



LUND UNIVERSITY

Women and maids

Perceptions of domestic workers, housework and class among young, progressive, middle- to upper-class women in Delhi

Harju, Otso

2017

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Harju, O. (2017). *Women and maids: Perceptions of domestic workers, housework and class among young, progressive, middle- to upper-class women in Delhi*. (Working papers in contemporary Asian studies; No. 55). Centre for East and South-East Asian Studies, Lund University.

Total number of authors:

1

Creative Commons License:

CC BY-NC-ND

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

Women and Maids

Perceptions of domestic workers, housework and class among young, progressive, middle- to upper-class women in Delhi

Otso Harju*

Working Paper No 55
2017

Centre for East and South-East Asian Studies
Lund University, Sweden

www.ace.lu.se

* Otso Harju was a student on the Masters Programme in Asian Studies, Centre for East and South-East Asian Studies, Lund University between 2014-2016. This is his Master thesis.
E-mail: otso.harju@gmail.com

This working paper is published by the Centre for East and South-East Asian Studies, Lund University. The views expressed herein, however, are those of the author, and do not represent any official view of the Centre or its staff.

ISSN: 1652-4128

ISBN: 978-91-981692-5-6

Printed in Sweden by Lund University, Media-Tryck, 2017

© Otso Harju

WORKING PAPERS IN CONTEMPORARY ASIAN STUDIES

General editor: Professor Marina Svensson

Assistant editor: Nina Brand

Publications in this series:

1. Is the world Ready for a Coherent ASEAN+3? / Cesar de Prado Yepes / ISBN 91-975093-0-2
2. Renegotiating Gender and Power: Women's Organizations and Networks in Politics - The China Women Mayors' Association / Qi Wang / ISBN 91-975093-1-0
3. Re-evaluating Preventive Diplomacy in Southeast Asia / J. Michael Tivayanond / ISBN 91-975093-2-9
4. The Role of Law in Contemporary Indonesia / Mason C. Hoadley / ISBN 91-975093-3-7
5. Closing the Digital Divide: Southeast Asia's Path towards a Knowledge Society / Hans-Dieter Evers and Solvay Gerke / ISBN 91-975093-4-5
6. De-colonising Indonesian Historiography / Henk Schulte Nordholt / ISBN 91-975093-5-3
7. Path Dependence, Change, Creativity and Japan's Competitiveness / Cornelia Storz / ISBN 91-975093-6-1
8. *China Regaining Position as Source of Learning* / Jon Sigurdson / ISBN 91-975093-7-X (cancelled)
9. Prospering on Crime: Money Laundering and Financial Crises / Guilhem Fabre / ISBN 91-975093-8-8
10. Implementing anticorruption in the PRC – Patterns of selectivity / Flora Sapio / ISBN 91-975093-9-6
11. Shaping the Future of Asia – Chiang Kai-shek, Nehru and China-India Relations During the Second World War Period / Guido Samarani / ISBN 91-975726-0-8
12. The Consumer Citizen in Contemporary China / Beverley Hooper / ISBN 91-975726-1-6
13. Defining Southeast Asia and the Crisis in Area Studies: Personal Reflections on a Region / Victor T. King / ISBN 91-975726-2-4
14. Women in Politics in Thailand / Kazuki Iwanaga / ISBN 91-975726-3-2
15. The Return of Piracy: Decolonization and International Relations in a Maritime Border Region (the Sulu Sea), 1959-63 / Stefan Eklöf / ISBN 91-975726-4-0
16. Youth and the State in Contemporary Socialist Vietnam / Phuong An Nguyen / ISBN 91-975726-5-9
17. In the Ancestors' Shadow: Cultural Heritage Contestations in Chinese Villages / Marina Svensson / ISBN 91-975726-6-7
18. Policies and politics underlying the path for universal access to treatment against AIDS in Cambodia / Frédéric Bourdier / ISBN 91-975726-7-5
19. Issue without Boundaries: HIV/AIDS in Southeast Asia / Kristina Jönsson / ISBN 91-975726-8-3
20. Modern Military Technology in Counterinsurgency Warfare: The Experience of the Nationalist Army during the Chinese Civil War / Victor Cheng / ISBN 91-975726-9-1
21. Reform after Reformasi: Middle Class Movements for Good Governance after Democratic
22. Revolutions in Southeast Asia / Mark R. Thompson / ISBN 91-975727-0-5
23. 'The Two-Sided Family': The Impact of the Family and Everyday Life on Women's Political Participation in Rural Karnataka / Louise Nolle / ISBN 91-975727-1-3
24. Representations - Practice – Spectatorship : A Study of Haptic Relations between Independent Cinema and Market- led Urbanization in contemporary China. / Andreas Tibrand / ISBN 91-975727-2-1
25. The 'Paradox' of Being Young in New Delhi : Urban Middle Class Youth Negotiations with Popular Indian Film. / Elizabeth Williams-Ørberg / ISBN 91-975727-3-X
26. Poverty and Sustainability Issues of Microfinance in China: A Case Study in Fu'an, Fujian Province / LiLian Lau / ISBN 91-975727-4-8
27. A Case Study of HIV Prevention in Reform-Era Shanghai : From Risk to an Enabling Environment / Jacinthe Dumont / ISBN 91-975727-5-6
28. 'Pornography', Sexual Objectification and Sexual Violence in Japan and in the World / Tomo Shibata / ISBN 91-975727-6-4
29. China's Environmental Crisis: Why Should We Care? / Simona Alba Grano / ISBN 91-975727-7-2
30. Unity-in-Diversity? : Regional Identity Building in Southeast Asia / Kristina Jönsson / ISBN 91-975727-8-0
31. "Bourgeois Utopias"? The rhetoric of globality in the contemporary suburban landscape of Calcuta / Swati Chattopadhyay / ISBN 978-91-978082-0-0
32. Single Women in Urban China and the "Unmarried Crisis": Gender Resilience and Gender Transformation / Arianne Gaetano / ISBN 978-91-978082-1-7
33. MGNREGA – Towards ensuring the Right to Work in rural India / Vipin Negi / ISBN 978-91-978082-2-4
34. The role of public policy in the formation of a business network / Ying Shih / ISBN 978-91-978082-3-1

35. A resource interaction perspective on standards competition: Some evidence from the optical recording media industry / Hsin-Hui Chou / ISBN 978-91-978082-4-8
36. Collective Resistance of Chengzhongcun Villagers in China – A Case of Guangzhou, Guangdong Province / Xianwen Kuang / ISBN 978-91-978082-5-5
37. Justice and The Khmer Rouge: Concepts of Just Response to the Crimes of the Democratic Kampuchean regime in Buddhism and The Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia at the time of the Khmer Rouge tribunal / Tallyn Gray / ISBN 978-91-978082-6-2
38. From the Caterpillar to the Butterfly: Social Entrepreneurship as a New Social Force in China / Sven Stegemann / ISBN 978-91-978082-7-9
39. The Effects of Contextual Characteristics on Team Creativity: Positive, Negative, or Still Undecided? / Ya-Ching Yeh / ISBN 978-91-978082-8-6
40. The global left behind child in China: 'unintended consequences' in capitalism / Annika Pissin / ISBN 978-91-978082-9-3
41. Why Stay Engaged with a State Deemed Fragile? The Case of Sweden toward the Democratic People's Republic of Korea / Magnus Andersson & Jinsun Bae / ISBN 978-91-980900-0-0
42. Transnational Civil Society and the Politics of Memory in Sino-Japanese Relations: Exhibiting the "Comfort Women" in China / Karl Gustafsson / ISBN 978-91-980900-1-7
43. Is Patriotism Distinct from Nationalism? The Meaning of "Patriotism" in China in the 2000s / Karl Gustafsson / ISBN 978-91-980900-2-4
44. Discourses of the Heian Era and National Identity Formation in Contemporary Japan / John L. Hennessey / ISBN 978-91-980900-3-1
45. The Changing Nature of the "Iron Triangle" Phenomenon: A Case Study of the "Iron Triangle" in the Postal Industry and Postal Reforms in Japan / Alena Rakhmanko / ISBN 978-91-980900-4-8
46. Suspect, Detainee, or Victim? A Discourse Analytical Study of Men's Vulnerability in Thailand's Deep South / Malin Nilsson / ISBN 978-91-980900-5-5
47. Civilizing Unmarried Urban Women in China: Authentic or Not? / Ting Li / ISBN 978-91-980900-6-2
48. ПЕЛЪМЕНИ or 饺子? [PELMENI] or [JIAOZI]? : Dietary Acculturation among Russian Immigrants in Beijing / Ekaterina Maiorova / ISBN 978-91-980900-7-9
49. Sayōnara Nukes -Development, Mobilisation Strategies and Organisation of Anti-Nuclear Protest in Japan after the 2011 Fukushima Accident / Jan Niggemeier / ISBN 978-91-980900-8-6
50. The Illusion of Totality: Critical Discourse Analysis on the Identity of Japanese Bureaucrats inside and outside of the Ministries / Kie Sanada / ISBN 978-91-980900-9-3
51. Another Dam Development Project? Development-forced displacement and resettlement in Nepal / Tobias Fast / ISBN 978-91-981692-0-1
52. Japan's Changing Official Development Assistance: How Institutional Reforms Affected the Role of Japan's Private Sector in ODA Delivery / Likki-Lee Pitzen / ISBN 978-91-981692-2-5
53. Japan's State Secrecy Debate: A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis / Bobbie van der List / ISBN 978-91-981692-3-2
54. Towards a Mobile Indigeneity? The Case of Indigenous Students from the Chittagong Hill Tracts in Dhaka, Bangladesh / Jacco Visser / 978-91-981692-4-9
55. Women and Maids : Perceptions of domestic workers, housework and class among young, progressive, middle- to upper-class women in Delhi / Otso Harju / 978-91-981692-5-6

Abstract

This thesis analyses ten in-depth interviews on domestic workers, class and gender roles with ten young, politically inclined and often adamantly feminist women from the upper end of the Indian class spectrum. It aims to deepen the understanding of employer-worker relations and gendered domestic roles in contemporary Indian households. Previous literature on the middle- to upper-class employers of domestic workers in the subcontinent has tended to emphasize the uncritical attitude most exhibit towards their employment practices. Distance from physical domestic work has been noted as a key site of class distinction, and a commonality for the otherwise fractured “middle” classes. *The maid* is hired for the reproduction of not just everyday life but, importantly, of class. Further, since Indian men are largely removed from the sphere of domestic work, and the domestic workers are mostly women, the problems around maids have come to be seen as socially second-rate “women’s issues”. In India, maids play a central role in the age-old issues around reproductive labour.

My findings corroborate previous research and also go on to provide a perspective of potential change. Far from just accepting what has been termed an Indian ‘culture of servitude’, my interviewees exhibit a deep reflexivity and often highly critical attitude towards the idea of employing maids, as well as towards the domestic assumptions put on themselves. Generational change, the desire for democratization and increasing expectations on male partners are central themes in my participants’ discussions. At the same time, the interviewees also display an often anxious ambiguity as to whether or not they are able to resist social and parental pressures, and to live up to their own ideals. My findings emphasize the existence of a critical, progressive, highly self-reflexive yet often politically pragmatic twenty-something-year-old, largely overlooked in discussions on the ‘new Indian woman’.

Keywords: Domestic workers, Delhi, Class, Gender roles, Reflexivity, Social change, Family

Acknowledgements

My sincerest thanks to the ten people who participated in this work. You are amazing. Working, learning and living life with you has been a privilege.

Thank you Monica Erwér. You were the best guide I could have hoped for.

Thanks to my parents for instilling in me a sense of curiosity and the desire to study and learn. And, speaking of class, for giving me the economic and social capital to actually do so.

Thank you Natha, for being my biggest personal and political inspiration during the process of making this study. You're the best.

Contents

Introduction	1
Conceptualizing Class and Gender.....	3
Domestic Work and Workers in India	8
Employer Techniques of Class Distinction.....	11
Field and Method	14
Ethical Considerations	17
Findings and Analysis	19
The idea of a proper girl	19
Stories of maids	25
New gendered fears.....	32
Can class boundaries be overcome?	34
Different from the 'average' employer?	38
Participants' ideas on possible change	42
Conclusion	46
Appendix: Participant profiles	50
References	53

Introduction

In middle-class urban India, domestic workers are both everywhere and invisible. Well-off households are dependent on their labour, yet they are routinely devalued and abused (Neetha 2004). In fact, domestics are consistently seen to perform the ‘most undesirable tasks in society’ (Ray 2000: 692). Stuck between bad working conditions and expectations of subservient loyalty, the Indian domestic worker has to cope with ‘the worst aspects of both feudalism and capitalism’ (Menon 2012: 18).

This thesis deals with the perceptions of domestic workers (“*maids*”¹) and housework among ten young, unmarried, politically-minded, feminist, middle- to upper-class women in Delhi. In-depth interviews with the women – who all have experience of hired domestic help – were conducted in early 2016. Participants were asked to share their thoughts on the employment of maids and on the gendered nature of housework in their current and family homes. The aim of the thesis was firstly to probe in what ways a *culture of servitude*² (Ray and Qayum 2009) can be said to exist in the mindsets of young progressives, and secondly to shed some light on some of the ways practical gender roles (i.e. the relationship to housework) are being challenged among young metropolitan women in India.

The findings in earlier studies of employer attitudes have all been quite negative: employers, it has been said, do not really care for their maids and do not see their chronic ill-treatment as an issue. In fact, as e.g. Hamid (2006) and Mattila (2011: Chapter 6) write, many employers feel that they are benevolent in providing employment. Focusing on people with an inclination for social justice, this thesis is about whether or not my participants see themselves as different from their larger social settings. It asks if and in what ways a change in maid-related attitudes is happening. While doing so, it revisits many of the themes discussed by previous authors. We also meet some new themes arising from the daily lives of young single women in Delhi.

Secondly, this thesis looks at the sensemaking processes that happen when individuals reflect upon the structures that form their surroundings. The literature on changing gender roles in post-liberalization India has so far focused primarily on (older, married) women in corporate environments, and paid little attention to their active political convictions (e.g. Belliappa 2013; Radakrishnan 2009; Phadke 2005). If there has been a discussion about personal politics, it has

1 A note on terminology: I consciously use the word ‘maid’ throughout this thesis. While ‘domestic worker’ is the politically correct term, ‘maid’ is the term most often used in discussions and popular culture in India. It *is* what female domestic workers are called in English in India. It also captures the semi-feudal and gendered dimensions of the relationship.

2 ‘A culture of servitude is one in which social relations of domination/subordination, dependency, and inequality are normalized and permeate both the domestic and public spheres’, ‘culture involves a total lived process not only of consciousness but also of experience and practice’ (Ray and Qayum 2009: 3).

been about the upholding of “traditional” (neo-conservative) class values or about the clash/marriage of consumer capitalism and Hindu-chauvinism (e.g. Kapur 2014; Upadhyaya 2011; Chowdhury 2011). My participants – unmarried students, scholars and NGO workers in their mid-twenties – offer a glimpse of another perspective on what has been called ‘the new Indian woman’.

Thesis question:

To what extent can a class-based culture of domestic servitude be said to exist among my participants?

Sub-questions:

What new domestic worker-related questions arise from my participants’ status as young, unmarried and politically conscious women?

In what ways do my participants agree with, disagree with and negotiate gendered expectations and the use of domestic workers in relation to their families?

How do my participants look at men and marriage in relation to domestic work?

In the next chapter I explain my theoretical starting points regarding class and gender. In the two chapters that follow I shed light on the organization of household work in India, and summarize relevant parts of the earlier literature on Indian maids and class distinction. Then, before moving on to my findings and analysis, I present my field and method and the ethical considerations related to them. Finally, in the conclusion, I return to the above questions.

Conceptualizing Class and Gender

The making of class in domestic settings is at the centre of this thesis³. My general outlook on this topic is heavily indebted to Bourdieu and feminist readings of him (such as Skeggs 1997, 2004, 2005; Moi 1991), and also borrows a great deal from the Marxist-feminist writing on the household done by e.g. Fraad et al. (2009; Fraad 2009; cf. Barker 2015; Federici 2012).

We can demarcate two meanings of class: a class relation – that is, any instance of exploitation⁴ – and class as an idea of distinction, of “worth”. Class, in the latter sense, is produced in more than just the extraction of surplus labour; it is produced and felt discursively and in a myriad of micro-level distinctions. Yet, I empathically do not wish to create any ‘false opposition’ between class as economic structure and class as discourse (Holgersson 2011: 150). As Weininger (2005: 84) writes, following Bourdieu, ‘class analysis can not be reduced to the analysis of economic relations; rather, it *simultaneously* entails an analysis of symbolic relations’. Nor can economic relations be reduced to symbolic.

This needs to be emphasized: “the maid” is an important site of study precisely because it combines – and bears the brunt of – all forms of classist inequality, and thus shows the intimate connection of ideas often thought separate. While scholars have argued about whether class happens on the ‘shop floor’ or in the home (ibid., 91), the case of the domestic worker becomes a kind of synthesis par excellence: it is shop floor and home, paid and unpaid, economic and symbolic all at once. The place that produces leisure, privacy and home for one produces capitalist exploitation, feudal servitude and symbolic alienation for the other. It also bridges the equally old questions of whether to look at class through production or consumption. The employer of the maid both extracts the different physical and emotional⁵ values produced by the worker, and consumes the leisure of abstaining from reproductive work.

Three ideas guide my thinking on the class positions of my participants. Two are borrowed from Belliappa (2013). My participants all have ‘the ability to

3 Caste is very much alive in India and the issues of maids and cleaning are not in any way removed from it. In this essay, however, I focus solely on distinction in terms of class and gender. Caste and class should not be seen as oppositional concepts or tools of discrimination; they are both entwined and incommensurable. On maids and caste see e.g. Frøystad (2003; 2005), Sharma (2016), Mattila (2011: Chapter 7), Raghuram (2001) and Gopal (2013). On the class-or-caste debate see Herring and Agarwala (2006).

Region and language are two other potential axes of analysis that I do not explore in this thesis. Beyond caste, or in addition to it, employers often discriminate against workers from certain geographical or linguistic backgrounds (cf. Mattila 2011: 239).

4 Following Fraad et al. (2009), I regard all class relations as always *more or less* exploitative. “Exploitation” is defined as ‘the appropriation of surplus labor from the direct laborer’ (ibid., 42), and by Wright (2005: 23) as inverse interdependent welfare, exclusion and appropriation.

5 On defining emotional labour in the home, see Fraad (2009).

accumulate and deploy several forms of cultural capital, including education, fluency in English and access to technical and professional qualifications as well as more intangible attributes such as a cosmopolitan outlook, the ability to interact with people outside of one's caste group, exposure to metropolitan lifestyles and familiarity with a broader range of cultures and languages' (ibid., 51). Secondly, all my participants self-identify as middle- to upper-class women⁶. The third idea, which closes the circle, is the use of maids. Class does not just exist *out there* but is *made* in the process of using maids: class makes maids make class (Dickey 2000; Ray and Qayum 2009, 2011; Mattila 2011).

Class is here viewed functionally, in action and relation. This lets us rid ourselves of the idea that classes are something large, coherent, defined or necessarily conscious. Classes are neither random nor given: they come about when different people fight for, gain and protect their access to different forms of capital. Further, any given social situation will simultaneously involve a number of qualitatively different class relations (Wright 2005: 12, 17). Being a part of one class in one situation does not rule out having another location at the same time in regard to something else. The functionality of maids is important: while the Indian middle to upper classes are vague and internally fragmented, they constitute a common class through their use of maids (Ray and Qayum 2009).

To understand maids in middle- to upper-class India, one needs to have at least a summarized view on the general situation of these classes⁷. The image of the middle class is largely defined by its upper layer (Fernandes and Heller 2006). The incomes, professions and lifestyles that make up the "middle class" as it is represented in the media are really only accessible for a fraction of perhaps two per cent of Indians (Kochhar 2015)⁸. Thus, neither the material nor the symbolic notions of "middle class" have anything to do with being in the actual middle, even if we include the lower-middle classes. Yet the 'victory' of the Indian elite is seen as somehow reflecting well on other Indians too (Kapur 2014: 34). This ability of the purported 'middle' to define itself as the non-political, enviable norm is why studies on the middle class are so important (Belliappa 2013: 9; Skeggs 1997, 2004). I purposefully use the words 'middle to upper' both to

6 Dickey, writing about employers of maids as early as 16 years ago, states: 'class provides [them] an additional and largely distinct hierarchy and source of identity [except for caste]', and that socioeconomic divisions and not caste define what employers mean by 'people like us' in the context of domestic workers (2000: 464, 467). This, I argue, is even more the case in contemporary Delhi.

7 The literature on the Indian middle classes has exploded in the last ten to 15 years; I cannot even attempt to sketch more than a few chosen points here, based on Fernandes' work. For other conceptualizations on the post-liberalization middle classes, see e.g. Baviskar and Ray (2011) and Scrase and Ganguly-Scrase (2009).

8 However, this layer does not always have ideological dominance. Fernandes (2011; Fernandes and Heller 2006) looks at the larger 'middle-class' spectrum through the lenses of hegemony and fracture.

reflect my participants' self-identification and to highlight the construction of the idea of 'middle'.

It is assumed that India is doing "better" than before: '[L]eading intellectuals of the new middle class have been able to frame the terms of discourse about India's development, shutting out much of what is happening in the "other" India. [...] India is consistently represented as surging ahead, with many problems still to be overcome but essentially on the right track' (Upadhyaya 2011: 189). Yet, the 'new middle class' is new merely in its outward appearance and lifestyle, and is built on 'old' class privilege (Fernandes 2006). Fernandes' Bourdieusian focus on the *reproduction of inequality* (2011) can be adapted for the purpose of this study: 'the contours of the [new middle class] can be grasped as a *class-in-practice*, that is, as a class defined by its politics and the everyday practices through which it reproduces its privileged position' (Fernandes and Heller 2006: 495).

Within their privileged group, the affluent often exhibit a combination of hyperbole and anxiety about not being like "the rest" (cf. Mander 2015). According to Kumar (2011: 221), growing up middle class in contemporary India means being 'daily exposed to the message that theirs is a sacred mission – to succeed'. The middle classes are promoted as the saviours of India but this privilege is never fully secured. Kumar talks about how warning children they'll 'end up' as a 'farmer' or a 'labourer' is a common scare tactic parents use to motivate kids. Successful class distinction needs a symbolically 'safe' side. One needs to show familiarity with the legitimated part of culture, especially if one's position is under potential threat (Kumar 2011). Thus, parental scare tactics are as much classist insults as signs of uncertainty regarding one's own position. To understand the importance given to the handling of maids, we need to understand this class anxiety.

In Bourdieusian thinking, the middle class is the class most dependent on the reproduction of social capital. In India too, the affluent are dependent on 'professional capital as a means of advancement' and 'must put [their] children through a rigorous training and educational process' (Kapur 2014: 16). For example, if your parents cannot get you into the right school at age four, your chances of ever seeing the upper tiers of employment and society are quite slim. This, according to Belliappa (2013: 94, 131), creates emotional debt and dependency, especially for women. Since the success of the girl child is based on the economic and care-related "sacrifices" of the parents, the child is then expected to pay back through her emotional allegiance: 'rather than engaging in the labour market as individualized workers, [women's] motivations to work are closely bound with their family responsibilities'.

This thesis is about female employers of female maids; it is about the inseparability of gender and class. Like class, I look at gender in a functional way, inspired by Skeggs (1997, 2004, 2005), Belliappa (2013) and Thapan (1995).

Skeggs insists on the comorbidity of class and gender, and toys with the idea of looking at gender as another form of capital. For her, there is no reason to ask which comes first, gender or class, but in what proportion they exist and interplay at a given moment. There is no one single womanhood at any given instance: for some, in some cases, “being a woman” can be a good thing while for others not. Gender, like social capital, can become a valuable resource to be used ‘if it is symbolically *legitimated*’ (2005: 24). Skeggs argues that sexual difference is always learned through *bodily practices* (e.g. the division of housework). The body is always learnt in relation to social standing (ibid., 21), and no non-classed “woman” exists. Like class, we should thus not think of male-female as just either-or, but as something people can possess and deploy in various forms at various times.

Like Fraad et al. (2009), I see the household as *the* site where gender and class meet and co-create. People have tended to see women’s gender roles as changing only when coming in contact with the “outside” through e.g. work – implying that gender on the “inside” is somehow unproblematic and that women only “get ideas” when they begin lives elsewhere (Mulinari and Sandell 2009). I agree with Mulinari and Sandell, who say that dismantling this divide is essentially what feminism is about.

The idea of ‘respectable femininity’ (Radakrishnan 2009: 201–2; Gilbertson 2014; Daya 2009) is important in the construction of new India⁹. This ‘new’ woman is celebrated for her purported ability to combine a career with ‘traditional’ womanhood. Talukdar and Linders (2013: 106–7) put it somewhat sarcastically: ‘What is new about this woman is her ability to participate in the modern economy as both worker and consumer but still largely stay within the confines of traditional gendered values. [...] the ideal modern Indian woman was now an ambitious, career-oriented, and successful executive by day, but a devoted and demure daughter/wife/mother by night.’ This ‘*modern urban middle-class progressive but respectable woman*’, as Phadke (2005) puts it, has thus become a trope of the ‘empowered’ India (Dhawan 2010; cf. Belliappa 2013: 66). Showing this ‘respectable modernity’ on the very surface of the body – e.g. through the consumption of the right clothes – is a central class marker.

This new woman is based on a double erasure. The woman who respectably goes out to work can only be new if we forget the working-class woman, who in India and elsewhere has always worked out of necessity (Dhawan 2010). The working-class woman was however never seen as a signal of national

9 The literature on the connections of neo-liberalism, Hindutva, gender and subjecthood in contemporary India is thriving, cf. Oza (2006), Dewey (2008), Chowdhury (2011), Uberoi (2006) and Lau (2006).

empowerment (cf. Parry 2014). The other erasure is that of the maid specifically. In day-to-day terms, the upper-class family's very possibility of accumulating social capital through the empowered woman is based on the economic and emotional exploitation of the poorer woman (cf. Sangari 1993).

Gender and class also interplay with individual agency and the convictions of each person. Bourdieu's concepts of field and habitus (Moi 1991; Maton 2008; Adams 2006; Holgersson 2011) are useful here. Habitus is *structured* and *structuring*, i.e. shaped but never passive. Habitus also denotes predispositions, which means it is likely for someone to think of something – in my case, keeping maids – as normal for one's class (Weininger 2005: 91). Further, habitus has the character of inertia, meaning it takes time to change. Looking at social situations as Bourdieusian fields, again, lets us see them as having internal 'objective' rules (Moi 1991: 1021). Like movements in a computer game, our strategies are both free and unfree (Jenkins 1992: 72; Skeggs 1997: e.g. 162)¹⁰. Thapan (1995: 42) writes, importantly:

'[A] woman's resistance to the dominant discourse is dependent on her variously marked and changing subjectivity which, at different times, will influence her resistance differently depending on which factor is most important at any given time. In certain situations, a woman's class and social background determines her response while in other situations her educational background, ideological and political commitments may shape the nature of her response.'

Like Bourdieu argued (1984), class sometimes binds more than gender or ethnicity.

10 For me, agency is always *tactical*, i.e. it relates and is restricted to a specific context and can only be judged within that. We need to stop thinking of 'individuality' or 'choice' and neutral, non-political concepts. Thus, like e.g. Skeggs (2004) I want to both criticize the idea of equal access to individualization under late capitalism *and* show that not having access to a certain type of self-creation does not mean we all do not self-create in other ways.

Domestic Work and Workers in India

The organization of housework is one of the primordial feminist questions. It is a key site where the supposed public-private divide shows its own constructedness. Men, classic patriarchy says, are concerned with the outside while women stay at home (either literally as housewives or mentally as the main keepers of the domestic sphere). Housework is politics embodied (Gothoskar 2013). ‘The household is not a capitalist enterprise but nonetheless is a site where husbands appropriate the surplus labor of their wives’ (Barker 2015: 432; cf. Fraad et al. 2009). The household has been described both as fundamental to capitalism and as neo-feudalist¹¹, but what feminists agree on is that patriarchy thrives on denying that housework de facto is *work*¹². Society is dependent on the work performed in the home, yet this labour is profiled as “caring”, “affection” or “love”. The magic of housework is that it is portrayed as simultaneously invaluable and worthless (Sangari 1993). Feminists have for decades challenged this and emphasized how much energy, work and oppression goes into this construction of the female desire to self-sacrifice (cf. Fraad et al. 2009; Barrett and McIntosh 1982; Mies 1986; McMahon 1999; the list could go on forever).

India has one of the largest gender disparities in the world in terms of time spent on unpaid housework (McKinsey Global Institute 2015). Cooking and cleaning have been identified as the most time-consuming and most acutely gendered of all domestic chores (Saraff and Srivastava 2010). Women are also in charge of raising the children and generational transferring domestic expectations (Luke et al. 2014): A girl child is expected to do housework in a way a boy is not (Lin and Adserà 2013).

Contrary to popular belief, things have not become better in recent decades. Indian women do more or less all the household work, while the share of women participating in any kind job giving them direct payment has been *decreasing* since independence and has intensified in the last ten years (John 2013). As John writes, the intensification of the trend has coincided with ‘a time when India has witnessed the highest growth rates in its economy, and where a certain commonsense would have us believe that we live in a time of unprecedented job opportunities’ (ibid. 180–1).

According to John (ibid. 181; cf. Mazumdar and Neetha 2011), a staggering 85 per cent of Indian women work without receiving any direct payment, which makes them dependent on a family unit. The women who do have some form of salary fall into a U-shaped curve: ‘namely, high labour participation among the poorest as well as among the relatively well to do at the other end of the

11 For the first position, see e.g. Federici (2012); for the latter, see Fraad et al. (2009).

12 I here avoid the problem of *value* inherent in a lot of the discussions on housework *as work*. The crux of this debate is whether or not one should accept the economic assumption that something has to be ‘productive’ – in contrast to ‘reproductive’ – in order to be taken seriously.

spectrum, with very low levels for large sections of women in between (unlike most other parts of the world where women's labour participation increases with education and income)' (John 2013: 184). The employment choices of poorer women are often determined by their embodied woman-ness, since they are perceived to be suitable for "womanly" things like housekeeping (Gothoskar 2013)¹³.

Participation in outside employment does not guarantee women physical or mental freedom from the domestic (Luke et al. 2014; Saraff and Srivastava 2010; Dutta 1999). Moreover, many women caught between the home and the workplace 'compensate' for the lack of 'respectable' femininity arising from their outside employment by either working extra hard in the home (Lahiri-Dutt and Sil 2014) or performing extra tasks of emotional labour through care of the extended family (Belliappa 2013)¹⁴. The Indian men who do participate in housework in some form usually get to cherry-pick the tasks they want to do. Indian women also routinely overestimate their partners' involvement (Saraff and Srivastava 2010; Belliappa 2013).

Domestic expectations can cut through classes and lifestyles. Yet, the situation in middle- to upper-class India is complicated by the omnipresence of paid domestic help, today mostly female maids¹⁵ (e.g. Gothoskar 2013; Neetha 2013; Ray and Qayum 2009, 2011; Mattila 2011; Dickey 2000; Sharma 2016; John 2013; Neetha and Palriwala 2011; Uberoi and Chakrabarti 2004). India is peculiar because 'there is no necessary relationship between the employment of domestic servants and middle-class women's labor-force participation' (Ray and Qayum 2009: 9). The amount of work, combined with a wide availability and cheap prices, definitely play key roles in the prevalence of maids in middle-class India¹⁶, but maids do more than just clean. As a woman interviewed by Dickey (2000: 474) put it: 'Everyone decides to have a servant in order to get prestige from

13 This argument works by taking into account the idea of respectability. There are thousands of Indian working-class women employed in highly visible, 'outside', not 'respectable' professions such as construction work.

14 Belliappa (2013: 72) points out that Indian extended family structures mean extra emotional labour for women, something she aptly calls 'kinship work'.

15 Histories of domestic servants in India state that some employers used to prefer male workers since they were seen as both more capable and more status conferring (Ray 2000; Raghuram 2001).

16 The rapid urbanization of India, powered by neo-liberal displacement, fuels a continuous stream of workers coming to cities like Delhi (see e.g. Ganguly-Scrase and Vogl 2007; Harriss-White and Prospero 2014; Wadhawan 2013; Singh and Hoge 2010). Most maids are unorganized and not protected by any national laws, although attempts to change this have been underway across India (cf. Neetha 2004, Gothoskar 2013; Sengupta and Sen 2013). As Menon (2012) points out, that a large-scale study of Indian sex workers found that a huge number of women preferred sex work over domestic servitude says a lot about the conditions many Indian maids face (cf. Sahni and Shankar 2013).

commanding someone else's work, not because they need a servant to help them with the work they are incapable of doing.'

On the employers' side, the man's retreat from household work conveniently also makes him distant from the issues regarding maids (Mattila 2011: 82). As Gothoskar (2013: 66) writes, this makes the issue socially second-rate, because seemingly the 'contradiction and the conflict is between two women'. The general devaluation of domestic work and the domestic workers' bad situation go hand in hand (Sankaran 2013; cf. Sengupta and Sen 2013) but they are not the same thing. While the woman doing housework in her own home can gain certain legitimacy within patriarchy, the maid cannot (John 2013)¹⁷. For the middle-class women unable or unwilling to challenge the men around them, maids are the next best thing since 'the double burden on middle class women is reduced without disturbing the traditional patriarchal system' (Neetha 2004: 1682).

There is one more complication. While middle- to upper-class women can abstain from performing the less desirable parts of housework *physically*, this does not guarantee mental freedom. Lahiri-Dutt and Sill (2014), Talukdar and Linders (2013) and Belliappa (2013) report that women feel unable to shake off the feelings of domestic responsibility even while employed outside the home. 'Managing' maids and making sure everything goes smoothly in the household is still their responsibility.

Dickey (2000), Ray and Qayum (2009) and Matzner (2014) have characterized the employment of maids as *the* dividing line between the Indian middle classes and those below. *Not* having a maid is then an anomaly demanding explanation. This is the functional description of class. The authors argue, along with Mattila (2011), that for a number of employers it is less important how *well* a maid cleans than that she performs the symbolic act of cleaning.

17 In this thesis I am explicitly concerned with the ideas of the employers. This shall of course not be viewed as the maids not resisting domination or not actively participating in the creation their own realities. For studies discussing workers' agency, see Sharma (2016), Wasiuzzaman and Wells (2010), Mattila (2011), and Ray and Qayum (2009).

Employer Techniques of Class Distinction

The literature has identified a number of techniques of class distinction related to the employers of maids. We have already looked at freedom from undesirable housework. Here, I talk about distance through gendered stigmatization¹⁸ and fear, and the obsession with managing “problematic” maids.

In a manner that echoes Bourdieu’s talk of the power of misrecognition and the ‘symbolic veil of honor’ (Weininger 2005: 101–2; cf. Wacquant 2013; Sayer 2005), domestic workers are generally looked down upon. Their ‘culture’ is perceived as lower than that of the employers (Dhawan 2010). Maids can be said to work as a “foil” for the middle classes’ ways of creating meaning and value’ (Weininger 2005: 97). Domestic violence, alcohol abuse, dirtiness and general vulgarity are some common stigmas attached to them. Their work is seen as undignified and meaningless. The worker’s body is constantly threatened by her class-related assumed dirtiness, and keeping it ‘neat’ (Dickey 2000: 474) requires constant effort.

This causes substantial anxiety for employers, for one’s house can never be clean as long as the person cleaning it is ‘dirty’. ‘Respectable femininity’ can only arise from a ‘respectable’ home, so the moral and physical grooming of the maid is of utmost importance to the family status. Still, the maid should never look or behave like you, for that could be subversive (*ibid.*)¹⁹. The domestic worker is to look spotless but nevertheless like a maid. In contrast, employers have to take precautions so as to not ‘look like maids’ (Frøystad 2005: 106, quoted in Mattila 2011).

Dickey (2000: 473) describes the maid as both a necessity and a threat. Sharing your home with an outsider brings vulnerability; it ‘involves the mixing of categories that might otherwise be kept separate’ (*ibid.* 469–470; Sharma 2016: 53). The working-class and the middle- to upper-class woman should not, by the logic of distinction, meet (Weininger 2005: 100). Yet, ‘they are actually highly integrated’ (Mattila 2011: 103). Since distinctions can no longer be kept through physical distance, other ways have to be created. Fear is one such way. It works in two directions: ‘[Maids] may transport in dirt, disorder, and disease and contaminate children with lower-class habits and language (cf. Bourdieu 1984); they may remove valued belongings and information through theft and gossip’ (Dickey 2000: 473). Most employers see their maids as at least potential thieves, liars and cheats (Hamid 2006). That maids steal is a commonly known ‘truth’ even if one has not experienced it personally (Mattila 2011: 172). If not outright

18 John (2013) gives a good conceptualization of stigma, although she is referring to caste. As e.g. Skeggs (1997) has shown, a class identity can be as stigmatized as any other identity based on caste or “race”.

19 Marxist critics like Kapur (2014: 41) would argue that there is nothing systematically subversive about poor people adopting the symbols of the rich.

criminal, the maid is assumed to try her best to avoid work. There is a presumed rising impertinence and greed among maids, reported by e.g. Ray and Qayum (2009: Chapter 6). As Mattila (2011: 149) argues, explaining the workers' fight for labour rights in terms of their personal maliciousness effectively delegitimizes their struggle.

The maid might also be dangerous in other ways. Sexual fears are discussed by both Ray and Qayum, and Dickey. These fall largely into two categories: the fear of a direct sexual threat from a male domestic, and the fear of the purportedly loose sexuality of the female domestic reflecting badly on the respectability of the employing family²⁰.

A live-in maid would traditionally be much more status conferring than a part-time worker. The two types are seen as causing different problems and threats. Although live-in employees bring with them further responsibilities, such as the loss of privacy in one's home and the potentiality of being assaulted when alone with the worker, employing outsiders means more insecurity about money and control over work (Mattila 2011: 176; Ray and Qayum 2009: 62).

Consumption patterns of the maids, whether physical or immaterial, are another reason for anxiety. Employers feel that maids should not use their small salaries for conspicuous consumption – they should not try to 'acquire the status symbols of the privileged class' (Dhawan 2010: 53), such as 'Western' clothes, mobile phones, or physically embodied signs of confidence (cf. Ray and Qayum 2009: 151, 157; Mattila 2011: 182).

Among domestic workers, an internal hierarchy is upheld (Mattila 2011: 10–11). People performing different tasks are seen as being of different value²¹ and are treated accordingly. Sharma (2016) argues that the workers themselves also strictly control this hierarchy.

Taken together, these fears reveal something important about class and gender. Although in practice often extremely rigid, class is at least in theory mutable and cannot be taken for granted (Dickey 2000: 481). If maids are central to performing middle class-ness, it means that a misbehaving maid can threaten it. The stigmatizing portrayal of the working class as fundamentally bad is a technique used to soothe some of this anxiety (Dickey 2000 and Ray and Qayum 2009: 9, echoing Skeggs 1997). Further, the workers' gender performances and sexualities might threaten the family harmony. As Ray and Qayum argue, the maid is in a 'dialectics of dependency' with the employer – both parties are central in the production of each other's identity (2009: 5).

Kapur (2014) identifies a larger fear of the 'common' outside spaces among the affluent. According to her, the 'freedom' of the upper-class Indian has to be

20 On Indian working-class women and sexuality as class distinction, cf. Parry (2014).

21 This is one of the main sites of study when looking at caste, since this hierarchy largely mirrors assumptions of caste purity.

incessantly guarded by air-conditioning, gates and militia against the 'sexual harassment, rape and kidnappings' outside (ibid. 4). What remains to be done is to 'minimize the threat' as well as one can (Mattila 2011: Chapter 5.3). For employers, domestic workers are an issue to be (endlessly) discussed when they are seen to not perform as wanted (cf. Menon 2012: 17–23).

Employers take 'safety measures' (Mattila 2011: e.g. 177) in order to convince themselves of their workers' good intentions. These can range from making sure the maid takes a bath before work to forbidding her to enter certain spaces or never being alone with her. Spatial politics are upheld even when the maid is inside your house (Dickey 2000). Forbidding the maids to sit on sofas or use family bathrooms, or serving them food on separate plates are mechanisms of symbolic distance. Practices like these are often 'so much part of the habitus that no explanation is or in a sense can be given' (Wasiuzzaman and Wells 2010: 285).

The current discourse on maids has been identified as ranging between 'feudal' and 'modern' (Ray and Qayum 2009: 16)²². In employers' discussions, maids of yesteryear were projected as 'servants' happily entwined with the family, while today they are nothing more than callous workers. It is believed younger employers partly encourage this move. Yet the relationship is, in reality, largely 'still governed by the discourse of dependency and loyalty rather than the work contract' (Sharma 2016: 58). According to Mattila (2011: 148), '[d]espite the gradual and partial shift from relations between families to market relations, the employers were reluctant to discuss workers' rights and to recognise their role as what they actually are: employers'.

The lingering feudalism benefits employers by bringing with it the possibility of demanding more than what was agreed on. Employers' 'love' for the worker, Mattila (2011: 155) notes, is used as a technique of control (cf. Dickey 2000: 478). Through this, Ray and Qayum (2009: 2) argue, maids help the employers 'produce themselves as the class destined to lead India to modernity', while the workers become 'premodern and dependent'.

22 Mattila (2011: 143) uses the corresponding terms 'maternalism' and 'contractualism'.

Field and Method

My method of data collection was the semi-structured qualitative interview (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009; Sherman Heyl 2001). Although I did not have the time frame or the possibility of mixed strategies needed for a proper ethnographic study, my thinking is largely indebted to Skeggs' writing on feminist ethnography (2001). Feminist ethnography posits a level of epistemological and ethical companionship between the researcher and the participant (cf. the chapter below), which in my opinion cannot be sustained without face-to-face engagement between the parties both in and outside the interview situation. I emphasize an on-going relationship with the participants, an immersion in their social space, and a political desire to document the production of gendered and classed life as it is understood when *lived*²³.

Following Cortazzi (2001), in-depth narrative interviews were the obvious option. As he writes, 'in recounting events in narratives, tellers also directly or indirectly give their own interpretations and explanations of those events. They also evaluate, in their own terms, the principal people and others featuring in narratives, the meaning of events and wider relevant contexts' (ibid. 6–7). Narratives of the self, although a grand-sounding term, do not have to be more than, for example, what we choose to tell our parents about a late night out. In my analysis of the interviews I was looking for how stories were constructed on the three levels identified by Cortazzi (2001: 12) – *events* (i.e. employing maids), *experiences* (participant's interpretations of these), and *narratives* (how these were combined and told to *me*) – through vocal and visual clues such as emphasis, choice of words, confidence, joy and awkwardness. These, I feel, would have been hopelessly lost in more quantitative approaches (cf. Reissman 2008).

Belliappa (2013) points out that narrative research is always open to the question of how a story of the self, as told to the researcher, compares to another story of the same self. How do the ones told to me differ from the stories told to close friends, parents or lovers? They are probably different in certain, perhaps important, ways. Still, none of these would be more "authentic" in any deeper sense. As Belliappa (ibid. 136) argues, the self is always constructed in interaction with others and there is no legitimate reason to believe that a narrative told to a researcher would be somehow more "untrue" than another one. In the analysis of my interviews, I pay attention to this. I am interested in how the story is told *to me*, what voices (e.g. first or third person) are used for expressing which sentiments. Since none of my participants had been interviewed on the topic before, they were all self-creating in the act of telling.

I asked all the participants a set of relatively fixed questions, divided into four groups, taking about one and a half hours in all: General background; experiences

23 Cf. Williams' (1977: 132) *Structure of feeling*.

of and opinions on housework; experiences of and opinions on maids; and thoughts on personal gender relations. I also asked the participant to comment on what kind of feelings her participation had created. The questions were tailored slightly to suit the previous responses²⁴.

My interviews took place in the south and central regions of the Delhi megalopolis. South Delhi – a synonym for both wealth and “Westernization” – is where nine out of ten participants lived, although in varying settings²⁵. I asked my participants to choose a location that was comfortable for them. Meetings took place in coffee shops or at the home or university of the interviewee.

Participants were chosen through what can be called a steered snowballing method. The women have both a lot in common and a lot of differences. I make no claims to giving anything like a full picture of young politically active women in Delhi, but I have made sure to only include people that I somehow “knew” beforehand would fit a politically-adjusted version of the class definition given by Belliappa²⁶. My participants were at the time of the interviews all unmarried women between 22 and 28 years of age. They all had lived in Delhi/NCR for at least a number of years. They all self-identify as middle or upper class. They are all highly educated, with social sciences or arts degrees from some of the most famous universities in India. Some have further degrees from prestigious European universities. All speak excellent English and live large parts of their lives in the language²⁷. Right now, they are students, research scholars, university teachers, or working in NGOs connected to social rights. They are politically engaged and feminist, in one way or the other (some much more strongly than others).

The living arrangements of my participants varied from living alone or with flatmates, to living in a university hostel, to never having lived outside the family home. Residential choices had to do both with the money available and family attitudes.

An ambivalence runs through this thesis: I am, for all intents and purposes, presenting the participants as variations on the theme of young progressives, while

24 The interviews became much more structured than I had originally envisioned. After conducting short test interviews on a separate occasion in the summer of 2015, I came to realize that a more structured approach was more suitable than open discussions. New theoretical revisions arose from my encounter with the field. While I had originally imagined only looking at my participants relations to their workers, it became clear to me that neither families nor boy/girlfriend relations and potential marriages could be ignored.

25 Many class-related implications exist in this urban geography. On the social spatiality of the Indian capital see S. Srivastava (2014) or Dasgupta (2014).

26 Although it would have been interesting to do a parallel study on young men, this was impossible for reasons of time.

27 Chaise LaDousa (2014, 2006) has argued for a metropolitan-provincial class distinction along the lines of English-language fluency and accent. In this thinking, the way you speak English is a primary factor in where you will end up in Indian society.

at the same time acknowledging that these women do not all know each other or at all agree with each other on nearly all points. In many ways, they only exist “as a group” for the purposes of this essay. As Weininger writes in a text on Bourdieu (2005: 99): ‘any social collectivity is the result of the combined symbolic acts of self-classification and classification by others that are applied to its members (and, therefore, also, to those who are excluded)’.

Ethical Considerations

We can now turn to ethical considerations. Obviously, all my participants were well informed about how the information they provided would be used. Participants were given the chance to read the unedited chapter on findings²⁸. They were all guaranteed anonymity. These are basic steps of any research process and give a level of formal equality to the situation. Here I focus on issues remaining within the murkier questions of power politics.

How could I, a white Finnish male with no experience of employing maids, interview brown Indian women about such sensitive issues? Wasn't I an outsider with a project about "uncovering" secret inconsistencies in people less fortunate than me and, on top of that, holding them accountable for moral paradoxes? If, following Bourdieu, we argue that every culture creates its own accepted notions of knowledge and truth – and that '[o]nly insofar as one does things is it possible to know about things' (Weininger 2005: 69) – this has serious limitations for the possibility of understanding my participants. Yes and no. We need to not conflate practical knowledge and the idea of identity-related "true" knowledge.

It is true, as Kapoor (2003: 632) writes, that "Southern" knowledge still largely remains a resource to be mined by unwittingly imperialist academics. Kapoor, following Spivak, argues that the global south provides raw material to be refined in Western higher value-added universities, in a way that is eerily similar to (neo-)colonial exploitation. While it is possible for me to go to India for fieldwork, few Indians could or would do the reverse.

Yet, this is today the postcolonial mainstream. No Western student or scholar of the non-West goes a day without a moral hangover. Instead of reiterating what is obvious, I want to here offer a glimpse of postcolonial criticism of postcoloniality. The crux of the matter is identity. I have already argued for looking at class and gender as transmutable and situational. I want to do the same for physical heritage.

Postcolonial feminism has, since at least the days of Mohanty (1984) argued against the monolithizing tendencies of much of the scholarship on the non-West, and against ideas of there being an "average" Southern woman. Yet, it sometimes upholds this very idea. Critical sociology has a natural desire to change the world through understanding discrimination, oppression and exploitation. It is inclined to sympathize with the "victim". What it does less well is realize that every "victim" is in another situation a "perpetrator". We need to not only study groups in virtue of their oppression, but also talk with and theorize the same people in their privileged roles too. The women in my study are all at least triply

28 This chapter originally included more information than stated here. Participants were thus privy to everything I claimed they said, as well as the profiles in the Appendix.

oppressed (gender, ethnicity, nationality), yet they are also powerful by virtue of class, connections and individuality²⁹.

As Belliappa writes, '[n]ot all Southern women are oppressed or even marginalized in the same way' (2013: 4). It is on this post-sisterhood, post-women-as-necessarily-righteous feminism that my own thesis also rests. For me it is demeaning, exoticizing and intellectually dishonest to perceive a young Indian middle- to upper-class woman *only* in virtue of all the oppression she faces. These women are also agents, active and creative. And, importantly, a part of this agency includes actions and ideologies that might in turn oppress someone else – such as a maid. As Thapan (1995: 32) argued, subjects are both *resisting* and *complicit* in the structures around them.

While post-nationalistic scholarship would never ask for “authenticity” in white people³⁰, the flip-side of the argument is used when denying the possibility of an “outsider” to ever understand a place like India. While the Western subject is viewed as fragmented, a new cultural essentialism is put into action on the Southern subject in the name of diversity and multiculturalism. It assumes that being *from somewhere* or being *something* is a stable identity. (Nederveen Pietersee 2010: 69). While trying to work against neocolonial racism, it actually creates a picture of a “Southern” subject with access to forms of knowledge not available to others (Narayan 1998; 1997). Southern voices, through expressions such as “Southern voices”, are made into authentic representatives of a point or way of life essentially different from the “Northern”, something criticized early on by e.g. Trinh T. Min-ha (1989) and called ‘ethically suspect’ by Belliappa (2013: 6).

As Spivak pointed out a long time ago (1988; cf. Kapoor 2004), we need to be able to distinguish between representation and re-presentation. I am not here to represent the women interviewed; they are more than able to represent themselves. I am not here to ‘solve’ anything. I am here to paint a picture, to represent.

My main concern with this thesis has been to do justice to the people I worked with. They are my friends, regardless of how well I know them, and people I often admire. This project would not have been possible without the extended periods of time spent in India over the last five years, without seeing my life as much there as anywhere else. For me – in relation to these particular people, not “Indians” in general – it is these things that determine how power relations are played out.

29 A study on caste would add that here.

30 The idea of me being an ‘authentic’ Finnish person with access to ‘real’ Finnish knowledge is either absurd or fascist.

Findings and Analysis

We can now move on to the empirical material. Using the conceptualization of class as previously explained and the studies on maids referred to before, this chapter highlights and analyses my participants' descriptions of class, domestic workers and gender roles.

We can now move on to the empirical material. Using the conceptualization of class as previously explained and the studies on maids referred to before, this chapter highlights and analyses my participants' descriptions of class, domestic workers and gender roles.

I will start by looking at how the women interviewed saw their upbringings in terms of domesticity and housework. I will also talk about what expectations of someday being "proper women/wives" my interviewees face. After that, I discuss the different ways domestic workers have been employed by my interviewees or their families, as well as the related spatial politics and fears.

After having looked at distance, I will highlight the ways my participants have viewed different relationships with domestic workers as close or meaningful. I also narrate my interviewees' opinions on whether or not their and their families' practices regarding domestic workers have been different from people around them.

Finally, coming back to the question of gender roles, I look at my participants' perceptions of people of their own generation, in relation to domestics and gendered expectations of housework. I inquire whether the future can be any different.

The idea of a proper girl

In this segment I look at what my participants' families have expected from them in terms of housework and gender. "Family" of course means very different things to different people. Two of my participants grew up in nuclear families while the domestic settings of the remaining eight can be described as 'hybrid'. Members of their extended families either cohabited with the nuclear family, or lived very close by. A few can be said to have grown up in stable 'extended' families. One participant grew up in a household where all the adults were female and another participant lived significant amounts of time with only her mother and her brother.

These differences were reflected in my participants' influences: while many expressed extended families to be a major, mainly negative influence on their self-determination, others reported very limited influence from non-nuclear family members. In the introduction we read that female children's initial relationship to

housework is often learned from their mothers. This was also encountered in my interviews. Female family members of different generations were seen to have had the main direct influence on gendered assumptions, corroborating studies on internalized patriarchy. While many were of the opinion that men ultimately exerted patriarchal power through the women, this power rarely needed explicit voicing.

My participants exhibited a large variety of past and future expectations. While some were expected to contribute from an early age and others cited daily routines, many expressed they had rarely or never done ‘anything’.

The participants who had not done housework while growing up were somewhat divided as to whether this was uncommon or not. Some expressed never viewing it as uncommon since no other children in their peer groups did it either and others expressed only ‘realizing’ it was uncommon much later. Others said it was markedly different from other female children around them.

Those of my participants who had fathers around the household, all but one expressed a lack of participation from their fathers’ side. Some mentioned this with a certain humour, which might imply they saw it as something that is impossible to change, while others were explicitly upset that their fathers saw housework as a ‘woman’s job’ or ‘none of [their] concern’. In the cases where the participants reported some level of involvement by the father, it was usually qualified either through gendered hierarchies of tasks (the father doing ‘manly’ things) or through the level of recognition the performance received (as one participant said, her father does ‘one thing’ and then ‘boasts’ about it for the rest of the month). The pattern follows previous studies, although my participants were aware and critical of the unequal burden.

There was little implication of serious conflict between mothers and fathers. The interviewees often implied a resignation or internalization on the part of their mothers: ‘It’s not like he’s told my mother to do it, but it is assumed that it’s her work’, as 25-year-old Riddhi³¹, who works at a classic feminist NGO, expressed it. The following quote captures this tendency of internalization as well as the negative impact of the extended family:

‘[My dad] doesn’t do a thing in the house. My mother complains about it but she also accepts it. Because my father is an only son – so his parents, who live with us, are very protective about his right to do nothing.’ – Aditi, 24 years old.

31 All names are pseudonyms.

Another participant used the same word ‘adamant’ when she stated that her aunt made sure her male cousin would be able to take care of himself, in spite of this causing anxiety for the grandmother.

Others reported that there never were any expectations placed on their male relatives, and that these family members therefore had internalized a ‘sense of entitlement’ or an expectation for things to ‘just appear’. Some were angry with male relatives or family friends for not appreciating the work done by others. Even Vinaya – a 24-year-old social rights activist whose family had generations of clear feminist tendencies – felt that patriarchy still creeps in despite the best efforts, that men ‘just don’t do certain things’.

When asked about whether or not class made a difference for how much they were expected to do, all but one said yes. For most, the fact that there was or could always be a number of maids taking care of things meant there was never a true *need* for them to contribute. Ananya, a 27-year-old chef and former feminist NGO worker, said she was never taught to do anything:

‘In India, especially people of my class, we look at housework as drudgery because we’ve never done it. We don’t know what it is. We don’t know how it feels to pick up a broom and clean the house – none of us have done it. [...] So we’re so alien from it, we don’t even think of it as *anything*.’

In several discussions, a distinction arose between *knowing* how to do things and actually *doing* them. Elite women were said to take pride in not doing anything even if gender dictated that they should know how to, thus showing a culture of servitude in action. Aditi, a 24-year-old NGO worker who identified as very upper class, summarized this position: ‘My mother wants me to know how to cook and wants me never to have to do it.’ Later, she mused over a kind of psychological dependency this upbringing had led to and described the production of habitus and predisposition:

‘[N]obody really wanted us to do [housework] – we were brought up to be rich kids who didn’t do *that*. And in a sense we were being trained, I guess, to *need* that much comfort so that we would then pursue careers which would allow us to *earn* that comfort subsequently. So in a sense it was getting us used to a certain way of living.’

Class was seen to practically or symbolically shield one from domestic messes. Noor, a 24-year-old social justice worker, told a self-critical story about buying new pieces of underwear instead of washing old ones. Dharini’s comments show a liminality currently offered to her by virtue of being unmarried and living on her

own. In her opinion, she is not seen as a 'real adult'. Therefore she is not as responsible for upholding class and gender status:

'I can live like this and my extended family will understand it because for them I am *not yet married*. But the point is that for me as a 28-year-old my family would expect me to be living in a very different kind of world right now, but they'll excuse this because I've been a student, and I'm whatever. For my family again, this is not adult life.'

Rules of respectability could in this case be bent without the fear of *really* slipping down the class ladder.

Yet, others expressed a number of conflicts between their current class status/performance and that of their parents. Except for overly modest living arrangements, their families also looked on career choices that did not provide large salaries as somewhat strange. The class locations of my participants were complicated by the fact that all of them live on a spectrum of dependence-independence in relation to their parents' standing and finances. Some of my participants are virtually independent financially and socially while others are economically dependent and under a lot of control. This supports the idea of a person existing in several different class relations at once, some more permanent and/or valuable than others.

Participants were also often highly aware of the constructed (moral) neutrality of the term middle class, even when they used the term themselves. One of my participants, who awkwardly self-described as upper middle class after admitting she had not really thought so much about it since she had 'had almost everything always', went on to argue that most people would call themselves middle class because it's 'safe' and avoids the extremes on both sides. Another participant explained at length that the middle class does not exist except for inside the heads of people like her parents who really are not middle class. All participants were keen on stressing their class privilege, resisting dominant narratives of the 'excellence' of the affluent.

Participants' comments on growing up complicate large-scale studies on Indian children's participation in housework (e.g. Lin and Adserà's 2011) that do not take class into serious account. Still, social class wasn't the only reason not to do housework for some of my participants' families. In some cases, mothers' gendered concerns were seen as highly important³², as described by Dharini:

32 This would warrant its own study. On 'feminist mothering' in India, cf. Phadke (2013).

‘I think part of the reason – I remember my mother actually saying that – was that I was a girl. And so she said that – I think she was kind of torn about that – that she didn’t want to teach me to do housework. I think there was an anxiety of that being gendered. I remember she used to say that if I was a boy, she would find it much easier to get me to do work around the house.’

For Dharini, her mother had the luxury of not making her contribute to housework. The mother didn’t want her daughter ‘doing it for someone else someday’, and wanted her to be able to focus on other things. This sentiment was shared by Aditi, who made a connection between certain kinds of ‘progressive’ status and not doing housework:

‘[F]or the women that I know it’s sort of asserting your own empowerment to say that “I never needed to learn how to cook”, you know, “I don’t know how to cook, I can’t cook a thing”. People say it with a lot of pride [...] I think it kind of shows that no-one has ever, that where you come from is sufficiently progressive that they don’t need to enforce cooking from you.’³³

Vinaya also expressed disbelief in any clear correlation between class and feminist individualism. For her it was the fact that her family had for generations encouraged women to do ‘other things’ that made it possible for her not to worry about stereotypical “womanly” expectations. On the opposite side of my spectrum is Nalini, a 26-year-old gender scholar, who said some members of her extended family felt that it was a matter of prestige to ‘train your daughter properly’, i.e. to take care of a household. Such comments point to a level of distinction along the axis of conservative-progressive, each with its own set of gendered symbolic capital, and each with its own idea of “good” womanhood. This follows its own logic, where for some performing partial social or gender equality becomes status, while others gain the same by following more traditional ways. The question of class is thus more complex than a path from more money to more maids to fewer expectations on the household’s women.

Not all of the women who *had* done housework felt that this was purely for sexist reasons. While some suspected that their mothers’ arguments about self-reliance weren’t as anti-sexist as they intended to sound, others stressed that their mothers taught them to take care of themselves because everyone should know how.

33 This echoes Federici (2010 [1975]: 22), who made a point about feminist women not wanting to be identified with the poor ‘losers’ who are still stuck with housework.

One participant expressed not being able to shake the feelings of domestic duties from the back of her mind. Yet, a clear difference was portrayed between my participants and their mothers. The existence of maids did not mean that the mothers of my interviewees were free from domestic labour, regardless of whether or not they were working full time outside the home. All participants stated that their mothers (in some cases together with grandmothers) were ultimately responsible for the smooth functioning of everything practical, as well as considerable amounts of emotional labour. This follows sentiments in the previous literature. My participants implied that they themselves were less entangled in domestic expectations. This was interpreted as a combination of (proto-)feminist engagement from either my participants' or their mothers' sides³⁴.

The idea of marriage was for most a conflicting or downright scary situation, whether or not one supported it in theory. Potential partners, families and the fear of succumbing to gendered stereotypes all worried my participants. The family differences regarding future expectations varied. Some participants laid emphasis on their families 'never' having any expectations of them being 'good wives' (or even wives at all) and instead telling them to focus on being independent. Others said these things had not really been discussed explicitly but that they could tell such expectations existed. At the other end, several of the women interviewed were currently engaged in complicated, often tumultuous, negotiations over marriage. Of these, some expressed a sense of shock when suddenly confronted with expectations that had not been talked about before. Others tried to politely postpone everything marriage-related for the far-distant future. Marriage was one of the key sites of strategic resistance and collusion, born out of a combination of structural (an Indian culture of marriage) and individual (how strict one's parents are) factors. A couple of cases, detailed below, will illustrate this point.

Maya – a semi-openly bisexual woman who lives on her own, describes herself as a radical feminist and grew up with a divorced mother – said her mother still 'obviously' expects her to get married someday. She feels that it was 'liberating in some ways' not to have a father's influence and that seeing the drawback of marriage and the possibility of an all-female household gave her a feminist spark. For her, 'it would be ridiculous' as a feminist to comply with any of her mother's demands. Still, Nalini, an equally staunch feminist who currently lives with her family, was very pessimistic when it comes to being able to negotiate marriage, although other victories could be achieved:

34 Still, this difference can be caused as much by my participants still being seen as 'daughters' in family settings as by generational political change. It would be interesting to return to my subjects in ten years to see if the cycle repeats itself.

‘Some of these things you cannot negotiate, but one has to be strategic about it. Like when it’s about everyday things like who will cook or all of that, so I can fight on these issues [...] On issues like marriage it’s very difficult.’

Some thus felt that marriage will be inevitable, and tried to instead focus on damage control. One participant expressed a desire for life-long commitment, something she saw as ‘a pretty controversial decision to take in certain liberal circles’.

Stories of maids

According to my interviewees, people employed maids³⁵ mainly for three reasons: Firstly because it made life easier, secondly because it was expected of one’s class, and thirdly because it was felt to be a social responsibility. Not employing a maid would potentially be met by a confused or bemused ‘Why?’. For some participants’ families it could also be potentially embarrassing not to have a maid.

Maya’s and Lalita’s stories constitute the ends of my spectrum: While the former grew up in a northern town without domestics (saying there was ‘no concept of maids’), the latter grew up on a large compound in a hill station, with workers whose families had been with her family for generations. From birth, Lalita was partly taken care of by the then nine-year-old daughter of older workers. Maya did not stay in a house with maids until after college. The other eight participants fall somewhere in between – six had or had previously had live-in workers while two had only had part-time maids. At the time of the interviews, Maya and Aditi (who both live independently) did not in their own households employ maids in any form, while seven did so either directly or indirectly by virtue of living with their families. The one remaining participant lives in a university hostel. Two participants who live on their own employed part-time workers.

Interestingly, three of the women accustomed to full-time maids implied that only having part-time workers is more or less the same as having none. Comments such as these point to a vaguely understood connection between the level of exploitation and the level of status produced by it:

‘We haven’t had a domestic help for over nine–ten years now, no sort of domestic help – we have part-timers who come in, but besides that we have to manage things amongst ourselves.’ – Ishana

35 The focus of my research lies on cooking and cleaning and thus only looks at domestic workers involved in these tasks. Nannies, drivers, watchmen and similar roles are not considered; it should not be understood that these roles do not exist in the participants’ family settings.

‘They don’t employ maids – they employ just part time.’ – Ananya, when asked if her newlywed friends have maids.

I asked my participants whether there were other reasons for hiring women than just their availability.

Disturbingly, tales of sexual violence perpetrated by male domestics were common. One participant told of having been sexually abused by a former male worker. Another told of narrowly escaping a molestation attempt. Two more told of similar things happening to female members of the immediate family. This had in all cases led to a preference for female workers, who were seen as less of a threat to the family. Even without personal traumas the remaining half also expressed they or their parents had similar feelings. The fear of the inherently bad male worker was expected by parents to be implicitly understood. One was supposed to know that ‘These kinds of people do these kinds of things’, which could lead to victim blaming in case something happened. Puberty was often seen as a particularly dangerous time.

The male domestic could cause very real harm to female family members, but the female domestic was not problem-free either. Participants mentioned families fearing female workers potentially causing moral injury. Aditi’s grandmother was said to view female domestic workers as a ‘pressure cooker that’s going to go off’. According to the grandmother, ‘there will be all these love affairs and moral degradation’ unless you police the maid’s sexuality. Aditi felt things are changing with younger generations but that both her mother and sister exhibited similar ideas. She herself saw this as a part of a patronizing tendency:

‘[I]t’s a thing with class difference. Not just difference, in terms of they think people from certain classes – very Victorian idea – they think people from certain classes are more likely to be sexually sort of...immoral.’

Similarly, the reason Ishana’s family hadn’t had a live-in worker for ten years was because their sexuality was felt to cause trouble. The more time the maid spent in your house, the more responsible one was felt to be.

These statements correspond with what has been said before and also show that there sometimes is a gruesome reality behind them. Separating real and ideological fear is thus important; fears regarding female domestics fall into the latter category. When talking about sexual fears, participants made a clear linguistic separation by quoting older generations’ ideas in ways that painted these opinions as absurd. Even in the cases where actual harm was inflicted on my participants, the implication was that regressive parental attitudes made the situations even worse. Participants poked holes in their families’ use of

essentializing language and instead voiced their own criticism of actual happenings in socio-economic or individual terms.

While everybody recognized the existence of the hierarchy of workers mentioned in previous literature, not all had seen this in practice³⁶. Those who had experience of it at home reported different reasons for its existence: inability to change parents' or grandparents' ideas, family ideas of class-related cleanliness, or the workers' own insistence on keeping up such practices. In all cases such hierarchies visibly upset and embarrassed the participants. Many compared their parents to their grandparents, saying that at least the former were less 'feudal' than the latter. Descriptions of discrimination from the employers' side figured liberally, yet the most common reason given for the hierarchy of tasks was that the workers themselves insisted: 'It's not just that I would have someone separate doing the bathroom and this thing, but they themselves don't', was a common sentiment.

Ishana, whose family was extremely vigilant about not letting anyone but family members cook and kept a strict separation from the cleaners, said they did so because one cannot know where the workers have been. Thus, the "dirtiness" of the maid does not come from her cleaning dirt, but from undisclosed 'different things' she might do elsewhere. In Ishana's comment, the symbolic and material switch places:

'[I]t's all again the idea that my grandmother had in terms of the cleanliness, that service-class people you do not know where they're coming from, you do not know what all they're doing in other people's houses. You know what they're doing in your house – they're cleaning – but in other people's houses they could be doing ten different things. So in our house it's completely due to the cleanliness factor.'

While distancing themselves from the opinion, several others mentioned their family members and society at large having similar ideas of working-class people being inherently 'unclean' and 'dirty'. This shows knowledge of the dirt discourse mentioned in earlier literature. Sometimes, the same knowledge was resisted through doing 'dirty' tasks oneself. For example, three women with maids revealed they always cleaned their bathrooms themselves for ideological reasons, 'because dirt is so political'. This practically and, more importantly, symbolically reduces the workload of the maid. As an approach, it also shows the creative political pragmatism of these individuals: in family settings, it makes a statement

36 Class-based prejudice was often talked about more freely than caste-based prejudice. While the hierarchy of maids is where caste becomes most prevalent, the participants' comments showed that the same stigma could be rationalized in classist terms too.

which forces family members to acknowledge the politics of domestic work, while at the same time avoiding undesired open confrontation.

Gender and the duration of employment were seen as factors affecting a worker's position vis-à-vis employers and other workers. A person who had worked for the family for decades was seen as able to wield more negotiating power. Although live-ins were generally considered more important than part-time workers, and although tasks like ironing and dusting were seen as "better" than mopping the floors, this could be undone by gender. For example, according to some of the participants, the others viewed a male part-time floor cleaner as being higher in the chain of command than a live-in woman taking care of dusting and ironing.

The overstepping of boundaries, whereby a too-close fraternization could lead to an undefined contamination, was a central concern in earlier literature. Ishana, while in theory speaking about her mother's views, revealed some of these fears in herself:

'[W]hen you're letting someone enter your house you don't know what's gonna happen. You don't know whether they'll be lacing your food with some kind of stuff for you to pass out or something.'

To combat this, some participants' families had instructed them not to be too 'soft' in front of the maid, lest she will not 'fear' them anymore. Others reported having been told as children not to play with the children of workers. Some level of spatial restrictions existed in almost every house. Again, participants said these 'social taboos' were enforced as much or more by the workers as by the employers.

All the women whose families had live-in maids provided them with their own bathrooms. According to Ananya, the segregation is internalized by the maids: when the maid's toilet broke she refused to use Ananya's bathroom in spite of repeated reassurances that it was okay to do so. Part-time workers were in most family homes expected to either use servants' bathrooms located somewhere in the building complex, or not to use bathrooms when at work. Dharini's family was, according to her, an exception. The women who employed maids in their own homes expressed having no restrictions on bathroom use.

When it came to the practice of separate utensils, Dharini and Vinaya denied their families ever supported such measures. Dharini said she does not know of anyone in her peer group who upholds the practice³⁷. Vinaya said their maid did for a long time, but that she and her parents eventually talked her out of it. Noor said the practice existed when she lived with her paternal grandmother but was

37 The issue of utensils is again one topic where caste and class come to mix.

‘done away with’ when living with her mother. None of the women who lived on their own upheld the practice of separate utensils in their current home, and all participants were highly critical of the practice. However, seven out of the ten said it still exists in their parental homes regardless of their best efforts to persuade their parents to stop the custom. Grandparents were again seen as a major reason for the continued endurance of the practice.

Restrictions on where maids were allowed to sit were said to exist in all family homes. In certain cases, more lenient rules applied for long-term workers or for the children of workers. The situation for those who lived on their own was again very different. As in earlier literature, my participants also mentioned the fear of information leaking out. While Vinaya said that their old maid is ‘like family’ and privy to most family secrets, and Dharini denied ever being told to keep particular things secret, most of the other participants reported being told to not let the maids know certain matters.

Throughout our discussions, spatial politics were said to be changing. Participants denied personally practising any such restrictions except when forced by the family situation, or when the maids themselves insisted. It is interesting that the roles were described as being so rigid, even with live-in workers in progressive households. One could think that an employer-employee relationship free of direct outside influences or fears of retribution would facilitate change more easily. Yet, participants claimed it was extremely hard to change things – even when the whole family desired to do so. This both shows the durability of class and makes the argument that maids are the upholders of distance sound somewhat suspicious. Yet, the findings of e.g. Sharma (2016) support the latter. Regardless of the “truth”, blaming the maid is in itself notable for its distance-creating effect. As with the case of gender roles above, we see different forms of social capital emerging. Being (or appearing to be) an exceptionally “progressive” employer becomes for some a new marker of status.

My participants readily recognized the expression ‘looking like a maid’. This ‘one of many class-based insults’, as Dharini put it, was mostly used to describe a dishevelled-looking person high up in the class hierarchy. While criticizing it, Riddhi slipped into classist language:

‘[“Don’t look like a maid”] just means that; don’t look like someone from a lower class than yours. [...] They are from a different class in the sense that they don’t have access to all the things that we do, they might not always have clean clothes.’

Noor told the following story about her instinctive reaction to a friend who used the expression to describe her, saying it was ‘not a very happy moment’ in her life.

Again, it shows both intimate knowledge of discriminatory practices, and the desire to not succumb to them oneself:

‘So the first instinct because of everything I’ve grown up with is “Oh shit!”. Then the other, the one that has *unlearned* the things and has gone through this, was like “Okay fine, thank you! Okay. It means that I’ve worked a lot”.’

The expression had another side to it, which, as in previous literature, puts the domestic worker in a lose-lose situation. The maid would be scolded if she tried to look like the employer. According to my participants, people expect female maids to dress in traditional Indian wear, and would be upset if they showed up at work in jeans and a tee-shirt – the outer signs of the “modern respectable woman”. Ananya told of an aunt whose maids do dress in ‘Western’ clothes, something that has upset Ananya’s parents:

‘[M]y mom and dad, when they went to visit my aunt who lives in Noida, they were like “Oh wow look at your maids, how they’re dressed”. So it was like a shock, not a shock but like “What is happening, how can she be dressed like that?”. Somehow it’s like an attack on your culture and your values – not your values – but it’s an attack on your culture, because you see your maid as someone less than you.’

Noor said people ‘won’t be able to deal with’ a maid in jeans because it would imply ‘that there is a certain mobility which is happening’. This relates back to Skeggs’ words about the bodily embodiment of gendered class and the employer’s desire for immutability, mentioned before. As identified previously by e.g. Dhawan (2010), “maid-ness” is supposed to readily show on one’s body. Participants said that clear expectations of clothes only extend to female workers, which further supports the idea of women as the ultimate guardians of class and the culture of servitude as being particularly female. The otherwise potentially “un-Indian” (thus “un-respectable”) “Western” clothing worn by privileged women can only work as a signal of modern middle- to upper-class respectability as long as the female maid acts as the foil. Such examples of class servitude were openly ridiculed.

We have already touched upon the threat of sexual abuse and the policing of the maid’s body. Several other fears were central. All participants expressed growing up with an internalized mistrust of maids. This could be consciously analysed and so potentially dismantled:

‘I feel we’ve just been brought up to distrust people from a lower social class. You see everywhere, you know you always automatically assume that the maid is evil and she’s gonna cheat you some way, things like that. I think it’s a general thing – every person I’ve lived with ever has always – including myself – has always been suspicious to if the maid is trying to take advantage of you in certain ways.’ – Riddhi.

The fear of stealing was the most widely recognized concern. Echoing Mattila’s (2011: 179) words on safety measures, some reported their families ‘testing’ new workers by leaving 100 rupee bills somewhere in the house, in order to check if the maid was stealing.

Many participants told a story of something going missing and the maid always being the first suspect because ‘she is the Other, she’s somehow not even from your own class’. The sociological language of participants’ self-analysis clashed with memories of past participation in discriminatory practices. Riddhi chastised herself for having done this:

‘That’s when we realized that you know we write papers on class and we write papers you know about this and that and at the end of the day...we ourselves are so conditioned in such a way that...[trailing off]’

Participants were engaged in a process of unlearning. The suspicions maids face were dismissed in terms expressing disgust. In some cases, participants did however report instances of maids stealing things of little value, which could lead to contradictory actions from participants. A remorseful Riddhi said she once fired a maid who was caught stealing vegetables:

‘I mean obviously she’s only stealing because she can’t afford it at all herself, right? I mean she lives in a camp – she was telling me one day that they have one bathroom in between some 80 families, so if you’re living in a place like that you can’t really...So...’

In a clear display of attitude change, most showed understanding towards people who steal. Nalini and Maya said they would do the same:

‘I feel it’s perfectly okay to steal even if one does. I mean given their harsh conditions, *jaar*, they work 24/7 to get that kind of...to have the amount to survive. Who would not steal? I would steal if I was in their position.’

‘[I]f you belong to a different class, and you come to a household that’s one class above you let’s say, it could be a possibility that thoughts of you know

stealing would come. Like for example I go to a hotel and I see a very shiny amazing something right, something I can't afford, the thoughts pass my mind like I could just take it, like "Fuck that I could just take it".'

There is among the older generations, some of my participants said, a fear of things changing, of maids wanting more and more. This again is in tune with what has been researched before. Older people, it was said, remember days when the workers *wanted* to work. Participants disagreed with romanticizing the past. Ananya said maids used to be 'basically just slaves' who had to be completely subservient to their employers, and that people in her extended family are now talking anxiously about how the maids nowadays demand things like 'salaries' and 'days off'. Balancing between the first and third person, Ishana said her mother is very concerned about the workers using cell phones or listening to music while working:

'According to her, gone are the days when the service-class people were actually dedicated to their work, or in it because they *wanted* to do it. Now they have – or what she likes to say – "they believe they have a life equal to us".'

New gendered fears

New uncertainties were expressed about being a young unmarried woman and about a potentially dangerous connection existing between the maid and one's parents. This puts further internal qualifications on the middle to upper classes. Parts of my participants' lives – considered high-status within their peer group – were not always readily understandable by older family members. Hence, caution had to be exercised when the maid was around in order to keep her from gossiping. Participants' abilities to run their lives in ways closer to what they desired were often dependent on their parents knowing as little as possible. While families were often seen as somewhat ridiculously conservative, participants also willingly decided to rather keep a distance than openly challenge or "hurt" them, showing typical diplomacy. Sexuality, late nights out, alcohol consumption, smoking and similar activities were things to be kept secret from the domestic worker:

'She should not know that I drink. Or she should not know that I'm sexually active. Because I am unmarried and it's looked down upon to be an unmarried non-virgin in India somehow. [...] I don't know why but they will tell your parents that you're sexually active or you're smoking or you're drinking.' – Maya

‘That [the maid would gossip to parents] was one of my biggest fears...like I would smoke...have friends come over...I feel my parents are quite liberal but they’re still probably not okay with say a guy staying over at my house at night, even if they’re just friends.’ – Riddhi

The maid herself could also be the reason for moralistic nuisance. Riddhi mentioned that her boyfriend is afraid of being seen with her by the maid because he thinks Riddhi will be viewed as a ‘loose character’. The maid had sometimes told her to ‘be careful with these boys’, i.e. her boyfriend, because ‘they’ll take what they want and they will leave you in the end’:

‘So she couldn’t fathom that I would maybe also just want to be you know sexually active with somebody without feeling the need to get married. She thought I’d get heartbroken.’

Some had found ways of negotiating this with the workers. Noor said she was initially nervous about leaving cigarette butts and beer bottles around the house, as well as nervous about the maid seeing her and her flatmate have boys over for the night. However, Noor said she ‘trusts’ the current domestic worker after talking with her and coming to a mutually good place in their relationship.

Dharini, who runs an openly queer household, found her current maid with the help of another queer friend: ‘[S]he’s worked for other queer friends, so in that sense nothing really surprises her’, ‘I can walk around in a towel and it’s not a problem, and she can come into the house and find me sleeping here with a guy and it’s not a problem’. Dharini’s parents know enough about her life for her not to have to worry about their disapproval, and her concerns are more about the relationship with the maid and the regressive Delhi society around them.

Thus, whether and how to maintain “respectability” in front of the maid are questions that needed to be answered for the smoothness of practical life. While these questions were the most pronounced in the four women living on their own, similar sentiments were seen among others too.

Following up on this, I asked my participants whether they felt there was a class difference in what was socially acceptable. The answers largely focused on the lack of a ‘backlash’. As Vinaya put it:

‘I have the liberty to do that because I’m from a class that is sort of immune to any social backlash – I can do anything I want and will not be hurt in any way, or there will be no reprisal, not even social boycott or anything, because it doesn’t matter.’

Aditi argued that the movements of all women are ‘in principle equally confined’ but that some people have better chances of tactically bending the rules:

‘[S]o if we were rich or poor we’re not expected to go out at night, we’re expected not to be too free in the company of men, we’re not expected to have multiple relationships or be interested in men other than the ones that we’re – or even look at other men than the ones we’re committed to. There are all those same rules. It’s just that we have more freedom to flout them without being noticed, in a sense.’

This again correlates with Skeggs’ argument of gender as a dimension and not a polarity. The legitimacy offered by class was explicitly felt to protect my participants.

Looking at old anxieties and new, we see two conflicting pictures of maids. The first one is the classic image that stands in opposition to what a ‘good’ middle-class woman is supposed to be – the worker as dangerous, scheming and sexually loose. Such ideas were mainly said to be held by participants’ parents, grandparents and other conservative groups. The other picture comes from a segment of the middle class that has personally moved past hyper-conservative notions of sexual morality. Now the maid was conversely portrayed as morally uptight and potentially ‘exposing’ you to the regressive society around you. Unless a trustworthy maid was found, it was feared she would gossip about one’s ‘looseness’. Class is here again performed in two oppositional ways – for certain parents or society at large as conservative ‘respectability’, but through individual (e.g. sexual) choice and liberty within the peer group. The domestic worker, once again, can scarcely do anything right. Yet, my participants also showed that these anxieties could be negotiated and stereotypes dismantled.

Can class boundaries be overcome?

Thus far in this thesis, I have only talked of differences and creating distance. We shall now, through three types of examples, look closer at what was seen to bring participants and workers together.

Most felt they had or had had important personal relationships with some of their domestic workers. Some relationships had grown during a number of years, while others had lasted only moments. While, it was said, women in earlier generations were duty-bound to extended families and through them completely assimilated regressive maid-related practices, my participants expressed an ability to form their own, private, relationships with the workers.

Three participants used the term ‘like family’ when referring to long-term maids, although one did so somewhat ironically. As mentioned, Lalita grew up

with a maid only nine years older than her. In her story, their childhoods were happy together. As children they would play together and stand up for each other. The parents of the maid ‘happily sent her with [Lalita’s] Mama’. The family tried to get the girl to go to school, but according to Lalita, she just didn’t want to and ran away repeatedly. Thinking about how true the “family”-like relationship really was, Lalita pondered what the situation might have been like if it was she herself who did not want to go to school. In her description, the maid oscillated between the roles of sister and servant:

‘[H]er only work – I won’t say work or whatever – her only thing was to be with me. I’d been with her for seven years, so for seven years I’ve been with her only. And she had no other work. Or, my mother used to cook back then so helping her a little bit and looking after me, and when I started going to school my uniform and all those things. I was very attached to her.’

Lalita spoke about the childhood relationship in a deeply romanticized way, while at the same time making it somewhat unconsciously clear that it was a relationship of service. The multiple compound disadvantages faced by the child-worker made class boundaries extremely hard to overcome, even with good intentions. Vinaya reported a very different “family” relationship:

‘I just think I know her very well and she knows me. I think before I used to be not so open, but when you’ve known someone for a long period of time and quite intimately and you know you’ve been through things together in life. We’ve been through things in her family, she’s been through things – obviously seen me in bad places, I’ve seen her in bad places – then there’s a level of comfort that kind of transcends the cultural stuff. I trust her, she trusts me. It doesn’t matter if our cultures are different. She’s on my side always and like I’m on her side always, so that’s different.’

Vinaya did not have to hide her sexuality or alcohol use from her parents. She lives with them and has previously had a long-term foreign boyfriend living with her in her room. While her parents had no objections to this, Vinaya said they were initially worried about how the maid would react. For Vinaya, this was a chance to overcome boundaries even though the lifestyle differences discussed above remained:

‘They said that “What will [the domestic] think, it will upset her”. Not that she would gossip in the neighbourhood, but that she would not be okay with something like that. So asked her “Are you okay with this, what’s

going to happen?” And then she was okay with it. Like for a while I think she was quite uncomfortable but then she was fine.’

‘[S]he’s very emancipated in her own spirit and her own way. But she wouldn’t think of meeting someone and being with them, even physically. And I suppose I would.’

These stories were offered as a kind of proof by Vinaya, who seemed to feel challenged by my inquiries as to whether a maid could really be seen as “family”. For her, personal stories of overcoming boundaries in specific supportive settings were more telling than categorical judgements.

A handful of employer-maid relationships grew from a political awakening and a subsequent desire to do what one could to help. According to almost every participant, their current or former workers had at some time or other suffered from domestic abuse, alcoholic and neglectful husbands, and the burdens of childcare³⁸. Interviewees had at some point invested their time in trying to help the workers, often spending time in their homes, getting to know their families and supporting their side in conflicts about labour, law and rights.

Many spoke of the ethical problems related to trying to help. In issues concerning family violence and sexual rights in particular, the workers themselves were said to resist support. ‘You cannot force empowerment’, ‘I cannot possibly understand [what it is like for her]’, ‘I can’t just pop into her life one day and be like “This is wrong! [...]”’ were typical expressions. Often things became emotional, and frustration arose out of not being able to help. One party would also eventually move on, which meant an emotional parting. Nalini said her relationships with the maids had therefore now become less personal:

‘I invest so much, and so does the maid. And when they leave it’s kind of like very painful. So I don’t know, even my relationship has become very functional.’

Noor raised a concern related to treating the worker as a subject of research:

‘I started talking to her because I was studying all of that, I was studying about inequality, about how it’s difficult to be poor in the country. I think one thing is, you know Otso, it wasn’t a very equal relationship that we also shared because I got to know more about her than she got to know

38 While there is no reason to doubt the truth in these statements, Dharini argued that many upper-class people have a stereotype of domestic violence among the working classes. Similar sentiments were expressed in Ray and Qayum (2009).

about me. [...] Somehow at that point I hadn't realized that it's also important for me to share my life or like, you know. I was asking most of the questions.'

This, although coming from a desire to help, echoes the 'asymmetry' of power (Mattila 2011: 147) identified earlier, wherein the employers felt they knew (and had the right to know) about their workers, whereas workers should only know what they were allowed to know. Again, participants were highly self-critical of even their 'good' practices. Personal voices were used to discuss the topic on several analytic and emotional levels.

The final type I highlight here is illustrated in two anecdotes that struck me as different from the rest of what was said. Both in their own way implied a momentary role reversal – one where the worker, for a second, became a real and equal person. Both were told with tenderness and humour, something that cannot be adequately reproduced here.

The first anecdote came from Maya, the woman with the least experience of maids in my group. After moving to Delhi, Maya lived with her then girlfriend in the latter's parents' house. The family employed a domestic worker:

'I would rarely interact with the maid, except on Sundays when the whole family would go to church and it was just me and her in the house. Even then we wouldn't interact much except like her hair was pretty and I would compliment her, really I had a tiny crush on her [laughs].'

While this comment could in a different context have been creepy at best, Maya – who later spoke at length about the issue of maids being sexually harassed by employers – said it in passing and with natural coyness. Recalling Skeggs' words (2005) on the embodiment of social standing as well as the taboos regarding workers' sexualities, the people we can and cannot be attracted to are also coded in terms of class³⁹. The fact that the worker was perceived as a woman that a woman higher up in the hierarchy could have a secret crush on – not just a sex object or a stereotype – is then a radical move. This does nothing of course for any material part of exploitation, but has implications for the overcoming of distance.

The second anecdote comes from Dharini, who said her maid usually works for much richer people and only works in her house because she knows her friend. Dharini, a college teacher, and her freelancer flatmate had asked the maid if she could do laundry for them, which the latter declined:

39 Also cf. Thapan (1995) on the classed female body as 'proof' of sexual 'worth'.

‘So when R told us she couldn’t wash clothes for us she tried to convince us to buy a washing machine – which we eventually did – but at the time we were like “Hahaha don’t be silly, we don’t have that kind of money!” And she was like “Come on how much does a washing machine cost? Like 10,000 rupees? I’ll give you 10,000 rupees!” And we’re like “Fuck, we don’t have savings!” [laughs]. And then...Yeah so she was quite horrified when she learned what [flatmate] and I did for a living...I suppose it’s not, sort of [laughs heartily]... Like she was like “Oh my god you guys are doing really badly!” And then [flatmate] told her what he does and she was like “It’s okay, it’ll get better soon” [laughs more]. So she’s like “Oh god you poor things, I will give you money until you get your next salary cheque”.’

By offering to lend her employers money, even as a joke, the maid creates a temporary and – as was obvious in Dharini’s hearty laughter – very intimate and warm role reversal. Dharini makes fun of the bad pay she and her flatmate receive, not in a way which implies hilarity because *even the maid* thinks it’s bad money but because, as she later specifies, she and her flatmate are ‘not really in [the maid’s] league’.

If we look at class as perpetual performance, moments like these appear as cracks in the system. We see a change from the anxious focus on creating distance to a security (or potentially lesser importance) of class, which allows for trying to now move in the opposite direction.

Of course one act of non-conformism does neither create nor undermine anything. It’s important to remember the very temporary nature of these reversals, and that the stories in this thesis always only reflect one side. Many participants were often also quick to add that moments of solidarity do not actually mean very much. According to Nalini, the existence of any type of solidarity is severely hampered by class. Aditi brought the discussion back to women’s complicity:

‘At the same time, I know that older women for example are the number one reason for moral policing or general like verbal violence towards women who work in houses. So I wouldn’t say that this [solidarity] extends very far.’

Different from the ‘average’ employer?

Despite the criticism expressed throughout, eight out of ten participants still felt that their families at least in some ways treated their maids relatively well. All participants agreed that ‘most of the time’ most people ‘treat domestic workers like crap’, as one of them put it. Their families were seen as in some way different from most other employers, at least outside their social circle.

What constituted “good treatment” was measured in terms of supposedly benevolent actions such as giving days off, not overworking the maids or obsessing about the quality of work, not being ‘cruel’, paying for medical bills, paying for the schooling of the maids’ children, etc. Among the eight participants, Lalita and Vinaya were the most positive: ‘[M]y parents have never treated the people who worked with them poorly. They’re not...they’re very fair people in that way. Or they try to be’ was the latter’s verdict. Several of the others expressed thoughts similar to Noor’s, who approved of certain tendencies in her mother but was visibly annoyed by what she called her mother’s ‘selective goodwill’:

‘I was like “Can’t we just go all out? Do we need to be so selective about the equality we want to give them?” Because it’s almost like – you still want to be on top, and you want to seem magnanimous to the person who’s not on top, but you don’t want them to come up completely.’

Since most participants had quite strong leftist leanings, they criticized the fact that whatever goodwill happened was always *goodwill*, i.e. dependent on the employers’ whims and not guaranteed.

The participants, it can be argued, have been trying to create an in-group when describing people “like themselves”, who are not as bad as other employers. Yet, like Ananya, many were critical even while comparing themselves positively to others:

‘I believe we are nice to our maids – then again all of us who employ maids will say that.’

Many felt inadequate and believed they could do much more than they currently were. The four women who lived on their own felt they had better possibilities of affecting how the maids were treated, since they were the primary employers.

I also wanted to know if my participants felt it was ideologically ‘okay’ to employ domestic workers. This is an important question because it sheds light on how ideology and practice are better seen as fluid and situational than two rigid and therefore morally exclusive fields. Personally, I fully believe in the moral sincerity of the participant who both condemns a practice and still lives it.

On this point, my participants can be divided into three categories: Those who were unconditionally opposed to the practice of maids; those who felt having maids was okay since in itself it was a neutral practice that could be good or bad depending on how you do it; and those who do not have a clear opinion on the subject. In reality, the two latter categories blended together as the interviews progressed. As was seen, a maid working part time in many households would in

some cases not be considered to be a “real” maid – and she would be paid better, be more independent and less exploited. Participants largely saw live-in maids as a highly exploitative and unnecessary practice, yet it was not necessarily criticized in one’s own (family) setting. It is important to note that some participants also disagreed with the use of the word ‘maid’ and scolded me somewhat for using it.

Three participants were opposed to the whole practice and saw it as counterproductive in the struggle against patriarchal attitudes:

‘It is [wrong], of course of it is. *It’s wrong to have maids*, it’s not just about the treatment – of course if you have a maid you treat her right – but otherwise I see it as totally wrong to have someone to work for you.’ – Nalini

‘I think the aim should be to make people do their own work. [...] [T]he aim should be to abolish this practice.’ – Maya

‘It’s not dismantling the patriarchy, or it’s not making a dent because women who have means, who have money are not doing [housework], but women who *don’t* have means *they* are doing it. I’m just giving my job to someone else.’ – Noor

Noor advocated the unionization of workers and social recognition of the work *as work*. Nalini and Maya agreed that the practice of maids was about ‘dumping’ one’s work on another class and that the workers were almost completely invisible. They were, however, more sceptical than Noor towards focusing on better conditions for workers and stated that Indian women should instead fight for something like wages for housework.

Two out of the three currently live in households with maids, leading to a deep sense of moral confusion and conflict. When asked about how she sees her future, Nalini said there ‘most likely’ will be a maid and then seemed genuinely saddened and confused before continuing:

‘Or I...I dunno, I hope I don’t end up with someone like that but...Or I’d have a very small place where there wouldn’t be work required. I’d probably manage on my own – I’d try to, I don’t know how it...[trailing off]’

While Maya does not currently employ anyone, she said this might be different if her financial and work-related situation changed:

'I can't say that if I was working like my roommate does, six days a week nine to seven, I don't know if I would have a maid then. I know it's wrong, but if I was earning that much and working that kind of hours I really...it's like I ask myself this question also "Would I?". I don't know, I really don't know.'

A common counter-argument, also alluded to in earlier literature, was that being employed as a maid could for some women be the lesser evil. Noor expressed harsh criticism against the idea of "benevolent" employers:

'[M]y mother tried to tell me that "You're providing employment for someone" – that's shit! That's stupid. I don't want to think of it that way, that's twisted logic. You're getting your work done, you're not giving them money for free. You're not just giving them money and hence you should feel good – what is this crap "You're providing employment"?''

Similarly, Nalini criticized the practice of giving old clothes to maids or their children – mentioned by other participants as a good practice – saying that what the employers are actually doing is just discarding what they consider 'dirt, unwanted stuff' and feeling that they've 'done such good work'. This echoes Mattila (2011: 150) who said workers were often highly critical of the gift-giving practices of employers, while the employers overstate the value of the gifts they give.

Others disagreed. Lalita felt that it was a utopian idea to think the maids would find better employment. Note the use of the word 'respectable', which hints at residual approval of the stigma associated with being a maid:

'It's not just easy to say that we don't want them to work for us because it's morally incorrect. You also have to answer the question of what they would do. Like if you'd stop giving them employment, they'd suddenly be employed in some firm or some work that you think is respectable.'

The acceptability of employing someone was, for these women, qualified through discussions of how one would treat the worker. Aditi, thinking of her future, said she could help a lot but also doubts the ethics of it:

'Just based on where I am socially, I can help a lot. You know, I can just...sort of like you would say patronage. Just having the support of someone who's from a different class is immensely helpful for them. I could extend financial support, I could extend social or emotional support. [...] At the same time, it's patronage and it's condescending so it's...it's a

very difficult relationship to think about beforehand. I think about it and I'm very confused.'

Thus Aditi stands on both sides of the *noblesse oblige* argument.

The rest of the women had less clear views, although they expected to have maids in the future. Some of the women were more concerned than others. Clearly and importantly, there was no one 'feminist thing to do'. While some participants' answers hinted at seeing liberation from housework as desirable, others argued for everyone's moral duty to take care of one's own dirt.

In general, all participants emphasized the practicality of having a maid. While discussions about parents and grandparents would contain talk about symbolic class distinction, my participants expressed their own desires in terms of an easier life. In the case of the women living on their own, maids were said to often come and go with their own keys when the employers were not at home; they were rarely physically around as status symbols. Freedom from cleaning remained an important class marker, but the expressed focus was more on the actual cleaning and less on the symbolic. This partly agrees with what Ray and Qayum (2009) said about younger women preferring contractual/functional relationships with maids, and partly reflects my participants' desire to distance themselves from classist ideas considered unethical. For my participants, housework was essentially *a lot of work* that could easily be outsourced to someone else. As Gothoskar (2013) argued, a shift towards 'professionalism' can on the one hand lead to less talk of 'servants', less false sentimentalism about how maids are 'part of the family' and perhaps more recognition of the work as work. On the other hand, putting an unequal relationship into terms of capitalist procedural fairness can further mask the exploitation.

Participants' ideas on possible change

Talk of generational evolution within the family figured throughout my interviews. Instead of a clear-cut process, it was seen as a slow and layered procedure. While my participants could practice whatever they wanted in their own homes or when their parents were away, they often felt unable or unwilling to change their families. Sometimes, participants expressed a desire not to cause troubles by interfering with what they saw as ultimately other people's decisions. And although they rarely condoned the situation, some felt that they themselves were not in the position to judge older family members because they didn't know what it was really like to be the employer in charge. Others judged, but without impact.

I wanted to know whether participants felt friends shared their views on domestic workers. I also asked whether or not they thought it was possible to find a male partner who would share the housework.

Opinions on whether younger people in general saw the treatment of domestic workers as a problem varied. Some said none of the young people they know would have ideas like those of the parents described in this thesis. Others, like Ananya, were highly pessimistic:

‘No, nobody gives a shit. Everyone is just...she’s invisible, she’s not really a part of our daily...[trailing off]’.

Several participants made a distinction between politically aware friends and other friends, again creating an in-group. Maya saw herself as a part of a set of like-minded people working towards changing the situation of domestic workers. Her old college friends, however, are very different, ‘not ready’:

‘The other set, when I interact with them, they do...like I have been asked “What’s the point of this?” Like once I raised an issue of housework [...] I was simply asked like “What do you want? You want that wives should start getting money, that’s ridiculous!” I really didn’t know what to say to that.’

Any political commonality was still seen as fragile by critics. Noor was unconvinced of the merits of progressive circles:

‘But you know what Otso, I think even in activist circles – I know people who...they don’t get it. They don’t get it. They might think that they’re treating people with respect, but sometimes it isn’t.’

Opinions on whether or not the younger generation of men was any different from their fathers when it came to housework were also divided. For participants like Vinaya, Dharini and Maya – whose understandings of relationships do not fall into traditional heterosexual monogamy – the division of labour was not felt to be much of an issue. They implied they could always get out of the relationship in case it turned out to be undesirable. Others recounted previous relationships that, according to them, had been good at various stages, and were therefore hopeful.

For the rest, it was going to be a fight. Ananya laughed and looked at me incredulously when I asked her if younger men contribute to household chores: ‘Do housework? Not at all. Not at all.’ According to her, she could at most hope to find someone who doesn’t expect her to do ‘everything’. Nalini was equally

pessimistic. She recounted a previous relationship with a man who was ‘very conscious of all these kinds of things’. Although she thought the situation would be different ‘because [she’s] a feminist’, it ‘turned out to be a total replica of marriage’. When asked what her duties would be if her parents’ plan to get her married was fulfilled, she replied: ‘If I get married? *Everything*. I will be responsible for almost everything – and housework, there’s no end to it.’

Even while doubting whether or not it was really possible, all women were vocal about expecting a partner to share to workload, and trying to avoid living with in-laws. There was an emphasis on dating and preferably living with the other person before taking any decision, as they would ‘rather be shocked right now, [when] I can say goodbye, instead of saying that some two years down the line when I’m deep down in shit’, as one participant expressed it.

Aditi, whose parents are also currently trying to get her married, saw that the discussion about young men had to be taken up with the family too, since their ideas of men were very different from hers.

‘I was trying to tell them that I want to share housework, and that this is a priority for me, or that I would want the guy to be comfortable with moving with me if I had a better job opportunity. And they said “What boy would do that??” and I said “Lots of boys!” [laughs]. “Update yourself”.’

However, Aditi also wondered if she had an ‘extremely unusual set of male friends’.

Interestingly, to achieve peace of mind, older generations had to sometimes be tactically shielded from younger generations’ ideas. Aditi told of her brother-in-law, who according to her is much more ‘normal’ (i.e. non-patriarchal) than her parents think. This recalls Belliappa (2013: 163), who states that because relationships are ‘enacted in the gaze of the family and community [...] women might “choose” to recreate more traditional gender relations [...] and may disguise evidence of egalitarianism’. Again, both feminist and anti-classist changes in the family could sometimes be more efficiently achieved through covert means.

Here too, many expressed criticism of certain supposedly progressive men. Lalita said the men at her university talk a lot and ‘at least pretend’ to be equal but that things might be very different when you actually marry them. Nalini was less diplomatic about the men in her circle:

‘I think they’re all pretty much the same. As much as they talk about gender, but no-one wants to work at home. I’ve never heard of such a thing [housework equality]. I really haven’t.’

For Dharini, this had a name:

‘It’s what my friends and I call the “progressive douchebag syndrome”, which is these like super feminist, super leftist, super progressive guys who are just like – why can’t you just keep things clean! – who are really feminist and really support the movement but who have no idea how to cook themselves a meal.’

Finally, I asked my participants how they felt about participating. Many said that the whole situation must look strange for me, coming from the outside, and that it would look strange for them too if they hadn’t grown up with it. Some explicitly felt challenged by being asked to participate, but that their initial annoyance turned into a learning experience. Participants can be said to be aware of the historical labour (Bourdieu 1993; Wacquant 2013) that has gone into creating the current class divisions. As Weininger (2005: 107) expresses it: ‘as a result of immersion (especially during primary socialization) in a world that was previously divided, the existing structures of social classification were necessarily impressed upon their habitus’. ‘Necessarily’ is for me a key word here. Unlike for Bourdieu (Adams 2006: 514; something Jenkins (1992) criticizes), my participants were not nearly always ‘unconscious’ about the class-based categories of division they embody. And unlike for Bourdieu’s critics, my participants showed both ‘conscious deliberation and awareness’ (ibid. 77) about their reflexivity within the field and habitus. In the interview situation participants were often very critically analytic, even while recognizing that they had not really thought of the matters before. Still, my participants’ answers also show a divided relationship to misrecognition and symbolic violence. Although they consciously recognize power as power and not legitimate worth, some participants’ language still slipped into the classist language games of the people they were quoting (cf. Capeheart and Milovanovic 2007: 126). However, some of the participants did not ‘slip’ at all.

Conclusion

I have in this thesis argued for both continuity and change in my participants' relationship to domestic workers and domestic work. Most expected to employ maids, even when political convictions dictated otherwise. Judging by participants' answers, a culture of servitude definitely exists in both current and previous environments. Raised in a society which normalizes the use of maids, and born into class positions enabling them to easily do so, my interviewees were aware of everything that supported their continued use of domestic workers. Yet, things were never simple. Participants were often highly aware and critical of their class privilege, both in relation to domestic workers and Indian society at large, and used sociological and feminist language to analyse themselves. While only a few were categorically against employing maids, all felt that the socially prevalent ways and notions are wrong – and expressed a moral imperative to change. In cases where it did not seriously threaten their social relations, this translated in to a desire for action. Thus, there were instances of (momentary) change or at least an opening up of new spaces, as well as sadness arising from the frustration of not being able to sustainably overcome boundaries. Moreover, the desire to 'help' was meta-analysed by many participants who feared patronizing the workers.

Participants were well versed in the fears, stigmas and techniques of "management" documented in previous studies. Still, these were mostly referred to as practices of *others*. In speech, first and third person pronouns were used to both show an intimate knowledge of the stereotypical maid-related discourses and to present themselves in opposition to it. Two different in-groups were created: one's family against the rest, and oneself against one's family. Participants also exhibited self-criticism and sincere distress over not being able to live up to their ideals. A number of cases of the merging of discourses were, however, seen among some participants. It is important not to overemphasize the changes that occurred, and to recognize that my study only looks at participants' *ideas* of themselves (which may be further shaped by their interaction with me).

This dialogue between a continued culture of servitude and the challenging of the class-based gendered labour, and the institution of maids within family settings, has been the central theme. A strong emphasis on generational change was combined with an analysis of examples of participants' tactical disagreements with family members. While answering my sub-questions I identified a number of further themes arising from the specific situations faced by my participants. Mothers were seen as both the main agents of patriarchy and the potential facilitators of feminist change. Young men were seen as offering both potential hope and strong disillusionment. I also pointed out a distinction along the line of different symbolic capitals existing in 'progressive' and 'conservative' families respectively. The maids were – in contrast to earlier generations' conceptualizations – presented as morally disapproving and potential threats to

single women's modern lifestyles. I also recorded moments of overcoming boundaries. Taken together, my interviews broaden the idea of the employer-maid relationship as reciprocal albeit highly unequal, as presented by Ray and Qayum and others.

Class anxiety is another point of both continuity with and potential change from earlier literature. My participants expressed less worry or fear of the 'common' than stipulated in the class theories discussed in this thesis. Most participants showed security in their class status, even while currently living in liminal situations. Various class positions experienced in different daily settings contrasted with little perception of any *actual* risk of permanently sliding down the class ladder. It was felt the middle to upper classes were securely 'shielded' from hardship. This, in its own way, in combination with the cultural capital of a political awakening, might have contributed to the participants' possibilities for challenging the institution of maids. Bourdieu (Adams 2006: 515) argued that reflexivity is itself 'a required constituent' of certain fields, such as those arising from academic training or any type of 'crisis'. Following Skeggs (2004), I argue that class status supports the ability to "play" with class. Still, not all my participants were as settled in other ways. While it was obvious that some were able to never really have to worry about money, employment or career choices, others considered themselves lucky because their parents 'allowed' them to continue on the paths they wanted, in a way similar to Belliappa's words on female emotional allegiance to parents.

This thesis has also been a feminist exercise in showing how the women involved never submit passively to structural confinements, but "make sense" of cultural discourses, accepting discarding and modifying elements of the discourses to create a self-identity that is presented via a narrative of self (Belliappa 2013: 136). When it came to both gendered assumptions and to the use of maids, my participants could tactically submit to and subvert social pressures. In the cases where they felt unable to opt out – from e.g. marriage – this was never done without a fight. While discourses of loyalty towards parents were prevalent and largely resigned to, participants could criticize and laugh at families in the private interviews with me. The women positioned themselves in the vanguard, while conservative tendencies in their own generation were criticized and ridiculed.

Moreover, these women resist any simple definitions of what young "Indian womanhood" is like. Their responses challenge the nationalist mythologies of 'India Shining'. My participants are part of a group that has benefitted the most from the new economy, yet they are by no means an all-approving part of contemporary India. Here, I join Fadaee (2014) – who (somewhat over-enthusiastically) talks about the 'critical activist milieu' in India – in pointing out that there is more than one type of post-liberalization politics. My thesis of course

only provides a tiny sample of what could be said to constitute a very broad group.

From my participants' thoughts on maids, we can also see how they combine individual and collective modes of action in their politics. Belliappa (2013) argued that many late capitalist Indian women approach structural problems with individual solutions. I've shown that this both can and cannot be the case among feminist women, and that there is thus not one "feminist" solution to the question of Indian maids.

It is important to note that even new acquaintances spoke openly and reflectively about sensitive issues such as sexual abuse, family troubles, mistreatment of maids, romantic relationships, alcohol use, etc. This shows both comfort in the interview situation and a high level of confidence, supporting Belliappa's definition of class given in the introduction. The interview recordings also reveal a significant amount of shared laughter between my participants and myself. Observations like these imply a level of mutually experienced kinship and shared references. If I have been able to show that our relationships – my participants' and mine – are more than just those of a "white man" interviewing "brown women" I shall consider this project a success.

I have argued that full moral or logical consistency is not necessary for strong belief and agency. All my participants in their own ways expressed struggles with living up to one's ideals in theory while in practice being less conflicted. Inability to change practices even when explicitly desired may be a result of both individual and structural inconsistencies. As Adams (2006: 522) writes, '[r]eflexive awareness does simply not equate with the ability to transform one's situation in every context'. "Practical desire" is as equally important as "ability". Convictions of class and gender can be fractured but are not, therefore, necessarily problematic for our sense of self. Using my participants as an example I argue that the need for logical or moral coherence is much less *lived* than theoretically assumed.

Thus, when looking at the apparent conflicts between my participants' politics and their practices, I argue that both positions can be equally authentic/inauthentic at the same time. While it is of course impossible for me to *really* say how "true" my participants' statements are, I have no real reason to doubt their sincerity. Taking agency and inconsistency together I want to show, like Belliappa (2013: 36) 'that winning and losing are not water-tight categories but points on a continuum where individuals are positioned based on the intersections of gender, class, ethnicity and geography' (2013: 36). I have here extended this 'winning and losing' to the sense of personal moral correctness.

Appendix: Participant profiles

Aditi, 24 years old. New friend. MA in sociology from well-known Delhi university. Works with political research centre/NGO. Identifies as very upper class. Grew up in an extended family, with two live-in domestics. Sees herself as economically leftist and feminist in opposition to her family. Says she wants to get married (although not now) and that this is 'a pretty controversial decision to take in certain liberal circles'. Expects any man to participate and thinks it is possible to find one who does. Lives with flatmate in up-and-coming neighbourhood; feels family would not approve of the area. Is very critical of the way domestic workers are treated, but is not categorically against the practice. No current domestic help.

Ananya, 27 years old. Old friend. Chef. Used to work at NGO for women's rights. Master in gender studies from a European university. Self-identifies as vocal feminist. Says it isn't an easy thing to be, both because of social pressure and emotionally because of the stories you face. Calls herself upper middle class. Grew up mostly in a hybrid family; feels it can still be judgemental and controlling in other ways. Openly critical about her father's lack of involvement in housework. Was 'brought up' by maids and a grandmother. Close relationship with earlier live-in maids. Feels that maids in general are often 'basically slaves', yet feels that she and women of her class are incapable of doing things on their own. Highly doubtful that any future husband would do anything. Lives with parents in upmarket upper middle-class neighbourhood; lived in Delhi most of her life.

Dharini, 28 years old. Old friend. Lecturer in philosophy at a Delhi college. Feminist and queer activist. Says her father was initially 'extremely anxious' about her queerness, but that she's been very lucky to 'land' in a feminist space in her teens. Identifies as middle-upper middle class. Stays with flatmate (and boyfriend) in a middle-upper middle-class neighbourhood. Employs part-time maid who was chosen because she was accepting of a queer household; close relationship with her. Sees the term 'maid' and the whole practice as problematic. Says it is not only about the morality of employing domestic workers or your treatment of them, but a complex labour issue. Does not seem worried about things like marriage or living up to family expectations.

Ishana, 24 years old. New acquaintance. Research scholar in cinema studies at well-known Delhi university. Identifies as feminist and left-of-centre. Says many people are scared or intimidated by the 'f word'. Says family talks of itself as 'middle class', but sees this as a construct and her family as actually much better off than they would admit. Lives with extended family in the house she grew up in, in a very upmarket area. Her family does not want to employ full-time

workers because they feel it is too much of a burden. Expects to employ domestic workers, part time, in a future independent home. Says it's non-negotiable that any partner would have to share housework with her.

Lalita, 22 years old. New acquaintance. Political science student at a well-known Delhi university. Wants to work in government. Self-identifies as upper middle class but says she hasn't thought about it a lot. Feels India has changed on the surface towards equality, but that this rarely materializes in practice. Grew up in a smaller town with an extended family and a long history of servant families reaching back several generations. Sees that housework tasks were highly gendered in family home. Brought up with child maid, 'who was like a sister'. Feels that people should look after their maids, and that maids are slowly becoming more assertive. Is very critical towards certain practices, feels maids should be treated equally to family members, but is not categorically against the practices. Doubts that a future husband would actually share housework. Lives on campus.

Maya, 24 years old. Old friend. MPhil scholar in gender studies at a well-known Delhi university. Self-identifies as a leftist radical feminist. Feels family is somewhat scared that she will get into trouble because of this. Calls herself middle class. Looks primarily at her current situation when describing her class, but says she received a privileged education. Feels social mobility in India is very slow. Grew up in all-female household with a single mother. Sees this as having impacted her feminist leanings. Limited exposure to maids. Feels having maids is categorically wrong, but expresses certain anxieties as to whether she will always be able to live up to this. Identifies as bisexual and questions marriage; says housework has to be shared. Lives with flatmate in an up-and-coming middle-class neighbourhood.

Nalini, 26 years old. Recent friend. PhD scholar in gender studies, working on issues related to domestic workers at a well-known Delhi university. Self-identifies as leftist and feminist. Says there is support in the public sphere for this but that matters with the family can be difficult. Sees herself as upper middle class; uses Marxist terms liberally. Feels there is mobility for some (the better off) while not for others. Grew up in hybrid family around North India. Critical of gendered housework in her family. Engaged in the cause of maids and very critical of the practice: sees it as categorically wrong. Lives with family that has always employed maids and with a clearly gendered division of labour. Sees her current relationship with her family's part-time maids as mostly functional, because previous relationships had been emotionally draining. Doubts that any future husband would really do much and therefore tries to resist marriage. Stays in a gated NCR community.

Noor, 24 years old. New acquaintance. Works at research centre for social justice issues. Master's degree in gender studies from well-known Mumbai university. Grew up in various family settings, largely with mother. Says her mother once told her that they 'shouldn't have sent [her] out to study, because by doing that [she] seem[s] to have gotten a lot of ideas', which hurt her a lot. Has now lived in Delhi for some years. Stays with flatmate-friend in middle-class neighbourhood. Currently employs a part-time maid after trying not to for years. Says maids uphold patriarchy and that it is wrong to 'dump' one's work on a lower class. Is upset that she recently 'gave in' to social pressure. Resists family's attempts to get her married, and says she could never live with a man who doesn't do his share.

Riddhi, 24 years old. New acquaintance. MA in peace and conflict studies from well-known Delhi university. Works at classic feminist NGO; wants to work with women and dissent in conflict zones. Feels there is support in her peer group; says her parents think Delhi is very dangerous. Identifies as upper middle class. Feels there is social mobility in cities. Grew up with highly gendered housework-related practices and several maids. Now lives with flatmate in upper middle-class locality. Employs a part-time domestic worker. Feels she has, through her studies and work, 'evolved' and now treats her maid better than she used to. Is still very apologetic and feels many things are very 'unfair'. Not categorically against the practice. Says men today do more but that they still get to cherry-pick the tasks.

Vinaya, 25 years old. Recent friend. Social and gender rights activist. MA in human rights from a European university. Identifies as very upper class. Lives with hybrid family in an upper-class locality. Sees her family as exceptionally supportive and pro-women – and having been for several generations – although 'not as leftist as they could be'. Sees the treatment of maids as a problem, and has worked on their labour rights, but does not see the institution itself as necessarily wrong if you treat the worker well. Sees current live-in maid as 'family'. Questions marriage and expects any future partner to share in housework equally; does not really worry about this or much else.

References

- Adams, Matthew (2006): 'Hybridizing Habitus and Reflexivity: Towards an Understanding of Contemporary Identity?', in *Sociology*, 40:3, pp. 511–528.
- Barker, Drucilla K. (2015): 'Unstable Feminisms: A New Marxian Class Analysis of Domestic Labor', in *Rethinking Marxism*, 27:3, pp. 431–439.
- Barrett, Michèle and McIntosh, Mary (1982): *The Anti-Social Family*. London: Verso.
- Baviskar, Amita and Ray, Raka (2011) *Elite and Everyman – The Cultural Politics of the Indian Middle Classes*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Belliappa, Jyothsna (2013): *Gender, Class and Reflexive Modernity in India*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984): *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1993): *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Capeheart, Loretta and Milovanovic, Dragan (2007): *Social Justice: Theories, Issues and Movements*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Chowdhury, Kanishka (2011): *The New India: Citizenship, Subjectivity and Economic Liberalization*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cortazzi, Martin (2001): 'Narrative Analysis in Ethnography' in Paul Atkinson et al. (eds) *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: SAGE.
- Dasgupta, Rana (2014): *Capital – A Portrait of Twenty-first Century Delhi*. New Delhi: HarperCollins.
- Daya, Shari (2009): 'Embodying modernity: reading narratives of Indian women's sexual autonomy and violation', in *Gender, Place and Culture*, 16:1, pp. 97–110.
- Deshpande, Satish (2003): *Contemporary India – A Sociological View*. New Delhi: Penguin.
- Dewey, Susan (2008): *Making Miss India Miss World: Constructing Gender, Power, and the Nation in Postliberalization India*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Dhawan, Nandita Banerjee (2010): 'The Married "New Indian Woman": Hegemonic Aspirations in New Middle-Class Politics?' in *South African Review of Sociology* 41:3, pp. 45–60.
- Dickey, Sara (2000): 'Permeable Homes: Domestic Service, Household Space, and the Vulnerability of Class Boundaries in Urban India', in *American Ethnologist*, 27:2, pp. 462–489.

- Dutta, Mousumi (1999), 'Gender equality in families: Bengali middle-class employed women in India', in *Contemporary South Asia*, 8:2, pp. 161–76
- Fadaee, Simin (2014): 'India's New Middle Class and the Critical Activist Milieu' in *Journal of Developing Societies* 30:4, pp. 441–457.
- Federici, Silvia (2012): *Revolution at Point Zero – Housework, Reproduction and Feminist Struggle*. Oakland: PM Press.
- Fernandes, Leela (2006): *India's New Middle Class: Democratic Politics in an Era of Reform*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fernandes, Leela (2011): 'Hegemony and Inequality: Theoretical Reflections on India's "New" Middle Class' in Amita Baviskar and Raka Ray (eds) *Elite and Everyman: The Cultural Politics of the Indian Middle Classes*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Fernandes, Leela and Heller, Patrick (2006): 'Hegemonic Aspirations – New Middle Class Politics and India's Democracy in Comparative Perspective' in *Critical Asian Studies*, 38:4, pp. 495–522.
- Fraad, Harriet (2009): 'Toiling in the Field of Emotion' in Graham Cassano (ed.) *Class Struggle on the Home Front – Work, Conflict and Exploitation in the Household*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fraad, Harriet, Resnick, Stephen and Wolff, Richard (2009): 'For Every Knight in Shining Armour, There's a Castle Waiting to be Cleaned: A Marxist–Feminist Analysis of the Household' in Graham Cassano (ed.) *Class Struggle on the Home Front – Work, Conflict and Exploitation in the Household*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Frøystad, Kathinka (2003): 'Master–Servant Relations and the Domestic Reproduction of Caste in Northern India' in *Ethnos* 68:1, pp. 73–94.
- Frøystad, Kathinka (2005). *Blended Boundaries. Caste, Class, and Shifting Faces of 'Hinduness' in a North Indian City*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Ganguly-Scrase, Rita and Scrase, Timothy J. (2009): *Globalization and the Middle Classes in India*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ganguly-Scrase, Rita and Vogl, Gillian (2007): 'Ethnographies of gendered displacement: Women's experiences in South Asia under neo-liberal globalisation', in *Women's Studies International Forum*, 31, pp. 1–15
- Gilbertson, Amanda (2014): 'A Fine Balance: Negotiating fashion and respectable femininity in middle-class Hyderabad, India', in *Modern Asian Studies*, 48, pp. 120–158.
- Gopal, Meena (2013): 'Ruptures and Reproduction in Caste/Gender/Labour', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII: 18, pp. 91–97.

- Gothskar, Sujata (2013): 'The Plight of Domestic Workers: Confluence of Gender, Class and Caste Hierarchies' in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII: 22, pp. 63–75.
- Hamid, Areeba (2006): 'Domestic Workers – Harsh, Everyday Realities' in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLI: 13, pp. 1253–1237.
- Harriss-White, Barbara and Prospero, Valentina (2014): 'The Micro Political Economy of Gains by Unorganised Workers in India', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLIX: 9, pp. 39–43.
- Herring, Ronald J. and Agarwala, Rina (2006): 'Restoring Agency to Class: Puzzles from the Subcontinent', in *Critical Asian Studies*, 38:4, pp. 323–356.
- Holgersson, Ulrika (2011): *Klass – Feministiska och Kulturanalytiska Perspektiv*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Jenkins, Richard (1992): *Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Routledge.
- John, Mary E. (2013): 'The Problem of Women's Labour: Some Autobiographical Perspectives', in *Indian Journal of Gender Studies* 20:2, pp. 177–212.
- Kapoor, Ilan (2004): 'Hyper-self-reflexive development? Spivak on representing the Third World "Other"', in *Third World Quarterly*, 25:4, pp. 627–647.
- Kapur, Jyotsna (2013): *The Politics of Time and Youth in Brand India: Bargaining with Capital*. London: Anthem Press.
- Kochhar, Rakesh (2015): *A Global Middle Class Is More Promise than Reality*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Accessed at http://www.pewglobal.org/files/2015/08/Global-Middle-Class-Report_8-12-15-final.pdf on 27.04.2016.
- Kumar, Nita (2011): 'The Middle-class Child: Ruminations on Failure' in Amita Baviskar and Raka Ray (eds) *Elite and Everyman: The Cultural Politics of the Indian Middle Classes*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Kvale, Steinar & Brinkmann, Svend (2009): *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE.
- LaDousa, Chaise (2006): 'The Discursive Malleability of an Identity: A Dialogic Approach to Language "Medium" Schooling in North India', in *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 16:1, pp. 36–57.
- LaDousa, Chaise (2014): *Hindi is Our Ground, English is Our Sky*. New York: Berghahn.
- Lahiri-Dutt, Kuntala and Sil, Pallabi (2014): 'Women's "double day" in middle-class homes in small-town India' in *Contemporary South Asia*, 22:4, pp. 389–405.

- Lau, Lisa Ee Jia (2006): 'The New Indian woman: Who is she, and what is "New" about her?' in *Women's Studies International Forum*, 29, pp. 159–171.
- Lin, Tin-chi and Adserà, Alícia (2013): 'Son Preference and Children's Housework: The Case of India', in *Popul Res Policy Rev*, 32, pp. 553–584.
- Luke, Nancy, Xu, Hongwei and Thampi, Binitha V. (2014): 'Husbands' Participation in Housework and Child Care in India' in *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76, pp. 620–637.
- Mander, Harsh (2015): *Looking Away: Inequality, Prejudice and Indifference in New India*. New Delhi: Speaking Tiger Books.
- Maton, Karl (2008): 'Habitus', in Michael Grenfell (ed.) *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*. Durham: Acumen.
- Mazumdar, Indrani and Neetha, N. (2011): 'Gender dimensions: Employment trends in India, 1993-94–2009-10', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLIII: 22, pp. 118–126.
- Mattila, Päivi (2011): *Domestic Labour Relations in India – Vulnerability and Gendered Life Courses in Jaipur*. Helsinki: Institute of Development Studies, University of Helsinki.
- Matzner, Deborah (2014): "'My Maid Watches It": Key Symbols and Ambivalent Sentiments in the Production of Television Programming in India', in *Anthropological Quarterly*, 87:4, pp. 1229–1256.
- McKinsey Global Institute (2015): *The Power of Parity: How Advancing Women's Equality can add \$12 Trillion to Global Growth*. Accessed on 29.04.16 at http://www.mckinsey.com/-/media/mckinsey/global%20themes/employment%20and%20growth/how%20advancing%20womens%20equality%20can%20add%2012%20trillion%20to%20global%20growth/mgi%20power%20of%20parity_full%20report_september%202015.ashx.
- McMahon, Anthony (1999): *Taking Care of Men – Sexual Politics in the Public Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Menon, Nivedita (2012): *Seeing Like a Feminist*. New Delhi: Zubaan/Penguin.
- Mies, Maria (1986): *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*. London: Zed Books.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade (1984): 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses', in *boundary 2*, 12:3, pp. 333–358.
- Moi, Toril (1991): 'Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist Theory and Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology of Culture' in *New Literary History* 22:4, pp. 1017–1049.

- Mulinari, Diana and Sandell, Kerstin (2009): 'A Feminist Re-reading of Theories of Late Modernity: Beck, Giddens and the Location of Gender' in *Critical Sociology* 35:4, pp. 493–507.
- Narayan, Uma (1997): *Dislocating Cultures*. London: Routledge.
- Narayan, Uma (1998): 'Essence of culture and a sense of history: A feminist critique of cultural essentialism', in *Hypatia* 13:2, pp. 86–106.
- Nederveen Pietersee, Jan (2010): *Development Theory* (2nd Edition). London: SAGE.
- Neetha, N. (2004): 'Making of Female Breadwinners – Migration and Social Networking of Women Domestic in Delhi', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXIX: 17, pp. 1681–1688.
- Neetha, N. (2013): 'Minimum Wages for Domestic Work Mirroring Devalued Housework' in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII: 43, pp. 77–84.
- Neetha, N. and Palriwala, Rajni (2011): 'The Absence of State Law: Domestic Workers in India', in *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, 23:1, pp. 97–119.
- Oza, Rupal (2006): *The Making of Neoliberal India*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Parry, Jonathan (2014): 'Sex, Bricks and Mortar: Constructing Class in a Central Indian Steel Town', in *Modern Asian Studies*, 48, pp. 1242–1275.
- Phadke, Shilpa (2005): 'Some Notes towards Understanding the Construction of Middle-class Urban Women's Sexuality in India', in Geetanjali Misra and Radhika Chandiramani (eds), *Sexuality, Gender and Rights: Exploring Theory and Practice in South and Southeast Asia*, pp. 67–82. New Delhi: SAGE.
- Phadke, Shilpa (2013): 'Feminist Mothering? Some Reflections on Sexuality and Risk from Urban India', in *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 36:1, pp. 92–106.
- Qayum Seemin and Ray, Raka (2011): '*The Middle Classes at Home*' in Amita Baviskar and Raka Ray (eds) *Elite and Everyman: The Cultural Politics of the Indian Middle Classes*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Radakrishnan, Smitha (2009): 'Professional Women, Good Families: Respectable Femininity and the Cultural Politics of a "New" India' in *Qual Sociol* (2009) 32, pp. 195–212
- Raghuram, Parvati (2001): 'Caste and Gender in the Organization of Paid Domestic Work in India,' *Work, Employment & Society*, 15:3, pp. 607–17.
- Ray, Raka (2000): 'Masculinity, Femininity, and Servitude: Domestic Workers in Calcutta in the Late Twentieth Century' in *Feminist Studies*, 26:2, pp. 691–718.

- Ray, Raka and Qayum, Seemin (2009): *Cultures of Servitude – Modernity, Domesticity and Class in India*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Reissman, Catherine Kohler (2008): *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Sahni, Rohini and V. Kalyan Shankaran (2013): 'Sex Work and its Linkages with Informal Labour Markets in India: Findings from the First Pan-India Survey of Female Sex Workers' in *IDS Working Paper*, 2013: 416.
- Sangari, Kumkum (1993): 'The "Amenities of Domestic Life": Questions on Labour', in *Social Scientist*, 21:9/11, pp. 3–46.
- Sankaran, Kamala (2013): 'Domestic Work, Unpaid Work and Wage Rates', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII: 43, pp. 85–89.
- Saraff, Anjula and Srivastava, Harish C. (2010): 'Pattern and Determinants of Paternal Involvement in Childcare: An Empirical Investigation in a Metropolis of India', in *Popul Res Policy Rev* 29, pp. 249–273.
- Sayer, Andrew (2005): *The Moral Significance of Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sengupta, Nilanjana and Sen, Samita (2013): 'Bargaining over Wages – Part-time Domestic Workers in Kolkata', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII: 43, pp. 55–62.
- Sharma, Sonal (2016): 'Of *Rasoi ka Kaam/Bathroom ka Kaam* Perspectives of Women Domestic Workers' in *Economic and Political Weekly*, LI: 7, pp. 52–61.
- Sherman Heyl, Barbara (2001): '*Ethnographic Interviewing*', in Paul Atkinson et al. (eds) *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: SAGE.
- Simister, John (2013): 'Is Men's Share of Housework Reduced by "Gender Deviance Neutralization?": Evidence from Seven Countries', in *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 44:3, pp. 311–325.
- Singh, Shweta and Hoge, Gretchen (2010): 'Debating Outcomes for "Working" Women: Illustrations from India', *Journal of Poverty*, 14, pp. 197–215.
- Skeggs, Beverley (1997): *Formations of Class and Gender*. London: SAGE
- Skeggs, Beverley (2001): '*Feminist ethnography*' in Paul Atkinson et al. (eds) *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: SAGE.
- Skeggs, Beverley (2004): *Class, Self, Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Skeggs, Beverley (2005): '*Context and Background: Pierre Bourdieu's analysis of class, gender and sexuality*' in Lisa Adkins and Beverley Skeggs (eds) *Feminism After Bourdieu*. London: Blackwell.

- Spivak, Gayatri (1988): '*Can the subaltern speak?*' in C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (eds) *Marxism and Interpretation of Culture*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Srivastava, Sanjay (2014): *Entangled Urbanism: Slum, Gated Community, and Shopping Mall in Delhi and Gurgaon*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Talukdar, Jaita and Linders, Annulla (2013): 'Gender, Class Aspirations, and Emerging Fields of Body Work in Urban India', in *Qual Sociol* (2013) 36, pp. 101–123.
- Thapan, Meenakshi (1995): 'Gender, Body and Everyday Life', in *Social Scientist*, 23:7, pp. 32–58.
- Trinh, T. Minh-ha (1989): *Woman Native Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Uberoi, Patricia (2006): *Freedom and Destiny: Gender, Family and Popular Culture in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Uberoi, Patricia and Chakrabarti, Sreemati (eds) (2004): *Gender and the Political Economy of Domestic Service: Comparative Perspectives from India and China*. New Delhi: Institute of Chinese Studies.
- Upadhyaya, Carol (2011): '*Software And The "new" Middle Class In The "new India"*', in Amita Baviskar and Raka Ray (eds) *Elite and Everyman: The Cultural Politics of the Indian Middle Classes*. London: Routledge
- Wacquant, Loïc (2013): 'Symbolic power and group-making: On Pierre Bourdieu's reframing of class', in *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 13:2, pp. 274–291.
- Wadhawan, Neha (2013): 'Living in Domesti-City – Women and Migration for Domestic Work from Jharkhand', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII: 43, pp. 47–54.
- Wasiuzzaman, Shazia and Wells, Karen (2010): 'Assembling Webs of Support: Child Domestic Workers in India', in *Children & Society*, 24, pp. 282–292.
- Weininger, Elliot B. (2005): '*Foundations of Pierre Bourdieu's class analysis*' in E. O. Wright (ed.) *Approaches to Class Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Raymond (1977): *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, E. O. (2005): '*Foundations of a neo-Marxist class analysis*' in E. O. Wright (ed.) *Approaches to Class Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

