Chapter 25

Working out the Urban: Gender Relations and the City

Liz Bondi and Hazel Christie

Working out the Urban: An Introduction

At the end of the twentieth century urban social relations are vastly different from those found in the cities of a hundred years ago. In advanced Western societies it is clear that the old central cities, many of which lend their names to major metropolitan hinterlands, contain a shrinking proportion of wealth and population (Fainstein and Campbell 1996: 2). We have also learnt that the old decays unevenly and that rapid shifts in the patterning of uneven development between both sectors of the economy and geographical regions have rendered some cities command centers of the global economy or nests of technological innovation, while others have experienced deindustrialization and stagnation even while they encompass large populations (Castells 1989; King 1990).

At the same time, intraurban variations have remained marked, and the reshaping of physical and social space has brought inequalities of urban living into starker relief. Concentrations of impoverishment, racial and ethnic discrimination, together with areas where the homeless wander or disaffected youth congregate, are part and parcel of the new urban condition entailed in the transition to a post-Fordist era. But in contrast to this "universal tale of urban woe" (Harvey 1996: 405) other parts of cities have experienced revival and reinvestment. Flows of population and affluence into gentrified neighborhoods, often adjacent to areas of great poverty, have produced a landscape of privilege and wealth, demarcated from poorer areas by walls and gates, which sharpen the distinctions between the "haves" and the "have nots". The imprint of urbanization in the late 1990s is thus a checkerboard or mosaic of neighborhoods in which the wealthy attempt to keep the impoverished at bay despite their close proximity (Christopherson 1994).

Whatever the explanation for these divisions – and we locate these in transformations that have occurred in the nature of capitalist development in the twentieth century – it is widely accepted that changes in urban society affect people's everyday lives. While most emphasis has been placed on radical shifts in *class* composition and on the class characteristics of spatial practices (Massey 1984; Sayer and Walker

1992), we wish in this chapter to draw attention to research on gender identities and gender relations in the context of urban change in Western societies. In so doing we argue for an approach that highlights the nature and extent of gender divisions, especially as these intersect with other dimensions of social differentiation and identification in urban spaces. We advocate a materialist reading of urban conflict and change that highlights the gender configuring of practice: we do not in any way dismiss or downplay the significance of class (Connell 1995; see also Sharp 1996).

Feminist critiques of urban studies have argued that women's lives have remained either invisible or sorely misrepresented within a good deal of urban studies (see for example Bowlby, Lewis, McDowell, and Foord 1989; McDowell 1983; Mackenzie 1984). But in the last two decades these problems have begun to be corrected. In this chapter we are indebted to a tradition in feminist urban studies that understands gender to be a significant element in the unequal structuring of urban space, alongside class, race, ethnicity, and so on (for influential early examples see Mackenzie and Rose 1983; McDowell 1983). Like these accounts, we understand gender (together with class, race, and other axes of inequality) as a relational process through which social identities are forged, and through which material inequalities are sustained and challenged. Moreover, we understand gender, class, race, and so on to be inextricably interwoven and situated processes (compare Pratt and Hanson 1994). Identities and inequalities can therefore be understood as social practices. Following from this, our concern in this chapter is to understand the context in which particular groups of women and men "work out" their lives: how are their material conditions of life structured? We are especially interested in differences (and similarities) between women and men occupying different class positions.

We suggest that cities render the gender configuring of *social* practice particularly visible. It is in cities that we see the spatial imprint of women's differential position within structures of exploitation and within a segregated division of labor. And it is also in cities that the complex interplay of power relations, and the array of social institutions, which lie behind a given form of gender relations, are most graphically manifest. In short it is a space within which we can recognize different gender identities and from which we can analyze the different logics that are superimposed on and contribute to the creation of these multiple identities. The hallmark of urban identity in the late 1990s, we argue, is one of fragmented and contradictory experiences of gender.

To map different kinds of gender identities is only a first step, of course: we must also understand the relations between them. To keep the analysis dynamic, and to prevent multiple identities from being collapsed into one static typology of gender relations, we must unpack the milieux of class and race and scrutinize the gender relations operating within them. And we must also recognize that these differences are socially constructed in and across space. Geographers and urban theorists have recognized that processes in place give rise to diverse and sometimes fragmented ways of being and becoming in patriarchal, capitalist societies (Bondi 1998; Chouinard 1996; Pratt and Hanson 1994). This relational approach makes it easier to recognize the hard compulsions under which gender configurations are formed, the bitterness as well as the pleasure in gendered experiences. This is crucial at a time when capitalist economies are becoming more individualistic: it

counters a widespread tendency to mistake new gender identities for alternative lifestyles, or for matters of consumer choice that are freely available to all women (Connell 1995).

So, in this chapter we adopt a dual focus in interpreting gender relations in advanced Western urban societies. We look first to the structural processes that have led to pressure to reorganize the interior spaces of cities, and which show the significance of gender differences within an interlocking matrix of power relations. And secondly, we link these changes in social structures and relationships to the lived experiences of women and men by comparing the life chances, opportunities, and identities of those who have benefited from new forms of capitalist accumulation with those who have been excluded from it. In so doing we suggest that attempts to evaluate general trends in gender relations are misplaced: we argue that convergences between the experiences of men and women, sometimes taken as evidence of greater gender equality, are inextricably bound up with deeply gendered forms of inequality that take particular spatial forms. While we illustrate our account with evidence drawn largely from cities in the UK, where both class and gender relations take specific forms, our general argument is applicable thoughout Western societies.

Gendering the Urban: A Theorization

It seems that capitalism is at a "crossroads" (Amin 1994: 1) in its historical development, as signaled by the emergence of forces – technological, social, spatial, and institutional – very different from those that dominated the economy after the Second World War. Inevitably there is much dispute about the precise magnitude and extent of the shifts involved but there is some consensus that the period from the mid-1970s represents a transition from one phase of capitalist development to another. Interpretations of this transition tend to hinge on assertions about the changing uses of labor (Peck 1996). Thus we hear much about the rationalization of manufacturing industry, about the emergence of new jobs in the service sector, and about developments in high-technology and knowledge-based industries (for example Castells 1994; Castells and Hall 1993; Sassen 1991). In short, we are now said to be living in a post-Fordist era, marked by flexibility and characterized by deepening social divisions of labor.

In contributing to and critiquing these debates, feminists have argued that the post-1970 period of capitalist restructuring has both speeded up the unraveling of an old gender order and has exposed the limitations of existing analyses of urbanization (McDowell 1991; Walby 1997). According to this argument, the idea and reality of cities as inherently divided cannot be understood without looking at realignments in gendered divisions of labor and in the structure of household organization. While much has been made of radical shifts in the nature of class relations, rather less has been said about how gender relations are built into the organization of the city and about how they continue to shape its development. Our starting point therefore is to broaden out some of these debates by looking at the gendered transformation of work practices, and so to read their implications for urban identities.

One way to capture the depth and complexity of the changes entailed in the emergence of a post-Fordist era is to ask a set of straightforward questions about who does what work and for what reward, through which broad shifts in

sociospatial inequalities may be identified. In this context one major empirical trend cannot be overlooked – even by those who are not sympathetic to the feminist project – and that is the increase in the number of women in paid employment. Although in the UK as in other Western societies women have always worked for money, and have formed a significant component of the workforce without interruption since the 1830s (Hakim 1993), the postwar period has been characterized by a marked increase in the participation of women in paid employment. Data from the UK Population Census indicate that in 1951 some 43 percent of women were economically active while the corresponding figure for 1991 was over 70 percent. Another significant empirical trend – and one that has come under attack from opponents of the feminist project – is the decline in the number of men in full-time paid employment. In a post-Fordist economy, where manufacturing industry is no longer the main wealth-generating activity, opportunities for skilled manufacturing workers have been reduced to a low level. A combination of outdated skills, age, and lack of geographical mobility have rendered many men unemployable in the new economy, or at least unable to find jobs that bring benefits comparable to those they enjoyed previously.

The increase in female participation in the labor market gives the impression of considerable progress towards financial independence for women and towards more egalitarian lifestyles. However, an important theme to emerge from studies of socio-economic change in the UK contradicts this impression (Anderson, Bechhofer, and Gershuny 1994; Scott 1994). Evidence from national surveys about rewards for different kinds of jobs shows that women's average hourly pay rates, and, to an even greater extent, their average total incomes, are still markedly lower than men's, with little if any increase with age or duration in employment (Hutton 1994). This reflects the fact that the majority of the new employment opportunities taken up by women have been in part-time jobs, which bring limited employment-related rights or benefits, and which tend to be offered at relatively low rates of pay. Continuing sex segregation in the labor market is also significant: the majority of employees, whether male or female, work in occupations strongly dominated by members of their own sex, and industries dominated numerically by women tend to be less well remunerated. Thus, the failure of real income from part-time work to increase with the duration of employment, together with job segregation and labor market segmentation, have together resulted in the persistence of a substantial difference between women's and men's average earnings (Lindley 1994). While the predominance of part-time employment among women is more marked in the UK than in most other Western societies, these gender differences have proven to be equally persistent elsewhere (O'Reilly and Fagan 1998).

But this averaged picture hides more than it reveals about the recompositioning of the labor force and about the recasting of gender and class relations in the city. The old gender order, based on the model of the female caregiver and the male breadwinner, has given way to different alternatives, and for some women it is the best of times while for others it is the worst of times (Brenner 1993). Growing numbers of women with professional and vocational qualifications have moved into "core" jobs and are advancing up the career ladder particularly in the professions, public administration and management (Crompton and Sanderson 1990; Kay and Hagan 1995; Wills 1996). They are also making inroads into political office, and are

changing cultural attitudes and images, albeit slowly (Casey 1995). The career paths and experiences of some of these female workers increasingly resemble those of their male counterparts, and illustrate a certain narrowing of gender divisions and inequalities. But such opportunities are not uniformly accessible to all women (or to all men). Increasing numbers of women are trapped in poorly paid jobs where occupational sex segregation persists and sexual harassment and violence against women remain entrenched (Beechey and Perkins 1987). Moreover an increasing number of men find themselves outside of "core" employment and many of them are subject to the same disadvantageous terms and conditions of employment previously associated strongly and specifically with women workers as well as racialized minorities. So among the less well paid too a narrowing of gender divisions in employment is apparent, accompanied by a widening of class differences among workers of the same sex. In this context greater gender parity is a Pyrrhic victory in which the majority have lost out. Thus a major characteristic of the post-Fordist era is that the insecurity engendered by a combination of poorly paid jobs, temporary contracts and limited employee protection is no longer limited to particular social groups previously positioned on the periphery of the labor market.

This restratification takes a particular spatial form. At the scale of households, an acute polarization is apparent between households with two professional salaries and those with low incomes or no incomes (Casey and McRae 1990; Jordan and Redley 1994). This has been exacerbated by characteristics of welfare provision, so that many households in the latter category are faced with a stark choice between two unattractive strategies: they can either attempt to maximize household income by adult members taking on double or triple working days, sequential shifts, and so on, or they face complete, long-term welfare dependency, which is often the only "choice" for lone-parent households (Glendinning 1991; McLaughlin 1994). As this indicates, improved wealth and status among one group of women has very limited "trickle down" effects: on the contrary, financial autonomy and independence for some is matched by economic insecurity and dependence (within the household or on the state) for others.

These two pictures, one of women's economic success and prosperity and the other of their poverty and marginalization, coexist and reflect the contradictions and tensions of the post-Fordist regime of accumulation. Moreover, this deepening of socioeconomic inequalities is not the result of structural variations in rates of economic growth, that is from there being more economic success in one place or part of the economy than another. Rather these inequalities operate at the very heart of contemporary economic processes (Massey and Allen 1995: 123–4). One of the consequences of this generates another aspect of the spatiality of restratification in the form of the close juxtaposition of poverty and affluence within urban areas to which we have already drawn attention.

The significance of the new interlocking divisions and spatialities of gender and class that we have described extends well beyond the world of work to encompass relations within the household unit and domestic politics, as well as the expression of new identities in the urban arena. Indeed, as Connell has suggested, we find "the gender configuring of practice however we slice the social world, whatever unit of analysis we choose" (1995: 71). It is to experiences of, and identities forged through, these practices to which we now turn.

Different Worlds of Work, Different Experiences of the City

Questions about the formation of new gender identities in the urban arena have vexed many feminist geographers (Bondi 1991; Ruddick 1996). The development of fragmented and contradictory experiences of gender in contemporary urban life, and their impact on gender identities, have attracted a good deal of attention (Collins 1991; Marshall 1994). That the feminization of the economy is a key factor in the everyday lives of women and men is also widely acknowledged. However, less attention has been paid to the connections between gender identities and post-Fordist economic relations. This neglect is explained, at least in part, by the claims of some poststructuralists that work can no longer be regarded as the primary basis for social organization or self-identity (Casey 1995). However we would suggest that there is a compelling case to be made for retaining the primacy of work and work relations in explaining the formation of new gender identities. This case is vested in the power differentials created between those who have been central to and benefited from the most recent rounds of capitalist accumulation and those who have been excluded from it.

In asserting the continued significance of work and work relations, we do not understand "work" in any prescriptive (or normative) sense as being based on full-time paid employment (see Gorz 1989). Rather we are arguing that the positions women and men occupy in relation to the (very uneven) distribution of economic opportunities and economic rewards apparent in post-Fordist regimes frame experiences in a manner that is fundamental to the forging of gender identities. We illustrate the working out of this with reference to two different groups of urban residents.

The best of times for some: gender, gentrification and urban affluence
The material significance of the distribution of work and work relations relates closely to other aspects of urban culture. A growing literature on city cultures and urban lifestyles points to new architectural, artistic, and cultural styles, which are sometimes described in terms of a postmodern shift (Featherstone 1991; Watson and Gibson 1995). Whether postmodern esthetic and cultural movements resist or endorse the logic of post-Fordist capitalist accumulation, the refashionings of urban space that result are intimately connected to the emergence of new urban sensibilities (Harvey 1989; Jameson 1991; Soja 1989, 1996). And it is within these urban spaces that cultural identities, including gender identities, are forged and maintained. So gender identities, work relations, cultural styles, and the meanings of urban space are constructed together in the late twentieth-century urban arena (Ruddick 1996).

Gentrifiers in particular, are often considered to be in the vanguard of these trends in their search for quality in urban living, whether through proximity to consumption palaces and sophisticated entertainment, or through the creation and exploitation of distinctively stylized ways of life (see for example Bridge 1994; Butler 1995; Jager 1986; Ley 1994; Ley and Mills 1993; Mills 1988; Smith 1996; Zukin 1982). Several dimensions of these experiences emerge from debates about the relative importance of, and the relationship between, class and gender in processes of

gentrification (Bondi 1991; Butler and Hamnett 1994; Rose 1989; Smith 1987; Warde 1991). In the various ways in which inner-urban neighborhoods have been transformed to accommodate particular strands of the middle classes of the late twentieth century a close interweaving between work relations, household form, urban culture, and gender identities is apparent.

A number of studies draw attention to career orientation and career success among women gentrifers, including female members of heterosexual dual-career households, women living alone, lone parents, and women living in lesbian partnerships (see for example Bondi 1999; Butler and Hamnett 1994; Rose 1989; Rothenberg 1995). While occurring predominantly in public sector professions strongly dominated by women, this at least suggests some shifts in contemporary constructions of femininity. Small inroads into previously male preserves such as the finance sector provide sharper evidence of ways in which gender identities and gender relations at work are being renegotiated (McDowell and Court 1994). Higher educational qualifications are crucial to this advancement and an intergenerational class dimension is apparent: for example in the UK the daughters of men in professional employment are considerably more likely than other women to move into a professional career themselves (Savage, Barlow, Dickens, and Fielding 1992).

Women and men in service-class employment exercise a good deal of choice in their housing and household conditions. While salaries in the female-dominated public sector professions in particular are modest compared to most male-dominated service-sector occupations, in many cities access to gentrified housing on one such income is a real possibility. The opportunities of dual-career households, particularly where both partners are in prestigious service sector occupations, are often much wider and consequently it is hardly surprising that the class transformations associated with gentrification vary considerably between different localities at both interurban and intraurban scales (see Beauregard 1990; Butler and Hamnett 1994; Lees 1994; Smith 1996). Nor is it surprising that gentrifiers adopt a wide range of household forms, including substantial numbers that appear "conventional" in the sense of containing a heterosexual couple plus children with the man in higher-status employment than the woman (see Butler and Hamnett 1994) as well as many that do not conform to this pattern (see Bondi 1999; Rose 1989; Rothenberg 1995). Thus, the phenomenon of gentrification fosters diverse experiences of urban living and a fragmentation of urban identities.

While the evidence available is limited, there is at least some indication that, even within the more "conventional" households in gentrified neighborhoods, attitudes to gender divisions are being formulated in ways that at least make space for egalitarian forms of gender identity (Bondi 1999; Butler and Hamnett 1994; Rose 1989; Rothenberg 1995). But the extent to which these trends are specific to gentrifiers remains in question: suburban lifestyles are changing too and even if rather fewer "non-traditional" households are to be found in suburban neighborhoods, it may be that this trend towards "lifestyle differentiation" within a discourse of equality operates throughout the late twentieth-century middle classes (Marsh 1990, 1994).

Perhaps the arena in which a reshaping of gender identities within the urban middle class is most evident is that of consumption practices. Relatively affluent inner-city neighborhoods with mixed land uses that incorporate both high-density residential accommodation and high-quality commercial outlets aimed at niche

markets, including shops, restaurants, cinemas, and so on, have certainly attracted women (and men) who, through their sexual orientation, household form and career choices, are actively forging distinctive gender identities (Mort 1996; Wilson 1991). To a degree, these localities point to the emergence of a feminine urban identity. But the distinctiveness and potential of this identity, and the extent to which it is impressed upon urban space, are matters of dispute. While some suggest that it is prefigurative, serving to illustrate the possibility of more emancipatory forms of urban living (see especially Wilson 1991; Young 1990), we would advance a more cautious reading, emphasizing that it is a class-specific development contingent upon access to adequate resources, educational, cultural, and material (Bondi 1998; Ravetz 1996). Consequently it depends upon a restratification within the city and is constitutive of new forms of inequality, linked to very different urban experiences and forms of gender identity.

The worst of times for others: gender, exclusion and poverty
As we have indicated, this restratification is double edged and many women (and men) have lost out in the restructuring of work practices and work relations. Concentrations of poverty and deprivation in inner urban areas, as well as in peripheral housing estates, make for a very different urban world and a very different set of urban experiences from those of gentrifiers. Constraint, not choice, is the overwhelming experience of the housing market and many individuals and households are isolated from mainstream economic and social activities. Again, several dimensions of these experiences emerge from debates about the relative importance of, and the relationship between, class and gender in processes of exclusion (Green 1997; Jordan 1996). The revival of and reinvestment in inner-city neighborhoods has not been uniform and, if anything, the spatial link between the inner city and disadvantage has become more entrenched (Green 1994; McGregor and McConnachie 1995). As with the case of professional women, we can identify connections among work relations, household form, urban culture, and gender identities, but under very different socioeconomic circumstances.

Research shows that polarization of gender experiences is clearly and inextricably linked to change in the quantity and quality of employment. In contrast to the career orientation and success of women gentrifiers, research on impoverished women highlights the problematic aspects of new employment contracts in the late 1990s. Some of the main losers in the drive towards a low-wage economy have been the working-class women who cannot find full-time paid employment or who are not able to afford to go out to work because of the prohibitive costs of childcare (Harrop and Moss 1995; Ward, Dale, and Joshi 1996). Unlike the gentrifiers, these women have neither the educational qualifications needed to gain access to jobs in the core labor market nor the resources required to escape the physical decay and economic disadvantage found in their immediate environs.

Under these new employment conditions many of the poorest households survive by piecing together income from several poorly paid and/or insecure jobs. For those caught in the pernicious benefits traps and unable to afford to take work, long-term unemployment paves the road to exclusion and spatial restriction (Morris 1987, 1994). Again, an intergenerational class dimension is superimposed on this gender realignment: for example in the UK unemployment tends to run in families

(Payne 1987; Ward and Bird 1995). In the worst-case scenario a culture of poverty or an underclass develops which generates negative attitudes towards education, training, and employment (Brown 1995). In such circumstances it is not easy to find evidence of egalitarian shifts in contemporary constructions of femininity. Exploitative gender relations and gender segregation are more obvious, and are reflected in the careful policing of gender identities at work (Glucksmann 1990; Pringle 1989). Consequently, although the vast majority of women are positively orientated to work, and expect to spend most of their adult lives in productive employment, opportunities are curtailed. Thus, for the majority of people, employment restructuring has tended to shore up the ideology of motherhood and so perpetuated the disadvantageous positioning of women in the labor market (Adkins 1995; Pateman 1989).

The contestation of gender identities at work has been brought into sharper focus by the extent to which men have also lost out in the new kind of employment growth in the 1980s and 1990s. The normative (and masculinist) vision of work as full-time paid employment has been ruptured by high levels of male unemployment and by the extension of low-paid jobs, poor career prospects and precarious employment to substantial sections of the (white) male labor force. Although both sexes have lost out in the creation of "flexible" working practices, media attention has focused on the costs incurred by men. This is because masculine identity in particular has long been understood in relation to workplace culture in a manner that has persisted regardless of supposed shifts towards other bases of identity. The other side of this equation of course is that poverty and unemployment, and their association with lawlessness, crime, and fear of violence or intimidation in public places, have exposed working-class men to moral scrutiny, especially those who are young and/or unemployed (Campbell 1993; Valentine 1996). Women in similar employment circumstances have not generally been subjected to the same degree of public concern, whether sympathetic or vilificatory, although the debate about lone mothers is an important exception.

Women and men with limited employment opportunities cannot exercise much choice in their housing and household conditions. For many women living in poor households, including those with two earners, women living alone and single mothers, employment vulnerability reduces choice of residence, so that those who are disadvantaged in labor market terms tend to be found in the least desirable housing. This is true of both the public sector, where residualization of council housing has become more intense, and the private market where low households on low incomes are restricted to cheaper properties which are often in poor repair and in less desirable areas (Hills and Mullings 1991; Doling, Ford, and Stafford 1988). So evidence suggests that the operations of housing and labor markets interact so as to produce spatial concentrations of people with similar class and lifestyle characteristics.

Disadvantaged neighborhoods increasingly come to be seen as "problem areas" from which those with economic resources migrate. In these circumstances the most disadvantaged groups and communities become even more detached from the mainstream economy and the problems of long-term unemployment and welfare state dependence grow (Jordan, James, Kay, and Redley 1992; Lovering 1997). Gender identities in these impoverished urban neighborhoods are both an expression of new

class relations and a statement about the connections among types of work, household dynamics, and neighborhood factors.

The costs of the new urban social relations embodied in these places are high. Women and men trapped in poverty suffer deleterious consequences – their health deteriorates, their skills decay, their aspirations decline and their self-confidence evaporates (Burchell 1994). An extensive literature shows that poverty and its side effects are not experienced equally by all household types or by all household members, and that hardship is borne disproportionately by women (Brannen and Wilson 1992; O'Brien 1995). Households headed by women, whether single mothers or the elderly living alone, are most vulnerable to poverty while in "conventional" nuclear families women surviving on low incomes are most likely to experience multiple disadvantage. Many women living under these restricted and restrictive economic conditions sacrifice the quest for more progressive gender relations to the need to ensure survival on a day-to-day basis. Women tend to undertake the extra mental labor involved in devising ways to reduce costs of living, and risk their own health, or sacrifice their own pleasures, by putting the needs of their partners and children above their own. Gender divisions may well be intensified by the consumption practices of the new urban poor. Here consumption is about "getting by" and the relentless grind of making ends meet in the midst of long-term adversity. The new class practices may shore up more traditional feminine roles; they have little to do with the search for style and good taste or the displays of social status often associated with the consumption practices of women in higher income categories. The trend towards "lifestyle differentiation" within a discourse of equality is not a luxury afforded to women in the lowest ranks of the income distribution.

These contrasts between the urban affluent and the urban poor illustrate our argument that the hallmark of urban identities in the late 1990s is one of fragmented or contradictory experiences of gender. Thus debates about the postmodern sensibility and the emancipatory nature of public space do not begin or end merely with accounts of the democratization or rehabilitation of urban space enjoyed by women gentrifiers. Indeed, not only are the freedoms of these spatial practices limited to a few, but the defence of this privileged lifestyle is translated into a proliferation of new repressions in space and movement (Davis 1990: 160; see also Christopherson 1994). Freedom for some is at the expense of control, manipulation, and ghettoization for "others" whose gendered or racialized identities constrain participation in the public sphere. Similarly the disenfranchised, the welfare dependent and the homeless, among others, are devalued and excluded, deliberately or otherwise, from the spaces of the urban elite. In short, social disintegration and increasing economic inequality have led to the commodification and privatization of urban space such that it is not universally accessible to a civic public.

Working out the Urban: A Conclusion and Prospectus

In this essay we have explored late twentieth-century forms of gender inequality and gendered identities from a materialist perspective. We have argued that post-Fordist economic relations have produced new and intense forms of social exclusion in

Western cities. We have identified convergences in at least some aspects of the experiences of women and men among both the urban affluent and the poor, and we have advanced an interpretation that does not marginalize gender domination in a tale of class oppression (Pratt 1991: 597). More specifically, we have drawn on research concerned with patterns of employment, the reorganization of housing markets and social polarization in cities to advance the feminist challenge to established ways of understanding processes of restructuring and their effects on the formation and experiences of various urban social groups. Our account also feeds into debates about the divided city, drawing attention to the gender configuring of class practices (Fainstein, Gordon, and Harloe 1992; Marcuse 1993).

We would suggest that our materialist reading of these complexities points towards several avenues for further research. While our account has engaged with issues of choice and constraint, there remains much scope to explore the strategies women and men use in planning and investing for their future needs. This would bring into the analysis consideration of life-courses in relation to paid employment, informal economic activities, family planning, childrearing, housing, and so on. It would also serve to illuminate intergenerational processes in the context of the gender configuring of class practices.

In this chapter we have drawn attention to ways in which class divisions are shaped by women's position within the income distribution. There is scope to examine more closely the nature of social relations between women earning higher incomes and those on lower incomes. Jordan (1994) has argued that exploitative employment relations are shaped by affluent women's preferences for "flexible" assistance with child-minding and domestic chores, and poor women's need to "fit in" employment with family responsibilities. This theme has been explored by Gregson and Lowe (1994) in relation to paid domestic work. Further research might explore other aspects of the decisions of dual-career households, including for example those pertaining to children's schooling (especially the use of private education and the exercise of parental choice within the state sector), to health-care (including the uptake of private health insurance and the use of private medical facilities), and so on. As well as illuminating the choices of the urban affluent, such research needs to explore the effects (unintended) on those excluded from the advantages their strategies are intended to capture. We also need to understand the dynamic relationship between the choices of the affluent, the shaping of social inequalities, and gender relations within households and communities.

The perspective we have adopted pays close attention to empirical evidence of gender inequalities and gendered experiences of urban life. In certain respects this contrasts with calls made a decade or so ago to go beyond empirical validation to more sophisticated theoretical understandings of gender divisions in urban society (Bowlby, Lewis, McDowell, and Foord 1989; Mackenzie 1984; Pratt 1991). Our argument can be understood as both a counterpoint to the influence of theoretically led (especially poststructuralist) approaches to questions of cultural identity in recent years, and as a response to the fragmentation of experience we have highlighted: we would argue that the multiplicity of differences that divide women in Western cities of the late twentieth century calls for research well grounded in the substantive complexities of life.

REFERENCES

Adkins, L. 1995: *Gendered Work: Sexuality, Family and the Labour Market*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Amin, A. 1994: Post-Fordism: models, fantasies and phantoms of transition. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: A Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 1–40.

Anderson, M., Bechhofer, F., and Gershuny, J. (eds.) 1994: *The Social and Political Economy of the Household*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beauregard, B. 1990: Trajectories of neighbourhood change: the case of gentrification. *Environment and Planning A*, 22, 855–74.

Beechey, V. and Perkins, T. 1987: *A Matter of Hours*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bondi, L. 1991: Gender divisions and gentrification: a critique. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 16, 190–8.

Bondi, L. 1998: Gender, class and urban space: public and private space in contemporary urban landscapes. *Urban Geography*, 19, 160–85.

Bondi, L. 1999: Gender, class and gentrification: enriching the debate. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*.

Bowlby, S., Lewis, J., McDowell, L., and Foord, J. 1989: The geography of gender. In R. Peet and N. Thrift (eds.), *New Models in Geography*, 2. London: Unwin Hyman, 157–75.

Brannen, J. and Wilson, G. (eds.) 1992: *Give and Take in Families: Studies in Resource Distribution*. London: Allen and Unwin, 2nd ed.

Brenner, J. 1993: The best of times, the worst of times: US feminism today. *New Left Review*, 200, 101–60.

Bridge, G. 1994: Gentrification, class and residence: a reappraisal. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 12, 31–51.

Brown, P. 1995: Cultural capital and social exclusion: some observations on recent trends in education, employment and the labour market. *Work, Employment and Society*, 9, 29–51.

Burchell, B. 1994: The effects of labour market position, job insecurity and unemployment on psychological health. In D. Gallie, C. Marsh, and C. Vogler (eds.), *Social Change and the Experience of Unemployment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 188–212.

Butler, T. 1995: Gentrification and the urban middle classes. In T. Butler and M. Savage (eds.), *Social Change and the Middle Classes*. London: UCL Press, 188–204.

Butler, T. and Hamnett, C. 1994: Gentrification, class, and gender: some comments on Warde's "Gentrification as consumption". *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 12, 477–94.

Campbell, B. 1993: *Goliath: Britian's Dangerous Places*. London: Methuen.

Casey, B. and McRae, S. 1990: Towards a more polarised labour market? *Policy Studies*, 11, 31–7.

Casey, C. 1995: *Work, Self and Society: After Industrialism*. London: Routledge.

Castells, M. 1989: *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring and the Urban-Regional Process*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Castells, M. 1994: European cities, the informational society, and the global economy. *New Left Review*, 204, 18–32.

Castells, M. and Hall, P. 1993: *Technopoles of the World: The Making of 21st Century Industrial Complexes*. London: Routledge.

Chouinard, V. 1996: Gender and class identities in process and in place: the local state as a site of gender and class formation. *Environment and Planning A*, 28, 1485–1506.

Christopherson, S. 1994: The fortress city: privatised spaces, consumer citizenship. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: A Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 409–27.

Collins, P. H. 1991: *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. London: Routledge.

Connell, R. W. 1995: *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity.

Crompton, R. and Sanderson, K. 1990: *Gendered Jobs and Social Change*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Davis, M. 1990: *City of Quartz*. London: Verso.

Doling, J., Ford, J., and Stafford, B. 1988: *A Property Owning Democracy*. Aldershot: Gower.

Fainstein, S. and Campbell, C. 1996: Introduction: Theories of Urban Development and their Implications for Policy and Planning. In S. Fainstein and C. Campbell (eds.), *Readings in Urban Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1–17.

Fainstein, S., Gordon, I., and Harloe, M. 1992: *Divided Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Featherstone, M. 1991: *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage.

Glendinning, C. 1991: Dependency and interdependency: the incomes of informal carers and the impact of social security. *Journal of Social Policy*, 19, 469–97.

Glucksmann, M. 1990: *Women Assemble*. London: Routledge.

Gorz, A. 1989: *Critique of Economic Reason*. London: Verso.

Green, A. 1994: *The Geography of Poverty and Wealth*. University of Warwick: Institute for Employment Research.

Green, A. 1997: Income and wealth. In M. Pacione (ed.), *Britian's Cities: Geographies of Division in Urban Britain*. London: Routledge, 179–202.

Gregson, N. and Lowe, M. 1994: *Servicing the Middle Classes: Class, Gender and Waged Domestic Work in Contemporary Britain*. London: Routledge.

Hakim, C. 1993: The myth of rising female employment. *Work, Employment and Society*, 7, 97–120.

Hanson, S. and Pratt, G. 1995: *Gender, Work and Space*. London: Routledge.

Harrop, A. and Moss, P. 1995: Trends in parental employment. *Work, Employment and Society*, 9, 421–44.

Harvey, D. 1989: *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Harvey, D. 1996: *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hills, J. and Mullings, B. 1991: Housing: A decent home for all at a price within their means? In J. Hills (ed.), *The State of Welfare: The Welfare State in Britain Since 1974*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 135–205.

Hutton, S. 1994: Men's and women's incomes: evidence from survey data. *Journal of Social Policy*, 23, 21–40.

Jager, M. 1986: Class definition and the aesthetics of gentrification: Victoriana in Melbourne. In N. Smith and P. Williams (eds.), *Gentrification of the City*. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 78–91.

Jameson, F. 1991: *Postmodernism Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London: Verso.

Jordan, B. 1994: *A Theory of Poverty and Social Exclusion*. Oxford: Polity.

Jordan, B., James, S., Kay, H., and Redley, M. 1992: *Trapped in Poverty? Labour Market Decisions in Low Income Families*. London: Routledge.

Jordan, B. and Redley, M. 1994: Polarization, underclass and the welfare state. *Work, Employment and Society*, 8, 153–76.

Kay, F. and Hagan, J. 1995: The persistent glass ceiling: gendered inequalities in the earnings of lawyers. *British Journal of Sociology*, 46, 279–310.

King, A. D. 1990: *Global Cities: Post-Imperialism and the Internationalization of London*. London: Routledge.

Lees, L. 1994: Rethinking gentrification: beyond the positions of economics or culture. *Progress in Human Geography*, 18, 137–50.

Ley, D. 1994: Gentrification and the politics of the new middle class. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 12, 53–74.

Ley, D. and Mills, C. 1993: Can there be a postmodernism of resistance in the urban landscape? In P. Knox (ed.), *The Restless Urban Landscape*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 255–78.

Lindley, R. (ed.) 1994: *Labour Market Structures and Prospects for Women*. Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission.

Lovering, J. 1997: Global restructuring and local impact. In M. Pacione (ed.) *Britain's Cities: Geographies of Division in Urban Britain*. London: Routledge, 63–87.

Mackenzie, S. 1984: Editorial introduction to special issue on women and environment. *Antipode*, 6, 3–10.

Mackenzie, S. and Rose, D. 1983: Industrial change, the domestic economy and home life. In J. Anderson, S. Duncan and R. Hudson (eds.), *Redundant Spaces in Cities and Regions*. London: Academic Press, 155–200.

Marcuse, P. 1993: What's so new about divided cities? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 17, 355–65.

Marsh, M. 1990: *Suburban Lives*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Marsh, M. 1994: (Ms)reading the suburbs. *American Quarterly*, 46, 40–8.

Marshall, B. 1994: *Engendering Modernity: Feminism, Social Theory and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.

Massey, D. 1984: *Spatial Divisions of Labour: Social Structures and the Geography of Production*. London: Macmillan.

Massey, D. and Allen, J. 1995: High-tech places: poverty in the midst of growth. In C. Philo (ed.), *Off the Map: The Social Geography of Poverty in the UK*. London: Child Poverty Action Group, 123–32.

McDowell, L. 1983: Towards an understanding of the gender division of urban space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 1, 59–72.

McDowell, L. 1991: Life without father and Ford: the new gender order of post-Fordism. *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers*, 16, 400–19.

McDowell, L. 1995: Body work: Heterosexual gender performances in City workplaces. In D. Bell and G. Valentine (eds.), *Mapping Desire*. London: Routledge, 75–98.

McDowell, L. and Court, G. 1994: Missing subjects: gender, power and sexuality in merchant banking. *Economic Geography*, 70, 229–49.

McGregor, A. and McConnachie, M. 1995: Social exclusion, urban regeneration and economic reintegration. *Urban Studies*, 32, 1587–1600.

McLaughlin, E. 1994: Employment, unemployment and social security. In A. Glyn and D. Miliband (eds.), *Paying for Inequality*. London: IPPR/River Oram Press, 145–59.

Mills, C. 1988: "Life on the upslope": the postmodern landscape of gentrification. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 6, 169–89.

Morris, L. 1987: Constraints on gender. *Work, Employment and Society*, 1, 85–106.

Morris, L. 1994: Informal aspects of social divisions. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 18, 112–26.

Mort, F. 1996: *Cultures of Consumption*. London and New York: Routledge.

O'Brien, M. 1995: Allocation of resources within the household: children's perspectives. *The Sociological Review*, 43, 501–17.

O'Reilly, J. and Fagan, C. (eds.) 1998: Part-time prospects: An International Comparison of Part-time Work in Europe, North America and the Pacific Rim. London: Routledge.

Pateman, C. 1989: *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism and Political Theory*. Cambridge: Polity.

Payne, J. 1987: Does unemployment run in families? *Sociology*, 21, 199–214.

Peck, J. 1996: *Work Place: The Social Regulation of Labour Markets*. New York: Guilford.

Pratt, G. 1991: Feminist analyses of the restructuring of urban life. *Urban Geography*, 12, 594–605.

Pratt, G. and Hanson, S. 1994: Geography and the construction of difference. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 1, 5–29.

Pringle, R. 1989: *Secretaries Talk*. London: Verso.

Ravetz, A. 1996: Revaluations. "The Sphinx in the City." *City*, 1 (2), 155–61.

Rose, D. 1989: A feminist perspective of employment restructuring and gentrification: the case of Montréal. In J. Wolch and M. Dear (eds.), *The Power of Geography*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 118–38.

Rothenberg, T. 1995: "And she told two friends": lesbians creating urban social space. In D. Bell and G. Valentine (eds.), *Mapping Desire*. London and New York: Routledge, 165–81.

Rubery, J. and Fagan. C. 1995: Gender segregation in societal context. *Work, Employment and Society*, 9, 213–40.

Ruddick, S. 1996: Constructing difference in public space: race, class and gender as interlocking systems. *Urban Geography*, 17, 132–51.

Sassen, S. 1991: *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Savage, M., Barlow, J., Dickens, P., and Fielding, A. 1992: *Property, Bureaucracy and Culture: Middle Class Formation in Contemporary Britain*. Andover, Hants: Routledge, Chapman and Hall.

Sayer, A. and Walker, R. 1992: *The New Social Economy: Reworking the Division of Labour*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Scott, A. M. (ed.) 1994: *Gender Segregation and Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sharp, J. P. 1996: Staking a claim to the high ground. *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 112, 181–85.

Smith, N. 1987: Of yuppies and housing: gentrification, social restructuring, and the urban dream. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 5, 151–72.

Smith, N. 1996: *The New Urban Frontier*. London and New York: Routledge.

Soja, E. 1989: *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Social Theory*. London: Verso.

Soja, E. 1996: *Thirdspace*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Valentine, G. 1996: Children should be seen and not heard: the production and trangression of adults' public space. *Urban Geography*, 17, 205–20.

Walby, S. 1997: *Gender Transformation*. London: Routledge.

Ward, C., Dale, A., and Joshi, H. 1996: Combining employment with childcare: An escape from dependence? *Journal of Social Policy*, 25, 223–47.

Ward, H. and Bird, D. 1995: The JUVOS cohort: A longitudinal database of the claimant unemployed. *Employment Gazette*, 103, 345–50.

Warde, A. 1991: Gentrification as consumption: issues of class and gender. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 9, 223–32.

Watson, S. and Gibson, K. 1995: *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wills, J. 1996: Laboring for love? A comment on academics and their hours of work. *Antipode*, 28, 292–303.

Wilson, E. 1991: *The Sphinx in the City*. London: Virago.

Young, I. M. 1990: *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zukin, S. 1982: *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*. London: Century Hutchinson.