Feminist Economics 18(3), July 2012, 1–24

WHO'S THE BOSS? THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF UNPAID CARE WORK AND FOOD SHARING IN BROOKLYN, USA

Tamara Mose Brown

ABSTRACT

Over the last two decades, scholars have situated paid and unpaid care work as an important component in the US economic infrastructure. Until recently, scholars have neglected to address the sociological significance of the cooking and sharing of food ("foodways") as part of the productive unpaid work of caregivers. This article details the lives of West Indian childcare providers in Brooklyn, New York and places their experiences in the context of economic structures. The study shows how childcare providers share food with their charges to establish forms of control and resist the subordination inherent in childcare work. By studying the unpaid care work of food sharing through participant observation and interviews during 2004–7, this research reveals blurred boundaries between reproductive and productive work. It also analyzes how childcare providers resist and momentarily invert the hierarchy of employer households, shaping their workdays beyond the responsibilities of taking care of children.

KEYWORDS

Caregiving, childcare, domestic workers, foodways, employment, feminist economics

JEL Codes: D13

INTRODUCTION

In the mid 2000s among the three- to four-story brownstone houses in the neighborhoods of gentrified Brooklyn, New York, commercial streets boast Italian restaurants, trendy boutiques, and Catholic churches. The population in these neighborhoods changes from the weekends, when mostly upper-middle-class, white parents can be seen caring for their children or walking the commercial strips, to the weekdays, when paid childcare providers move between the homes of their employers and the public spaces of the neighborhood in which they work. The work of a childcare provider who resides outside of the employer's home is primarily

Feminist Economics ISSN 1354-5701 print/ISSN 1466-4372 online © 2012 IAFFE
http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2012.704148

to care for children in all aspects, including but not limited to: feeding, reading stories, taking the child to lessons or school two to three days a week, ensuring the safety of the child at all times, and engaging the child with the larger community through play in public spaces or participating in playdates.[1] Molly, a black Guyanese childcare provider in her early 60s who at one time did trading for her homeland's government while raising her seven children, is one of the main participants in a community of West Indian childcare providers.[2] Molly enjoys her community of sitters with whom she congregates everyday at the public parks and does not want to leave it, especially because she is known for cooking West Indian food for them. As she explained in one of our interviews, "It makes me feel good that I could make something and I could share it and they enjoy it," and, she also told me, "I love to share... I would like to think that they think of home." This community where food sharing is common practice also impacts how providers and the children for whom they care share food. Childcare providers like Molly will often cook food at their home and bring enough to the park or to an employer's home to share with other providers. Only on rare occasions would a provider cook food at an employer's home. While Molly insists that she does not feed West Indian food to the child she cares for (it is unclear whether she is allowed to), she prides herself on the fact that whenever the food is around, the child often wants to eat off of Molly's plate.

Molly, along with the other twenty-four childcare providers I came to know, discussed how cooking West Indian food and sharing it with a community is a source of ethnic pride. After three years of fieldwork, I noticed that food sharing was also a form of resistance to the hierarchy within the private households of employers.[3] The paradox is that this resistance (the sharing of food with the children under care or with employers) is in fact unpaid productive work that further exploits the worker's noncontractual obligation while at the same time expropriating a worker's skills to the benefit of the employer.[4]

This paper contributes to our understanding of how food and the experience of foodways, the routinized and regulated aspects of the sensory and social food experience, become representations of socialized self-exploitation. It places the cultural disparities between childcare providers from the Caribbean and purchasers of care services in the US at the forefront of this discussion. This study also shows how West Indian women are affected by the unpaid care work they perform. According to the participants of this study, because of the nostalgia of eating West Indian food, sharing it with others, especially children, is an expression of love.

Sociologist Paula England (2005) outlines five frameworks that appeared routinely as themes in her review of care work literature that speak directly to how unpaid care work is commodified. While all of the frameworks England outlines offer differing analyses, many of them overlap as they are

used to conceptualize the care work being done in the US. The two frameworks I use for the purposes of this study are "prisoner of love," a term coined by Nancy Folbre (2001: 40), and "commodification of emotions," as defined by England (2005: 382). I use the other frameworks – "devaluation," "love and money," and "public good" (England 2005) – peripherally to outline the obvious questions of how care work is devalued as women's work and to discuss the benefits to care work markets that devalue this work in the First World.[5] These theories of care work further highlight the tensions West Indian providers endure between altruism, love, and money, even if only symbolically.

The body of research on the prisoner of love framework states that care work has distinct parts. One part is about the labor itself or meeting some labor standard. The second part, which is more intrinsically or emotionally motivated, results in providers continuing to work even if they are not paid well because they are prisoners of love (Emily K. Abel and Margaret K. Nelson 1990; Francesca M. Cancian and Stacey J. Oliker 2000; Deborah Stone 2000; England 2005). This burgeoning literature suggests that if this emotional work were recognized as valuable, then care workers would have better chances to mobilize as a group for higher wages (Julie A. Nelson and Paula England 2002). However, others argue that the public good motive flourishes precisely because there is no public recognition of the value of the work (Cameron Lynne Macdonald and David A. Merrill 2002).

In the prisoner of love framework, childcare providers have difficulty bargaining for better wages because they love the child or children for whom they care and cannot easily commodify their emotions (Folbre 2001). I use the prisoner of love framework to detail how West Indian childcare providers offer food to their employers and the children they care for out of a socialized intrinsic motivation that goes unrewarded monetarily. I use the commodification of emotions framework to show how childcare providers are made to use the intimacy of cooking and food preparation as a service to employers. I follow England's (2005) approach to explore how motherhood and food are commodified in care work and how these women create what I call a "social food space." In this social food space, these women attempt to decommodify understandings of their own care work while creating an intimacy that blurs the lines between productive and reproductive work. This study builds on England's frameworks and those of other scholars of care work to develop a feminist critique of domestic workers who experience forced intimacy in alienating private spaces that ultimately results in the undervaluing of care labor (Judith Rollins 1985; Nancy Folbre 1995; Julia Wrigley 1995, 1999; Susan Himmelweit 2000; Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Joan C. Tronto 2002).

By looking at how provision of food is used to assert the role of the childcare provider in the household, this study shows how food and

cooking become symbols of power that can challenge the private sphere inequalities found in other studies (Rollins 1985; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Rhacel Salazar Parreñas 2001). Hondagneu-Sotelo (2001) finds that food traditions are indicators of social interaction among Latina domestic workers on the West Coast of the US. Pei-Chia Lan (2006) describes how food sharing created community among Southeast Asian domestic workers, specifically in Taiwan. While much of this literature focuses on the periphery (meaning parts of South America, Asia, and Africa) where reliance on domestic workers is widespread and the class distinctions and inequality between domestic worker and employer are prominent, these class distinctions are not specific to periphery nations. It is important to examine the relationships considered in this literature in the context of core countries, such as the US. This perspective of the periphery and the core nations has been theorized by world-systems scholars as a way to understand how dominant nations (core) extract labor and resources from the subordinated nations (periphery). The exploitation of emotions of care workers by employers continues in urban centers across the core countries such as the US and, more specifically, in Brooklyn, New York. Recent studies of care work, including childcare and healthcare work, demonstrate that there are direct benefits to parents and the public built into these forms of work that are not reflected in the low wages of care workers (Paula England and Nancy Folbre 1999, 2002). The benefits of childcare include an indirect – and, some might argue, direct – contribution to the child's later social capital (England and Folbre 2002), or "social chits" as Alejandro Portes (1998) terms it, referring to the exchange of one type of currency and repayment in another. The social exchange in this case is the exchange of caregiving at low wages and repayment in the form of a child who grows up to be a contributing citizen with human capital or capabilities that serve the general public.

This article offers the first in situ investigation of how West Indian childcare providers in the US narrate and enact their nonpaid foodways while performing their duties throughout the workweek as part of a community of West Indian childcare providers. Following an overview of relevant research on the intersections of domestic work and foodways, I document how food is used to resist the hierarchies of class and invisibility through a pan-ethnic identity that is shared with children. I then discuss the social context of food sharing among West Indian childcare providers to show how communities are maintained. I also shed light on the difficulties in maintaining West Indian foodways in the private spaces of the employer.

INTERSECTIONS OF DOMESTIC WORK

The intersections of race, gender, and class create unique characteristics and consequences for domestic workers. Domestic childcare is uniquely

distinguished from other forms of paid childcare because it typically involves an employer–employee relationship between women that results in isolation for the employee.[6] Rollins (1985) finds in domestic work done by African-American women home cleaners for white women employers in Boston that the employer–employee relationship is marked by forms of subservience and "maternalism" from the employer side and "spatial deference" on the domestic-worker side that results from limitations regarding the use of household space. The spatial deference domestic workers exhibit toward their employers mirrors historical patterns in the 1950s–60s patriarchal household of the US, in which men earned the primary income while women's contribution to the household was seen as secondary. In the case of the patriarchal household, women were not considered owners of the household space since they were not the primary earners. Similarly, domestic workers do not have autonomy over the household spaces they occupy throughout their workday. We begin to see, then, how the relationship of domestic workers and women employers mimics that of the patriarchal father figure and his household. This intrinsically asymmetrical relationship between domestic worker and employer becomes a situation in which the childcare provider knows everything about the intimacies of the family they work for since they are inside the home, perhaps answering calls and sometimes working around documents that reveal personal transactions. Meanwhile the employer knows almost nothing about the provider, since the employer often only sees the provider at the beginning or end of the workday when the transfer of childcare happens.[7] My research looks at spatial isolation in the private sphere (the home), as well as in public places such as parks, to show how domestic workers – specifically, childcare providers – negotiate their daily work in the context of this patriarchal relationship.

Rollins (1985) describes the patriarchal relationship between women employers and their women employees in the private household, where the biological mother of the children being cared for takes on the role of traditional father figure. Bonnie Thornton Dill (1994) observes that it is this relationship between the two women that makes the employer–employee relationship unique from other types of work. As fewer white, middle-class women assume the full burden of household and childcare work, that work becomes increasingly devalued (Dill 1994; Tracey Warren, Gillian Pascall, and Elizabeth Fox 2010). Dill suggests that the role of the woman employer gains in value even when fathers perform primary caregiving duties alongside a hired childcare provider. She observes that among heterosexual couples who hire domestic workers to care for a child, responsibility for payment of wages, training for the job, supervision, and any necessary discipline of the employee usually remains in the hands of the mother.

Dill (1994) states that during the era of slavery in the US, women slaves tended to mother a young master's wife since she was seen as

inexperienced, thus engendering a stereotype of the domestic worker as omniscient matriarch, and of the master's wife as a dependent child. When contemporary, private household dynamics between women are positioned in this way, the domestic worker rationalizes her subordinate position even as the employer takes advantage of the worker by requesting more "women's work" from her and giving the employee a false sense of empowerment. Again, using this example, the patriarchal household is reinvented in modern societies in that the woman childcare provider and woman employer are positioned in opposition to one another. Exhaustive demands on the childcare provider maintain her subordination much in the same way that gender subordination can be seen under patriarchy.

In addition to allowing for this form of gender oppression, the institution of private childcare contributes in general to the depression of both wages and public esteem for this work to a degree that might be construed as contributing to both racial and class oppression. Endemic social inequality provides families of the middle and upper-middle class with ample opportunity to exploit – albeit respectably – the labor of poorer women of color, many of whom are new immigrants. Such workers, stigmatized by their race and class, are objects of these families' conspicuous consumption under the illusion of partnership in "one big happy family." Wrigley (1995), a US-based sociologist who has written extensively about Caribbean domestic workers in the US, notes that even while workers participate in the illusion of partnership, they are humiliated by constant supervision. As my study shows, this supervision even extends outside the privacy of their employers' homes.[8]

Because the family is the locus of social reproduction and also a component of the public sphere, an overlap exists between what is public and private in the home. By virtue of the very work they perform, domestic workers expose the familial space as a site of capitalist reproduction, rather than as a haven from it. The home itself is a worksite, where multiple interactions dictate the workday structure and the sense of control negotiated between both the employer and employee under the auspices of gender, class, and racial oppression.

Foodways

Foodways – defined as the practices, rules, and rituals that shape the food experience in all its aspects: sensory, social, and communicative – have recently become a topic of great interest in social science.[9] Managing foodways is one avenue through which West Indian childcare providers increase their sense of control throughout a workday that spans from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., since it is a means of temporarily resisting the hierarchical structure established in the homes of their employers.

The concept of foodways has been, until recently, informed by traditional anthropological and folkloric cultural analysis (Claude Lévi-Strauss 1983 [1969]; Richard Wilk 1999; Lucy Long 2004). From the standpoint of sociological or economic analysis, the discussion of food practices has been limited, thereby restricting dialogue on how social groups are reproduced and bounded by space (Doreen B. Massey 1984; Priscilla P. Ferguson and Sharon Zukin 1995; Elaine N. McIntosh 1995; William C. Whit 1995; Alex McIntosh 1996; Paul Rozin 1999). Further, few have researched the relationship between food and care in the context of private and public places (Elaine Bell Kaplan 2000; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Lan 2006). Clearly, this should be of central concern in the attempt to understand food production as gendered work and exploitation, to grasp its patterned meanings, and to demonstrate the role of food in social dynamics as witnessed in rituals of offering, eating, and sharing (Marjorie DeVault 1991; Kaplan 2000). These relationships, however, are fraught with conflicting ideas of the role that food preparation plays in an economy that does not recognize care work as purchased labor. England's (2005) frameworks add to this discussion and help to illustrate how subordination is temporarily subverted through differing means.

West Indian food is used as a symbol of power for childcare providers to resist the inequality of the household hierarchy created by the employer–employee relationship. Foodways not only help to resist this inequality; in fact, foodways sometimes invert the inequality childcare providers feel. This article considers how movement between a public place and a private place (such as the employers' homes or sitters' homes) strains or alters West Indian foodways practices. It also demonstrates how food enables providers to assert a form of perceived control over their employers by connecting food to "good" motherhood, thereby blurring the line between reproductive and productive work. I uncover how these women negotiate their movement from a public place, where everyday socialization is key to the daily collective lives that are created, to private places, such as the homes of their employers, where childcare providers occupy a subordinated position.

METHODS

I collected qualitative data between 2004 and 2007 in Brooklyn, New York, using interviews and participant observation after conducting initial snowball sampling in several Brooklyn public parks. I conducted participatory observations with dozens of childcare providers, mainly in public spaces. Of the many providers I observed, I completed in-depth interviews with twenty-five West Indian childcare providers while regularly observing over the three-year period their workdays in parks, in employers' homes during weekday playdates, during children's lessons, at the public library, and on the neighborhood sidewalks. I conducted several follow-up interviews and group interviews, which ranged from one hour to several

hours. All participants were first generation West Indian women migrants to the US, of whom nine were born in Grenada, six in Trinidad, three in Guyana, two in St. Lucia, two in Jamaica, two in St. Vincent, and one in Barbados. The age range of these childcare providers was from 25 to 61 years old. Five women were in their 30s, three were in their 20s, and the remaining seventeen women were over 40 years of age at the time of the interviews. All of the women in this study self-identified as Caribbean, West Indian, and by national origin (such as, "I am Trinidadian"); therefore, I use the term West Indian as a pan-ethnic identifier. I chose West Indians as the target population since they have a long migration history to New York City, beginning in the late 1800s. In addition, West Indian women have participated in paid domestic work in New York beginning in the early- to mid-1900s, when they were given preference in hiring due to their ability to speak English and their higher education levels (Julia Wrigley 1991). Lastly, I chose this group of women because from 1980 to 2000 there was a steady increase in the migration of West Indian women who identify as "childcare worker" to New York City (Tamara Mose Brown 2011).

While I did not ask specifically about the immigration status of participants, I found out over time that many were undocumented, two had become citizens, and some had green cards. Many participants came to the US on tourist visas and overstayed those visas once they found employment as either domestic workers or eldercare workers. Some came to the US on behalf of their home country's government to work and then stayed beyond their contractual obligation. Almost all participants had family members or friends from their homeland living in New York prior to their arrival and stayed with them until they found work and a residence of their own. The primary reason for coming to the US was to gain employment, since economic security in the Caribbean was, according to participants, nonexistent for people who had limited education. However, participants found themselves in low-wage work that was and is mostly underpaid.

This study captures enactments of gender roles and the providers' place in the household hierarchy to analyze social and cultural relationships as indicators in the reproductive nature of productive work for West Indian childcare providers. These expressions illustrate how childcare providers articulate the meaning behind their productive work as being nurturing and culturally valorized, yet also illustrate how these caregivers are being appropriated through food as part of the larger reproductive nature of their work.

The focus of my research is the food consumption patterns of childcare providers among themselves as well as with the children in their charge while they perform their duties in public spaces. My analysis sheds light upon the cultural significance of food preparation, sharing, and

consumption and its connection to increasing women's work burdens; food also offers insight into the interaction between child and caregiver.

FOOD CULTURE

Urban parks provide an ideal setting to observe food culture, both in practice and as symbolic gesture, since they are richly populated with subjects eating and sharing snacks or meals. Culture is transmitted through the food made for consumption and the frequency of feeding. Childcare workers who bottle-feed infants every few hours are also seen to participate in the social networking that goes on at the park, both related and unrelated to food. Thus, food culture, food activity, and its frequency – topics that scholars such as Deborah Lupton (1996) and Jonathan Deutsch (2004) have begun to study – are well worth examining in the context of social food space and the practices of Caribbean childcare professionals. Because the children that many of these women care for are from white, middle-class families, it is important to consider ethnicity and culture as factors that may contribute to differing food consumption patterns. Since cooking is a part of household work that becomes ritualized (Kaplan 2000), it is also key to understanding how food reflects back on parents.

Who feeds whom?

Though they have been living in New York for years, many of the childcare providers in this study continue to maintain their West Indian foodways. For most of these childcare workers, the day begins as early as 5:30 a.m. with the preparation of breakfast and the packing of lunches for their working husbands and children in school. If unmarried or childless, these women often prepare a portable midday meal to bring to their workplace. All of this cooking is likely to be West Indian in style. Upon returning home, perhaps as late as 7:00 p.m., there are additional meals to prepare unless leftovers from the previous day offer respite from the routine (low wages forbid their frequenting restaurants). Only rarely do childcare providers in this population purchase prepared food (take-out or eat-in) for themselves or their families, or partake of prepared food from a store while fulfilling their childcare responsibilities. Thus, the foodways of their culture remain in place even as the childcare providers insist they do not impose such habits, customs, or tastes upon the children in their care.

Molly and another childcare provider named Sylma, whom I met in the park one spring morning, both reacted with surprise when asked if they cooked West Indian food for the children they cared for. Both women immediately shook their heads "no" emphatically and then stated that "the parents leave food for them [the children]." Molly felt required to seek approval from her employers to bring food for the child for whom she

cares. She did not indicate whether she would want the additional chore of cooking for the child – although I later found out that she did sometimes cook for her employers. Molly reported that her young charge often asks for a taste of what is on Molly's own plate at lunchtime, something she cooked the night before in the traditional West Indian style. Molly went on to state that the food her employers leave for their child disgusts her (she points her finger down her throat and says, "Yuck!"). When questioned what the employing parents prepare in advance for their children's meals, the two women replied as one: "Pasta." [10]

Molly went on to say the parents' favorite choice of vegetable for their children was spinach or peas – "lots of greens." At this point, Sylma turned to the topic of baby food. In West Indian homes, she said, children were expected to eat what the adults eat. She said, "From four months [of age] you eat out of the pot," meaning that you eat whatever the grown-ups are eating. Molly does not "understand why they use baby food," and adds, "we never used it." All of the childcare providers interviewed claim that baby food is unheard of in the Caribbean and that babies simply eat what is offered to the entire family, albeit mashed to an appropriately soft texture. They do not understand why parents in the US feed their children what they consider to be a bland and limited diet spooned from jars.

Arlene, another childcare provider from Grenada, told me about her West Indian niece, Samantha, who also provided paid care for children. Arlene shared this story:

> Samantha used to make dumplings [a traditional West Indian complement to several dishes that is a mixture of flour, oil, and water, made into rolls and then boiled] for the boy and girl she cared for, but they were only supposed to eat kosher food.[11] Samantha never did tell the parents that she fed it to them and now that the children are older, they still ask Samantha to make the dumplings for them and ask her to bring it over.

Arlene explains, "If you start the kids early [eating different foods] they will like it." Arlene is suggesting that somehow the dumplings are more flavorful since they are typically boiled in a soup mixture and therefore seasoned differently than kosher food. She deemed this religious food directive as a flavor limitation. She continues to talk about her employers' views on feeding the 2-year-old child for whom she cares, explaining how they are very different from the views of Samantha's employers. She says, "I don't bring my own food to work with me. The parents don't leave food for the girl. I buy food when I am there in the neighborhood for the two of us. We are a little team." Arlene discovered later that the mother of the child for whom she cared was not that concerned if Arlene offered the child a variety of foods, just as long as the girl ate.[12] Arlene now wishes she had

been a little more adventuresome introducing her charge to new flavors at a young age without waiting for the go-ahead from her employer. She says that she "would have trained her to eat different foods."

In regard to both Arlene and Samantha, I identify a close relationship between the professional care and service these women provide and the communication inherent in foodways, specifically what and how food is put into the mouths of the children in their charge. There is meaning, beyond food, in the act of feeding itself. It is this form of food sharing with children that fits with the prisoner of love framework in that the unpaid emotional connectedness overrides any form of monetary compensation that these women may seek to gain for food preparation for children under their care. In Samantha's case, the parents stake their claim on the children's spiritual health by ensuring that they only eat kosher food. There is, however, a counter motivation by the West Indian care provider to expose the children to other foods in order to diversify their palate. At the same time, the childcare providers are promoting their authority over something as important as food consumption, which ultimately brings them closer to the children they care for and undermines or at least challenges dominance of the mother employer. The children Samantha looks after continue to ask for dumplings despite their parents' cultural preferences. As Arlene stated, they are "a little team."

Arlene and Samantha demonstrate how childcare providers expand the culinary experiences of children and deepen the emotional bond with them through their feeding practices. While the children are of course socialized by their parents and acquire cultural awareness from them, they begin to understand the possibility of assimilating differences in this way. Thus, the foods that West Indian childcare providers share with them open up a freedom to eat, and perhaps do other things, differently than the parental figures in their lives.

As I noted previously, parents do not always frown upon a caregiver introducing West Indian foods to their child's diet. Some caregivers, like Carol, who has had responsibilities preparing food for the family employing her, report that they derive pleasure and satisfaction when the traditional foods they serve are enjoyed and appreciated. Carol reports,

> Today I make Okra and rice, cook it up together with chicken and coconut milk and stuff... and he [the child for whom she cares] tell me bring some rice for him because Monday I had rice... so I bring some today and what I cook in a little container. Would you believe when I bring him from school, if you see when he sit down... and them ladies does laugh in the park cause he does sit down and he chomp and chomp it down... oh my god! His father calls him an Italian Trini [Trinidadian] because he eats fruitcake, he eats roti, everything!

Carol laughs and promptly continues with a story about a girl from another family for whom she cares, who cannot pronounce her name correctly and therefore calls her "Carrie." The little girl even wants to have special playdates with Carol in the park on Saturdays and makes food requests for the occasion such as macaroni pie, pelau (a rice and beans dish), and stewed chicken. The girl asks, "Carrie, you take the order?," and she replies laughingly, "Yes, I take the order." The girl eats the food and tells Carol, "Oh Carrie, you make my day."

Carol enjoys the fact that the children under her care enjoy something that she is producing for them with her own hands. There is an enthusiasm for Carol's West Indian food, which she proudly points to as a reflection of the positive regard her employing family has for her. The preparation and presentation of the food she cooks is a cultural performance that demonstrates her powerful role in the family and perhaps a measure of skill over the parents who do not cook similar food. She is visible in a household hierarchy that normally relegates childcare to an invisible space. She might even decline a request to cook, thereby contributing to a sense of control in the situation that may mask other feelings about having contributed extra labor for which she was not remunerated, or she may pay for some Caribbean ingredients out of her own pocket. Indeed, she is now fulfilling on "order" from the children in her charge and using what little money she makes to do so.

The sharing of food in public spaces

As is the case with many regional cuisines, traditional foods from different parts of the Caribbean, despite their similarities, may have different names or methods of preparation. An obvious instance of this is seen in the many versions of a "one-pot meal" referred to by subjects of this and other studies as "callaloo" (Lynn Marie Houston 2005). This ubiquitous dish, a kind of thick soup, is composed of okra, ground dasheen leaves or spinach, butter, spices, and coconut milk – all of which are staple foods in the West Indies. Callaloo is the entrée of choice among the childcare workers I interviewed and observed for my research. All of the workers I interviewed, including the youngest, like Hazel and Debbie who cook for themselves infrequently, make callaloo on occasion in the particular manner they are familiar with; they say it is their very favorite dish. None of them would agree, however, on precisely how this should be done. In Carol's words: "Trinidadians like their callaloo ground up and smooth... I don't like the way Guyanese make it... It's too thick with chunks of spinach... They don't grind it up like we do." Substantial differences in recipes for traditional Caribbean dishes from country to country offer an entry point for the expression of cultural connection and continuity among childcare providers. The park is the perfect setting for this opportunity to affirm

similarity and explore differences. Food sharing in public spaces secures and defines the pan-Caribbean identity. It builds solidarity among the "people from the islands," no matter which island they call their own.

The Trinidadian childcare provider, Carol, approached Janet, a sitter from Grenada, on a bright fall morning as we sat in the infant playground on a bench near the swings and slides. Carol announced that day that she had "stopped cooking for the ladies because no one was coming around consistently." It was relatively early in the course of this study. Two years later, however, there was a longer exchange with Carol in which she reversed her position and explained that she does "still cook for the 'ladies,' [13] but in the winter months it is too cold and they don't come around the park as much." She went on to comment, "all the women have been asking for [me] to bring food for them." She is used to hearing this request from the children in her charge. This tradition of food sharing in the park develops over time. The tradition is further cultivated by Molly, for years a passionate cook and regular contributor of West Indian foods to her professional companions in the park. As Molly herself puts it:

> For example, Debbie don't know about saltfish cake, how we [Guyanese] make it. We make it a different way, so I always promising her to bring saltfish cake for her, but I don't tell her that I'm making it for tomorrow. I will give her a surprise tomorrow.

In a separate interview, Debbie says that every time Molly cooks or eats West Indian food, she is reminded of Grenada:

> It brings back memories... These are the things we usually eat at home, so like when you eat it, you think about maybe your family because you always eat this together. You think about maybe your friends... the environment you used to be eating this food in and now you eat in a different environment.

The connections that childcare providers develop in this context grow deeper through food sharing. This creates a basis upon which power relationships can be established between them and within the childcare community at large. In one example, Debbie confides that she would prefer to perform a favor for Molly rather than for some other woman who does not bring food to be shared in the park or who does not accept her own offerings. Food is thus a medium of reciprocity in certain cases. Additionally, it serves as antidote to the isolation that would otherwise pervade the work life of childcare providers employed by individual families.

Unlike Molly, however, Debbie does not cook for her employers and does not bring food she has cooked to share in the park with the other childcare

providers. She claims that if she were asked to do this she might oblige, but says that this would "depend on the mood [I'm] in and the type of food." No matter how common or ubiquitous, food sharing among childcare providers is seen as a gift, a voluntary practice without expectations of reciprocity in every instance (Marcel Mauss 1990; Natalie Zemon Davis 2000). This aspect of the practice deepens the connections between providers to establish a social community (Lupton 1996; Barbara Tarlow 1996). Molly takes pride in the activity of cooking for her professional cohort in the park. When she has promised to please them with a particular dish, she always delivers. The robust practice of food sharing between Molly and others reinforces their sense of community. In this context, the women in this study also support feelings of professional competence and confidence in a world far from home.

Food sharing in private spaces

Moving from the public to the private space – from the park to the employer's residence – adds new dimensions to the social hierarchy and imposes additional restraints on the expression of cultural identity through foodways. Food sharing, in either context, continues to play a role in the employer–employee relationship.

Molly spoke at length about contributing home-cooked food to the residence where she works, even though this was certainly not a part of the work agreement. Molly confided that her employer would often plead with her: "Oh, bring me food," whenever she knew that Molly was planning to do a lot of cooking for some holiday or family event in her own home. Molly goes on:

> So I used to bring them [food]... I used to bring to them nearly every week... On the weekends I used to bring for them, but it's a couple weeks now that I haven't made for them... Now they're telling me: "Oh you're going home to cook a lot this weekend Molly?" [since it was Easter weekend] and I said yes. They said "Okay!" because they been looking for it.

On the surface, it would appear there was no pressure placed on Molly to be generous with her unpaid time and labor and share with her employer household the food for which she had paid and prepared in her own home for an Easter weekend. Of course, leftovers would be gratefully accepted and enjoyed. But the very enthusiasm for this as expressed by the employing family sets up a dynamic in which Molly's choice to comply or refuse may affect the employer–employee relationship. The employers in no way implied that Molly was obliged to provide them with unremunerated service; however, putting into her hands the decision to

do so or not creates a tension in the social hierarchy. Resistance or compliance with the request to bring gifts of food, even leaving the family to guess whether the gift would be forthcoming, puts Molly in a position of control. It also leaves her vulnerable to exploitation.

Sitting for 2-year-old Margaret, Debbie notes other differences between the sharing of food in public and private settings. She, too, carries West Indian food to eat wherever she may be providing a luncheon meal for her charge who, as Debbie reports, "loves it, she got a taste one time and then she got addicted... She will leave hers [food] and then she will eat all of [mine]." In response to questions about the differences between partaking of West Indian foods in her own home, in contrast to that of her employer, Debbie continues:

> When you are eating in your own little environment you feel more comfortable than when you're eating out, you know, in somebody else's environment or among other people, maybe people you don't know that good or something like that... you may tend to maybe do other things like... when you're eating home you play loud music, but when you're in someone else's place you may not be able to do that, so all of these things could change the way you feel.

This discussion with Debbie shows that private spaces contribute a sense of ease that is not always felt in the employer's home. Comfort and complete relaxation is reserved for the private sphere of one's own home (Rollins 1985; Mary Romero 1992; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001). This sentiment is echoed by Arlene, who articulates her difficulty in eating at the private residence of her employer, explaining, "It's too hard to warm up the food at work... I wasn't raised with a microwave." She says, however, that she might have used a toaster-oven if one was available. Heating her food on the stove complicates her job and makes it harder, she says. She also reports that when pouring a glass of orange juice for herself out of a container in the fridge, she observed that the mother must have taken a swig from the nearly full carton. Arlene was disgusted by this: "I saw this ring of lipstick around the nozzle of the container and it just made me sick to think that I almost poured a glass of juice from that container for myself... it was so nasty." Arlene found the food experience in her employer's residence difficult in many ways – from hygiene to the family's way of heating meals. She would rather go out in the neighborhood and pick up something to eat. The inequalities of both space and habit in the private sphere, as well as cultural and generational differences, may pressure West Indian childcare providers to eat their food in places other than the workplace.

I once watched five West Indian childcare providers – among them Gail, a sitter from Grenada – as they supervised a playdate at the home of Gail's

employers. With the permission of the employers, as always, I was welcomed to join in with my own daughter. Gail completed the preparation of a Caribbean chicken stew that another Grenadian sitter, Victoria, had contributed to the party, along with rice and beans. While Victoria and Gail took charge of the kitchen duties, a festive sense of community grew among the playdate guests on the lower level of a duplex brownstone near the park where the childcare providers regularly meet. Most of the women sat on the carpet before a television set and played with the children. I noted that this picture is in contradiction with literature suggesting that West Indian childcare providers do not play on the ground with the children they care for (Shellee Colen 1995). At this lively playdate, I saw how traditional food preparation for these women initiates social interaction, discussion, and cultural identification. I conjectured that, in this relaxed atmosphere, in the presence of the white children they care for, they feel free to perform their West Indian identities on a more conscious level.

The women methodically prepared the chicken, cleaning it with a lemon rub, seasoning it generously with the "right spices," and debating over the perfect technique to brown the sugar for the stewing of the bird. The question was the precise degree of browning needed to produce a chicken not too sweet and not too black so that, as Arlene suggested, "the chicken will have a bitter taste." The congenial debate exemplifies cultural variation in foodways and the way that subtle differences actually become a bond between distinct nationalities – as in this case, from Trinidad to Grenada.

The food sharing and conversation enjoyed on this playdate took other forms as well.[14] Some childcare workers dined on the floor while playing with the children. Others, including myself, sat on a couch or chair to eat the food. Without formal arrangements for the consumption of the food, this may simply reflect the casual nature of the occasion: there were too few highchairs for each child to sit in one, so the children and most of the childcare providers remained on the carpeted floor. Over the children's chatter, most of the adult discussion during the meal concerned the taste of the stew, how a particular ingredient (such as garlic, cumin, or coriander) had improved its flavor, and how the dish differed from one or another type of West Indian food.

Such a gathering of several childcare workers and their charges, in the absence of the employer in her home, contributes to an ease and comfort greater than that felt by Debbie and Arlene when the employers are present. The private, social food space of the playdate can be seen to approximate the public social food space in parks, where West Indian childcare providers enjoy their own society – in groups. A certain degree of isolation and inequality necessarily pervades the private household of the employer. This is momentarily reversed when members of a social group, such as childcare providers, share food, culture, and what they refer to as "old talk" (recalling memories from the homeland). The common cultural

background shared between these women sustains a comfort level. When these workers have an opportunity to share in their ethnic identities through the food they eat, additional meaning accrues to the food as expressed through their animated discussions. This meaning is communicated through the matrix of serious conversation, light banter, and, ultimately, the food memories of "home." Economic inequalities within the household spaces seem to be set aside once providers engage in this cultural expression, yet at the same time they reproduce the very same inequalities when they share their own food with or succumb to requests from their charges.

Food and mothering

When the West Indian women in this study talked about food, they communicated a sense of authority and control. In their role as childcare providers, this control is evidenced through the way their food practices contradict their lack of control in the social order of the employer's household. I cannot estimate the times I questioned Molly about some detail in the preparation or ingredients needed for a traditional dish and she impatiently rolled her eyes because I had forgotten a previous discussion and forced her to repeat herself. Molly can rattle off any recipe as if she were making the dish in real time before my very eyes. Feeling self-conscious about my failure of attention to the actual cooking (while I focused on collecting data), I defensively told Annie, a middle-aged Trinidadian who sits part-time with a 2-year-old girl, "I always have to follow a recipe exactly in order to cook anything, especially West Indian food." Her reply was, "Nah man, if you taste it once, you know how to make it."

Like the Latina domestic workers Hondagneu-Sotelo (2001) discusses, the West Indian domestic workers in my study often referred to the fact that their employers do not feed their children "proper food." They were critical of those who employed them for not performing the physical task of feeding their own children. This sentiment is expressed in comments such as Sylma's and Molly's about the dependence on "pasta" for children's meals in employer households. I encountered the following example of this sentiment during my time in the field.

I happened to meet Deondra, a Trinidadian in her late 50s, on a street near my home on a workday in June. As the lunch-hour rush had just subsided, the street was quiet. Deondra pushed a stroller holding one of the three children she cared for. "Where are your children?" Deondra asked. "With Sharon," I replied, referring to my sitter, whom Deondra knows from the social scene in the park. Stopping to chat, I explained that I was on my way to the gym for a workout and asked Deondra how long she would be on duty today. "Late," she said, and she told me she needed to get the kids down for a nap. I responded that I like to have my own children

fed and napping before Sharon arrives. This means she will get a couple of hours to relax before the two toddlers wake up to create chaos. "I try to always... have the food prepared in a bowl for them so she just has to heat it up in the microwave," I added. Deondra's reaction came as a surprise to me. "That's because you are a real mother and you care for your children." I prompted her to say more, remarking that I thought most mothers prepared food for their children. Deondra offered her opinion: "No, these people [mothers who employ childcare workers] don't always prepare the food." She continued,

> Motherhood means that you feed your children, you bathe your children, and you spend time with your children... These mothers go to work and don't do anything for their children and then want the childcare providers or nannies to do everything, that's not motherhood... See you want to be with your children, feed them, give them a bath to be with them, that is a good mother.

Though I felt flattered by Deondra's validation of my mothering style, I was struck by her broad generalization regarding the practices of the employers she works for and her assumption that mothers do not "do anything for their children" if they have jobs that take them from the home. To me, this had the sound of Arlie Russell Hochschild's (1997) view that long work hours may be used as an avoidance tactic against the pressures of hectic family life.

Everyone's economic position is different, and the way people use and apportion their time involves individual choice. However, Deondra appeared to be highly critical of the entire cohort of employers in general. With her sweeping statement, Deondra positioned herself in a dominant mothering role. Counter to the feelings of inequality inherent in domestic work, she demonstrated to me how power can be assumed through the intrinsic "job" of "mothering," whether that work is economically compensated or not, thus falling into the trap of the prisoner of love.

This topic arose later in a lecture on West Indian foodways I presented at Queens College. During the time allotted at the end for questions and answers, a woman of West Indian background raised her hand and proclaimed:

> West Indian childcare providers bringing their home-cooked food to work with them and then allowing the children they care for taste it makes it more difficult for working mothers who don't have the time to cook and can only give jar foods or pasta.

This woman seemed to praise the generous childcare worker on the one hand, and to side with the employer on the other. But, what stood out in

her statement about "working mothers" who employ childcare providers was the subtle implication that childcare providers (like herself) were "nonworking mothers."

It is important not to pit employer against employee; however, consider the typical West Indian mother in my study who is also employed as childcare provider. She rises early enough to prepare breakfast for her husband and children. She commutes for perhaps an hour or more to a job tending other people's children for as long as a twelve-hour shift. She commutes home again and prepares dinner for her own family. To fulfill the role of mother in her own home, the childcare provider tries to find time to do all this "mothering" on two fronts. The sharing of traditional foods with employers or children under care is a part of her heroic effort, and yet as nonpaid work it contributes to the devaluing and invisibility of paid caregivers.

There is another point that the student from Queens College expresses: the private and public along with the productive and reproductive divides have become blurred, making the role of employer and mother more difficult to manage. Because of this difficulty, childcare providers tend to critique the motherhood practices of their employers (and employers critique the motherhood practices of their childcare providers) in order to gain symbolic power within the household hierarchy, but it is more than that. It is a clear illustration of the care crisis within the US political economic structure where power is distributed so unevenly, rendering the "mother" role invisible altogether (Arlie Russell Hochschild 2000; Folbre 2001; England and Folbre 2002). This study suggests that it is this invisibility of the mother's role with regard to care work that people may consider a Third World problem in the First World. There is an assumption that it is only in the Third World, where there could be less divergent class and ethnic cleavages, that women's roles are exploited. However, in the First World (core), with the additional complications of more stratified class and ethnic structures, care work is even less visible. World-systems scholars would see this arrangement as an instance of core nations expropriating the human capital of nations on the periphery, whose economies are disrupted (Cynthia A. Wood 1997; Jo Murphy-Lawless 2000). As large numbers of women of color from the periphery emigrate to the US, where they must often leave their own children to care for the children of the privileged class for whom they work, they fall into the prisoner of love framework in which emotionally motivated care work is not compensated (Abel and Nelson 1990; England 2005).

CONCLUSION

Childcare providers of West Indian origin create social spaces within public parks that allow for the sharing of food and conversation. The daily

interactions that transpire in these negotiated spaces both bond and ground the caretaking community in a unique way. Food becomes the expression of West Indian ethnic solidarity. A social food space develops out of the frequency of sharing in a public setting while the complex and intimate tasks of childcare are carried out. Food becomes a symbol; food sharing is a language, a means of communication. Through it, West Indian childcare providers reveal the mechanisms of their social networking in a pan-ethnic community. They illustrate how the lines between reproductive and productive work can be blurred. Food sharing also provides a medium for resisting the household hierarchies that care workers inhabit while performing both paid and unpaid work.

The negotiation of private space is an issue for many West Indian childcare providers as they seek to hold onto the "taste" of their homeland and preserve their cultural identities. Patterns of inhibition and circumvention of inhibition in foodways emerge as forms of resistance. Through the caregivers' voices and their foodways, it becomes clear how critical the symbol of food is to the formation of their interactions and the maintenance of their worldview.

West Indian childcare providers demonstrate both similarities and differences that characterize the various Caribbean island cultures, as well as those that have developed in the US social context. Even the differences, however, serve to promote a group identity among West Indian childcare providers and at times invert the subordinated or invisible position that many of these women hold to a more elevated status of motherhood in the household hierarchy. The practice of tying foodways closely with motherhood further illustrates how providers are making this attempt to invert their status in the private sphere while at the same time establishing their closeness to the children for whom they care. In Carol's case, when the children for whom she cares, or those for whom she has cared in the past, make food requests, she feels empowered yet somewhat emotionally obligated to meet the demands of her unpaid duties. It is the inherent intimacy and emotional work of the childcare profession that encourages someone like Carol to do additional work for no additional wages; as part of her role as a prisoner of love, she pays the price of the commodification of emotions (Abel and Nelson 1990; Stone 2000; Cancian and Oliker 2000; England 2005). The subsequent attachment felt between the child and the childcare provider from meeting such demands elevates the motherhood status of the provider and further supports the feelings of being a good mother in the eyes of the childcare provider herself, while also contributing to the social capital that the children carry with them over the years.

Care work scholars have only begun to examine how emotional work, which is a form of nonpaid work that may be seen as an intrinsic motive, is the basis for the caregiving industry in terms of capitalist reproduction (Folbre 2001; England 2005). Childcare providers contribute to human capital (both

social and cultural capital in the form of networks and tastes) as they shape citizenry, yet studies do not explicitly reflect this outcome. As care work frameworks, such as those outlined by England, begin to gather momentum, scholarship that studies the additional mechanisms of advantage over care workers can provide a unique perspective relative to the understanding of childcare and unpaid productive and reproductive work.

Conducting longitudinal studies on children who have been cared for by West Indian childcare providers and providers from other ethnic backgrounds would contribute greatly to an understanding of the tangible costs of the commodification of emotions. By understanding the benefits more clearly and the circumstances under which they are acquired, policies that seek to ensure minimum wage standards will have added strength. Additionally, since ethnographers have contributed to understandings of how people create meaning in their everyday lives, scholars have an opportunity to further this call by illustrating how people define and interpret their own cultural identities. Economists specifically should see this study as a part of the burgeoning literature that extends the conversation of racial, ethnic, and cultural differences between providers and purchasers of the services rendered by childcare providers.

Tamara Mose Brown
Department of Sociology, Brooklyn College
2900 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11210, USA
e-mail: TBrown@brooklyn.cuny.edu

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Erynn Masi de Casanova for her endless revisions of this paper, as well as Greta Friedemann-Sánchez and Marina Prieto-Carron for their helpful comments on earlier versions. I would also like to thank my peers from the CUNY Faculty Fellowship Publication Program, under the direction of Stephen Steinberg, for their comments.

NOTES

[1] A playdate is typically a gathering of children and adults in either a public or private space where socializing occurs. Playdates can take place in many spaces, such as in the home of an employer or at a public park (see Tamara Mose Brown 2011).

[2] All personal information that would allow the identification of any person or person(s) described in the article has been removed.

[3] The households in this study were comprised primarily of married heterosexual couples, with the exception of one same-sex household. Further research on various types of households would help to eliminate some of the inherent biases that may occur due to this homogeneity.

[4] Only one of the women I interviewed was responsible for cooking for the employer on occasion, and none of the women were asked to feed West Indian food to the

children under care. Some providers were, however, encouraged by the employer to bring leftovers from home for the employers to eat, and felt obligated to feed the child if they were hungry – even if that meant giving them some of their own food because the child did not want to eat the employer's food.

[5] England (2005) shows how the public good framework points to societal benefits of care work to go beyond that of the direct care recipient, but that it becomes difficult to determine a corresponding wage since care work is devalued. In the love and money framework, she argues against a dichotomous view that care work and markets are hostile towards each other, and demands that these claims ought to be empirically tested. The devaluation framework illustrates the gender gap in wages and how the care industry and other service industries that rely heavily on women tend to suffer these gaps as a result of cultural cognitive biases.

[6] Other forms of paid childcare include daycare centers and community childcare cooperatives.

[7] Intimacies are also revealed when childcare providers enter the public spaces of parks and sometimes engage with their employer's friends who happen to be there with their children at the same time. Also, many childcare providers do light housekeeping duties and run errands, thereby making them privy to how clean or unclean their employers are, what they eat, or how they like their clothes pressed at the dry cleaners.

[8] The present article is part of a larger ethnographic study in which I discuss how providers are also supervised through the use of the internet and cellular phones (Tamara Mose Brown 2011).

[9] Foodways have multiple meanings. It is how we consume food, prepare food, and discuss food, as well as food's impact on cultural and social interactions in the larger context of social structures. Some say that belief systems can come from foodways. An example would be with kosher food that is blessed or prepared specifically in line with Jewish beliefs (see Tamara Mose Brown [2011] for more).

[10] Participant West Indian childcare providers criticized pasta as an American food that they do not consume on a regular basis. Many of the employers tended to leave packages of, or make and store, Annie's Organic pasta for their children – a meal that participants saw as an "American" food that was tasteless.

[11] Dumplings were probably not considered to be kosher by the providers, nor by the children under care, since Samantha did not follow Jewish dietary laws in selecting her ingredients or preparing her dumplings.

[12] Many childcare providers indicated that they assumed parents would not want the child under care eating food other than the food prepared by the parents or left out for the provider to prepare.

[13] The term "ladies" is used between West Indian childcare providers. See Mose Brown (2011) for more on how this term is used.

[14] Young children can participate in a playdate by simply being included in the social space that has been created by the providers. They are spoken to and played with as part of a bonding process that takes place outside of their time spent solely with their primary childcare provider. Many of these children will also see each other when they are with their parents on the weekends. Playdates are sometimes seen as formal events for the upper-middle class, and are considered to be more structured affairs than simply "playing."

REFERENCES

Abel, Emily K. and Margaret K. Nelson, eds. 1990. *Circles of Care: Work and Identity in Women's Lives*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Cancian, Francesca M. and Stacey J. Oliker. 2000. *Caring and Gender*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Colen, Shellee. 1995. "'Like a Mother to Them': Stratified Reproduction and West Indian Childcare Workers and Employers in New York," in Faye D. Ginsburg and Rayna Rapp, eds. *Conceiving the New World Order: The Global Politics of Reproduction*, pp. 78–102. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. 2000. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Deutsch, Jonathan. 2004. "Chunky Soup: The *Sumotori* Diet." *Gastronomica* 4(1): 47–53.

DeVault, Marjorie. 1991. *Feeding the Family: The Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton. 1994. *Across the Boundaries of Race and Class: An Exploration of Work and Family*. New York: Garland.

England, Paula. 2005. "Emerging Theories of Care Work." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31: 381–99.

England, Paula and Nancy Folbre. 1999. "The Cost of Caring." *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science* 561(1): 39–51.

———. 2002. "Care, Inequality, and Policy," in Francesca M. Cancian, Demie Kurz, Andrew S. London, Rebecca Reviere, and Mary C. Tuominen, eds. *Child Care and Inequality: Rethinking Carework for Children and Youth*, pp. 133–44. New York: Routledge.

Ferguson, Priscilla P. and Sharon Zukin. 1995. "What's Cooking?" *Theory and Society* 24(2): 193–9.

Folbre, Nancy. 1995. "'Holding Hands at Midnight': The Paradox of Caring Labor." *Feminist Economics* 1(1): 73–92.

———. 2001. *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*. New York: New Press.

Himmelweit, Susan, ed. 2000. *Inside the Household: From Labour to Care*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1997. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

———. 2000. "The Nanny Chain." *The American Prospect* 11(4): 32–6.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2001. *Doméstica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Houston, Lynn Marie. 2005. *Food Culture in the Caribbean*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Kaplan, Elaine Bell. 2000. "Using Food as a Metaphor for Care: Middle-School Kids Talk about Family, School, and Class Relationships." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 29(4): 474–509.

Lan, Pei-Chia. 2006. *Global Cinderellas: Migrant Domestics and Newly Rich Employers in Taiwan*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1983 (1969). Trans. John Weightman and Doreen Weightman. *The Raw and the Cooked: Introduction to a Science of Mythology, Vol. 1*. Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Long, Lucy, ed. 2004. *Culinary Tourism: A Folkloristic Perspective on Eating and Otherness*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Lupton, Deborah. 1996. *Food, the Body and the Self*. New York: SAGE.

Macdonald, Cameron Lynne and David A. Merrill. 2002. "'It Shouldn't Have to be a Trade': Recognition and Redistribution in Care Work Advocacy." *Hypatia* 17(2): 67–83.

Massey, Doreen B. 1984. *Spatial Divisions of Labor: Social Structures and the Geography of Production*. New York: Routledge.

Mauss, Marcel. 1990. Trans. W. D. Halls. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. New York: W. W. Norton.

McIntosh, Alex. 1996. *Sociologies of Food and Nutrition*. New York: Plenum Press.

McIntosh, Elaine N. 1995. *American Food Habits in Historical Perspective.* Westport, CT: Praegar.

Mose Brown, Tamara. 2011. *Raising Brooklyn: Nannies, Childcare, and Caribbean Creating Community.* New York: NYU Press.

Murphy-Lawless, Jo. 2000. "Changing Women's Lives: Child Care Policy in Ireland." *Feminist Economics* 6(1): 89–94.

Nelson, Julie A. and Paula England. 2002. "Feminist Philosophies of Love and Work." *Hypatia* 17(2): 1–18.

Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. 2001. *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration, and Domestic Work.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Portes, Alejandro. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1–24.

Rollins, Judith. 1985. *Between Women: Domestics and Their Employers.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Romero, Mary. 1992. *Maid in the USA.* New York: Routledge.

Rozin, Paul. 1999. "Food Is Fundamental, Fun, Frightening, and Far-Reaching." *Social Research* 66(1): 9–13.

Stone, Deborah. 2000. "Caring By the Book," in Madonna Harrington Meyer, ed. *Care Work: Gender, Labor and the Welfare State,* pp. 89–111. London: Routledge.

Tarlow, Barbara. 1996. "Caring: A Negotiated Process that Varies," in Suzanne Gordon, Patricia Benner, and Nel Noddings, eds. *Caregiving: Readings in Knowledge, Practice, Ethics, and Politics,* pp. 56–82. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tronto, Joan C. 2002. "The 'Nanny' Question in Feminism." *Hypatia* 17(2): 34–51.

Warren, Tracey, Gillian Pascall, and Elizabeth Fox. 2010. "Gender Equality in Time: Low-Paid Mothers' Paid and Unpaid Work in the UK." *Feminist Economics* 16(3): 193–219.

Whit, William C. 1995. *Food and Society: A Sociological Approach.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Wilk, Richard. 1999. "'Real Belizean Food': Building Local Identity in the Transnational Caribbean." *American Anthropologist* 101(2): 244–55.

Wood, Cynthia A. 1997. "The First World/Third Party Criterion: A Feminist Critique of Production Boundaries in Economics." *Feminist Economics* 3(3): 47–68.

Wrigley, Julia. 1991. "Feminists and Domestic Workers." *Feminist Studies* 17(2): 317–29.

———. 1995. *Other People's Children: An Intimate Account of the Dilemmas Facing Middle-Class Parents and the Women They Hire to Raise Their Children.* New York: Basic Books.

———. 1999. "Hiring a Nanny: The Limits of Private Solutions to Public Problems." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 563: 162–74.