

# THE HIDDEN BACKBONE OF OUR ECONOMY: A STUDY ON VALUE ASSESSMENT OF HOMEMAKING

Swayam Prava Mishra<sup>1</sup>

Dibya Prava Mallick<sup>2</sup>

## ABSTRACT

*A housewife ensures the smooth functioning of the household, but the work she performs is not recorded as economic activity because these works at home are not a part of the market system and do not receive compensation through wages. Even if some of the contributions of housewives are intangible and cannot be valued in terms of money, it should not mean that their contributions are reduced to a naught. Keeping in view the immense contribution of a housewife, the question that arises is how to value the services of a housewife? Economists have argued for different methods to measure the value of work of a housewife. This paper is a pilot survey which looks into the engagement of housewives in different types of household works and time spent on those works and also tries to assess the market value of those household chores in line with the replacement cost approach.*

**Keywords:** Household work, Women, Method of measurement

## 1. Introduction

A housewife generates in each and every member of a family a feeling of being wanted and loved. She provides her spouse a tension-free

---

1 Assistant Professor, Department of Analytical and Applied Economics, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha E-mail: swayampravamshr@gmail.com

2 Completed Masters Degree from Department of Analytical and Applied Economics, Utkal University E-mail: deepa.mallick1994@gmail.com

atmosphere so that he can prosper in his life. She provides the desirable care and comfort to elders at home. She is in true sense a trainer of a child right from its infancy to adulthood. She is a dutiful wife, a caring mother, a daughter-in-law, a manager etc. All these jobs require a lot of patience, tolerance and sense of responsibility. According to the experts, a woman as a housewife contributes to society directly by providing a sound foundation for a well-knit family unit and indirectly in the development of the society.

### ***Definition of Housework***

Housework consists of non-market activities which produce goods and services for the members of the household not desired in and of themselves, but rather for the utility which they yield (Hawrylyshyn, 1977). As per the National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) data, 'domestic duties' are 'non-economic activities' and therefore, not considered as labour force. Consequentially, persons merely attending domestic chores like "cooking, cleaning utensils, looking after children, fetching water, collecting firewood, going to market" etc. or even when engaged in ancillary "free collection of goods, sewing, tailoring, weaving, etc." aren't considered as 'working', and therefore, are 'economically inactive persons' (Manual on Labour Statistics-(I), 2012, p. 18).

From the above definition it is clear that housework is a non-market activity but definitely has some utility for the household. Being non-marketable has been the mere criteria for its exclusion in the national account statistics. But, in economics it is the demand and supply of a good which determines the market price of the good. Hence from the pure economics point of view the housework done by a housewife can be seen as supply of labour and the expectations of the other members of the family to do their work can be taken as demand for labour. Therefore, the work done by a housewife should not be without a price. Moreover, in spite of these definitions it should be borne in mind that it is the homemaker and her contribution which helps the productive labour force to contribute to the GDP. When we try to label it as "non-economic activity" we are in a way undermining the time spent and the labour of a homemaker in the process of homemaking.

Housewives ensure the smooth functioning of the households, but the work they perform is not recorded as economic activities because these works at home are not a part of market system and do not receive compensation through wages. This important human and social capital goes unrecorded in the official statistics. Even if some of the contributions of the housewives are intangible and cannot be added to the GDP, it should not mean that their contributions are reduced to a naught. How can one rule out the fact that even today in India, as per an NSSO Survey (2011-12),

more than 50 per cent of the rural women and 20 per cent of the urban women are engaged in activities like collection of fuel woods, fetching water from a distant place and providing a silent latent hand in small household businesses – activities that go completely unpaid. Almost all the works done by a housewife is economic in nature as in most of the developed countries, the work that housewives generally do are carried out through paid contracts. According to experts, if we were to add the contributions made by the housewives to their respective households – to the National Income – then GDP would go up by many folds (McKinsey Global Institute, 2016).

In this context, the present study seeks to analyse the various types of work performed by a housewife and time spent on those works and measuring the market value of household work by applying a suitable method. The scheme of the paper is as follows: the section following this brief introduction describes the review of literature of the study. The third section discusses the methods of estimation of unpaid household work and data sources. The fourth section illustrates the findings of the paper and the final section concludes the study.

## **2. Review of Literature**

Some past research had been done in this area by national and international scholars. Here, in this section, we present a brief review of the existing literature on the subject. Islam (2012) examined that lower middle class housewives are the worst victim of recognition of household work time in terms of national economy though they have a lot of contribution to household work. The cultural interpretation of women's work in Bangladesh was not socially well recognized, thus women became victims of economic agency of their own. Homemakers worked longer hours in their household work but they remained invisible in terms of economic recognition as this work is treated as unpaid and non-economic work and has no relation to per capita income. He suggested that revaluing household work time can make homemaker's contribution visible in the national economy as well as in GDP and make the country's position high in international arena. So, the recognition of homemaker's contribution should be important for ensuring women's development as well as their empowerment.

Kansal (2014) in his paper highlighted the theoretical debates concerning the valuation of homemaking, and, economic, practical and theoretical viability of the approaches adopted in this case especially for India. Monsod (2007) argued that System of National Accounts (2008) of UN threw a cloak of invisibility over women's contributions to the economy, by using narrow, and at the very least inadequate definitions. He opined that this cloak should be removed. He further suggested that the full integration of unpaid work into the macro economy can be accomplished by gathering time-use data, then valuing that unpaid work, then creating the satellite accounts, then

institutionalizing them (estimating them regularly), and then by fully integrating them as part of the national accounts' "central system". Lastly, he lamented that the progress in removing the cloak of invisibility has been slow and the slowness of this progress is a problem of demand – either a lack of ability or a lack of willingness, or a combination of both, to carry it forward on the part of potential users, or even the potential beneficiaries themselves.

Prügl (1996) took the help of Maria Mies' theory of "housewifization" as a point of departure and demonstrated that some of her universalist assertions hold valid when tested on the empirical evidence collected by International Labour Organisation (ILO). As per Mies' theory, the ideology of housewifization supports the exploitative integration of workers into global production. It creates a readily available and readily disposable labour power. Mies cites the complicity of trans-national corporations and international organisations in spreading the notion of housewifization but fails to theorise the role of these agents in creating global understanding of women. This paper had dual purposes. First, the author introduced cross-national evidence to test the empirical validity of Mies' proposition and second, the author elaborated on the theoretical weakness in Mies' theory.

Hamid (1994) worked with an objective to develop a new system of national income accounting that better reflects women's contribution to the national income. The new methodologies were developed to decompose conventional GDP by gender and evaluate non-market work to be included in the measurement of GDP. The methods were then applied to the case of Bangladesh using nationally representative data on time allocation of men and women. The paper concluded that a more realistic estimation of GDP can be achieved only if women's and men's non-market work is accounted for and this methodology gave a GDP figure that is 29 per cent higher than the conventional estimates and it showed that women contribute 41 per cent to the total GDP.

Freudiger (1983) examined the variables affecting the life satisfaction in three categories of married women – those who are presently employed, were formerly employed, and those never employed. The study revealed that while there are little differences in the overall life satisfaction, there are significant differences in variables that influence life satisfaction for each category. The findings suggest that sources of life satisfaction for three groups differ far more than their similar social characteristics and it could be possible that such differences are due to the impact of work experience or lack of it, on the lives of the married women.

Ariffin (1986) gave an overall view of Malaysian women, who occupied a lower position vis-à-vis men in Malaysian society as well as were being exploited by the interplay of various factors within the system. The main aim of this paper is to provide further insights into the real situation of women's inequality in Malaysian society, and how exploitation in many contexts

reinforces their disadvantaged position. The author used secondary data to serve the purpose of the paper.

Hodgkins et al. (1987) compared the amount of time dual-career husbands and wives spend in housework, relative to their same sex counterparts in other dual earner and single earner households. Data on 1,565 couples were drawn and entered into a multiple regression analysis of husbands' and wives' weekly hours of housework. Dual-career couples were not found to be more egalitarian than other couples in their allocation of time to household labour. The results of the regression analysis of husbands' and wives' time in housework reaffirmed the results of the bivariate comparisons across couple types. Dual-career husbands' involvement in household labour differed significantly only from that of non-professional or non-managerial husbands of full-time housewives who spent considerably less time in housework. And dual-career wives' time in housework differed significantly only from that of full-time housewives.

Brownlee (1979) in his paper has explored the state of economic knowledge regarding the development of households' economic life in United States since early industrialisation by examining the explanations for low labour-force participation of middle-class married women prevailing until the 1940s. These explanations, including those from fertility studies and resting on market forces, imprecisely specify the domestic roles of housewives. The findings of the paper focused on the interdisciplinary specification of these roles, drawing on social and cultural historians, and rigorous measurement of time allocation within the household which could help resolve the various interpretations and assist in estimating the contribution of household work to social product.

Wright (1978) emphasized that full time housewives have benefits and costs attached to them; the net result is that there is no consistent or significant differences in the patterns of life. Satisfaction between the two groups, namely, women with jobs outside the home and full time housewives, was taken into consideration. Six national surveys were employed in this study. The largest and earliest of these was the "Quality of American Life" survey conducted at the University of Michigan. Because this survey contained available details on happiness, life satisfaction, and related topics, it was employed most extensively in the analysis. However, some information was also presented from the five General Social Surveys conducted by the National Opinion Research Centre between 1972 and 1976. In all cases, analysis was restricted to white married women who were either in the labour force (fulltime or part time) or were housewives at the time of the survey. Thus, non-white women as well as those whose labour force status was reported as student, retired, disabled, or "other" as well as all non-married women were excluded.

Wright (1977) used a materialistic methodology to assess the origin of modern feminism. There was a comparison of role of women in modern industrial societies with traditional role of women in agrarian families. The author argued that loss of productive economic role is the most important factor for producing modern feminism. The author concluded by discussing the similarities in the roles occupied by employed housewives in working class American families when compared with Amish<sup>1</sup> housewives.

Hawrylyshyn (1977) attempted to refine and develop practical definitions from basic Utility Theory to the measurement of household work. First, a distinction was made between economic and other activities and then in the framework of Becker-Lancaster, a Household-Production Function was posited and a criterion for identifying the indirect utility activities (third person criterion) was outlined. Finally, four practical estimation methods were outlined: simple opportunity cost of time; gross replacement cost; individual function replacement cost; and the full production function approach. The Production function approach which included evaluation of capital contributions was deemed theoretically most valid and the paper concluded that there exists both a theoretical basis for valuing non-market activities and the necessary data to apply the formulas developed.

Ferree (1976) analysed that house work may not be felt to be menial or degrading but it also does not lead to a sense of competence, social connectedness or self-determination equal to that produced by paid employment. To investigate these issues, a study of women's attitudes and employment experience was done in the late 1974 in a predominantly working class community in Eastern Massachusetts. The sample was drawn from the school records and was restricted to women who had a child in first or second grade but none in preschool, who were presently married. All the interviewers were female. The response rate was 75 per cent and a total of 135 women were interviewed.

Reid (1947) suggested two ways to address the issue of evaluating the economic contribution of homemakers. One was a floor under family income at a level where extreme pressure was not put on the mothers of small children to earn; and second to have part-time jobs for homemakers and childcare facilities at relatively low cost as a substitute for home-care.

In the Indian context, Sengupta (2016) tried to figure out the labour force participation of women, their time use pattern and the type of domestic activities they are involved in their monetary value using Time-use survey method. A sample of 400 households comprising of 200 each from both rural and urban areas was collected. Computation of monetary value of unpaid household chores was done using replacement cost method. From the study it was found that average work time of women is higher than their male counterparts and average time for leisure and personal care for women is lower than that of men in both rural and urban areas. Kapur (1969) studied

the problem of role conflict of employed housewife. It was postulated that the extent of role conflict would be influenced by such variables as values, motivation, job satisfaction on the one hand and coping facilities and bio-social variables on the other. Analysis was also done to assess the relative degree of role conflict experienced by employed housewives; to compare three professional groups – nurses, social workers and researchers – in relation to the variables under study. The findings of the study suggested administrative action and policy for working housewives in general and professional groups in particular.

From the review of literature it is clear that though most of the studies have acknowledged the fact that homemaking should be added in the GDP yet it is not accepted worldwide as an economic activity. So, homemaking being a full time job in itself still remains underrated and un-recognised. In a developing country like India and more so in a state like Odisha where women are not aware of their own worth due to backwardness, social dogmas and cultural constraints, this study sheds some light on the fact that they do contribute a lot to the household by their services and to the care economy and hence the policy makers should value it in some form as an economic activity.

### **3. Method of Measurement of Homework and Data Sources**

In this section we analyse the method of measuring the contribution of a housewife in value terms. Economists have argued for two different methods to measure the value of a housewife: the opportunity cost method and replacement cost method.

The fundamental idea behind the opportunity cost method is “what does the household sacrifice by having the wife staying at home to work?” In other words, what is the opportunity cost of the housewives’ time? If a female worker is earning Rs. X per hour and she decides to forgo an hour of work to do the dishes, the cost of the task is Rs. X. The economists then say that Rs. X measures the value of an hour of housewife’s service.

The replacement cost approach to the problem asks “how much would it cost to replace the services of housewife?” The idea being – one could go into the market place, find the wage for nannies, cooks etc., and then use these wages as the value of the housewife’s services. Sometimes an average is used; sometimes the wage within each specialty is used.

Symbolically, in the case of opportunity cost method

$$HW = W \left( \sum_{i=1}^n T_i \right)$$

$HW$  is the dollar value of household work,  $T_i$  is time spent in household work activity  $i$ ,  $n$  = number of household work activities and  $W$  is opportunity cost of time (market wage) of the individual doing household work (Hawrylyshyn, 1977).

And for Replacement cost method

$$HW = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \right)$$

$D_i$  = cost of service  $i$  and  $n$  = number of market agents or specific services hired.

According to some studies, globally, women spend roughly three times the amount of time spent by men on unpaid work. India has one of the largest gender gaps in unpaid work, where men spend less than two hours per day on household chores. It is essential to bring out here that Supreme Court of India has upheld the economic role of a housewife also. As per the apex court "Housewives are an invaluable unpaid resource and definitely not unproductive". According to the law, it is possible to apply opportunity cost in valuing a housewife's services. For instance, the monetary value of cooking for the family members should be assessed in terms of what it would cost to hire a cook or to purchase ready cooked food or assessing how much money could be earned if food cooked for the family were to be sold in the locality. Alternatively, the time taken for housewives to produce these services could be compared with the time that is taken to produce goods and services that are commercially viable. This is because the non-financial benefits of the housewives are the time spent in attending to children, family members and emotional quotient or traditional parenting or so on, which cannot be precisely measured. The Supreme Court documented that if their contribution is taken for granted, this may escalate the unforeseen costs in terms of deterioration of human capabilities.

An important role is played by the housewife in a family because not only does she perform various tasks at home, but also liberates her spouse to devote his energy and attention to his work outside by which income and property is generated for the family. Thus, in calculating the value of her house works, her husband's income becomes a very important element. Housewives are the foundation of the household and society. In order to understand the needs and capabilities of the nation their work needs to be recognised and valued.

#### ***Pilot study based on Replacement Cost Approach***

This paper is a pilot research study based broadly in line with the replacement cost method for valuation of homemaking taking 50 Homemakers from



Housing Board Colony and Satyasai Enclave of Khandagiri and Netaji Subhas Enclave of Mancheswar locality (Table 1).

**Table 1: Sample Size of Households**

Name of the locality	Netaji Subhas Enclave	Satyasai Enclave	Khandagiri Housing Board Colony
Total number of houses	93	75	68
Number of houses included in the sample	27	10	13

Source: Field survey, 2017-18

In order to meet the objectives, primary survey was done based on random sampling using a structured questionnaire. For further analysis of the data, advanced excel has been used and the same analysis has been represented through tables. The data on market values of various services were collected from Sai Naukri Sahajya (SNS) Agency.

#### 4. Results and Analysis

In this section, we analyse different types of works performed by housewives and time spent on those works and measuring the household work in value term. Table 2 (in appendix) shows the different types of works that are done by the housewives and time taken by them to do those works along with the annual family income.

Table 3 shows the results of the survey, representing all the 50 (sample) housewives.

**Table 3: Different Types of Household Works done by 50 Housewives**

Code	Number of Housewives
Co	48
La	36
Cl	25
Sw	25
Dust	35
Ba S	21
G Sh	36
HhB	32
S Sk	41
Gu H	41
Tut	30

Notes: Cleaning = Cl, Sweeping = Sw, Dusting = Dust, Baby-sitting = Ba S, Grocery Shopping = G sh, Managing household budget = H hb, Sewing skills = S sk, Guarding the house =Gu h

Source: Author's own compilation

It shows various kinds of works done by the housewives between the age group of 20 to 70 years. From the table it is clear that the majority of housewives are engaged in cooking, followed by guarding the house and sewing.

Table 4 shows the various types of works done by the housewives between 30-39 years age groups. There are 20 housewives in this particular age group. The table reveals that 95 per cent of housewives are into cooking followed by tutoring their kids and then dusting. 55 per cent of housewives are into sweeping, sewing and cleaning. 80 per cent of housewives guard their homes and 65 per cent of housewives manage their household budget. 60 per cent of housewives babysit their kids and are into laundry activities. Lastly, the total percentage share of all the household activities for the age group taken into consideration is 770 per cent. This is because these works are not mutually exclusive in nature. So, the sum of total percentage is more than 100.

**Table 4: Distribution of Types of Household Works done by the Housewives between the Age Group 30-39 years (in per cent)**

Code	Percentage share
Co	95
La	60
Cl	55
Sw	55
Dust	85
Ba S	60
G Sh	70
HhB	65
S Sk	55
Gu H	80
Tut	90
Total	770

Notes: Co: Cooking; La: Laundry; Cl: Cleaning; Sw: Sweeping; Dust: Dusting; Ba S: Baby Sitting; GSh: Grocery Shopping; HhB: Household Budget Management; S Sk: Sewing Skills; Gu H: Guarding the House; Tut: Tutoring

Source: Authors' own compilation

There are 15 housewives in the age group of 40-49 years (Table 5). All of the 15 housewives are into cooking which makes it 100 per cent. 86 per cent of housewives shop the grocery items and guard their houses. 73 per cent of housewives are into laundry activities. 60 per cent of housewives are into dusting and also have sewing skills. 53 per cent of housewives manage the household budget and teach their kids. 40 per cent of housewives are into

cleaning and sweeping and 13 per cent housewives baby sit the kids. Lastly, the total percentage share of all the household activities for the age group taken into consideration is 664 per cent. This is because these works are not mutually exclusive in nature. So, the sum of total percentage is more than 100.

**Table 5: Different Types of Household Works done by the Housewives between the Age Group 40-49 years**

Code	Percentage of housewives engaged in particular household work
Co	100
La	73
Cl	40
Sw	40
Dust	60
Ba s	13
G sh	86
H hb	53
S sk	60
Gu h	86
Tut	53
Total	664

Notes: Co: Cooking; La: Laundry; Cl: Cleaning; Sw: Sweeping; Dust: Dusting; Ba S: Baby Sitting; GSh: Grocery Shopping; HhB: Household Budget Management; S Sk: Sewing Skills; Gu H: Guarding the House; Tut: Tutoring

Source: Authors' own compilation

As per SNS Agency (Table 6), the amount that is paid to a tutor is Rs. 1,000 per subject; Rs. 5,000 for a cook who cooks two times in a day; Rs.6,500 for a full timer which includes cooking, laundry, dusting and grocery shopping; Rs. 5,500 for babysitting; Rs. 6,000 for guarding the house, and Rs. 1,500 for cleaning and dusting.

So, as per the replacement cost approach, if we look at the market values assigned to the various types of household works, though a housewife is no less than a full time worker, she gets nothing in lieu of her services in spite of the fact that she undertakes a lot of strain in doing all these activities.

Table 7 shows the number of housewives coming under different age groups and the time they spend in doing different household works. 30-39 years and 40-49 years are the most productive age groups and maximum number of housewives fall under this age group in our sample. On an average 8-9 hours are spent by a housewife in the age group of 30-39 years and 40-49 years for doing household chores.

**Table 6: Top Six Types of Works and Their Market Values**

Types of works	Market value (in Rupees)
Cooking (two times in a day)	5000
Guarding the house	6000
Tutor	1000( per subject)
Babysitting	5500
Cleaning and sweeping	1500
Full time worker	6500

Note: A full time worker does cooking, laundry, dusting, grocery shopping as per the agency. If we look at a housewife's work, she does more work than a full time worker like dusting, guarding the house and some other miscellaneous activities like sewing, taking care of elders, etc. and each component has a separate market value.

Source: SNS Agency

**Table 7: Time spent in Household Works by Housewives**

Age group (years)	No. of housewives	Time spent in works in hours per day
20-29	7	63
30-39	20	174
40-49	15	119
50-59	7	69
60-69	1	8
Total	50	

Source: Authors' own compilation

Table 8 shows the qualification of the sample housewives in the study. Out of 50 housewives, 23 are post graduates and 19 are graduates. In our sample it means 84 per cent housewives are post graduates and graduates who are eligible for paid jobs. However, as they are housewives they get no remuneration.

**Table 8: Qualifications of Sample Housewives**

Qualifications	Number of Housewives
Post Graduate	23
Graduate	19
Intermediate	04
Matriculation (10th )	04
Total	50

Source: Authors' own compilation

*Summary of the above results:*

- a) The various types of works performed by a housewife are cooking, babysitting, cleaning, sweeping, dusting, laundry, grocery shopping, guarding the house, tutoring the children, sewing, managing the household budget etc. In this study, 84 per cent of the housewives who are highly educated are engaged in different kinds of the above household works.
- b) On an average, 8-9 hours is spent by a housewife in the age groups of 30-39 years and 40-49 years.
- c) The market value for cooking, guarding the house, cleaning and sweeping, full timer service are Rs. 5,000, Rs. 6,000, Rs. 1,500 and Rs. 6,500 respectively as per the data collected from the SNS Agency.

From this study it is evident that 84 per cent of housewives, who are capable of getting well-paid jobs, are engaged in homemaking, which does not bear any market value. On an average, housewives spend 8-9 hours in a day to complete the household chores.

## **5. Conclusion and Suggestions**

In today's world where no work is free, despite their immense contribution to the family and economy, the housewives or homemakers do not receive any remuneration for their works. Hence, there should be some incentives meant for the housewives for contributing towards the household works which have a market value. The Government should formulate more schemes and plans that can value the works of housewives. Nonetheless, in the GDP calculation, valuation of the housewives' contribution should be included if not at one go but gradually. Homemakers are the foundation of the household and society. In order to understand the needs and capabilities of communities and nation, housewife's works need to be recognized and valued.

According to the experts, the effective way of doing this might be to recognize the contribution of housewives towards the economy. It's not about being paid, it's about being valued. If ever there was a time to include unpaid housework in GDP figures, it is now.

Without including the housewives' contribution the GDP figures can never be accurate; at best they can be undervalued. Working mothers have a stake in this too. They still do most of the unpaid works in their homes. While society recognizes their role in the conventional economy, housewives stand hidden and unacknowledged. This study is exploratory in nature and throws light as to how the valuations for the housewives' contribution be done. The Government of one of the largest democracies needs to pay attention to this so far neglected area. To conclude in the words of C. S. Lewis, *The homemaker has the ultimate career. All other careers exist for one purpose only – and that is to support the ultimate career.*

### Note

1. Amish: The farmlands of the Pennsylvania Dutch Country are very productive. Many of the farmers here are different from most Americans, by choice. They are the Amish and Mennonites. The Amish trace their heritage back hundreds of years, and yet, despite all the time that has passed and the many changes that have taken place in society, they still live and work much as their forefathers did. For them, family, farm and faith are top priorities.

### References

- Ariffin, R. (1986), The Exploitation of Women: An Overview, *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, Vol.1, No.2, pp. 133-154.
- Brownlee, E.W. (1979), Household Values, Women's Work, and Economic Growth, 1800-1930, *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 39, No.1, pp.199-209.
- Ferree, M. M. (1976), Working Class Jobs: Paid work and Housework as Sources of Satisfaction, *Social Problems*, Vol. 23, April, pp. 431-441.
- (1984), Class, housework, and happiness: Women's work and life satisfaction" *Sex Roles*, Vol.11, No.11/12, pp. 1057.
- Freudiger, P. (1983), Life Satisfaction among Three Categories of Married Women, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 213-219.
- Hamid, S. (1994), Non-market Work and National Income: The Case of Bangladesh, *The Bangladesh Development Studies*, Vol. 22, No.2/3, pp.1-48.
- Hawrylyshyn, O. (1977), Towards a definition of Non-Market Activities, This paper was written at the Office of Senior Advisor on Integration, Statistics Canada, as part of a project investigating the conceptual methodological and empirical aspects of valuing non-market activities, retrieved from <http://www.roiw.org/1977/79.pdf>.
- Hodgkins, D. (1987), A Residue of Tradition: Jobs, Careers, and Spouses' Time in Housework, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 381-390.
- Islam, M. (2012), The GDP Matter: Valuing the Fulltime Homemakers Household Work Time, *Modern Social Science Journal*, Vol. 1, No.1, pp. 1-20.
- Kansal, V. (2014), Economic Value Assessment of Unpaid Homemaking, *Journal of Studies in Dynamics and Change (JSDC)*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 88-96.
- Kapur, R. (1969), Role Conflict among Employed Housewives, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 5, No.1, pp.39-67.
- Manual on Labour Statistics-(I) (2012), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, pp. 18.
- Mckinsey Global Institute (2015), The Power of Parity: How Advancing Women's Equality can add \$12 Trillion to Global Growth, Report , September.

Monsod, Solita Collas (2007), Removing the Cloak of Invisibility: Integrating Unpaid Household Services in the Nation's Economic Accounts, 10th National Convention on Statistics (NCS), Retrieved from <http://nap.psa.gov.ph/ncs/10thNCS/papers/plenary%20session/PS-2/ps02.pdf>.

National Sample Survey Report No. 559 (68/10/3), Participation of Women in Specified Activities along with Domestic Duties, NSS 68<sup>th</sup> Round, July 2011-June 2012.

Prügl, E. (1996), Home-Based Workers: A Comparative Exploration of Mies's Theory of Housewifization, *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol.17, No. 1, pp.114-135.

Reid, M. G. (1947), The Economic Contribution of Homemakers, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 251, pp. 61-69.

Sengupta, A. (2016), Measurement of Unpaid Household Work of Women in India: A Case Study of Hooghly District of West Bengal, Paper prepared for the IARIW 34th General Conference, Dresden, Germany, August 21-27, 2016.

System of National Accounts (2008), New York, ISBN 978-92-1-161522-7, pp. 542.

Wright, J.D. (1978), Are Working Women Really More Satisfied? Evidence from Several National Surveys, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 301-313.

Wright, R.A. (1977), A Comparative Analysis of Economic Roles within the Family: Amish and Contemporary American Women, *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, Vol. 7, No.1, pp. 55-60.

**Appendix**

**Table 2: Different types of the works that are done by the housewives and time taken to do those same works**

Sl. No.	AFI (in Rs.)	Co	La	Cl	Sw	Dust	Ba S	G sh	MHhb	S sk	Gu h	Tut	TSHC
R 1	1200000	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	3	
R 2	1200000	✓	✓			✓			✓				12
R 3	1800000	✓	✓			✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	3
R 4	1300000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				10
R 5	1200000	✓	✓					✓	✓			✓	9
R 6	1300000	✓	✓					✓	✓			✓	8
R 7	1800000	✓						✓	✓				5
R 8	1500000	✓				✓	✓					✓	10
R 9	1400000	✓						✓		✓		✓	7
R 10	1600000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	12
R 11	1300000	✓	✓					✓					7
R 12	1800000	✓						✓	✓	✓		✓	5
R 13	1500000	✓					✓			✓		✓	5
R 14	700000	✓	✓			✓						✓	8
R 15	1300000	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	3
R 16	1800000	✓	✓							✓			8
R 17	1800000	✓	✓							✓			6
R 18	1400000	✓	✓				✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	15
R 19	1300000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				5

*(contd.)*



(Table 2 contd.)

R 20	1200000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	7
R 21	1000000	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	11
R 22	1020000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	13
R 23	1400000	✓				✓		✓			✓	8
R 24	1500000	✓		✓	✓	✓						7
R 25	1200000	✓	✓			✓						5
R 26	840000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	5
R 27	100000	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6
R 28	480000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	14
R 29	1600000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	7
R 30	1100000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	6
R 31	1200000	✓	✓				✓	✓		✓	✓	5
R 32	1700000	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	5
R 33	1500000	✓				✓	✓		✓		✓	12
R 34	800000		✓				✓					14
R 35	600000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	5
R 36	1200000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		4
R 37	1200000	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	13
R 38	600000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	8
R 39	840000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	16
R 40	640000	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	10

(contd.)

(Table 2 contd.)

R 41	700000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		10
R 42	750000		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	16
R 43	800000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		12
R 44	1400000	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	18
R 45	960000	✓					✓			✓	✓		16
R 46	1500000	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8
R 47	700000	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	6
R 48	100000	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	12
R 49	1300000	✓					✓		✓	✓			9
R 50	1100000	✓				✓					✓		8

Notes: Co: Cooking; La: Laundry; Cl: Cleaning; Sw: Sweeping; Dust: Dusting; Ba S: Baby Sitting; G sh: Grocery Shopping; MHhb: Managing Household Budget; S sk: Sewing Skills; Gu H: Guarding the House; Tut: Tutoring; TSHC: Total Time spent in doing Household Chores in a day

Source: Primary Survey, 2017-18