



Assumption  
University

## Digital Commons @ Assumption University

---

Economics, Finance and International Business Department Faculty Works      Economics, Finance and International Business Department

---

2021

### Labor and Social Reproduction

Smriti Rao

Assumption University, [srao@assumption.edu](mailto:srao@assumption.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.assumption.edu/economics-faculty>



Part of the [Labor Economics Commons](#), and the [Political Economy Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Rao, Smriti, "Labor and Social Reproduction" (2021). *Economics, Finance and International Business Department Faculty Works*. 10.

<https://digitalcommons.assumption.edu/economics-faculty/10>

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Economics, Finance and International Business Department at Digital Commons @ Assumption University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Economics, Finance and International Business Department Faculty Works by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Assumption University. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@assumption.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@assumption.edu).

Labor and Social Reproduction in Critical Agrarian Studies

By

Smriti Rao

Professor, Economics and Global Studies, Assumption College  
and Resident Scholar, Women's Studies Research Center, Brandeis University.

Chapter for possible inclusion in the Edward Elgar Handbook of Critical Agrarian Studies,  
Haroon Akram-Lodhi, Kristina Dietz, Bettina Engels, Ben McKay, eds.

Abstract

This essay discusses the importance of embedding the concept of social reproduction within critical agrarian studies. I begin by reviewing the debate over the definition of social reproduction and then discuss what we know about the possible specificities of social reproduction in agrarian societies of the global South. I make the argument that societal transformations in the contemporary agrarian South can be usefully understood as the unfolding of the dynamics of social reproduction. If that is the case, a successful politics would have to take those dynamics into account.

## 1. Introduction

Processes of ‘life-making’ (Bhattacharya 2017b) take on an outsized importance for marginalized groups fighting for survival. But while the literature on profit-making is vast, life-making has received less attention from social theorists, particularly when it comes to processes of life-making that are outside the purview of states and markets. This is precisely the space occupied by social reproduction theory (Frederici 2012, Bhattacharya 2017a).

The term social reproduction, as originally formulated by the Physiocrats and then by Marx, referred to the reproduction of the social relations of production as a whole, but emphasized political, cultural and economic processes that originated in the workplace or the public sphere. Indeed, Marx’s definition of the term famously ignored the reproduction of labor power itself (Hartmann 2010). The term has, however, been reclaimed by feminist political economists who are seeking a way to analyze what happens beyond the relatively well-studied worlds of the capitalist workplace or the public political sphere (Fraser 2016). When we examine references to the term ‘labor of social reproduction’ or ‘reproductive labor’, these converge quite quickly and unambiguously upon the forms of labor most often assigned to women - the work of cleaning, cooking, care of dependents, basic health care and education. The ‘social’ in ‘social reproduction’ signals that the concept extends beyond biological reproduction to the many labors required to maintain life once it is produced (Bakker 2003, Luxton and Bezanson 2006).

And so on the one hand we have Marx’s expansive definition of the term social reproduction, which barely addressed the production of labor power itself, and on the other, we have its use by feminist political economists, who tend to highlight precisely the production and maintenance of labor power; not rejecting Marx’s broad definition, but insisting that it begin where life begins (Sehgal 2005). This essay largely employs the latter, narrower definition. This is not just because of the analytical clarity we gain from such a perspective, but also because, as Sylvia Frederici (2012) reminds us, the dissonance between the production of life and production of labor power, which is especially evident within the realm of social reproduction, makes it rich with political possibilities.

The renewed interest in ‘social reproduction’ in the last decade or so is the result of the general resurgence of interest in critiques of capitalism in the post-recession era, combined with a now widespread acknowledgement that gender, alongside race, ethnicity and caste, is a vitally important category of social analysis (Levein et al 2018). This time emergent ‘social reproduction theory’ is able to build on the small base of data and empirical methodologies on time use and ‘invisible’ work developed in the last few decades (Kongar and Connelly 2017). But, as I will argue in this essay, current theorizations of social reproduction, while attuned to issues of race within the global North, and even, to some extent the specificities of patriarchal forms outside the North, are insufficiently attuned to the specificities of capitalism in the global South today (for exceptions see Naidu and Osome 2016 and 2017). And such theorizations can only be termed nascent when it comes to the particulars of agrarian societies in the global South.

In the spirit of critical theory, this essay on labor and social reproduction has two key entry points. Many dominant narratives dismiss the rural, often conflated with the agricultural, as no longer capable of being history making. This essay, like the others in this collection, instead foregrounds agrarian society as the stage upon which some of the key political, economic and cultural conflicts of our time are playing out (Akram-Lodhi and Kay 2010). It defines agrarian societies as those where agriculture is an important, but by no means the only, form of livelihood generation, and where an unresolved agrarian question of labor remains a useful starting point for understand the economy and the polity (Bernstein 1996). It also rejects any telos of transition, assuming nothing about the shape of any resolution of the agrarian question.

As its second entry point, this essay also argues that current theorizations of social reproduction fail to sufficiently address contexts where i) wage labor is one of many forms, rather than the primary form, of livelihood generation; ii) the penetration of both state and the market in the realm of social reproduction is shallow and thus iii) the labor *of* social reproduction is dominated by what is sometimes termed ‘indirect care work’: cooking, cleaning or fetching fuel and water in ways that are less mediated by technology, and highly dependent upon access to the commons<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> This essay is not a review of the gender and development literature, but is narrowly focused on social reproduction, a term that is genealogically closely tied to Marxist-feminist conceptions of the economy.

As Luxton(2006) points out, if social reproduction is not merely to be a fancy name for the list of activities assumed to be performed mostly by women, mostly within the family-household, to reproduce labor power, it must dialectically connect those activities, and their unequal distribution by gender, race, ethnicity and caste, to the wider political economy. Furthermore, the question of social reproduction cannot become a new ‘woman question’, subject to mechanical analysis. Whether and how the labor of social reproduction, alongside the labor of production, is gendered must be an empirical question. Social reproduction crises are crises for men and women, adults and children, and their differential gendered, generational, classed and raced effects are contextually specific and cannot be assumed.

To the extent that work on labor and social reproduction in agrarian contexts is still emergent, the essay discusses the importance of embedding the concept of social reproduction within critical agrarian studies. I begin by reviewing the debate over the definition of social reproduction and then discuss what we know about the possible specificities of social reproduction in agrarian societies of the global South. I make the argument that societal transformations in the contemporary agrarian South may be usefully understood as the unfolding of the dynamics of social reproduction. If that is the case, a successful politics will have to take these dynamics into account.

## 2. The Emergence of Social Reproduction Theory

Our current understanding of social reproduction emerges from three intertwined debates conducted in the 1970s and 80s, and led by Marxist or Socialist Feminists. In her excellent review of these debates, Luxton(2006) terms them the production/reproduction debate, the sex/gender debate and the domestic labor debate, a classification that I follow here.

The production/reproduction debate was an initial attempt to explore the production and maintenance of labor power within the framework of Marxist theory. Marxist-feminists debated whether to conceptualize a separate sphere of reproduction, and if so, whether to characterize it as surplus producing itself, a debate that became increasingly caught up in technical questions about the labor theory of value. In the process it became clear that Marxian theory alone could

not explain why it was women who were often assigned the labor of reproduction, leading to the theorization of a 'mode of patriarchy' that interacted with the 'mode of production' (Hartmann 1977). However, the project of replicating a 'mode'-like analysis of patriarchy proved to be difficult to sustain and eventually, not entirely productive (Rowbotham 1981). This in turn led to the domestic/household labor debate, which examined the labor of reproduction without embedding it any systematic 'mode of patriarchy'.

Participants in the domestic/household labor debate helped us develop an understanding of the gender division of labor as historically specific and mutually constitutive of capitalist processes. But the term 'domestic labor' was, and is, apolitical enough that it could be coopted into liberal or conservative analyses that divorced it from questions of class as well as race or ethnicity. And while using the term 'domestic' does focus attention on the relatively understudied sphere of the household-family, it also allows us to remain there, accepting a particular division between domestic and non-domestic, and documenting what happens within the 'domestic' without going any further.

Both these debates were conducted alongside a third, which revolved around the terms sex and gender, and led to increasingly sophisticated feminist formulations of gender as the social construction of biological difference (Scott 1988). Much of this theorization failed to account for race, ethnicity and the 'third world difference' (Mohanty 2003). But this debate may have had the most widespread, if often problematic, influence. Concepts of gender that emerged from this debate quickly became central to liberal 'lean in' feminism in ways that entirely divorced gender from class (Fraser 2016). And of course we are all familiar with the completely apolitical mainstream use of 'gender' as simply a stand-in for the word 'women' (Luxton 2006). Nevertheless, the fact that it is now relatively uncontroversial, at least in the realm of theory, to state that biological difference does not explain economic, political or cultural power is a critical accomplishment, the importance of which cannot be overstated.

At the intersection of these debates lay the question of the extent to which women's assignment to the sphere of reproduction helped to explain their subordination under capitalism. Peasant societies, which were largely considered to be pre-capitalist, were seen as interesting case studies

of women's status under alternative economic systems. Two features of peasant pre-capitalist societies were considered particularly noteworthy: i) a greater articulation between production and reproduction than under capitalism, with less subordination of the latter and ii) the fact that reproductive activities were not entirely relegated to women (Beneria and Sen 1981). One possible argument was therefore that the development of capitalism in these societies would result in a decrease in women's status, because capitalism tended to push women into an increasingly subordinated reproductive sphere (Deere 1976). On the other hand, there was also a tendency for the debates within Northern feminism to be inflected with orientalism. The realm of reproduction, considered to be relatively dominant in peasant societies, was cast as the primary site of 'tradition' and was thus often assumed to be particularly oppressive to women. This then meant that women's condition could be improved by the expansion of the productive, capitalist sphere, and of course the interventions of western feminism itself (Mohanty 2003).

Empirical work in the agrarian south made it clear, however, that the development of capitalism had contradictory effects for women - in some cases enhancing women's status, and in others reducing it (Mies 1982, Hart 1995, Kapadia 1995). Furthermore, feminists argued that the development (or not) of capitalism intersected in contextually specific ways with "household relations", forms of family-household and kinship systems that shaped gender divisions of labor constitutively with changes in the forces and relations of production (Deere 1990). Empirical work in the agrarian south showed that the household took different forms in different contexts, often varying significantly from the male-headed, nuclear family assumed in the North (Hart 1995, Razavi 2009, Ruwanpura 2006). This work challenged assumptions about public-private divides, and pointed out that in some contexts reproductive work was better understood as the responsibility of the community or neighborhood rather than the family unit (Katz 2001). Changes in the form and extent of reproductive labor could not therefore be understood by merely looking 'within' the household. This work also pointed out that the agrarian question, in so far as it examined the persistence of the peasantry, *was* a question of social reproduction and could not be understood by merely examining the 'productive' sphere (Deere 1995).

The explicitly Marxist-feminist orientation of these debates in the 1970s and 80s faded as both feminism and social theory more generally turned away from Marxism. But the debates

influenced later feminist work on time use, 'double burdens' and time poverty which echoed themes that emerged in these earlier debates, without using the language of social reproduction, or directly linking questions of 'time poverty' to capitalist accumulation processes. On the one hand, the methodologies developed to generate time use data return labor time to the center of the analysis in ways that align with Marxist approaches, while allowing us to recognize and analyze the role of un-commodified labor. On the other hand, most time use data is currently analyzed within theoretical frameworks that do not consider questions of class. The central problematic presented in such analyses is that the burden of unpaid/unwaged/domestic work reduces the well-being of the women (or, more rarely, men) who perform such labor, either because such burdens prevent them from more fully participating in the labor force, or because participating in the labor-force prevents them from fully performing or enjoying reproductive labor.

The goal of 'reducing, redistributing and recognizing' reproductive work is thus aimed at improving the well-being of those who perform such work, by emphasizing its widespread benefits (Elson 2008). Increased state subsidies for social reproduction, funded by higher taxes on the wealthy, are usually called for in order to achieve this goal. These demands are clearly consequential, as more extensive subsidies for social reproduction would improve the lives of millions of women, men and children in very concrete ways. But to a large extent these are demands for the redistribution of existing surplus within capitalism, without an explicit critique of the economic system that provides the context for reproductive labor. Feminist political economists looking back at the last four decades may conclude that our difficulties achieving either the redistribution or the reduction of such labor for all but the most privileged women suggests that we have, as Beneria et al (2015) point out, not one problem here, but at least two, a framing that is much more embedded in the genealogy of the term social reproduction.

The residues of those early debates can also be found in the mainstream policy argument that directing social welfare programs toward women will result in the more efficient transformation of welfare/aid money into health or education outcomes. This latter approach has often had a profoundly conservative bias, reifying both a particular gender division of labor as well as existing capitalist structures of accumulation (Razavi 2009, Beneria et al 2015). In a neo-liberal



context, this placed the responsibility for economic development upon women, while providing them with very little by way of resources to accomplish these daunting goals (Bakker 2003). As we seek to re-theorize social reproduction today, this inadvertent reification of existing structures of inequality remains a danger. One of the most complex acts of navigation for those us who wish to ‘recognize’ the role that the labor of social reproduction plays in production, accumulation and politics, is to avoid romanticizing that labor or suggesting that the links between women’s work and the labor of social reproduction are anything but historically contingent and entirely mutable (Razavi 2009).

### 3. Social reproduction in the context of wage labor

Social reproduction as it is being re-theorized today highlights the mutually constitutive articulation between reproductive labor and processes of surplus generation and appropriation, but largely does so in the context of the wage labor-capital relationship (Bhattachary 2017a). The primary link between these processes, as articulated in this literature, is that the labor of social reproduction converts wage income, via the commodity inputs purchased with that wage income, into use values that produce and maintain labor power, which in turn becomes an input back into the production of surplus (Bhattacharya 2017b, Quick 2004). The unresolvable contradiction at the heart of capitalism is then that as capital strives to minimize the wage paid to workers (in order to maximize the rate of exploitation), it can create not just crises of realization, but crises of reproduction as well, as the quality, and at an extreme, quantity, of the workers produced is reduced (Fraser 2013). If we take the dialectical relationship between these processes seriously, changes in “household relations” – shifts in marriage and childbearing practices, or in household structures– can in turn create crises for capital by setting in motion similar reductions in the quality and quantity of labor power produced and maintained. Unlike some of the early theorizations of reproduction or domestic labor, the diversity of household forms even amongst the professional classes in the global North, not to mention amongst its working classes, has led to a greater acknowledgment of variations in gender divisions of labor, and less automatic conflation between the work of women and reproductive labor.

The debate over whether or not such labor of social reproduction is itself productive of surplus value appears to have subsided. An examination of advanced capitalist countries today shows

that a part of such labor can indeed be subsumed by capital, as the proliferation of home cleaning companies, day care centers and elder care centers would seem to suggest, and thus turn into paid, surplus producing wage labor of the kind performed (mostly by women) in such spaces. Reproductive labor can also be replaced by commodity form substitutes, such as prepared food, or by state provisioning such as in the case of state provided health and education services in at least some parts of the North (Bezanson and Luxton 2006).

But there is also an assumption that capitalism will never fully subsume the sphere of social reproduction (Fraser 2013, Beneria et al 2015). Most feminist political economists today begin from the observation that forms of capitalism and patriarchy can coexist quite comfortably, and while this co-existence can include differing degrees of subsumption of the labor of social reproduction to capital, this subsumption is always incomplete. To the extent that some portion of this labor always remains unpaid and outside the circuits of capital, the literature is interested in examining how, when and why the subsidy to capital provided by this unpaid component of reproductive labor varies, and how that reshapes both capitalism and patriarchy. The neo-liberal revolution in advanced capitalist countries, for example, is thus seen as a successful attempt to shift these processes away from state and capital and back into the household-family (Bakker 2003).

This theorization of social reproduction is explicitly political, in that it aims to reclaim the sphere of social reproduction as a site from which working class struggles can be launched. Rather than organizing workers only through trade unions, at work sites, and over wages and work days, social reproduction theorists point to successful struggles in the US and Europe launched from homes and communities and mobilizing protesters around social reproduction issues of education, health care and the social safety net, but this time without the racialized and gendered exclusions of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century movements around these issues (Frederici 2012). Social reproduction theorists demand not only the redistribution of surplus toward social reproduction, but also an end to exploitation (read as the capitalist-wage labor relationship), as well as gender and race based oppressions (Bhattacharya 2017b).

#### 4. Social reproduction in the agrarian south

#### 4.1 Social reproduction, production and accumulation

I would argue that this new formulation of social reproduction remains insufficiently attuned to contexts in the global South, primarily because it assumes the institutional context of advanced capitalism, which in turn has at its center the wage labor-capital relationship.

As is now widely documented, the livelihood generation strategies of a majority of workers in the developing world do not resemble the “proper job” of the salaried wage worker (Ferguson and Li 2018). They are instead engaged in non-standard, informal work- a mixture of petty commodity production and spells of wage labor, often requiring intermittent migration both spatially from place to place, but also terms of industry/occupation, as the same worker moves from agriculture to construction or petty trade (Bremner 2010, Scully 2016). While some of these livelihood strategies are directly tied to land, the peasant household that derives most of its income from agriculture is also no longer the dominant empirical reality in the agrarian South.

Thus while the primary link between reproductive labor and surplus production and appropriation in the North may be the conversion of wage income into use values that reproduce the labor force, in the agrarian South there may be a substantial component of reproductive labor that consists of unpaid labor converting ‘free’ inputs from nature into use values for reproduction. Commodity inputs/substitutes and household technology may play a smaller role (Razavi 2007). These are also contexts in which state provisioning was rarely a viable alternative to family-household based social reproduction even before the onset of neo-liberalism/structural adjustment (Sehgal 2005, Scully 2016).

The relative absence of technology, and of state-provided or commodity form inputs/substitutes means more time spent on labor intensive, physically strenuous forms of cooking, cleaning, washing, gathering of fuel, water or firewood, with care work necessarily taking a back seat (Razavi 2007). An important implication is that such reproductive work would also be much more dependent upon land, and upon access to commons of various kinds, making it less mobile and much more rooted in place (Naidu and Osofsky 2016). This would also make it much more vulnerable to the threat of climate change. Refusing to give up land, and resisting full

proletarianization, may thus be a reproductive than an accumulative strategy for rural households (Zhan and Scully 2018).

Last but not least, the labor power thus reproduced has a much more uncertain destiny. It is more likely to be formally rather than really subsumed by capital (Banaji 2013), and more likely to become part of a pool of relative surplus labor than to have a “proper job” or “proper business” (Ferguson and Li 2018). To the extent that signals from capital have any effect upon the forms of cultural production that occur as part of social reproduction, these signals are ambiguous at best in such contexts.

The temporal and spatial instability of increasingly diverse livelihood strategies thus creates very sharp contradictions between potentially surplus generating activities and social reproduction (Rao and Vakulabharanam 2018). Reproductive labor may intensify as neither real nor formal subsumption to capital can cover the costs of reproduction. During the industrial revolution the working day for children and adults, male and female, was often so long that the reproductive labors of cooking, cleaning or care work were reduced to their barest minimum (Berg 1992). We may find households in the global South likewise going through phases when the difficulties of temporally and spatially reconciling the labor of reproduction with the demands of petty production/wage reduce the former to a minimum, or force some members of the household to withdraw from the latter (Naidu and Oosome 2017). The same household may go through phases where reproductive work increases, and where it decreases, both in the context of insufficiency.

These spatial and temporal disjunctures can in turn enhance contradictions between class and gender. Gendered and generational divisions of labor may harden as it becomes increasingly impossible to combine productive and reproductive work, and the latter becomes the realm of women, or of the elderly (Jacka 2012); or as dowries, or bride-price, are used as a way to access otherwise scarce investible funds (Kapadia 2017). When the promise of male breadwinning cannot be kept, this can generate struggles within household relations that in turn lead to their dissolution and restructuring, and their failure to reproduce themselves (Ferguson 2015). Household relations may be transformed as a consequence of new livelihood strategies, as de-facto female-headed households and female farmers emerge as a result of male outmigration, and

those relations do not quite return to ‘normal’ when the spell of migration ends; or as women out-migrate and become primary breadwinners in contexts where this situation strains dominant gender ideologies (O’Laughlin 2008, Ramnarain 2016, Gidwani and Ramamurthy 2018).

There is clearly no telos here, but here is a tentative hypothesis that may be advanced. If Bernstein is correct in arguing that the agrarian question of capital has largely been bypassed in the age of globalized, financialized capital, then the dynamics of accumulation may play an increasingly small role in explaining or helping us to understand the lives of the majority of those living in the agrarian South. Instead what propels changes in their economic activities are the dynamics of reproduction, which draw upon household as well as class relations, commodified as well as non-commodified forms of labor, and the commons as much as private property. We may not find significant class differentiation, but rather significant livelihood diversification (O’Laughlin 1996), and from a political perspective it may be that the labors of social reproduction provide the unifying common ground for an otherwise fragmented working class.

#### 4.2 Social reproduction and politics in the agrarian south

As with other marginalized groups, peasant struggles have been first and foremost about survival and thus framed in what Marxist-feminists would recognize as a language of reproduction first. The empirical realities of this survival have changed with the adoption of more diverse forms of income generation, the continuing if less complete dependence on smaller plots of land, more limited access to the commons, and the new threat of climate change. The struggle may no longer be primarily about holding onto land, or for land reforms, although those may remain significant issues (O’Laughlin 2008). Unlike in the North, the struggle may not primarily be about eliminating wage labor per se, but rather against the extraction of surplus by capital in a variety of more nebulous and more indirect forms (Banaji 2013). It may be over access to the commons but require fighting against forms of dispossession that involve state and corporate power in new ways (Levein 2018).

As Katz (2001) points out, the realm of social reproduction is tricky terrain for politics. First, the imperative of ensuring the survival of our loved ones may be all-consuming in ways that numb the power and energy to resist. Second, the very fact that social reproduction implicates the

intimate sphere of households and families can make it very difficult to organize around the issue of reproductive labor. The difficulties feminist movements have had when they try to organize around issues of intra-household inequality are well-documented (Kapadia 2017, Rao 2018). Insofar as social reproduction is about reproducing existing, often problematic, social relations, it can be at odds with a project of radical transformation. These difficulties are compounded by the fact that the labors of social reproduction, as discussed above, are often organized across clear boundaries of family-household. There is no workplace site where workers can be easily found, and reproductive labor may be spatially dispersed across entire neighborhoods or communities. The “everywhere of social reproduction can quickly turn into a nowhere” from the perspective of organizing (Katz 2001).

But if we believe that livelihood strategies in agrarian societies are driven by the dynamics of social reproduction, a politics that does not understand or respond to those dynamics would not be very fruitful. As pointed out by O’Laughlin (2008) such a politics would have to recognize claims based on class exploitation and but also the non-class oppressions that shape household relations, and which are rooted in gender, as well as race or caste. It would have to adjust to a context where exploitation occurs not just through the wage-capital relationship, and where claims can be based upon participation in un-commodified labor. In short, it would have to legitimize “forms of political agency, however, transient or fragmentary- that have been illegitimized by formal politics” (O’Laughlin 2008, 213).

## 5. Conclusion

This essay proposes that social reproduction theory may be a particularly useful way to examine the dynamics of agrarian societies in the global South. This is not just because it may better explain the unexpected (from the perspective of classical theories both Marxian and Liberal) trajectories of agrarian societies in their survivals, as well their transformations. But this is also because the realm of social reproduction can provide a model, even if flawed, of mutuality and solidarity that is hard to find elsewhere in capitalist society (Charusheela 2010). This is a realm within which the discursive and material power of productivity, of commodified contributions, and of competition are blunted by claim-making based upon belonging. Feminists have extensively documented the ways that these spaces can be suffused with inequality and violence,

but, as the Marxist-feminist re-theorization of social reproduction indicates, feminists have also not given up hope that those spaces can be remade as more inclusive and egalitarian, and that from such spaces can emerge a better vision of a better world.

### **Key texts**

Deere, Carmen Diana. 1990. *Household and Class Relations: Peasants and Landlords in Northern Peru*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

O’Laughlin, B. 2008. Gender justice, land and the agrarian question in southern Africa. In: H. Akram-Lodhi and C. Kay, eds. *Peasants and globalization: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question*. London: Routledge, pp. 190–213.

Razavi, S., 2009. Engendering the political economy of agrarian change. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(1), pp.197-226.

Frederici, S., 2012. *Revolution at Point Zero*. San Francisco, CA: PM Press.

Bhattacharya, T. ed., 2017a. *Social reproduction theory: Remapping class, recentering oppression*. Pluto Press.

### **Additional References**

Akram-Lodhi, A.H. and Kay, C., 2010. Surveying the agrarian question (part 2): current debates and beyond. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(2), pp.255-284.

Bakker, I. 2003. Neo-liberal governance and the reprivatization of social reproduction: Social provisioning and shifting gender orders. In *Power, production and social reproduction* (pp. 66-82). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Banaji, J. 2013. *Theory as History: Essays on Modes of Production and Exploitation*, Delhi: Aakar Books.

Beneria, L., Berik, G. and Floro, M., 2015. *Gender, development and globalization: economics as if all people mattered*. Routledge.

Beneria, Lourdes and Gita Sen. (1981). Accumulation, Reproduction and Women’s Role in Development: Boserup Revisited, in E. Leacock and H. Safa (eds.), *Women’s Work*, pp 141-157. Massachusetts: Begin and Garvey.

Berg M. 1992. Women's Work and the Industrial Revolution. In: Digby A., Feinstein C., Jenkins D. (eds) *New Directions in Economic and Social History*. London: Palgrave.

Bernstein, Henry, 1996. Agrarian Questions Then and Now. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 24 (1): 22–59

Bhattacharya, T. ed., 2017a. *Social reproduction theory: Remapping class, recentring oppression*. Pluto Press.

Bhattacharya, T., 2017b. Introduction: mapping social reproduction theory. *Social reproduction theory: remapping class, recentring oppression*. Pluto Press, London.

Breman, J., 2010. *Outcast Labour in Asia: Circulation and Informalization of the Workforce at the Bottom of the Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Charusheela, S., 2010. Engendering feudalism: Modes of production revisited. *Rethinking Marxism*, 22(3), pp.438-445.

Deere, Carmen Diana. (1990). *Household and Class Relations: Peasants and Landlords in Northern Peru*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Deere, C.D. 1995. What difference does gender make? Rethinking peasant studies. *Feminist Economics*, 1(1), 53–72.

Elson, D., 2008. The three R's of unpaid work: Recognition, reduction and redistribution. Presentation in Expert Group Meeting on Unpaid Work, Economic Development and Human Well-being, UNDP, New York. Mimeo.

Ferguson, J., 2015. *Give a man a fish: Reflections on the new politics of distribution*. Duke University Press.

Ferguson, J. and Li, T.M. (2018) 'Beyond the "Proper Job:" Political-economic Analysis after the Century of Labouring Man', *Working Paper 51*. PLAAS, UWC: Cape Town.

Fraser, N., 2013. *Fortunes of feminism: From state-managed capitalism to neoliberal crisis*. Verso Books.

Fraser, N., 2016. Capitalism's Crisis of Care. *Dissent*, 63(4), pp.30-37.

Frederici, S., 2012. *Revolution at Point Zero*. San Francisco, CA: PM Press.

Gidwani, V. and P. Ramamurthy. 2018. Agrarian questions of labor in urban India: middle migrants, translocal householding and the intersectional politics of social reproduction. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 45:5-6, pages 994-1017.



Hart, Gillian. 1995. "Gender and Household Dynamics", in M.G. Quibria (ed.), *Critical Issues in Asian Development*, pp 39-74. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hartmann, H., 2010. The unhappy marriage of Marxism and feminism: Towards a more progressive union. In *Marx Today* (pp. 201-228). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Jacka, T., 2012. Migration, householding and the well-being of left-behind women in rural Ningxia. *The China Journal*, (67), pp.1-22.

Kapadia, Karin. (1995). *Siva and Her Sisters*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Kapadia, K. 2017. "Introduction: We ask you to rethink: Different Dalit women and their subaltern politics." in Anandhi, S., and K., Kapadia. (Eds.). *Dalit Women: Vanguard of an Alternative Politics in India*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Katz, C., 2001. Vagabond capitalism and the necessity of social reproduction. *Antipode*, 33(4), pp.709-728.

Kongar, E. and R Connelly. 2017. Introduction. In Kongar, E. and R Connelly, eds. *Gender and Time Use in a Global Context*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Levien, M., 2018. *Dispossession Without Development: Land Grabs in Neoliberal India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Levien, M., M. Watts & Y. Hairong (2018) Agrarian Marxism, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 45:5-6, 853-883, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2018.1534101

Luxton, M. and Bezanson, K. eds., 2006. *Social reproduction: Feminist political economy challenges neo-liberalism*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.

Luxton, M., 2006. Feminist political economy in Canada and the politics of social reproduction. in Luxton, M. and Bezanson, K. eds. *Social reproduction: Feminist political economy challenges neo-liberalism*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP. pp.11-44.

Mies, M. 1982. *The Lace Makers of Narsapur: Indian Housewives Produce for the World Market*. London: Zed Press.

Mohanty, C.T., 2003. "Under western eyes" revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles. *Signs: Journal of Women in culture and Society*, 28(2), pp.499-535.

Naidu, S.C. and Ossome, L., 2016. Social reproduction and the agrarian question of women's labor in India. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy*, 5(1), pp.50-76.

Naidu, S.C. and Ossome, L., 2017. Work, Gender, and Immiseration in South Africa and India. *Review of Radical Political Economics*,

- O'Laughlin, B., 1996. Through a divided glass: dualism, class and the agrarian question in Mozambique. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 23(4), pp.1-39.
- O'Laughlin, B. 2008. Gender justice, land and the agrarian question in southern Africa. In: H. Akram-Lodhi and C. Kay, eds. *Peasants and globalization: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question*. London: Routledge, pp. 190–213.
- Quick, P., 2004. Subsistence wages and household production: Clearing the way for an analysis of class and gender. *Review of radical political economics*, 36(1), pp.20-36.
- Rao, N., 2018. Global Agendas, Local Norms: Mobilizing around Unpaid Care and Domestic Work in Asia. *Development and Change*, 49(3), pp.735-758.
- Ramnarain, S., 2016. Unpacking widow headship and agency in post-conflict Nepal. *Feminist Economics*, 22(1), pp.80-105.
- Rao, S. and V. Vakulabharanam. 2018. Migration, Crises and Social Transformation in India after the 1990s. in *Handbook of Migration Crises*, Eds. Cecilia Menjivar, Marie Ruiz, Immanuel Ness. Oxford University Press.
- Razavi, S. 2007. The political and social economy of care in a development context: Conceptual issues, research questions and policy options. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Working paper 3.
- Razavi, S., 2009. Engendering the political economy of agrarian change. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(1), pp.197-226.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. 1981. "The Trouble with Patriarchy", in R. Samuel (ed.), *People's History and Socialist Theory*, pp 364-370. London: Routledge.
- Ruwanpura, K.N., 2006. *Matrilineal communities, patriarchal realities: a feminist Nirvana uncovered*. Zubaan.
- Scott, Joan. 1988. Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis. *American Historical Review*. 91(5), 1053-1075.
- Scully, B., 2016. Precarity north and south: A southern critique of guy standing. *Global Labour Journal*, 7(2), pp.160-173.
- Sehgal, R., 2005. Social reproduction of third world labour in the era of globalization: State, market and the household. *Economic and Political Weekly* 40(22), pp.2286-2294.
- Zhan, S. and Scully, B., 2018. From South Africa to China: land, migrant labor and the semi-proletarian thesis revisited. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 45(5-6), pp.1018-1038.