**Social Class Discussion**

In the proposed study, I combine theoretical approaches, especially bargaining and doing gender to explain the discrepancies in the division of the domestic labour and its change over time in Canada, using the ideas highlighted by Brines (1994) as a starting point. Brines (1994) focuses on one aspect of class, relative income, to analyze housework division. Here, I add another dimension, education, which I think is a better explaining factor of discrepancies in time spent on household tasks between women and men. The intersection of gender and class is long of great analytical interest (Acker 1989). Despite the recent fad of pronouncing the concept “class” dead (Kingston 2000), with development and re-conceptualization (Petev 2013; Weeden and Grusky 2011) class remains a relevant notion in the analysis of inequality. There are three main traditions in the conceptualization of class, which I refer to as Marxian (Marx 1867), Weberian (Weber 1978), and Bourdeusian (Bourdieu 1980).

One of the earliest formulations of the idea of class belongs to Karl Marx (1867). In his vision, classes were distinguished by their relations to the means of production. Consequently, Weber (1922) and Bourdieu (1980) extended this narrow notion of class. The ideas of the latter, though heavily borrowing from frameworks offered by predecessors, are more apt for the analysis of unpaid work and non-market class situations compared to Marx's (1867) and Weber's (1922), which rely more on the economic manifestations of class.

There are differences in how Weberian and Bourdieusian perspectives approach class. Neo-Weberian scholars focus on life-chances as the outcomes of class, while the Bourdieusian camp include broader definitions of class together with lifestyle and sentiments (Bourdieu 1980; Thompson 1963). In this regard, Weeden and Grusky (2011) help to differentiate between specifically “(a) life chances (e.g., income, education, working conditions)” and “(b) lifestyles (e.g., consumption practices, institutional participation)” (Weeden and Grusky 2011). It is worth noting that for Weber, lifestyles were foundations of status rather than class. Here, I employ a more inclusive definition of class developed by Bourdieu (1980) and at the same time avoid the duality of class and status proposed by Weber, by employing the notion of “habitus” instead in regards to class (Bourdieu 1980).

There are two main contributions that I add to the framework of analyzing housework and gender. First, I add education as a similarly important factor to explain the gendered patterns, introduced by Brines (1994). Furthermore, to conventional discussions of social class as a bundle of reward packages (such as income), endowment (such as education), and working conditions (such as occupations) (Petev 2013), I add the dimension of lifestyle, even it is not the main focus herein and is outside of the scope of the present paper. Lifestyle is another outcome of class because both lifestyles and life chances become very important for the class situations within non-market relations.[[1]](#footnote-1) I avoid the aggregate “big” class notions on theoretical grounds because, first, “big classes” do not adequately capture the change since the era of industrial revolution and macro-level working-class revolutionary agenda (Weeden and Grusky 2011), and second, the Bourdieusian framework fits the study of domestic work better and is preferred to the alternative of blindly following the tradition without contemplation of its contemporary and research-specific relevance.

1. I also believe unlike Weeden and Grusky (2005) that demographic composition represents other types of societal differentiation which should be analyzed separately but in interaction with class. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)