

Gendered Spaces: Examining the Role of Public and Private Spheres in Women's Empowerment

Jahanzeb Khan

University of Management and Technology, Lahore

Abstract

The concept of gendered spaces plays a pivotal role in shaping the empowerment of women, particularly through the dichotomy of public and private spheres. Historically, societal structures have confined women to the private sphere—home and family—while men dominated the public sphere—work, politics, and social engagement. This division has contributed to gender disparities in economic, political, and social participation. However, feminist discourses and contemporary research highlight that dismantling rigid gendered boundaries fosters women's empowerment. This paper explores the role of public and private spaces in influencing women's access to resources, education, employment, and political representation. It argues that increased participation in the public sphere empowers women by providing opportunities for leadership, financial independence, and social mobility. Simultaneously, transforming the private sphere by promoting gender-equitable domestic roles is essential to sustaining empowerment. The discussion draws upon sociological and feminist theories, including those of Simone de Beauvoir, Nancy Fraser, and Judith Butler, to critically analyze how spatial dynamics impact gender roles and identities. Case studies from both Western and non-Western societies are examined to illustrate the intersectionality of cultural, economic, and legal factors in shaping women's experiences. The paper concludes that achieving gender equity requires a redefinition of both public and private spaces, fostering inclusivity and agency for women. A multidimensional approach involving policy reforms, education, and societal shifts in gender perceptions is necessary to ensure sustainable empowerment.

Keywords: Gendered spaces, public sphere, private sphere, women's empowerment, gender equity, feminist theory, social mobility, political participation, economic independence, domestic roles

Introduction

The concept of gendered spaces has been a subject of critical discussion in feminist scholarship, as it directly influences power dynamics, agency, and the overall status of women in society. Historically, the division of space into public and private domains has reinforced gender roles, with men traditionally associated with the public sphere of work, governance, and decision-making, while women have been relegated to the private sphere of domesticity, caregiving, and familial responsibilities (Pateman, 1988). This spatial distinction has perpetuated structural inequalities, restricting women's access to education, economic independence, and political participation (Fraser, 1990). However, the shifting socio-political landscape and feminist movements have challenged these traditional roles, advocating for the redefinition of spaces to promote gender equality and women's empowerment.

Theoretical Perspectives on Gendered Spaces

Feminist theorists have extensively debated the implications of gendered spaces. Simone de Beauvoir (1949) argued in *The Second Sex* that women's subordination is historically constructed through societal norms that confine them to the private sphere. She emphasized that

liberation necessitates women's active participation in the public sphere, particularly in education and employment. Nancy Fraser (1990) expanded on this argument by highlighting the intersection of gender, class, and power, asserting that true empowerment requires both access to public spaces and the transformation of private spaces to reflect egalitarian values. Judith Butler (1990) further problematized gender binaries, arguing that the rigid categorization of spaces based on gender is a social construct that must be deconstructed to achieve inclusivity and equality.

Public Sphere and Women's Empowerment

The public sphere has traditionally been dominated by male-centric structures, limiting women's agency and decision-making power. However, access to education, professional opportunities, and political representation has significantly contributed to women's empowerment (Sen, 1999). Studies indicate that when women actively participate in the workforce, they gain financial independence, self-confidence, and the ability to influence societal decisions (Nussbaum, 2000). Moreover, political participation has been instrumental in addressing gender-based policies and legal reforms, as seen in the case of women's suffrage movements and contemporary leadership roles in various countries (Phillips, 1995).

Despite these advancements, challenges persist in ensuring equal opportunities. Gender pay gaps, workplace discrimination, and cultural biases continue to hinder women's progress in public domains (Acker, 1990). Furthermore, the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions underscores the need for systemic changes to foster gender-inclusive spaces (Krook & O'Brien, 2012). To address these disparities, policy interventions such as gender quotas, anti-discrimination laws, and educational initiatives have been proposed to create more equitable public spheres.

The Private Sphere and Its Role in Empowerment

While much focus has been placed on integrating women into the public sphere, transforming the private sphere is equally crucial for sustainable empowerment. Traditional gender roles within households have often constrained women's autonomy, reinforcing economic dependence and limiting their ability to engage in public life (Oakley, 1974). Domestic labor, disproportionately assigned to women, remains undervalued and unrecognized in economic policies, further exacerbating gender inequalities (Folbre, 2001).

Recent shifts in societal attitudes and feminist activism have emphasized the importance of shared domestic responsibilities. Studies show that when men actively participate in household and caregiving duties, women are more likely to engage in professional and educational opportunities (Hochschild & Machung, 1989). Additionally, legal frameworks supporting parental leave, flexible work policies, and affordable childcare services have proven effective in balancing domestic and professional responsibilities, thereby facilitating women's empowerment (Gornick & Meyers, 2003).

Intersectionality and Cultural Contexts

The impact of gendered spaces varies across cultural, economic, and political contexts. In many developing societies, traditional norms continue to restrict women's mobility, limiting their participation in public life (Kandiyoti, 1988). For instance, in some South Asian and Middle Eastern countries, cultural and religious interpretations influence gender segregation, affecting women's access to education and employment (Moghadam, 2003). Conversely, Nordic countries, known for their progressive gender policies, have successfully implemented inclusive

social structures that integrate women into both public and private spheres (Esping-Andersen, 2009).

The intersectionality of race, class, and gender further complicates the discourse on gendered spaces. Women from marginalized communities often face compounded disadvantages, necessitating intersectional approaches to empowerment (Crenshaw, 1989). Addressing these complexities requires culturally sensitive policies that recognize diverse experiences and structural barriers.

Redefining Gendered Spaces for Sustainable Empowerment

To achieve gender equality, it is essential to redefine and reconstruct gendered spaces through a multidimensional approach. This includes legal reforms that promote gender equity, educational programs that challenge traditional norms, and societal shifts that encourage shared domestic responsibilities (Walby, 2011). Additionally, urban planning and infrastructure development should consider gender-sensitive designs to create safer and more inclusive public spaces (Kern, 2020).

Technology has also played a transformative role in bridging the gap between public and private spheres. Digital platforms have provided women with opportunities for remote work, online education, and activism, enabling greater participation in socio-economic and political spheres (Gill & Ganesh, 2007). By leveraging these advancements, societies can foster more inclusive environments that empower women across different contexts.

Conclusion

The division of public and private spheres has historically shaped gender roles, often limiting women's empowerment. However, feminist movements and socio-political changes have challenged these boundaries, advocating for gender equity in both domains. While progress has been made, significant barriers persist in achieving full participation and representation for women. Addressing these challenges requires a holistic approach that integrates legal, economic, and social strategies to redefine gendered spaces. By promoting inclusive public and private spheres, societies can ensure sustainable empowerment and progress toward gender equality.

Literature Review

The discourse on gendered spaces and their impact on women's empowerment has been extensively explored in feminist and sociological literature. Scholars have analyzed the historical, cultural, and socio-economic dimensions of public and private spheres, emphasizing the role these spaces play in shaping gender roles, opportunities, and inequalities. Traditional gender norms have long dictated that men occupy the public domain—engaging in politics, economics, and decision-making—while women have been relegated to the private sphere, responsible for domestic and caregiving duties (Pateman, 1988). This division, deeply embedded in patriarchal societies, has resulted in systemic barriers that limit women's autonomy and participation in socio-economic and political spheres (Fraser, 1990).

Feminist theorists such as Simone de Beauvoir (1949) and Nancy Fraser (1990) have critiqued the rigid separation between public and private spaces, arguing that true gender equality requires dismantling these dichotomies. De Beauvoir's seminal work *The Second Sex* highlights how societal constructs have historically defined women as the "Other," confining them to subordinate roles within the private sphere. Fraser (1990) extends this argument by asserting that empowerment must involve both access to public resources and the restructuring of private domains to reflect egalitarian values. Judith Butler (1990) problematizes gender binaries,

emphasizing that gendered spaces are not natural but socially constructed, requiring active deconstruction to promote inclusivity.

The public sphere has been instrumental in advancing women's empowerment, particularly through education, employment, and political participation. Sen (1999) argues that access to education is a crucial determinant of women's social mobility, as it enhances economic independence and decision-making power. Empirical studies indicate that women's inclusion in the workforce leads to financial autonomy, increased self-confidence, and greater societal influence (Nussbaum, 2000). However, despite significant progress, structural challenges such as the gender pay gap, workplace discrimination, and occupational segregation persist, reinforcing traditional gender hierarchies (Acker, 1990). Women remain underrepresented in leadership positions, highlighting the need for policy reforms such as gender quotas, affirmative action, and anti-discrimination laws to create equitable opportunities (Krook & O'Brien, 2012).

Political representation has also been a key area of feminist inquiry. Phillips (1995) emphasizes the importance of women's presence in political institutions, arguing that their participation leads to more inclusive policy-making that addresses gender-specific issues. Studies show that countries with higher female political representation tend to enact policies that promote gender equality, such as maternity leave, childcare support, and equal pay regulations (Gornick & Meyers, 2003). However, cultural and institutional barriers continue to restrict women's political engagement, particularly in patriarchal societies where leadership roles are traditionally male-dominated (Kandiyoti, 1988).

The private sphere remains a critical site of analysis in discussions on gendered spaces. Historically, domestic labor has been undervalued and disproportionately assigned to women, reinforcing economic dependence and limiting professional opportunities (Oakley, 1974). Hochschild and Machung (1989) coined the term "second shift" to describe the dual burden of employment and household responsibilities that many working women face. This imbalance has significant implications for gender equality, as it constrains women's ability to engage fully in public life. Feminist scholars argue that achieving true empowerment requires a reconfiguration of private spaces, where domestic responsibilities are equitably distributed between men and women (Folbre, 2001).

Cultural factors also shape the dynamics of gendered spaces, influencing women's experiences across different societies. Kandiyoti (1988) discusses "bargaining with patriarchy," where women navigate traditional gender norms to maximize their agency within restrictive social structures. In many non-Western societies, cultural and religious interpretations continue to enforce gender segregation, limiting women's access to education and employment (Moghadam, 2003). Conversely, Nordic countries have implemented progressive gender policies that integrate women into both public and private spheres, resulting in higher levels of gender equality (Esping-Andersen, 2009). Intersectionality further complicates these dynamics, as women from marginalized communities often face compounded barriers related to race, class, and socio-economic status (Crenshaw, 1989).

The role of urban planning and infrastructure in shaping gendered spaces has gained attention in recent years. Kern (2020) argues that cities are often designed with male-centric perspectives, creating environments that are unsafe or inaccessible for women. Gender-sensitive urban planning, which includes well-lit public spaces, accessible transportation, and policies addressing gender-based violence, is essential for fostering inclusive environments. Digital spaces have also emerged as a new frontier for empowerment, enabling women to access remote work, online

education, and social activism (Gill & Ganesh, 2007). These developments challenge traditional spatial constraints and provide alternative avenues for participation in public life.

The literature collectively underscores that redefining gendered spaces requires a multidimensional approach involving legal, social, and economic strategies. Legislative reforms that promote gender equity, educational initiatives that challenge patriarchal norms, and societal shifts in perceptions of gender roles are essential for fostering sustainable empowerment. By addressing the structural and cultural barriers that restrict women's mobility and agency, societies can create more inclusive public and private spheres, ultimately advancing gender equality on a global scale.

Research Questions

1. How do public and private spheres impact women's empowerment in different cultural and socio-economic contexts?
2. What structural and policy interventions can redefine gendered spaces to promote greater inclusivity and equality?

Conceptual Structure

The conceptual structure of this research is based on the intersection of gendered spaces and women's empowerment. The framework integrates feminist theories, spatial dynamics, and socio-political factors to analyze the relationship between public and private spheres. The diagram below illustrates the interconnected dimensions influencing gendered spaces:

Significance of Research

This research is significant as it contributes to the ongoing discourse on gender equality by critically examining the spatial dynamics that shape women's empowerment. By analyzing the role of public and private spheres, this study provides insights into how structural barriers and cultural norms influence women's access to opportunities. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for policymakers, educators, and activists working to create more inclusive and equitable environments. The findings will inform policy recommendations aimed at fostering gender-sensitive urban planning, workplace inclusivity, and legal frameworks that promote shared domestic responsibilities. Additionally, this research highlights the importance of intersectionality in addressing the diverse experiences of women across different socio-economic and cultural contexts (Crenshaw, 1989). By redefining gendered spaces, societies can move toward sustainable empowerment and gender equity, ensuring that women have equal opportunities to participate in all aspects of life (Walby, 2011).

Data Analysis

The analysis of gendered spaces in relation to women's empowerment requires an in-depth examination of qualitative and quantitative data collected from diverse sources, including surveys, interviews, and case studies. This study critically evaluates how the division between public and private spheres affects women's participation in economic, social, and political activities. Previous research has demonstrated that women's engagement in the public sphere significantly contributes to their financial independence and social mobility (Sen, 1999). However, despite policy reforms aimed at gender equality, data indicates that gender disparities persist in employment opportunities, wage gaps, and leadership positions (Acker, 1990).

Quantitative data from global labor force reports reveal that women continue to be underrepresented in high-paying professions and decision-making roles, highlighting structural inequalities in workplace dynamics (Krook & O'Brien, 2012). Statistical analysis of employment

trends indicates that even in countries with progressive gender policies, women are often concentrated in lower-paying, part-time, or informal sector jobs due to prevailing socio-cultural norms (Nussbaum, 2000). Furthermore, the persistent gender pay gap underscores the challenges women face in negotiating salaries and career advancements (Phillips, 1995).

In contrast, qualitative data derived from interviews and focus groups with women across different cultural contexts reveal the social and psychological barriers that hinder their full participation in public life. Many women report that traditional gender norms and domestic responsibilities limit their ability to pursue professional and educational opportunities (Oakley, 1974). The concept of the "second shift" described by Hochschild and Machung (1989) remains relevant, as women in dual-income households continue to shoulder disproportionate household and caregiving duties. Case studies from patriarchal societies illustrate that restrictions on women's mobility and decision-making power further constrain their empowerment (Kandiyoti, 1988).

Analyzing data from political representation statistics also indicates that although the number of women in governance has increased, they remain significantly underrepresented in policymaking positions (Fraser, 1990). Countries with legislative gender quotas have shown higher female participation in politics, but qualitative analysis suggests that women still struggle with institutional biases and societal perceptions that frame politics as a male-dominated domain (Walby, 2011). Moreover, intersectional analysis highlights that women from marginalized communities experience compounded challenges due to race, ethnicity, and socio-economic background (Crenshaw, 1989).

The integration of spatial analysis into this study further examines how urban planning and infrastructure contribute to gendered spaces. Research indicates that poorly designed public spaces, lack of safe transportation, and inadequate facilities disproportionately affect women's mobility and safety (Kern, 2020). By analyzing case studies from different urban environments, this research identifies best practices in gender-sensitive planning that facilitate women's greater engagement in public life.

Overall, data analysis confirms that while significant strides have been made in advancing women's empowerment, deeply embedded societal structures continue to reinforce gendered spaces. The findings emphasize the need for comprehensive policy interventions that address both structural and cultural barriers to ensure sustainable gender equity.

Research Methodology

This study employs a mixed-methods research design, integrating both qualitative and quantitative approaches to provide a comprehensive analysis of gendered spaces and women's empowerment. The rationale for adopting a mixed-methods approach is to combine statistical insights with personal narratives, allowing for a deeper understanding of the structural and socio-cultural factors that shape gender roles in public and private spheres (Creswell, 2014).

The primary quantitative data source includes national and international labor force reports, gender disparity indices, and political representation statistics from organizations such as the United Nations, World Economic Forum, and national government databases. These datasets provide measurable indicators of women's participation in economic, social, and political domains, highlighting trends and disparities across different regions (Sen, 1999). Statistical tools such as regression analysis and comparative studies are employed to examine correlations between policy interventions and gender equity outcomes (Krook & O'Brien, 2012).

For qualitative analysis, the study relies on semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with women from diverse socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. These interviews explore their lived experiences, challenges, and perceptions of empowerment in relation to gendered spaces (Oakley, 1974). A purposive sampling strategy is used to ensure representation from various demographics, including urban and rural populations, working professionals, homemakers, and women in leadership roles (Crenshaw, 1989). Thematic analysis is applied to identify recurring patterns and narratives that highlight the influence of societal norms, family expectations, and institutional barriers on women's mobility and decision-making power (Fraser, 1990).

Additionally, case study analysis is incorporated to examine the impact of gender-sensitive policies in different countries. By comparing nations that have successfully integrated gender-inclusive policies with those that still enforce rigid gender norms, this study identifies best practices and areas for improvement (Esping-Andersen, 2009). Urban planning and spatial analysis are also employed to evaluate how physical environments influence women's participation in public life, focusing on factors such as safety, accessibility, and infrastructure (Kern, 2020).

The research ensures ethical considerations by obtaining informed consent from participants, maintaining confidentiality, and adhering to guidelines for ethical qualitative research (Creswell, 2014). By utilizing a multidisciplinary approach, this study provides a holistic understanding of gendered spaces and their role in shaping women's empowerment. The findings contribute to academic discourse, policy recommendations, and practical strategies for fostering gender equity across different societal contexts.

The analysis of masculinity in the 21st century requires a multidisciplinary approach that incorporates sociological, psychological, and cultural perspectives. Data collected from qualitative interviews, surveys, and content analysis of media representations provide a comprehensive understanding of how masculinity is evolving. A thematic analysis of qualitative data reveals recurring themes such as the decline of traditional male roles, the rise of alternative masculinities, and the impact of digital culture on male identity. According to Connell (2005), hegemonic masculinity is being challenged by changing societal norms, and data suggests that younger generations are more accepting of fluid gender roles compared to older demographics.

Quantitative data from surveys highlight significant shifts in perceptions of masculinity. For instance, studies indicate that a growing number of men reject traditional notions of dominance and stoicism, instead embracing emotional expression and egalitarian relationships (Kimmel, 2017). Statistical analysis further demonstrates that men who adopt progressive masculinity models report higher levels of psychological well-being compared to those who adhere strictly to traditional masculine norms (Courtenay, 2000). The correlation between mental health and masculinity is evident in research indicating that men who resist rigid gender expectations experience lower levels of stress and anxiety (Seidler et al., 2016).

Content analysis of media further reveals that masculinity is being reconstructed in digital spaces. Television, film, and social media platforms increasingly portray diverse forms of masculinity that challenge traditional stereotypes (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014). Data from media analysis indicates a shift in cultural narratives, with representations of caring, vulnerable, and emotionally intelligent men becoming more prevalent. However, the analysis also highlights the persistence of toxic masculinity in certain online communities, where traditional gender roles are

aggressively reinforced (Ging, 2019). This duality suggests that while progressive masculinities are gaining visibility, resistance from conservative segments of society remains strong.

Overall, data analysis supports the argument that masculinity is undergoing transformation rather than being in crisis. The intersection of economic changes, gender equality movements, digital influence, and mental health awareness is reshaping male identity. The findings align with Anderson's (2009) theory of inclusive masculinity, which posits that as society becomes more accepting of gender diversity, men have greater freedom to express their identities in non-traditional ways. Future research should further explore how these trends evolve across different cultural and socioeconomic contexts.

This study adopts a mixed-methods research approach, integrating both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to provide a comprehensive analysis of masculinity in the 21st century. The mixed-methods approach allows for an in-depth exploration of how socio-economic, cultural, and digital transformations influence male identity. Qualitative data is gathered through semi-structured interviews and content analysis of media representations, while quantitative data is collected via surveys and statistical analysis. This combination ensures a holistic understanding of the evolving nature of masculinity (Creswell, 2014).

The qualitative component involves conducting interviews with men from diverse backgrounds to understand their perspectives on masculinity. Participants are selected using purposive sampling to ensure representation across different age groups, professions, and cultural backgrounds. Interview data is analyzed using thematic analysis, identifying key themes such as emotional expression, economic challenges, and societal expectations (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Additionally, content analysis of television shows, movies, and social media discussions provides insights into how masculinity is constructed and challenged in digital spaces (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014).

The quantitative component includes survey-based research, with respondents answering questions related to gender norms, mental health, and perceptions of masculinity. Statistical analysis, including correlation and regression techniques, is used to examine patterns and relationships between masculinity and variables such as psychological well-being and social attitudes (Pallant, 2020). The survey is distributed across various demographic groups to ensure a representative sample, providing empirical evidence to support or challenge theoretical claims (Kimmel, 2017).

Ethical considerations are central to this study, ensuring confidentiality, informed consent, and respect for participants' perspectives. The research adheres to ethical guidelines in social science research, prioritizing the well-being of participants (Bryman, 2016). By integrating both qualitative and quantitative approaches, this study provides a nuanced and evidence-based understanding of how masculinity is being redefined in contemporary society. Future research can build upon this methodology by exploring cross-cultural variations in male identity formation.

References

1. Acker, J. (1990). "Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations." *Gender & Society*.
2. Beauvoir, S. de. (1949). *The Second Sex*.
3. Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*.
4. Crenshaw, K. (1989). "Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex." *University of Chicago Legal Forum*.

5. Esping-Andersen, G. (2009). *The Incomplete Revolution: Adapting to Women's New Roles*.
6. Fraser, N. (1990). "Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy." *Social Text*.
7. Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (2003). *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*.
8. Hochschild, A., & Machung, A. (1989). *The Second Shift: Working Families and the Revolution at Home*.
9. Kandiyoti, D. (1988). "Bargaining with patriarchy." *Gender & Society*.
10. Kern, L. (2020). *Feminist City: Claiming Space in a Man-Made World*.
11. Krook, M. L., & O'Brien, D. Z. (2012). "All the president's men? The appointment of female cabinet ministers worldwide." *The Journal of Politics*.
12. Nussbaum, M. C. (2000). *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*.
13. Oakley, A. (1974). *The Sociology of Housework*.
14. Pateman, C. (1988). *The Sexual Contract*.
15. Phillips, A. (1995). *The Politics of Presence*.
16. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*.
17. Walby, S. (2011). *The Future of Feminism*.
18. Acker, J. (1990). "Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations." *Gender & Society*.
19. Beauvoir, S. de. (1949). *The Second Sex*.
20. Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*.
21. Crenshaw, K. (1989). "Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex." *University of Chicago Legal Forum*.
22. Esping-Andersen, G. (2009). *The Incomplete Revolution: Adapting to Women's New Roles*.
23. Fraser, N. (1990). "Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy." *Social Text*.
24. Gill, R., & Ganesh, S. (2007). "Empowerment, constraint, and the Internet." *Feminist Media Studies*.
25. Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (2003). *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*.
26. Hochschild, A., & Machung, A. (1989). *The Second Shift: Working Families and the Revolution at Home*.
27. Kandiyoti, D. (1988). "Bargaining with patriarchy." *Gender & Society*.
28. Kern, L. (2020). *Feminist City: Claiming Space in a Man-Made World*.
29. Krook, M. L., & O'Brien, D. Z. (2012). "All the president's men? The appointment of female cabinet ministers worldwide." *The Journal of Politics*.
30. Moghadam, V. M. (2003). *Modernizing Women: Gender and Social Change in the Middle East*.
31. Nussbaum, M. C. (2000). *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*.
32. Oakley, A. (1974). *The Sociology of Housework*.
33. Pateman, C. (1988). *The Sexual Contract*.
34. Phillips, A. (1995). *The Politics of Presence*.
35. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*.

36. Walby, S. (2011). *The Future of Feminism*.
37. Acker, J. (1990). "Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations." *Gender & Society*.
38. Crenshaw, K. (1989). "Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex." *University of Chicago Legal Forum*.
39. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.
40. Esping-Andersen, G. (2009). *The Incomplete Revolution: Adapting to Women's New Roles*.
41. Fraser, N. (1990). "Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy." *Social Text*.
42. Hochschild, A., & Machung, A. (1989). *The Second Shift: Working Families and the Revolution at Home*.
43. Kandiyoti, D. (1988). "Bargaining with patriarchy." *Gender & Society*.
44. Kern, L. (2020). *Feminist City: Claiming Space in a Man-Made World*.
45. Krook, M. L., & O'Brien, D. Z. (2012). "All the president's men? The appointment of female cabinet ministers worldwide." *The Journal of Politics*.
46. Nussbaum, M. C. (2000). *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*.
47. Oakley, A. (1974). *The Sociology of Housework*.
48. Pateman, C. (1988). *The Sexual Contract*.
49. Phillips, A. (1995). *The Politics of Presence*.
50. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*.
51. Walby, S. (2011). *The Future of Feminism*.
52. Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4(2), 139-158.
53. Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.
54. Alcoff, L. (2006). *Visible identities: Race, gender, and the self*. Oxford University Press.
55. Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination*. Stanford University Press.
56. Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
57. Cockburn, C. (1991). *In the way of women: Men's resistance to sex equality in organizations*. Macmillan.
58. Cornwall, A., & Rivas, A. (2015). From 'gender equality' to 'gender justice': The role of rights in feminist politics. *Third World Quarterly*, 36(2), 396-415.
59. Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139-167.
60. De Beauvoir, S. (1949). *The second sex*. Vintage.
61. Esping-Andersen, G. (2009). *The incomplete revolution: Adapting to women's new roles*. Polity Press.
62. Fainstein, S. S. (2011). *The just city*. Cornell University Press.
63. Federici, S. (2004). *Caliban and the witch: Women, the body and primitive accumulation*. Autonomedia.
64. Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, 25/26, 56-80.
65. Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.

66. Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.
67. Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Cornell University Press.
68. Hartmann, H. (1981). The unhappy marriage of Marxism and feminism. *Women and Revolution*, 1(1), 1-41.
69. Hochschild, A. R., & Machung, A. (1989). *The second shift: Working families and the revolution at home*. Viking.
70. hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. South End Press.
71. Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, 2(3), 274-290.
72. Kern, L. (2020). *Feminist city: Claiming space in a man-made world*. Verso.
73. Krook, M. L., & O'Brien, D. Z. (2012). All the president's men? The appointment of female cabinet ministers worldwide. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(3), 840-855.
74. Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. University of Minnesota Press.
75. McDowell, L. (1999). *Gender, identity, and place: Understanding feminist geographies*. Polity Press.
76. Mohanty, C. T. (1988). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review*, 30, 61-88.
77. Nussbaum, M. C. (2000). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge University Press.
78. Oakley, A. (1974). *The sociology of housework*. Martin Robertson.
79. Pateman, C. (1988). *The sexual contract*. Stanford University Press.
80. Phillips, A. (1995). *The politics of presence*. Oxford University Press.
81. Puwar, N. (2004). *Space invaders: Race, gender and bodies out of place*. Berg.
82. Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 5(4), 631-660.
83. Robinson, F. (2011). *Globalizing care: Ethics, feminist theory, and international relations*. Westview Press.
84. Scott, J. W. (1986). Gender: A useful category of historical analysis. *American Historical Review*, 91(5), 1053-1075.
85. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
86. Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). University of Illinois Press.
87. Walby, S. (2011). *The future of feminism*. Polity Press.
88. Waring, M. (1988). *If women counted: A new feminist economics*. Harper & Row.
89. Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton University Press.
90. Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). *Gender and nation*. Sage.
91. Zakaria, R. (2021). *Against white feminism: Notes on disruption*. W. W. Norton & Company.