

## Investigation into the extent on how woman are seen to be oppressed/controlled by men

### Hypothesis

I'm investigating into what extent married women who carry a dual burden (homemaker and work in paid employment) are oppressed/controlled by their husbands, in Britain. The gender division of labour is essential here. I have witnessed that most woman are controlled by men and are under the control of men. Men have the instrumental role; men are more practical, they work outside the home and are the provider of the family. Women have the expressive role. Women stay at home/work/nurture children. I've chosen this because, different studies have different ways of interpreting the benefits of the roles men and woman carry. Personally I have seen that men tend to be in control of the family. I'd like to study to what extent men are in control.

### Concepts and Context

The **division of labour** states that men are the breadwinner and woman are the homemaker. Men go out to work/protect their family; women are locked out of the wider society (stay at home and work). Ann Oakley argues that women carry a dual burden: they take on paid job and domestic labour. She argues that conjugal roles are unequal although most women have paid jobs. Men still don't do domestic tasks at home. She argues that woman take on **emotional work**: Woman are socialised to have the emotional roles of mother/carer. Men are socialised into rationality. Looking after a sick child means emotional and physical needs. The mother (barrier of the child) is distinguished to be responsible for this. Some women take on "part time" jobs, because they're primarily responsible for the nurturing the children.

A belief grew that woman belong in their homes. Men tend to be the controller of the family. Woman always put themselves second place to men. They work under the control of men, due to men being stronger, bigger, and more aggressive. Woman are seen to be soft, and therefore are controlled by men.

"The sociology of housework", (Ann Oakley's study) compared the work of housewives to car production line workers in factories. Housewives work approximately 72 hours every week, longer than workers in factories. Housewives

find their job boring and feel isolated within the home. The amount of physical work is greater than manual workers. The difference is that, women don't receive any wages/rewards for their work, workers do. This study shows how women aren't benefiting and are being controlled.

Dobash and Dobash are radical feminists who argue that, women are oppressed/controlled by men: men are the enemy: "They are the reason why women are oppressed; they must be abolished. Women should organise themselves to live independently". Their study shows patriarchy: this is the power relations which men hold between women. Their study shows men's power through domestic violence. In a patriarchal society, domestic violence is an inevitable feature. Patriarchal society helps to maintain men's power through violence. 25% of women are abused in Britain. Wife beating is the extension to the husband's control. Also, the male domination of the state society's aids to explain the lack of effort of the police/courts to deal effectively with domestic violence's. Domestic Violence wasn't treated the same like other crimes before. It seems like women are forced into becoming a housewife. They get trapped inside the home.

#### Research Methods:

Anonymous closed questionnaires will be used. This is a primary source data. They give straight answers, which are direct and simple. Such questions would be to find out, if they are a housewife/worker, how many hours of domestic tasks do they do in a week, do their husbands help? There can be tick boxes in which they can choose, and most of the questions would be based on the role/jobs they do. I shall make sure that there is a mixture of women with different ethnic backgrounds. There will be a question asking them about their ethnicity.

Questionnaires produce quantitative data. Quantitative data helps to quantify the results, especially when it's closed questionnaires. Questionnaires allow comparisons to be made, between different times and societies. They are cheap and quick to produce. Large scale studies can be reached, widely spread geographically; it is representative. Care is taken into sampling procedures therefore it produces a more representative sample. There is no need to recruit interviewers to collect the data, because questionnaires are sent and given back by post.

Questionnaires produce reliable data. If another researcher was to repeat the research, using the same method, similar results should be produced. Woman with the same ethnic background must be questioned.

There will be no problems with any ethical issues. A letter can be sent explaining to them about the survey taking place. Using questionnaires doesn't cause any harm to the participant/s. This is because the questionnaire I will be carrying out will be anonymous. Also, the respondents consent will be requested, and they shall choose to answer the questions or not. Total confidentiality is taken into consideration. Therefore, questionnaire is ideal for this hypothesis.

Positivists like functionalists and Marxists, use quantitative data like questionnaires. This is a macro theory: society is what creates individuals. Macro theory states that sociology is like science, where social facts are analysed. These factors affect individual's behaviours. It can easily be measured. Positivists agree that questionnaires are objective (unbiased) and hard core facts which cannot be changed/manipulated. The sociologist's personal involvement is kept to a minimum. There's less contact with the researcher, making it a good way of maintaining detachment and objectivity.

The variety of roles woman hold shows the control of men; women are like house slaves. The control of men a big effect to the function of the family.

#### Potential Problems:

Questionnaires are normally superficial and limited. Most respondents don't answer all the questions and don't always have the time to answer these questions. This limits the amount of information gathered. They may find it dull and boring. This will cause them to lose concentration, and will start to answer the questions without giving any thought to it. Some respondents may lie. There are others who may not understand the question, and may guess. This will cause invalidity to the data received. Respondents can be persuaded to answer the questions, by giving them a prize if they do so. However, this causes questionnaires to be more expensive.

Due to lying, forgetting and misunderstanding, it produces invalid data. They don't give a true picture of what people think/feel. Interpretivists argue that individual's opinions aren't taken into account i.e. why exactly people act in certain ways. They argue that questionnaire only give a snap shot of social reality at only one

moment. This produces invalid data. It doesn't count peoples behaviour and attitude changes.