Journal of Studies in Dynamics and Change (JSDC), ISSN:2348-7038
Vol. 1, No. 2, June 2014
Suggested Citation
Kansal, V. (2014). Economic Value Assessment of Unpaid Homemaking. *Journal of Studies in Dynamics and Change (JSDC), 1*(2), 88-96.

JSDC

Economic Value Assessment of Unpaid Homemaking

Vishrut Kansal

The W.B. National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata

ABSTRACT

'Homemaking' refers to unremunerated non-market activities, performed by family members themselves (esp. women), for production of goods and services for self-consumption, which are neither taken into consideration while evaluating Gross Domestic Product (GDP) nor while calculating labour force statistics. While it is usually admitted that such ignorance renders the efforts of calculating 'actual' GDP futile, economists point out that the problems of assessing the economic value of homemaking activities, even to the degrees of proximity, are real to be ignored either, notwithstanding benefits of such valuation. In this backdrop, the work surfaces the theoretical debates concerning such valuation, and, economic, practical and theoretical viability of the approaches adopted, in an ultimate effort to highlight the void in economic developments, be they international or specifically pertaining to India, in this field.

Keywords: work, income, household behavior, accounting, unpaid work, opportunity cost, time use survey, homemaking, household activities, care economy

JEL classification: E01, C82

Author Details and Affiliations
Pursuing B.A.LL.B.(H) at The W.B. National University of Juridical Sciences, Kolkata

Introduction:

'Homemaking' (a preferential term used for housework or household duties/chores), as also used here, consists of unremunerated non-market activities, performed by family members themselves (esp. women), producing goods or services for consumption within same household;i however, not assessed as 'work' in national accounts.ii These include, inter-alia, cooking, cleaning, washing dishes, laundry, ironing, sewing, collection and processing of raw materials and primary products, care for children, ill and elderly, etc.iii These activities are neither taken into consideration while evaluating Gross Domestic Product (GDP) nor while calculating labour force statistics.iv This gross neglect allegedly renders the efforts of calculating 'actual' GDP futile (Boserup, 2008, p. 151), much because, such contribution by homemakers is not a mere iota which can be traded off for greater ease and efficiency in data collection (Health Bridge, 2009).

As felt by sociologists and economists alike, several other reasons also lurk behind the necessity to evaluate homemakers' contribution. While it is usually admitted that assessing economic value of homemakers' activities would not only surface existing social and economic undervaluation of women's worth,v and consequent gender inequalities (assuming that major burden of homemaking falls on womenvi), but will also enhance their social (through gender budgetingvii and policy frameworkviii) and economic well-being (through appropriate monetary compensation to homemakers in accident and divorce claims;ix homemaker women's inalienable right to a share in husband's property, equal access to all State-provisioned facilities and rights guaranteed to the 'workers') (Hakim, 1996, p. 95); sociologists, however, fear that social appreciation of economic worth of homemaking (besides its social worth) will rigidify patriarchal division of labour and relegate women to domestic sphere, perpetuating viciously their economic dependence on men.x Furthermore, as also pointed out by economists, the problems of assessing its value, even to the degrees of proximity, are real to be ignored either, notwithstanding benefits of such valuation (Beneria, 2001).

While limiting its scope necessarily to 'homemaking' as described above, this literature survey is primarily aimed at understanding the economic viability of valuation of homemaking activities in GDP while surfacing the critiques and corresponding debates around such attempt. However, for sake of realistic simplification; theories arrived at in any literary source used in this literature survey have been judiciously assumed to be reliable in general context, even when geographical domain of data relied upon by such source was not in International context.

Is Homemaking Work?

National (India-Specific) and International Economic Standards

In terminologies used for data collection by National Sample Survey Organization (hereinafter, for brevity, 'NSSO'), 'domestic duties' are 'non-economic activities'xi (therefore, not 'work'xii), and any person so engaged is not considered as labour force.xiii Consequentially, persons merely attending domestic chores (like "cooking, cleaning utensils, looking after children, fetching water, collecting fire wood, going to market" etc.) ("Census of India", 2011, p. 68, 82), 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' (NSSO, 2001). This economic exclusion of homemaking, in India, is in light of United Nations System of National Accounts (SNA) which also considers such activities to be falling outside the scope of gainful work (UNSNA, 2008), notwithstanding acknowledgment of their economic importance and productivity (UNSNA, 2008, p. 64, 65, 600; "Census of India", 2011, p. 83).

However, as evident from NSSO guidelines, usually there exists arbitrary distinction between 'non-market economic activities' from 'non-economic activities' in context of domestic work (Krishnaraj, 2008). For instance, while cultivation of agricultural goods in family farm for self-consumption counts as 'economic activity',xiv cultivation of fruits and vegetables in small kitchen garden (for self-consumption) doesn't ("Census of India", 2011, p. 82). But, besides this, both NSSO and UN SNA are clear on the non-inclusion of any domestic chore in ambit of 'work'.

Theoretical Debate:

Against this backdrop, economists have obscurely argued homemaking as category of 'work'. While the argument based on 'economic productivity' of homemaking, and hence, its ought-to-be inclusion in 'economic activities' finds no direct contempt (Hakim, 1996, p. 35, 46; Loutfi, 2001, p. 90-91; UNSNA, 2008, p. 64); the bone-of-contention surfaces when scholars cast difficulties in its inclusion on basis of 'motivation' and 'qualitative aspects' underlining it (Himmelweit, 1995, p. 1-19).

Scholars argue that homemaking is essentially the provision of family and community-oriented goods and services as part of the process of caring for people. Therefore, they term the economic interplay of such activities as 'care economy' (Elson, 1997, p 8-9). Developing upon this idea of 'economy of care', Himmelweit argued that homemaking is neither 'work' nor otherwise; essentially because not only it is motivated by selfless emotional bonding, love and affection, but is also marked by 'inseparable' link between homemaker and other household members, such that beyond the conventional notions of 'market work', it provides homemaker with the sense of fulfilment and satisfaction (1995, p. 1-19).

Despite the acknowledged intellectuality of this argument, economists challenge the assumptions behind it (Beneria, 2001, p. 101-102, Folbre & Nelson, 2000, p. 123). They argue that, first of all, care to elderly is usually perceived as monotonous burden by homemakers, such that unsurfaced 'quid pro quo expectations' or moral coercion underline such care and not the affectionate love (ibid). Secondly, even when it is assumed that all homemaking activities are motivated by emotional bonding, it is inappropriate to assume that market-equivalents of such services (like, nursing, paid child-care, surrogacy, nursing homes for elderly, old-age homes, talk-therapies etc.) shall lack emotion, altruism and 'care' (ibid). In other words, engagement in monetary exchange doesn't essentially render one "insatiable materialist" such that people may engage in transactions both for money as well as for moralistic satisfaction underlined by emotions of bonding, affection and love (Folbre & Nelson, 2000, p. 130-132). Furthermore, in these cases, monetary flow is usually a way of 'compensating' carer while acknowledging and appreciating his intrinsic motivations rather than 'monetary exchange' (for provision of services) in lieu of extrinsic satisfaction (ibid, p. 133). Thirdly, the element of care in homemaking does not essentially result in 'inseparable link' between carer and cared, much because activities like cleaning, laundry, ironing, etc. are mere burdensome monotonous physical labor or 'manual work'xv which can easily be performed by third-persons without ripping them of their essential utility (Hawrylyshyn, 1977). Lastly, skills form the

underlying basis for homemaker's services and their continuity, such that what essentially matters is skill and not the underlying affection (Beneria, 2001, p. 101). For instance, if the food cooked by mother will not satisfy the taste of family, it is most likely that cook's professional services will be employed thenceforth, essentially because notwithstanding the affection underlying cooking of food by homemaker, it is the indirect utility of such service that matters for the household.

Notwithstanding these theoretical concerns, many economists argue that inclusion of unpaid homemaking activities within ambit of 'work' will pose serious practical ramifications, such that it is economically and statistically viable for efficient data-collection and analysis that status quo is maintained (UNSNA, 2008, p. 64-65; "Phase I", 2012). However, as these do not have direct bearing on whether homemaking is 'economic activity', they are discussed hereinafter.

Balancing Conflicting Interests:

Besides the theoretical concerns as addressed before, the most debated issue is whether projected comprehensibility of GDP (by including homemaking) outweighs the alleged difficulties in such discourse; addressing which requires a practical analysis of these 'difficulties' in light of economic interests underlining such inclusion (UNSNA, 2008, p. 64-65; Collas, 2007).

Unemployment- A Virtual Impossibility

The first concern, as expressed by UN and backed by NSSO, is co-option of all un-employed people, engaged in homemaking, into self-employed labour, making unemployment a virtually impossible (UNSNA, 2008, p. 64; "Phase I", 2012). Since unemployment statistics are essential for state policy-making, it will be adversarial to economic interests of those who despite being engaged in domestic work wish to seek employment in market economic activities ("Phase I", 2012). However, as expressed by Hakim, this anomaly is self-inflicted, because said objective would have been better achieved had 'employment' been confined to participation in market economic activities (1966, p. 19-23). By extending it to non-market economic activities and including subsistence production in GDP, this concern has already been ousted (ibid). Moreover, separate Time-Use Surveys (hereinafter, 'TUS', for brevity) ('satellite accounts'), which are different from, but extension of, SNA, can effectively assess the quantum of homemaking without affecting conventional EUS (Employment and Unemployment surveys) ("About the Time," n.d.).

Demarcating Work from Non-Work:

The second concern is alleged difficulty in distinguishing economically productive homemaking activities from leisure and personal activities in light of three basic arguments: First, while some homemakers consider activities like child-care, cooking, etc. as burdensome manual labour, others consider them as leisure or recreational, therefore, subjectivity may lead to obscurity between 'work' and 'leisure' in context of homemaking (Hakim, 1996, p. 52); Second, homemaking may also involve activities like maintaining socio-cultural relations within family and with neighbours, emotional support, etc. which are considered as 'economically non-productive'[xvi] and should not be accounted for in GDP (Hakim, 1996, p. 22); Last, while some may consider 'reproduction' as 'economically productive homemaking activity' because of its contribution to supply of productive labour force in economy, others consider homemaking to be distinct economic category than household supply of labour (Health Bridge, 2009, p. 11).

To counter these concerns, many economists have advocated the concept of "substitution rule or third party principle criterion" (Hakim, 1996, 22-23; Hawrylyshyn, 1977, p. 9; Reid, 1947, p. 61), which states that, if an activity loses its pleasure, value or utility on being done by substitute, because of its intrinsically personal nature, it will be economically unproductive 'personal activity'; however, if it can be performed by someone, other than the one benefitting from it, without any substantial loss of its utility, it will be 'work'. Therefore, while reproduction is clearly 'personal activity', routine cleaning is not (Hakim, 1996, p. 23). However, it needs to be noted that substitution principle does not preclude those homemaking activities which do not have a market equivalent (as of now), rather those activities are also assessable within its meaning as long as they can be performed by a third party (Beneria, 2001, p. 94).

However, the issue emerges as to what nature of 'utility' should be taken into account. Hakim argues that it must be direct utility of pleasure derivable from homemaking activity that needs to be taken into account (Hakim, 1996, p. 23). For instance, while routine cooking is essentially 'work', cooking a special dish on particular occasion shall be personal activity if its performance by employed cook will spoil the pleasure. But, difficulties may emerge when certain activities are performed with combined motivations of 'pleasure' and 'work', e.g. routine

cleaning to be enjoyed with newly purchased equipment. Therefore, in light of difficulties in clearly analysing subjectivity of homemaker, such approach is likely to be rejected.

As an alternative to this approach, Hawrylyshyn defines homemaking as "consisting of non-market activities which produce goods or services for the members of the household not desired in and of themselves, but rather for the utility which they yield"; such 'economic household activities' as "those producing indirect utility," and identified in relation to substitution principle (1977, p. 11). Therefore, only those homemaking activities that do not per se yield direct utility (like, satisfaction, well-being, recreation, parental pride, emotional bonding, socio-relational fabrications) rather produce 'basic commodities' (like, clean house, cooked meal, child-care) which in turn yield such utility (indirect utility) should be economically assessed as 'work' (ibid, p 8). Therefore, while child care (along with imparting formal and informal education) is economic homemaking activity because of corresponding 'indirectly' derivable utility (satisfaction of developing an effective human, gratification of affection, etc.); fabricating socio-cultural relations is not (ibid, p. 9).

In this manner, Hawrylyshyn theory is particularly helpful to avoid assessment of "economic value of the housewife" instead of sought assessment of "the value of economic services provided by housewife" (ibid, p. 8).xvii This was important so to avoid fusion of economic income with psychic income, which was the subject matter of controversy in Hakim's formulation (Folbre & Nelson, 2000, p. 123, 137). Psychic income, or the value of direct utilities derived by homemaking activities, though, is important to determine the welfare of individual, but is redundant when determining the monetary income which may serve as a means to such welfare but not the end in itself (Hawrylyshyn, 1977). For instance, while the value of dining in restaurant is assessable, the income value of 'externalities' like resultant relaxation, status-pride or enjoyment (which together forms the abstract notion of 'psychic income') cannot be even proximally assessed (Reid, 1947, p. 251).

Doubting Time Use Survey (TUS) Methodology:

For assessing income generated by homemakers, time expended in performance of their routine homemaking activities need to be recorded (CSO, 2012). Time-use surveys (TUS) are an effective machinery to record "quantitative summaries of how respondents allocate their time over a specified time frame," which is either a day or a week ("About the Time-Use", p. 1).

However, economists have argued that number of hours of 'work' (economically productive homemaking activities), as recorded by time-use statistics, can be misleading. Firstly because, homemakers may utilize their time flexibly such that they may perform their activities with "different degrees of intensity, efficiency and productivity, interspersing it with leisure time and other breaks"; secondly, not every homemaker is equally efficient and productive for each activity; thirdly, even when they are assumed to be equally skilled and efficient in, say cooking, same meal may be produced by different homemakers in different time (depending upon technology, time constraints, manner of execution, etc.) (Hakim 1996, p. 47); and lastly, homemakers usually perform more than one activity at a time, for instance, cooking and cleaning may be performed together with child-care; such that it is difficult to determine time allotted for individual activities (Hawrylyshyn, 1977). Accordingly, since there is no perceivable direct link between output and time expended for the same, there is no practicable method of recording quantum of homemaking activities. As stated by Hakim, "half the full-time house-wife's hours are attributable to inefficiency, huge amounts of unnecessary make-work or to activities done for pleasure rather than necessity" (1996, p. 47-49).

However, many of these difficulties can be catered to if only the minimum required time for an activity is taken into account, primarily because, any additional time devoted, to produce the same output, yields direct utility or satisfaction, which is to be avoided as constituting psychic income [adopting Hawrylyshyn theory] (Hakim, 1996, p. 47-49). For instance, if house repairing can be efficiently performed by a professional in say, 5 hours, but, a homemaker, having same efficiency and skills, performs it in 11 hours; then while 5 hours produce indirect utility from the basic commodity of housing, additional 6 hours produce direct utility of mental relaxation and sense of replenishment. Therefore, only 5 hours, being the minimum required time for producing the desired output of housing, should be taken into account (ibid, p. 7-9).

This reasoning is underlined by two basic assumptions: first, that homemaker is reasonable person and will devote additional time only if valuation of his direct (from additional time) and indirect utility (from basic commodity, 'housing') of the last hour (in instant example, 11the hour) equals

his opportunity cost or wage; and second, that there is conceivable method of measuring minimum required time (ibid, p. 47). While both the assumptions seem to be theoretically correct, economists have challenged the latter arguing its practical misguidedness. To this, as suggested by Hawrylyshyn and seconded by Hakim, there are two viable alternatives, first, considering 'minimum required time' as time needed by individuals engaged in performance of similar activities in market, for they conceivably do not derive any direct utility; and second, considering it as time spent by homemakers who are also engaged in full-time paid market work for they need to be more efficient in their domestic work (Hawrylyshyn, 1977, p. 13). Such an approach is expected to fundamentally reduce the risk of misevaluation and to increase the efficiency.

Methodological Critiques:

Even when the theoretical and practical concerns about idea of valuing homemaking and data-gathering methods (e.g. TUS) are put to rest, the main issue emerges as to how such an assessment can be made viably. Economists have suggested two main approaches: first, input-related method (imputation of value to homemakers' labour time) and second, output-related method (imputation of market prices to goods and services produced by homemakers).

Input-Output Approach or Production Function Approach!

As stated by Hawrylyshyn, Household production function for any homemaking activity is represented by:

FZi = F (Li, Ki, Ri),

Where i is the basic commodity, which in turn yields some perceivable indirect utility; FZi is gross output of such basic commodity i (which needs to be determined); Li is minimum labour time used in its production; Ki is capital stock required (which involves imputed rental cost of fixed assets used in production; for instance, rental cost of frying pan used in production of meal), and, Ri is intermediate inputs, or raw materials used (e.g. cost of vegetables used in production of meal) (1977, p. 10). Therefore, in her terms,

HX = WT + RK + HI,

Where, HX is value of gross output while WT, RK and HI are values of Labour, Capital and Raw Inputs respectively (1977, p. 14-15). Therefore, imputation of value to all inputs used in production of basic commodity i will give correct estimation of its value HX.

However, as against its basic assumption 'that the sum of factor inputs fully exhausts the value of output" (Hawrylyshyn, 1977, p. 15), Beneria suggests that imputation of value to FZi while deducting input costs (corresponding to Li, Ki and Ri) should be the correct approach ('Double Entry Book-keeping') (Abraham & Mackie, 2005, p. 24; Beneria, 2001, p. 96). Therein, value to FZi could be equated with opportunity costxviii of consumption of such service by household itself, which is monetary income corresponding to its sale in wage market (Beneria, 2001, p. 96).

However, despite being conceptually correct, this approach is "far too intractable in practice" (Hawrylyshyn, 1977, p. 16), essentially because: first, distinguishing RK and HI from household's direct final consumption poses serious conceptual and empirical difficulties (ibid, p. 15); Second, there may be joint-production of different i from same K or R (ibid, p. 9); Last, inputs like R and K may not be purchased from market (e.g. wood gathered by family members or home-made stove) (Beneria, 2001, p. 96).

In view of such difficulties and for interests of even partial valuation of homemakers' activities, economists have focused only on 'WT' component of HX, such that money value of homemaking (say, HW) becomes similar to Value of Labour services (WT); i.e. HW ~ WT (Beneria, 2001, p. 96; Hawrylyshyn, 1977, p. 16).

There are primarily two methods proposed for estimating HW:

Substitute Method or Replacement Method:

Identifying the cost of hiring domestic worker to carry out all types of household tasks, presently being carried out by homemaker, is one such approach (usually referred to as, 'market alternative=housekeeper cost (MAHC)' or 'global substitute method') (Hawrylyshyn, 1977, p. 13). However, it is usually critiqued as empirically misguided as it is not only 'market' inconceivable but also impossible to assume, because not only a domestic worker is unlikely to do all the homemaking activities unless necessary propitious externalities so exist (e.g. full co-operation of household members), but even if one may assume utopia, there will be income undervaluation for such a worker as there is for homemaker (ibid).

The second approach is identifying the collective cost of hiring individual workers with appropriate skills for each specific activity performed by homemaker ('specialized substitute method') (ibid). However, essential need to disintegrate each task, false assumption of individual and not joint-performance of all activities by homemaker, and disregard of scale economies that exist if one person performs all the activities, render this approach as highly contradictory (ibid, p/ 14).

Opportunity Cost of Time Theory:

Assuming rationality of homemaker, optimization rule indicates that value of time spent in an activity will be its 'opportunity cost' in wage market, i.e. 'the value of marginal hour of time in each activity (marginal product) equals its market price, which is wage of homemaker' (Becker-Lancaster theory or 'wage opportunity cost of time model (WOCT)') (ibid, p. 5, 8, 12; Becker, 1965, p. 493).

However, as indicated by Hawrylyshyn, homemaker will be willing to contribute so much time as would yield him both direct and indirect utility, summation of values of which should be equal to opportunity cost of time equilibrium (1977, p. 6-9, 12-14). But the opportunity cost so desirable in Becker's theory and also empirically feasible is only the wage homemaker would have earned had he been employed in wage market (ibid). Therefore to avoid this anomaly, only 'minimum time required' should be taken into account; such that,

$HW = W(\sum_{i=1}^{n} TM)$,

Where, W is 'opportunity cost of time (market wage) of homemaker' and TM is minimum time necessary to perform activity i (ibid, p. 13).

However, as argued by Beneria, WOCT gives widest, rather absurd, range of estimates depending not on the quality of output but on the market skills of the individuals, without even confronting market situations (as there is alleged lack of market competition in home) (2001, p. 96). Therefore, a better quality food prepared by blacksmith will be valued less than relatively inferior food prepared by scientist. Moreover, it assumes disjunction between market skills of individual and homemaking activity in which he is engaged.xix

But, if instead of market wage of homemaker, market wage of service equivalent to activity performed by him is taken into account to determine W (MAIFC or 'Market Alternative Individual Function Cost'), then aforementioned criticisms can be countered. Thus,

$HW = \sum_{i=1}^{n} TMi.\, Wi$

Where, Wi is market wage for service equivalent to i (Hawrylyshyn, 1977, p. 12-13).

However, a closer scrutiny will reveal that MAIFC is actually a logical extension of earlier referred 'specialized substitute method' and thus encounters similar problems by comparing household with market (Beneria, 2001, p. 96-97). Furthermore, this will produce different results even when same nature of activity in same time is performed by different people, say a specialist and a novice ('Hawrylyshyn Paradox') (Berg, Brower & Koopmanschap, 2004, p. 36, 39). For example, same nature of care provided by professor of health economics will be more valued than a mere PhD student (ibid).

Therefore, some economists have argued that that wage value should be taken into account at which homemaker is willing to supply same services in labour market for 1 hour ('Modified Opportunity Cost Method (MOC)') or minimum amount of money a homemaker is willing to accept to provide certain additional amount of output ('contingent valuation method (CVM)') (ibid). Howsoever logically viable they may seem, both MOC and CVM are not only empirically difficult to determine but also against principle of 'revealed preference'. As economists have argued that "it is just the intention of respondents that is measured in CVM and MOC instead of real behavior as required in the revealed preference axiom" (ibid, p. 41).

Conclusion:

As analysed above, every approach outlined for economic assessment of value of homemakers' activities has met criticisms, be they theoretical, practical or empirical. However, the economic and social interests underlining proposed valuation outweigh these criticisms, such that, whatever valuation is viably possible, even when partial or proximate, is viewed as huge step towards egalitarianism and comprehensibility (Hawrylyshyn, 1977, p. 16). However, what is usually forgotten or ignored while trying to economize homemaker's contribution are externalities like emotional-bonding between carer and cared, preferences of household, etc. (representing 'direct utility' in Hawrylyshyn terms) which also need to be assessed not only to resolve many of the inherent conflicts which economists have usually faced, but also to surface 'real' factor behind homemaking as economically productive activity (Berg et al., 2004, p. 36, 39). In any case, it should be noted that worth of homemakers' activities is usually much more than

what could even be economically assessed, and therefore, it is beyond any doubt that they need to be calculated in GDP.

Works Cited

Abraham K & Mackie C, 'Beyond the Market: Designing Nonmarket Accounts for the United States' (National Academies Press, Washington DC 2005) 24 <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11181.html> last accessed 1 September 2013

Banerjee N, 'Whatever Happened to the Dreams of Modernity? The Nehruvian Era and Woman's Position' (1998) 33 (17) EPW WS 3 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4406694> last accessed 1 October 2013

Becker G, 'A Theory of the Allocation of Time' (1965) 75 (299) The Economic Journal 493 <http://www.apec.umn.edu/grad/jdiaz/A%20theory%20of%20Allocation%20of%20Time%20-%20Becker.pdf> last accessed 1 September 2013

Beneria L, 'The Enduring debate over unpaid labour' in Martha Fetherolf Loutfi (ed), *Women, Gender and Work* (1st, International Labour Organization, Geneva 2001)

Boserup E, 'The Lure of the Towns' in *Women's Role in Economic Development* (1st, Earthscan, London 2008)

Collas S, 'Removing the Cloak of Invisibility: Integrating Unpaid Household Services in the Nation's Economic Accounts' (10th National Convention on Statistics, University of Philippines, 2007)

CSO, MSOPI, GoI, 'National Industrial Classification: All Economic Activities' (New Delhi 2008)

--*Report of Sub-Committee on Time-Use Activity Classification* (New Delhi 2012) <http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/upload/Sub-Committee_REPORT_Final_4dec12.pdf> last accessed 1 September 2013

Elson D, 'Gender-Neutral, Gender-Blind, or Gender-Sensitive Budgets?' (Commonwealth Secretariat, London 1997)

Evangelical Social Action Forum & Health Bridge, 'Women's Economic Contribution through their Unpaid Work: The Case of India' (Health Bridge, Nagpur 2009)

Federici S, *Wages against Housework* (1st, Fading Wall Press and Power of Women Collective 1975) 4

Folbre N and Nelson J, 'For Love or Money-or both' (2000) 14 (4) Journal of Economic Perspectives 123

Hakim C, 'Marginal Work and Domestic Work' in *Key Issues in Women's Work* (1st, Athlone Press Ltd., London 1996)

Hawrylyshyn O, 'Towards a definition of Non-Market Activities' (1977) <http://www.roiw.org/1977/79.pdf> accessed 31 August 2013

Himmelweit S, 'The Discovery of Unpaid work' in *Feminist Economics* (Vol.1 No.2, Summer, London 1995)

Kollontai A, 'Communism and the Family' in *The Worker* (1920)

Krishnaraj M, 'Women's work in Indian Census: Beginnings of change' in Mary E. John (ed), *Women's Studies in India* (1st, Penguin, New Delhi 2008)

NSSO, MOSPI, GoI, 'Concepts and Definitions used in NSS' (New Delhi 2001)

--'Phase I Report on Periodic Labour Force Survey' (New Delhi 2012)

--'About the Time Use Survey' <http://mospi.nic.in/mospi_new/upload/TU_survey/About%20the%20Survey.pdf> accessed 31 August 2013

Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India, Ministry of Home Affairs, GOI, 'Census of India 2011 Instruction Manual for Updating of Abridged Houselist and Filling up of the Household Schedule' (New Delhi 2011)

Ramesh K, 'Homemaker or Breadwinner' *The Hindu* (Delhi, 19 July 2012) <http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/opinion/homemaker-or-breadwinner/article3658491.ece> last accessed on 1 September 2013

Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, 'Census of India 2011 Instruction Manual for Updating of Abridged Houselist and Filling up of the Household Schedule' (New Delhi 2011)

Reid M, 'The Economic Contributions of Homemakers' (1947) 251 Annals of the

American Academy of Political and Social Science 61

Sharp R, 'Budgeting for equity: Gender budget initiatives within a framework of performance oriented budgeting' (UNIFEM, 2003)

UN, 'United Nations System of National Accounts 2008' (UN Document Symbol: ST/ESA/STAT/SER.F/2/Rev.5, 2009)

Berg B, Brouwer W and Koopmanschap M, 'Economic Valuation of Informal Care: An Overview of Methods and Applications' (2004) 4(1) The European Journal of Health Economics 39

End Notes

[i] If any person of a household provisions for goods/services for consumption within the same household, such person is sociologically termed as 'homemaker'; however, if the same activities are provided for by person of different household against remuneration in cash or in kind, such person is termed as 'domestic worker': UN, 'United Nations System of National Accounts 2008' (UN Document Symbol: ST/ESA/STAT/SER.F/2/Rev.5, 2009) 64

[ii] Refer NSSO, MOSPI, GoI, 'Concepts and Definitions used in NSS' (New Delhi 2001), UN, 'United Nations System of National Accounts 2008' (UN Document Symbol: ST/ESA/STAT/SER.F/2/Rev.5, 2009), Oli Hawrylyshyn, 'Towards a definition of Non-Market Activities' (1977) <http://www.roiw.org/1977/79.pdf> accessed 31 August 2013

[iii] Refer Division 98 (undifferentiated Goods and Services producing activities of private households for own use), Section T: CSO, MSOPE, GoI, *National Industrial Classification: All Economic Activities* (New Delhi 2008) 127; also refer CSO, MOSPI, *Report of Sub-Committee on Time-Use Activity Classification* (New Delhi 2012) <http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/upload/Sub-Committee_REPORT_Final_4dec12.pdf> last accessed 1 September 2013

[iv] These activities are, however, distinct from production of primary commodities for self-consumption (like, unpaid participation in agriculture, poultry, dairy farming, etc. by family labour) or own account production of fixed assets (e.g. self-construction of homes, wells, machinery, tools etc.); while homemaking is non-economic activity, these are non-market economic activities: NSSO, MOSPI, GoI, 'Concepts and Definitions used in NSS' (New Delhi 2001) Economic Activity, §4.2.1.; §4.2.11.2 (Self-Employed in Household Enterprise) and §4.2.11.4 (Helper in Household Enterprise)

[v] The concept of economic valuation of unpaid homemaker women's work and their proportionate compensation for work done along with recognition of workers' rights was first recognized in India in 'Women's Role in Planned Economy', a research paper published by Congress in 1930s: Nirmala Banerjee, 'Whatever Happened to the Dreams of Modernity? The Nehruvian Era and Woman's Position' (1998) 33 (17) EPW WS 3 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4406694> last accessed 1 October 2013

[vi] Contra Lourdes Beneria, 'The Enduring debate over unpaid labour' in Martha Fetherolf Loutfi (ed), *Women, Gender and Work* (1st, International Labour Organization, Geneva 2001); As capitalism grew dominant, along with changing economic structure, family values, customs and morals have also changed such that many women have started working outside (against wages) instead of being engaged solely in homemaking: Alexandra Kollontai, 'Communism and the Family' in *The Worker* (1920)

[vii] Rhonda Sharp, 'Budgeting for equity: Gender budget initiatives within a framework of performance oriented budgeting' (UNIFEM, 2003)

[viii] "*having reliable estimates of the great amount of time spent by women fetching water in any country may prevent authorities from placing a low priority on the installation of running water on the grounds that fetching water doesn't take up much of women's time*": Lourdes Beneria, 'The Enduring debate over unpaid labour' in Martha Fetherolf Loutfi (ed), *Women, Gender and Work* (1st, International Labour Organization, Geneva 2001) 100

[ix] *Arun Kumar Aggarwal v. National Insurance Company* (SC) wherein SC observed homemaker's economic contribution and enhanced the compensation claimed by housewife against an accident: K. Ramesh, 'Homemaker or Breadwinner'

The Hindu (Delhi, 19 July 2012) <http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/opinion/homemaker-or-breadwinner/article3658491.ece> last accessed on 1 September 2013

[x] Ibid 99; Contra "to demand wages for housework does not mean to say that if we are paid we will continue to do it. It means precisely the' opposite. To say that we want money for housework is the first step towards refusing to do it, because the demand for a wage makes our work visible, which is the most indispensable condition to begin to struggle against it, both in its immediate aspect as housework and its more insidious character as femininity": Silvia Federici, *Wages against Housework* (1st, Fading Wall Press and Power of Women Collective 1975) 4

[xi] "Any activity that results in production of goods and services that adds value to national product is considered as economic activity. Such activities include production of all goods and services for market, i.e., production for pay or profit and the production of primary commodities for own consumption and own account production of fixed assets, among the non-market activities… Execution of household chores or social commitments, etc. are not considered gainful activities (work)": NSSO, MOSPI, GoI, 'Concepts and Definitions used in NSS' (New Delhi 2001) Economic Activity, §4.2.1.

[xii] 'Being engaged in economic activity' is 'work': ibid Activity Status, §4.2.3.

[xiii] §4.2.3. (Activity Status) read with §4.2.14 (Attended domestic duties and was also engaged in free collection of goods, sewing, tailoring, weaving, etc. For household use) in addition to §4.2.15 (Out of labour force (economically inactive persons / not available for work)) ibid

[xiv] "'production of agricultural goods for own consumption' covering all activities up to and including stages of threshing and storing of produce for own consumption, comes under the coverage of the economic activities of NSSO": NSSO, MSOPE, GoI, 'Phase I Report on Periodic Labour Force Survey' (New Delhi 2012)

[xv] NSSO, MOSPI, GoI, 'Concepts and Definitions used in NSS' (New Delhi 2001) §4.1.1. (Manual Work)

[xvi] Economically productive activities are those which add to the flow of goods or services in the economy: NSSO, MSOPE, GoI, 'Phase I Report on Periodic Labour Force Survey' (New Delhi 2012)

[xvii] Ibid 8

[xviii] Opportunity cost is defined as cost of next best alternative forgone: Bernard van den Berg, Werner B. F. Brouwer and Marc A. Koopmanschap, 'Economic Valuation of Informal Care: An Overview of Methods and Applications' (2004) 5(1) The European Journal of Health Economics 39

[xix] There may be cook engaged as full time homemaker, then his OC are themselves related to his condition as homemaker: ibid