is that it may simply create 'more work for mother' (Cowan 1983), even when the person occupying the role of mother/wife is not female. Indeed, returning to Joe Green's resentment toward his male housemate's failure to show consideration for other kitchen-users he says:

"He's a shit in the kitchen, he just makes such a mess, you might as well just tip all the cupboards out, sprinkle stuff everywhere, dump what's left on the floor and then just walk out, and then chuck a hand grenade in afterwards to cement it to the walls. It's like 'What the fuck have you done in there?! Surely what we just had on a plate didn't create that much mess? [laughing] *There's stuff in there that I didn't even see on my plate!'"*

Conclusion

In this paper, we have drawn on evidence from focus groups, interviews and ethnographic observation of everyday domestic practice to explore how women's and men's relationship to the domestic kitchen has shifted since Second Wave feminists first drew scholarly attention to the position of 'captive wives' and 'housebound mothers'. The landscape of home has clearly witnessed significant changes both in terms of household composition and changing ideologies about gendered roles, but also in terms of how these roles are performed in response to wider historical and more personal biographical changes.

Rather than making definitive statements about whether heterosexual households are now characterised by greater gender equality, our findings are more tentative and, since they are based mainly on the observation of middle class households, are not generalizable. Our work supports those who argue that men are increasingly involved in domestic tasks such as cooking but that they have entered the space of the kitchen largely on their own terms, as a lifestyle choice, rather than taking primary responsibility for the routine work of feeding the family, which still falls mostly to women. Even where men do assume the main responsibility for domestic cooking, gendered inequalities persist both in terms of the physical design of the kitchen and in the use of domestic technologies. Indeed, new kitchens are no longer simply concessions made by husbands to wives (see Freeman 2004) but, rather, are spaces in which masculine identities are also inscribed.

Focusing on the observation of domestic practices as well as on the evidence of reported behaviour from interviews and focus groups, our research also demonstrates the persistence of other gendered constructs regarding the nature of cleanliness and order where men's involvement in food preparation may, as with the introduction of 'labour-saving' technologies, ultimately result in 'more work for mother'. Our analysis supports those who have suggested that shifts are clearly taking place in terms of the relationship between masculinity and domesticity. According to Smith and Winchester (1998), breaking down rigid place and gender boundaries facilitates the negotiation of a wider range of masculinities than those which were previously available, also making visible the inter-relational and co-constitutive nature of gender, masculinity and domesticity (see also Cameron 1998 and Gorman-Murray 2008). While domestic practices and gendered subjectivities are in a constant process of negotiation and transformation, there is little evidence, within the households reported here, of a significant transformation in gender roles and relations

amounting to the 'democratisation' of domesticity. Our findings highlight the need for further research in to establish the extent to which the questions raised by our participants' experiences are pertinent across other population groups, and what the implications might be at a wider social level.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to the participants in this research who opened up their homes and their provisioning routines to us. We would also like to thank Beverley Mullings and the anonymous reviewers whose helpful comments and suggestions have considerably improved this paper.

References

Aarseth, H. (2009), 'From modernized masculinity to degendered lifestyle projects: changes in men's narratives on domestic participation 1990-2005', *Men and Masculinities*, 11: 424-40.

Adler, T. A. (1981), 'Making pancakes on Sunday: the male cook in family tradition', *Western Folklore* 40, 1: 45-54.

Allan, G., Crow, G. and Hawker, S. (2011), *Stepfamilies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Avakian, A. V. and Haber, B. (2005), *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies: critical perspectives on women and food.* Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press

Bennet, K. (2006), 'Kitchen drama: performances, patriarchy and power dynamics in a Dorset farmhouse kitchen', *Gender, Place and Culture,* 13, 2: 153-60.

Blunt, A. and Dowling, R. (2006), *Home*. London: Routledge.

Cairns, K., Johnston, J. and Baumann, S. (2010), 'Caring about food: doing gender in the foodie kitchen', *Gender and Society*, 24, 5: 591-615.

Cameron, J. (1998), 'The practice of politics: transforming subjectivities in the domestic domain and the public sphere', *Australian Geographer*, 29, 3: 293-307.

Chapman T. (1999), '"You've got him well trained": the negotiation of roles in the domestic sphere', in T. Chapman and J. Hockey (eds.), *Ideal Homes? Social change and domestic life*. London: Routledge; 163-180.

Charles, N. (1995), 'Food and family ideology', in S. Jackson and S. Moores (eds.), *The Politics of Domestic Consumption: critical readings*. London: Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Charles, N and Kerr, M. (1988), *Women, Food and Families*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Christie, M.E. (2006), 'Kitchenspace: gendered territory in central Mexico', *Gender, Place and Culture*, 13, 6: 653-661.

Counihan, C. (2005), 'The border as barrier and bridge: food, gender and ethnicity in the San Luis Valley of Colorado', in A. V. Arvakian and B. Haber, *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies: critical perspectives on women and food*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press; 200-217.

Cowan, R.S. (1983), *More Work for Mother: the ironies of household technology from the open hearth to the microwave.* New York: Basic Books.

Coxon, T. (1983), 'Men in the kitchen: notes on a cookery class', in A. Murcott (ed.), *The Sociology of Food and Eating: essays in the sociological significance of food.* Aldershot: Gower; 172-177.

DeVault, M. (1991), *Feeding the Family: the social organisation of caring as gendered work.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Floyd, J. (2004), 'Coming out of the kitchen: texts, contexts and debates', *Cultural Geographies,* 11: 61-73.

Freeman, J. (2004), *The Making of the Modern Kitchen*. Oxford: Berg.

Friedan, B. (1963), *The Feminine Mystique*. London: Victor Gollancz.

Gavron, H. (1966), *The Captive Wife*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gelder, K. and Jacobs, J. (1995), 'Uncanny Australia', *Cultural Geographies*, 2, 2: 171-183.

Giard, L. (1998), 'Doing Cooking' in M. De Certeau, L. Giard, L. and P. Mayoll (eds.), *The Practice of Everyday Life Volume 2: living and cooking*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; 149-247.

Giddens, A. (1992), *The Transformation of Intimacy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gorman-Murray, A. (2008), 'Masculinity and the home: a critical review of a conceptual framework', *Australian Geographer*, 39, 3: 367-79.

Greer, G. (1970), *The Female Eunuch.* London: Granada.

Hayden, D. (1978), 'Two utopian feminists and their campaigns for kitchenless houses', *Signs* 4, 2: 274-90.

Heldke, L (2003), *Exotic Appetites: ruminations of a food adventurer*. New York: Routledge.

Hockey, J., Meah, A. and Robinson, V. (2007), *Mundane Heterosexualities: from theory to practices*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Holden, T.J.M. (2005), 'The overcooked and the underdone: masculinities in Japanese food programming', *Food and Foodways*, 13(1-2): 39-65.

Hollows, J. (2003), 'Oliver's Twist: leisure, labour and domestic masculinity in The Naked Chef', *International Journal of Cultural Studies,* 6: 229-48.

hooks, b. (1991), *Yearning: race, gender and cultural politics*. London: Turnaround.

Hughes, M. (1997), 'Soul, Black women and soul food', in C. Counihan and P. Van Esterik (eds.), *Food and Culture: a reader*. New York: Routledge, 277-280

Inness, S. A. (2005). *Dinner Roles: American women and culinary culture.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Jackson, P. (2009) (ed.). *Changing Families, Changing Food*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Jackson, P., Ward, N. and Russell, P. (2010), 'Manufacturing meaning along the chicken supply chain: consumer anxiety and the spaces of production', in D. Goodman, M. Goodman and M. Redclift (eds.) *Consuming Space: placing consumption in perspective*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 163-187.

Johnson, L. (2006), 'Browsing the modern kitchen – a feast of gender, place and culture (part 1), *Gender, Place and Culture*, 13, 2: 123-32.

Kan, M.Y., Sullivan, O. and Gershuny, J. (2011), 'Gender convergence in domestic work: discerning the effects of interactional and institutional barriers from large-scale data', *Sociology*, 45: 234-51.

Kemmer, D., A. S. Anderson, et al. (1998a), 'Living together and eating together: changes in food choice and eating habits during the transition from single to married/cohabiting', *The Sociological Review* 46**:** 48-72.

Kusenbach, M. (2003), 'Street phenomenology: the go-along as ethnographic research tool', *Ethnography*, 4, 3: 445-485.

Llewellyn, M. (2004), 'Designed by women and designing women: gender, planning and the geographies o the kitchen in Britain 1917-1946', *Cultural Geographies,* 10: 42-62.

Lloyd, J. and Johnson, L. (2004), 'Dream stuff: the postwar home and the Australian housewife. 1940-1960', *Environmental and Planning D: Society and Space*, 22: 251-72.

Meah, A. and Watson, M. (2011), 'Saints and slackers: challenging discourses about the decline of domestic cooking', *Sociological Research Online*, 16, 2.

Mennell, S., Murcott, A. and van Otterloo, A. (1992), *The Sociology of Food, Eating, Diet and Culture*. London: Sage.

Metcalfe, A., Dryden, C., Johnson, M., Owen, J. and Shipton, G. 2009. Fathers, food and family life, in P. Jackson ed. *Changing Families, Changing Food*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 93-117.

Munro, M. and Madigan, R. (1999), 'Negotiating space in the family home' in I. Cieraad (ed.), *At Home: an anthropology of domestic space*. Syracuse, N.Y: Syracuse University Press; 107-117.

Murcott, A. (1982), 'On the social significance of the "cooked dinner" in South Wales', *Social Science Information,* 21: 677-696.

Murcott, A. (1983a), '"It's a pleasure to cook for him": food, mealtimes and gender in some South Wales households', in E. Gamarnikow, D. Morgan, J. Purvis and D. Taylorson (eds.), *The Public and the Private*. London: Heinemann, 78-90.

Murcott, A. (1983b), 'Cooking and the cooked: a note on the domestic preparation of meals', in A. Murcott (ed.), *The Sociology of Food and Eating: essays in the sociological significance of food.* Aldershot: Gower, 178-85.

Murcott, A. (2000), 'Is it still a pleasure to cook for him? Social changes in the household and the family', *Journal of Consumer Culture,* 24: 78-84.

Natalier, K. (2003), '"I'm not his wife": doing gender and doing housework in the absence of women', *Journal of Sociology*, 39: 253-69.

Oakley, A. (1974), *The Sociology of Housework*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Probyn, E. (2000), *Carnal Appetites: food sex identities.* London: Routledge.

Robson, E. (2006), 'The 'kitchen' as women's space in rural Hausaland, Northern Nigeria', *Gender, Place and Culture,* 13(6): 669-676.

Roos, G., R. Prättälä and K. Koski (2001) 'Men, masculinity and food: interviews with Finnish carpenters and engineers', *Appetite*, 37: 47–56.

Saarikangas, K. (2006), 'Displays of the everyday. Relations between gender and the visibility of domestic work in the modern Finnish kitchen from the 1930s to the 1950s', *Gender, Place and Culture*, 13, 2: 161-172.

Schatzki, T. (2002), *The Site of the Social: a philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*. London: Pennsylvania University Press.

Schroeder, K. (2006), 'A feminist examination of community kitchens in Peru and Bolivia', *Gender, Place & Culture,* 13, 6: 663 – 668.

Shapiro, L. (2009), *Perfection Salad: women and cooking at the turn of the century.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shaw, A. (1999) "'What are 'they' doing to our food?": public concerns about food in the UK', *Sociological Research Online*; 4, 3.

Short, F. (2006), *Kitchen Secrets: the meaning of cooking in everyday life*. Oxford: Berg.

Shove, E. Watson, M. Hand, M. Ingram, J. (2007), *The Design of Everyday Life.* Berg, Oxford.

Smart, C. and Neale, B. (1999), *Family Fragments?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Smith, G. and Winchester, H. (1998), 'Negotiating space: alternative masculinities at the work/home boundary, *Australian Geographer,* 29, 3: 327-339.

Supski, S. (2006), ''It was another skin': the kitchen as a home Australian post-war immigrant women', *Gender, Place and Culture,* 13, 2: 133-41.

Swenson, R. (2009), 'Domestic divo: televised treatments of masculinity, femininity and food', *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 26, 1: 36-53.

Swinbank, V. (2002), 'The sexual politics of cooking: a feminist analysis of culinary hierarchy in Western culture', *Journal of Historical Sociology,* 15, 4: 464-94.