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ABSTRACT

A dichotomous division of life space into two domains of activity, public and domestic, has been treated as virtually axiomatic in much of the feminist literature, with a further identification of public/male and domestic/female. The present study offers empirical data on the saliency of this distinction in the thinking of a sample of Americans. Findings indicate that a simplistic distinction between public and domestic does not reflect accurately the actual categorizations of life space made by contemporary Americans. Consequently, such classifications cannot be assumed a priori to be valid cross-culturally.
"In the 1950s, as before and since, reverence for the ideal family and concern for its autonomy limited the scope of public efforts to help real families meet their responsibilities."

An ancient distinction in Western society, that between the public and the domestic domains, has, in the past several years, come to be used by anthropologists and sociologists alike as a background variable to explain several aspects of sexual asymmetry prevailing in diverse world societies. It has been assumed, sometimes explicitly, other times implicitly that cultural systems consist of identifiable segments or domains (Black, 1973). Some scholars have used domains concepts to explain facets of sexual segregation and integration (Fluehr-Lobban, 1977; Schlegel, 1977; Sanday, 1980). Others have employed them to account for the differential possession of power and authority by males and females (Lamphere, 1974; O'Brien, 1977; Rogers, 1975; Rosaldo, 1974, 1980; Sanday, 1974, 1980). Differential access to power and authority, in turn, has been seen to have implications for the status of women relative to men. Division of labor between the sexes (Parker and Parker, 1979; Sanday, 1973, 1974); differential physical access of men and women to certain geographic space (Reiter, 1975; Deaver, 1980); aspects of male dominance and female subjugation (Roger, 1975) and origins of sexual asymmetry (Rosaldo, 1974) have all, at one time or another been examined and interpreted as related to the existence of two societal domains, the public and the domestic.

More recently, however, both the universal applicability and the utility of a model of society that assumes the dualistic opposition between the domestic and the public domain have been increasingly questioned (e.g., Leacock and Nash, 1977; Caplan and Bujra, ed. 1978; Rapp, 1979; Rosaldo, 1980; LaFontaine, 1981). At least in part, this is a reflection of the rapid strides made by the anthropology of women, the accumulation of new data and the illuminating reanalysis of old data, together with vigorous debate and discussion.
How, then, have domestic and public been defined? To begin with, domains may either be assumed to exist as predetermined categories in the mind of the observer, or, by contrast, they may be thought to operate as constituents of a native system of classification. In the second view, rather than taken as given, the domains and their contents remain to be discovered. The definitions of domains found in the literature today have almost always come from the observer or theoretician, with no attempt made to take the insider's cognitive map into consideration. Focus on space, activities, personnel or institutions characterize the theoreticians' conceptions of the domains. Often the domestic is identified as "private" and "inner", and the "public" as "outer" or "outside". A further step, often taken almost as automatically, sees the inside or private/domestic domain as that of the woman and the outside or public domain as that of the man. Janeway, who takes the title of her book from two old folk expressions, "a woman's place is in the home" and "it's a man's world", comments: "so old is this partition and so built into our minds and our cultural background that it still produces an illusion of inevitability and revealed truth. Outer space is reserved for men, inner space belongs to women" (1971:7).

More specifically, Ernestine Friedl (1975) distinguishes between the domestic unit or household, and everything beyond it, which she calls "the extradomestic." Sanday (1974:190) says: "The domestic domain includes all activities performed within the domain of the localized family unit." Elsewhere, she speaks of "the whole of public life, that is, life that does not revolve around childrearing and family activities" (Sanday 1980:9). Rosaldo (1974:23) writes: "'Domestic'... refers to those minimal institutions and modes of activity that are organized about one or more mothers and their children; 'public' refers to institutions, activities, and forms of associ-
ation that link, rank, organize or subsume particular mother child groups."

Writing from the perspective of household studies, rather than feminist anthropolo­
gy, M. Fortes defines the domestic domain as "the system of social relations through which the reproductive nucleus is integrated with the en­
vironment and with the structure of the total society" (1958:9).

In general, we may ask, how sharply drawn are the divisions in the real world (or worlds), and furthermore, can the social be described exhaustively by these two domains. For example, is a private or personal domain to be distinguished from a domestic one? For the United States, Nancie Gonzalez (1973) has suggested the existence of a supradomestic domain, somewhere be­
tween the domestic and the public. For ethnic minority groups, such as the Cuban immigrants whom M. Boone (1980) has studied in Washington D.C., an ethnic public domain has been described, lying between the domestic and the national public spheres. Perhaps such intermediary spheres occur frequently under specified conditions in multiethnic societies. A further question con­
cerns the congruence between the public/domestic and the male/female divisions in societies.

The focus of the present research takes a more modest form. Our aim has been to inquire into American "folk" categorizations: instead of assuming the existence of a public and a domestic domain, we wanted to see first whether Americans do, in fact, think of different activities and decisions as belonging to these contrasting domains, and if so which activities and decisions seem to constitute the domestic domain; and finally, whether these classifications reveal any similarities to the way the domains have been classified by anthropologists and sociologists. If parallels between "folk" and scientific classifications are found to exist, this would, at the very least, show that the conceptions of American (perhaps more generally, Western)
social scientists are rooted in the same cultural universe as those of the "folk". Hence such scientists could be said to be carrying their cultural baggage into their analyses of women's authority, power and status in other cultures. If this were found to be the case, certain implications for cross-cultural research would be evident: Western cultural bias would have to be compensated for before one might assume that independent studies of diverse cultures and societies had converged on "universal truths."

METHOD

1 - The Respondents

A sample of 177 undergraduate students in introductory social science courses at The Ohio State University was asked to fill out a questionnaire on "the sociocultural aspects of public and domestic domains" during the Spring and Summer quarters of 1980. No definitions of the "domains" were, however, provided to the respondents.

The composition of the sample broke down as follows: 56.5% were women, 41.8% were men; 64.3% were between the ages 18-23; 15.2% between the ages 24-29; 12.9% between the ages 30-39; and 2.4% between the ages 49-64. There were no individuals between the ages of 40-48. Ethnically 79.7% identified themselves as WASP, 5.6% as Black or Afro-American, 4.5% as Asian, and the remaining 7.3% as Hispanic, American Indian, or white minority background. With regard to marital status, 61% of our respondents had never married, 19.2% were married, 10.2% were engaged, and 3.4% were divorced. The remaining 1.2% were separated or widowed. An overwhelming majority of 80.2% did not have children, while 14.1% did; 5.6% chose not to disclose any information with regard to parenthood.

Although this is a student population, note that more than a third of
the sample are above the age of 24, 15.3% above the age of 30, and 2.4% above 49. Moreover, about a quarter are or have been married, though only 14.1% are parents. With regard to ethnicity, WASPs constitute the majority of the sample, while non-WASPs constitute the minority.

2 - The Questionnaire

One of the major aims of this undertaking was to formulate a culturally relevant and culture-specific conception of the domains. It was, therefore, deemed absolutely necessary to get input from "insiders" of American culture (i.e. Americans) in the formulation and operationalization of these conceptions. To this end, students enrolled in the Anthropology of Women course during the Winter 1980 term were asked to "develop (their) very own and very explicit definition of public and domestic domains, excluding the private sphere from (their) definition, which (they) (thought) would be appropriate for American culture". The instructions for the assignment further asked them to operationalize their definitions and to prepare individual questionnaires consonant with their conceptual and operational definitions. About half of the questions had to be on the domestic domain, and the other half on the public domain. They were then to administer their personal questionnaires to one individual of their choice. Upon the administration of these individual questionnaires, the students were then to revise them by deleting "bad", "ambiguous", or "redundant" questions and adding new ones as they saw fit.

From the material turned in by the students, the present investigators derived three dimensions on which public and domestic domains would be investigated, namely: activities/behaviors, decisions, and the acting and deciding agents. These then, may be taken to be the native working components of domains as seen by Americans. More specifically, we propose a
native definition for the domestic domain by an application of these components: the limits of the authority for decision making and action within which American households operate.

Utilizing the material in the individual questionnaires and the three derived dimensions, the authors designed a pilot questionnaire on the perception of the public and the domestic domains which was administered to the students in the same class as a pre-test. Then, using the responses and evaluations of the students and their listing of the various activities and decisions, this pilot questionnaire was revised. The final product to emerge from this process was the standardized questionnaire on public and domestic domains. The motivation underlying these stages of effort was to develop a tool that would be consonant with the prevailing values and perceptions of the public and domestic domains in American culture; in other words it would provide an emic or native perspective on the domains.

The individual questionnaires produced by the students proved to be heavily concentrated on items concerning the domestic domain and items that were at least marginally domestic; very few dealt with issues that we think (and as the students themselves pointed out) can be designated as solely public in the context of American culture. Since our aim had been to evoke an American ethnosemantic conception of the domains, we did not attempt to correct for this bias when we designed the standardized questionnaire. We should add that although this is an American emic definition, it is also one developed by mostly middle class women with ages ranging from twenty to forty since they constituted the majority of this class.

The standardized questionnaire had four parts. The first part listed a series of activities and decisions which the respondents were asked to categorize as "domestic", "public", "both domestic and public", "neither
domestic nor public", and "don't know". The second part listed a series of decisions and respondents were asked (1) who makes these decisions in their home, and (2) who makes them in their parent's home. The third part listed a series of activities and the respondents were asked who is responsible for performing each (1) in their own home and (2) in their parent's home. The questionnaire also included a fourth section designed to obtain data on the sociocultural background of the respondents; it asked for information concerning their sex, age, living arrangements, ethnicity, income, education, religious and political beliefs, also their fathers', mothers', and spouses' political and religious beliefs and the intensity of their religious commitment.

3 - Analytic Focus

Our aim in the present paper is to discover how our respondents classify decisions and activities involving children ("the children's sphere") with regard to the hypothesized distinction between a domestic and a public domain. We undertake this analysis, in view of the numerous definitions of the domestic domain in the literature which refer to childrearing and household activities. We do so by relating the perception of the children's sphere to sociocultural variables pertaining to the respondents background and comparing it to the sphere of central household chores.

Let us now turn to a discussion of the research results.

RESULTS

Overview of Findings

What is the stuff that the domestic domain is made of in American society? Between 80 to 96% (or, on the average 88.8%) of our respondents placed the decisions and the activities shown in Table 1A in the domestic
For a vast majority of this student population then, decisions and activities with regard to minor chores (making the beds, washing the dishes, etc.), decisions for major chores (to buy new home furniture, to rent an apartment, etc.), tasks of a semi-recreational nature (looking after plants, cooking for dinner guests), decisions pertaining to religion and family (having children) are issues solely of the domestic domain. These activities and decisions then represent the domestic core.

The category of mid-level agreement, where between 60 to 79% (on the average 70.9%) of the respondents placed a particular item in the domestic domain, is shown in Table 1B.

A medium degree of agreement prevails, then, concerning the attribution of selected major and minor chores, financial and political matters, recreational and semi-recreational activities, and practicing religious beliefs in the church to the domestic domain.

There was much less agreement, on the other hand, in placing the following decisions and activities in the domestic domain: issues concerning children, payment of bills, voting, doing volunteer work and reporting of various types of crime. Between 2.8% to 59% of the respondents categorized these as issues belonging exclusively to the domestic sphere, while 23% to 70% categorized them as issues belonging both in the domestic and in the public realm. Table 1C shows the
percent of respondents classifying these low-level agreement decisions and activities in the domestic domain.

The Children's Sphere

In contrast to the core domestic domain, the total sphere of decisions and activities pertaining to children, with two exceptions, was seen by a significant proportion of R's as issues involving both the domestic and the public domain. The exceptions are the decision to have children and the decision to give children religious education. Table 2 summarizes these results.

Overall, the responses reveal a relative lack of consensus with regard to the categorization of activities and decisions in the children's sphere. Hence, we now turn to an analysis of the sociocultural variables associated with the classification of individual items in the children's sphere.

(1) Decision to have children

The "decision to have children" was placed in the domestic domain by 82.5% of the Rs and in both the public and the domestic domains by 13.6% of the Rs. The categorization of this decision is significantly correlated with one variable from the sociocultural background of the R's, namely religious affiliation (see Figure 1).
While 65% of the agnostics perceive the decision to have children to be a domestic issue, on the average 90% of the Catholics and Protestants do so. Jews are closer to the other two religious groups than to the agnostics in that 80% of them attributed such a decision to the domestic domain.

(2) Bringing up children

The item "bringing up children" is placed exclusively in the domestic domain by 59.3% of the Rs and in both public and domestic domains by 37.9% of Rs. Its classification vis-à-vis the domains is correlated with the political beliefs of the R's mother (see Figure 2).

For Rs who had liberal mothers, "bringing up children" was less of a domestic issue than for those who had moderate or conservative mothers (35% versus 69% and 52% respectively). Of the three groups, those with "moderate" mothers were most likely to consider the issue of bringing up children as one belonging in the domestic domain (69%).

(3) Caring for Children

Of the total Rs, 55.4% placed the "caring for children" in the domestic domain while 39.5% placed it in both the public and the domestic domains. Its categorization was not significantly correlated with any of the variables pertaining to the sociocultural background of the respondents.
(4) Decision to reward children

The "decision to reward children" was classified in the domestic domain by 52% of our Rs and in both the public and the domestic domains by 41.8% of them. This classification was correlated with the degree of religiosity of the Rs father (see figure 3).

Those Rs whose fathers were not religious were more likely to consider it as a domestic issue (63%) than those whose fathers were very religious (29%). Rs who perceived their fathers to be somewhat religious were also more likely to classify the decision to reward children as solely a domestic concern (59%).

(5) Rewarding children

Our respondents were equally divided in the categorization of the "rewarding of children": 47.5% considered it to be a domestic issue, and another 47.5% considered it to be both a public and a domestic issue. The categorization of "rewarding children" was found to relate to variables other than those linked to the definition of the "decision to reward". It was significantly associated with the R's sex, and the religious affiliation of the R's spouse (see figure 4).

Females and Rs with Protestant spouses were less likely than males and those
with Catholic or Jewish spouses to place this issue exclusively in the domestic domain (41% and 38% versus 59% and 75%). When we control for the religious affiliation of the R's spouse however, the association between sex and the categorization of "rewarding children" disappears. Within each religious group, females are not significantly more likely than males to see this issue as one belonging in both the public and the domestic realms.

(6) **Decision to punish children**

Of our respondents 54.2% placed the item "decision to punish children" in the domestic domain, while 40.1% placed it in both the public and the domestic domains. Like the classification of the "decision to reward", the classification of the "decision to punish" them was also correlated with the Rs political beliefs (see figure 5).

Following a pattern somewhat analogous to the classification of the "decision to reward children", moderates were most likely to perceive this decision as solely a domestic issue: 70% of the politically moderate as compared to 44% of the liberals and 46% of the conservatives attributed it to the domestic domain.

(7) **Punishing children**

Of our total respondents 54.8% placed "punishing children" in the domestic domain and 36.7% categorized it in both the public and the domestic domains. The classification of the actual punishing of children,
like the decision to do so, was significantly correlated with R's political beliefs. In analogous fashion, moderates were most likely to perceive it as a domestic issue. While 54% of the liberals attributed it to the domestic domain, 70% of the moderates and 43% of the conservatives did the same (see figure 6).

(8) Decision to give religious education to children

Of all the items pertaining to children, the decision to give religious education to them was classified in the domestic domain by the greatest proportion of R's: while 83.6% placed it as primarily a domestic concern, only 11.3% placed it as a concern of both the public and the domestic domains. The categorization of the decision was correlated with the R's living arrangement and with their ethnic background (see figure 7).

WASPs are more likely to consider it a domestic issue than NONWASPs (87% versus 80%). R's living with their parents were also less likely to consider it as solely a domestic issue, while those living alone or with roommates or lovers were more likely to conceptualize it as an issue pertaining to the domestic realm (74% versus 90%). The group most likely to perceive this as a domestic issue was the group of individuals living with their spouses (see figure 7). When we control for ethnicity, however, we find that living arrangement has a significant bearing on the classification of the decision to give religious education to children only for
WASPs ($X^2 = 16.4$, d.f. = 8, $p = .07$, two-tailed). Within this group those living with their parents are least likely to attribute this decision to the domestic domain (73%) and those living alone or with their spouses most likely to do so (100% and 97%). Those living with their roommates or with a "mate" are more like the two latter groups in that respectively 93% and 90% of them attribute the decision to the domestic domain. Among NONWASPs however, there is no such significant pattern; i.e. living arrangement has no bearing on the categorization of the decision. In fact, in this group only one person out of a total of twenty-one (or 4.8%) considers this decision to be an issue of both the public and the domestic domains, the remaining twenty, or 95.2% all, without exception, attribute it to the domestic domain. (When missing data on living arrangement is excluded for NONWASPs, the percentage attributing the decision to domestic domain after controls, 95.2%, is higher than the overall percentage of 80% cited earlier.)

(9) **Giving religious education to children**

The actual giving of the religious education was placed in the domestic realm by 52% of the Rs and in both the public and the domestic domains by 41.8% of the Rs. The categorization of this item is correlated with age, marital status, respondents' present and future living arrangements (see figure 8).

---

Giving religious education to children was less likely to be ascribed to the domestic domain by individuals living with their parents or roommates (39%), those who expected to live in different circumstances in the future
-five years from now- (46%), those occupying the 18-23 years age group (44%), and those who were never married or were engaged to be married (47%), than by those living alone (67%) or with a lover (92%), those who expected to live in the same circumstances in the future (72%), those aged 24 and above (73%), and those who were married or whose marriages had ended (73%). Looking at this list of variables making up the sociocultural background of the Rs we can say that essentially, they refer to the same individuals. In American culture, in other words, individuals living with their parents or roommates are more likely to be ages 18-23, unmarried, and would expect to live in different circumstances in the future (expected living arrangement five years from now) since many will marry and/or find jobs and move out. Those aged 24 and above are more likely to be living alone or to have been married (2).

(10) Decision to give sex education to children

Of our total respondents, 36.7% placed this item in the domestic realm while 54.2% placed it in both the public and the domestic realms. However, the categorization of the decision to give sex education to children was not found to be correlated with any of the variables depicting the R's sociocultural background.

(11) Giving sex education to children

Of all the issues concerning the children's sphere "giving sex education to children" was placed in the domestic domain by the smallest proportion of the respondents: only 21% placed it in the domestic realm while 71% placed it in both the public and the domestic realms. The classification of this item is correlated with ethnicity (see figure 9). WASPs are less likely to ascribe this decision to the domestic domain than NONWASPs (19% versus 30%).
Decisions Versus Activities

Overall, in the issues pertaining to children, the decision concerning a child-related activity (to have children, to reward them, to give religious or sex education) is placed in the domestic domain by a larger percentage of respondents than the activity itself (see Table 3A).

The lone exception refers to the punishment decision, and the greatest divergence of more than 30% appears in regard to religious education. The implication that suggests itself is that the domestic domain is concerned more with decisions than with activities. A similar prevailing tendency can be seen in the core domestic domain which consists of basic chores. In all of the ten matched items, the decision is placed in the domestic domain by a greater proportion of respondents than the activity (see Table 3B). In neither instance, however, is the trend statistically significant (t = 1.17, d.f. = 4, p > .20, two-tailed; and, t = .286, d.f. = 9, p > .50, two-tailed).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of the Children's Sphere

As we saw earlier, there is a very high consensus among our respondents regarding the domestic core. By contrast, with reference to those decisions and activities which concern children, the children's
sphere, there is considerably less agreement. A significant proportion of our sample of subjects (39.6%) perceive a role for both decision-making and responsibility by agents outside the household in the children's sphere. That is to say, decisions and activities involving children are perceived as located only partly in the domestic domain.

Before proceeding further in our analysis, it is important to stress that, as we have seen, how various decisions and activities involving children are categorized by respondents does not reflect whether they themselves are parents; parenthood is not significantly associated with any of our items. Furthermore, in only one instance (rewarding children) is there a significant association with R's sex.

We postulate that the assignment of the various decisions and activities to different domains by the individual respondents is a reflection of their cognitive maps. Our graphic representations of the responses are a collective, visual rendering of these maps; in other words, they are a depiction of the "folk" classification system. Even where there are major differences among the groups within the sample, overall, the graphs show that somewhat different stretches of the domains space are utilized in the categorization of different decisions and activities concerning children. The greatest polarization here comes with regard to the "decision to give religious education" and "giving sex education". In the former the only area of the domains space occupied is above the 50% line (74% to be exact), in the case of the latter, the space occupied is totally below the 50% line (30% to be exact). The former is considered by an overwhelming majority to be a domestic decision, while the latter is seen to be largely a public responsibility. The finding concerning religion speaks
strongly for keeping religious education out of the public schools, and also perhaps for the separation of church and state. In this connection, we must recall our finding (of Table 1B) that 78% of our respondents placed "going to church" in the domestic domain. The church is seen, it would appear, as intimately linked to the family and not as a public arena beyond the family. Note that there are no significant differences between religious groups or groups with different religious commitment, regarding either "decision to give religious education" or "giving religious education".

In the case of assigning the responsibility for sexual socialization to the public, on the other hand, we seem to have an argument in favor of sex education courses in the schools. In these instances, we might extrapolate and say that individuals perceive more or less choice for self and/or more or less control by outside authorities respectively -- depending on the proportion of Rs that attribute a specific undertaking to the domestic or the extradomestic domain, or both for that matter (3). Assignment to the domestic domain, in other words, implies the perception of a greater degree of personal (internal) control and choice, while assignment to the public implies the perception of a lesser degree of personal control and a greater degree of external control.

When we consider the variables that affect the classifications made by the respondents regarding the children's sphere, it is clear that a majority of these are factors pertaining to ideology, in a very broad sense, (e.g. the religious and political identifications of self and significant others), rather than demographic characteristics such as sex, age, marital status and parenthood. In fact, in all instances except one when these
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ideological variables are controlled, the significant associations between the demographic characteristics and the classifications of the various items disappear. (The exception is living arrangement of WASPs and the manner in which they categorize the decision to give religious education to children).

Such religious and political "tags" may be interpreted as short-hand expressions of larger world views or symbolic realms. The classifications in the children's sphere are consistent with these tags. Sex is not an ideological variable and men and women live in the same culturally constituted universe.

We will now briefly attempt to interpret these classifications and the relationships.

(1) Decision to have children: There is general agreement that this is a household decision and little room is accorded to the public here. Individuals who identify with an institutionalized religion are, however, more likely to consider this a domestic decision than those who do not. It is particularly significant that the "hard core" religious groups should subscribe to this view. Overall, if the finding that an overwhelming majority of the American people consider the decision to have children to be domestically determined has any validity, then a public population policy is unlikely to be acceptable to the members of this society. This is consistent with the opinion polls showing Americans in the great majority to be in favor of choice about rather than prohibition of abortion (Source: Market Opinion Research, 1981 "Voter Attitudes About Government Involvement in the Abortion Issue").
(2) Bringing up and Caring for children: Approximately similar proportions of Rs place each responsibility in the domestic or both the public and domestic domains. A significantly higher proportion of those with liberal mothers rather than moderate or conservative ones accord a place to the public in bringing up children. The classification on the liberals' part might relate to concern over day care centers and problematic issues such as child abuse. For those Rs with moderate or conservative mothers, who see less of a public role in childrearing, it might imply a willingness to urge greater discipline in the home as well as in the school. Or, more indirectly it might suggest a return to traditional values with an emphasis on the view that "mother's place is in the home" since assignment to the domestic domain implies the presence of a caretaker at home.

(3) Rewards and Punishments in the Process of Child Socialization:

Rewards and punishments are considered essential to learning and discipline by the academic elite and lay people alike in American society; as the traditional folk saying goes: "Spare the rod and spoil the child". And, learning of course, is essential to becoming a well-functioning adult member of any society. Yet these are the items concerning the placement of which there is the greatest uncertainty: they produce the largest number of "don't know" responses (see Table 2).

The assignments of aspects of rewarding and punishing to the public and domestic domains were correlated with ideological variables: the former with religious and the latter with political ones. Father's degree of religiosity affected the decision to reward children, suggesting
that the model is respondent's own upbringing, rather than his or her own present situation. Respondents with more religious fathers were more likely to allow a place for the public domain in the making of this decision. For the action of rewarding children, R's own religious affiliation is relevant. For a majority of Jews, followed by Catholics, this is largely a domestic issue; for Protestants and agnostics, largely a public one. The groups that accord a greater place to the public may perceive rewards as being obtained in the public sphere—in school, or in scouting, rather than given as gifts or privileges in the home. On the other hand, the same might also relate to a greater degree of involvement with institutional structures. We may ask whether those who are very religious or of Protestant upbringing feel a greater sense of solidarity with the public domain, compared to those who are not. Boone (1980) has suggested, for instance, the presence of an ethnic public domain for the Cuban immigrants living in Washington D.C., a feature of life space which might be postulated for other minorities living in a pluralistic society as well. The ethnic public mediates between the domestic and the national public and is not necessarily congruent with the latter. This explanation, however, fails to account for the agnostics whose position parallels that of Protestants. It may well be that it is their upbringing rather than their present identification that affects their response.

Decision making and responsibility for punishing children are influenced by the same ideological variable and follow somewhat similar trends. In both cases, moderates are most likely to consider aspects of punishment as solely domestic issues. Regarding the decision to give
punishment, approximately equal proportions of the liberals and conservatives attribute it to both domains, while with the actual punishing more conservatives than liberals accord a place to the public. Presumably, as long as they themselves make the decision on which issues and on what grounds children are to be punished, conservatives would not mind public disciplining of their children, as for instance in schools, while liberals would seem to want the actual process of chastisement to take place in the home.

(4) Religious Education: We have already discussed the fact that the overwhelming majority classify the decision to give religious education to children as belonging to the domestic domain. Overall, WASPs are somewhat less likely to allow a place for the public than NONWASPs, however. When living arrangement is taken into account, though, we find that it is those WASPs who live alone or with a spouse or mate that are most likely to assign the decision to give religious education to children to the domestic domain; those living with their parents or roommates on the other hand, also see a role for the public here. Perhaps these latter groups, like the NONWASPs, are responding to the fact that they have less personal control over such decisions than older WASPs the course of whose lives has been more or less settled through jobs and/or marriage. Since the public domain in this country is more likely to reflect values of the Protestant culture, WASPs may feel a lesser degree of external control (and a greater degree of personal control) in religious matters than members of religious minorities. Also, of course, separation of church and state is a prominent feature of Protestant ideology.
The actual giving of religious education presents a trend consistent with the above explanation in at least one aspect. There is a statistically significant tendency for younger individuals living with their parents or roommates, and who expect to live in different settings in the near future to admit to a greater role for the public in the undertaking of this responsibility. Again, this might be interpreted to mean that this younger group perceives itself to be in a situation of low choice, with their parents, their church, or the school system having largely determined the course of their life on these matters up to this point. They might, in other words, be making their classifications on the basis of the circumstances they find themselves in now.

(5) Sex Education: As we noted earlier, a significantly higher share is accorded to the public in the matter of sexual socialization of children than in any other aspect of the children's sphere. The issue may well be one of recognizing and coming to terms with the current existence of sex education courses in schools and not necessarily a reflection of the preferences of individuals (4).

A higher proportion of WASPs allocate a role to the public in giving sex education to children than NONWASPs. Although the categorical distinction WASP-NONWASP is a very rough one, we interpret this to mean that as a result of the Protestant majority in this country, and the pervasive influence of Protestant values in all areas of life in American society, WASPs feel somewhat less threatened by the sex education their children would receive in schools and feel more assured of their role in the decision making process than do members of NONWASP minorities. Alternatively, it might be considered to be a function of the Puritan heritage
of Protestants that makes them relinquish what they perceive to be an embarrassing task to the impersonality of the school system.

The Children's Sphere Versus The Sphere of Basic Chores: A Contrast

A comparison between the sphere of basic chores and the children's sphere reveals an interesting contrast, as far as their position in the cognitive maps of our respondents is concerned. As we have seen, for an overwhelming majority of our respondents (93.6% on the average), the basic chores belong to the domestic domain; they represent its undisputed core. A common factor underlying the decisions and activities that make up this life space is that they need not involve more than one person and that their actual execution need not extend, spatially and socially, beyond the single household unit. In contrast to this core sphere of the domestic domain, the children's sphere is located betwixt and between the domestic and the public. It represents a marginal and transitional area, with the exception, as we have seen, of two items: the decision to have children and the decision to give children religious education. (Note that both of these concern decisions.) The children's sphere occupies this marginal position bridging two domains in two significant ways; First, a substantial number of Rs (41.1% on the average) categorize the children's sphere in both the public and the domestic domain, rather than exclusively as belonging to either domain. Secondly, in contrast to the high degree of consensus shown by our respondents in regard to the core domestic domain, where the children's sphere is concerned no such shared system of classification is to be found: slightly more than half (56.7% on the average) place the children's sphere in the
domestic domain, while on the average, slightly less than half (41.1%) place it in both the domestic and the public domains. In the case of the children's sphere, then, it is clear that we are not dealing with an area whose classification, with regard to the categories represented by the concept of two contrasting domains is shared by a preponderance of Americans (5). As we have already noted, however, there are two significant exceptions to this pattern: the decision to have children and the decision to give children religious education. In these two instances, but only in these two, did we find a high degree of agreement and in both instances the decisions were placed emphatically in the domestic domain: by 82.5% of the Rs in the former case, and by 83.6% in the latter.

In other words, in the children sphere (excepting these two items) we are dealing with an area where there is no consensus among Americans—approximately half place decisions and actions concerning children fully in to the domestic sphere, while the other half places them in both the domestic and the public sphere. (In those items where there is the greatest division, there is also the greatest uncertainty, as evidenced by neither and don't know responses (see Table 2)). This lack of consensus suggests two possibilities: 1) that the children's sphere is going through culture change which some respondents have internalized to a greater degree than others, and 2) that Americans are divided by differences in world view as reflected by religious and political variables. Decisions and actions concerning children are directly linked to values while the core domestic domain is not so linked.

The respective positions of the core domestic area (basic chores) and
of the children's sphere are represented graphically in Figure 10.

INSERT FIGURE 10 ABOUT HERE

Compared to the clearly delineated central position of the chores in the domestic domain, the overlapping position of the children's sphere reflects both the double assignment (domestic/public) by a large proportion of our Rs of various decisions and actions concerning children, and, also, the lack of consensus among the Rs regrading this sphere.

A Niche for the Children's Sphere

How can we account for the fact that overall the children's sphere appears as a fuzzy, transitional category such that it occupies almost a marginal place in the domestic domain while major and minor household chores and chore decisions have a solid, central place in the household, and, in fact, constitute the domestic core? In attempting to place this finding in to a meaningful framework we draw upon Gonzales' formulation of a supradomestic domain.

To fill the gap between the domestic world and the jural domain of industrial society, Gonzales proposes a third domain which she labels "supradomestic". She defines it as "that dimension of social organization in which so called domestic matters are at least partially controlled by the state apparatus" (1973:54). The supradomestic like the domestic, and unlike the jural, is increasingly dominated by women in the U.S. Gonzales points out that as production needs led men away from the household, they also left the affairs of the community to the women. Women
mayors, for instance, are no longer a rarity, but women are also active in all those matters requiring an articulation between the household and the larger community.

Women in the public realm tend to deal with domestic issues that have been increasingly encroached upon by juridic institutions (Gonzales, 1973). From the perspective of the children's sphere these include issues like child abuse, schoolboard politics, school taxes, busing, and other concerns surrounding public education. Indeed, women's political involvement in areas concerning children has broadened in the last decade, with women now vitally concerned about, and divided by, issues of abortion ("right to life") versus freedom of choice, and prayer in the schools, as well as sex education. Hence, it can be said that the public domain has intruded upon the domestic or that the domestic has expanded or been redefined especially in issues concerning children. It is the children's sphere, in other words, that has been most affected by changes in the industrial society and their impact upon the family unit. The bringing up of children is no longer an exclusive function of the domestic unit.

State agencies have assumed some control over them in the supradomestic domain. This control involves the entire education of children (schools) and their juridic concerns (through the formation, for instance, of agencies dealing with child abuse as well as adoption, juvenile justice, etc.). Hence, an explanation for why a considerable proportion of our respondents, compared to issues concerning the domestic core, designate children's issues in the betwixt and between category of "both the public and the domestic domains".
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Concluding Remarks

In this paper we have sought to analyze the children's sphere within the context of the domestic and public domains as defined by a sample of Americans. The larger study, of which this paper constitutes only a part, seeks to discover how Americans define the "domestic domain", that is, the limits of the authority for decision-making and actions within which they perceive American households to be operating. In doing so, we worked with a sample of college students, but, because the population of large public universities is no longer composed exclusively of "traditional" students, that is unmarried, young people between 18 and 25, we did, in fact, obtain responses from a much broader group with regard to age and marital status. This increases our confidence that our findings are indeed applicable to a larger population.

It is important to point out that our respondents live in diverse household settings, within which they hold varying positions. Thus of the 81 individuals (or 45.8% of the total sample) who live in nuclear family households, only a little more than half (55.6%) do so as dependent children, while a slightly lesser proportion (44.4%) are themselves spouses and/or parents. Others live in temporary arrangements (campus housing, such as dormitories or apartments) with friends or mates while maintaining ties to "home", that is to parental households. These frameworks, then, often serve as models for the classifications made by the respondents. In spite of these differences, as well as differences in sex, age, and parenthood, there is a high degree of convergence (88.8%) on what constitutes the "core" of the domestic domain -- a series of
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activities, and decisions regarding these, that fall to the household exclusively.

We interpret the convergence between the classifications made by the independent respondents as evidence for the underlying cultural basis of the conception of life-space in terms of public and domestic domains. It is important to note that of the 177 individuals who were given the questionnaire, only a very small minority asked the question of "What is the public (or domestic) domain?". In addition, very few (on the average 1.3%) were willing to concede that they did not know how to categorize a particular activity or decision. Furthermore, except in one instance (rewarding children), there were no significant differences between males and females in any of the classifications made, and, in that instance, when we controlled for the religious affiliation of the spouse, the significant association disappeared. Hence, we might say that the tacit norms and ideologies implicitly expressed in all areas of life, throughout life in American society, make their presence known in unexpected, alien settings such as during a class period devoted to filling out a questionnaire on the "sociocultural aspects of public and domestic domains".

In spite of the evidence thus produced to show that "public domain" and "domestic domain" are meaningful folk concepts for our American sample of respondents, there is also an indication here that this simple opposition does not accurately represent their perceptions. That the actual classifications are more complex is shown by the number of Rs who find that many items cannot be adequately classified as either domestic or public and rather see them as "both", that is, as involving both public
and domestic aspects. Our survey instrument asked Rs to classify items; it did not inquire into their motivations for the attributions they made. Some subsequent discussion with individual students suggests that classification may reflect either assessment of an actual state of affairs ("sex education in schools is a fact") or of a preference ("there should be public day care facilities"). In either case, a more complex conceptualization than a simple dichotomy appears to be operative.

The definitions and dichotomizations of life space into public and domestic domains provided in the literature -- primarily the women's studies literature -- appears to be only partially congruent with the "folk" classification we have elicited. It may well reflect the dichotomization more fully present at an earlier historical time, and thus reveal a type of "cultural lag". As far as other cultures are concerned, although they may also contain a public/domestic distinction, there is no reason to think that tasks and decision making are classified in the same manner that we found for the American sample investigated here; even the questions considered meaningful in another society are likely to be different.
NOTES

2 Indeed, when we examine the relationships between these variables, we find strong associations: age is correlated with marital status ($X^2 = 67.4$, d.f. = 9, $p = .0000$, two-tailed), with present and future living arrangements ($X^2 = 59.7$, d.f. = 12, $p = .0000$, two-tailed, and $X^2 = 31.6$, d.f. = 3, $p = .0000$, two-tailed, respectively); marital status is correlated with present and future living arrangements ($X^2 = 165.0$, d.f. = 12, $p = .0000$, two-tailed and $X^2 = 33.5$, d.f. = 3, $p = .0000$, two-tailed, respectively); and present and future living arrangements are correlated with each other ($X^2 = 37.6$, d.f. = 4, $p = .0000$, two-tailed).

3 A more refined measure of this would have been to ask the extent to which they assign a given undertaking to a particular domain. This is a more sensitive measure which we unfortunately do not have; only hindsight enables us to see its significance.

This assumes, of course, that the responses from our sample of respondents adequately represents the American macrocosm.

4 But see Opinion Polls e.g., study by Boy Scouts of America which found majority of parents and adolescents agreeing that sex education belongs in the schools (NBC Today Show, September 7, 1982).
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TABLE 1A
Decisions and Activities Assigned to the Domestic Domain
(n=177)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions/Activities</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making the beds</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after plants</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing the dishes</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to buy groceries</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to clean house</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking for household members</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to cook for household members</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking for dinner guests</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to buy pets</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning the house</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to call guests for dinner</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to go to church</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to buy new home furniture</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to rent an apartment</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to have elderly parents live in R's home</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to maintain religious beliefs</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying groceries</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to buy a house</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior decoration</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to give religious education to children</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to empty the garbage</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to buy a car</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to have children</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining religious beliefs</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions/Activities</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining the lawn</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to church</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to do volunteer work</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday planning and organization</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emptying the garbage</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after pets</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to open a charge account</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renting an apartment</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying a house</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to put elderly parents in an institution</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying a car</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to vote for public officials</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening a charge account</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IC
Decisions and Activities Assigned to the Domestic Domain
(n=177)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions/Activities</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bringing up children</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to maintain the lawn</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying monthly bills</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing volunteer work</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for children</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishing children</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to punish children</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving religious education to children</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to reward children</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding children</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting for public officials</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to give sex education to children</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving sex education to children</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting rape as a victim(^1)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting theft as a victim</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting white collar crime as a victim</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting theft as a witness</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting white collar crime as a witness</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting rape as a witness</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting murder</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) In all questions concerning crime reporting the aggressor was specified as a non-household member.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision or Activity</th>
<th>Domes. Domain</th>
<th>Both D &amp; P Dom.</th>
<th>Public Domain</th>
<th>Neither Domain</th>
<th>No info/ Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to have children</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing up children</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for children</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to reward children</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding children</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to punish children</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishing children</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to give religious education to children</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving religious education to children</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to give sex education to children</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving sex education to children</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3A
% of Rs Assigning Decisions Versus Activities Concerning Children to the Domestic Domain (n=177)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To have children</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>Bringing up children</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reward children</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>Rewarding children</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To punish children</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>Punishing children</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give religious education to children</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>Giving religious education to children</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give sex education to children</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>Giving sex education to children</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 61.8 46.9
Standard Deviation 20.54 15.15

\[ t = 1.17, \text{ d.f.} = 4, p > .20, \text{ two-tailed} \]
TABLE 3B

% of Rs Assigning Decisions Versus Activities Concerning the Domestic Core to the Domestic Domain
(n=177)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To buy groceries</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>Buying groceries</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To clean house</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>Cleaning the house</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To cook for household members</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>Cooking for household members</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To buy pets</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>Looking after pets</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To go to church</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>Going to church</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To rent an apartment</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>Renting an apartment</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain religious beliefs</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>Maintaining religious beliefs</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To buy a house</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>Buying a house</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To empty the garbage</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>Emptying the garbage</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To buy a car</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>Buying a car</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 88.83                                      77.59
Standard deviation 3.85                         9.83

$ t = .286, \text{d.f.} = 9, p > .50, \text{two-tailed} $
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<tr>
<th>Living Arrangement</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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