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As Chairman of Home Renaissance Foundation, it always gives me great pleasure to see one of our international conferences materialise into an e-book. A lot of hard work goes into organising these events and we are especially indebted to all the academics and practitioners who contribute papers. These collaborations between the Foundation and our speakers and panellists are helping us build a solid foundation of knowledge around the importance of the work of the home.

The Sustainable Living: Professional Approaches to Housework conference proved to be an important milestone for the Home Renaissance Foundation not only because it gathered speakers and delegates from 22 countries around the world, but also because it dealt directly with the issue the Foundation was created to study, namely housework and its place in the life of the home and of society. What is more, the bold strap line Professional Approaches to Housework reflected the values we put forward in our mission statement: ‘Home Renaissance Foundation believes that professional excellence in attending to the fundamental needs of persons and their environment contributes to the well-being of people and society by making it more humane.’

By taking this approach, the conference provided a fresh, contemporary look at a universal topic. Whether or not everyone agrees with Laura Ingalls Wilder, ‘home is the nicest word there is,’ it is a place that is near and dear to everyone’s heart. The home is a special place, but it is more than a mere physical environment we love to be in. It is the context in which we share conversations with people we care about, where we are looked after and the retreat where we can find rest from our duties and responsibilities outside the home. The home is built on relationships, and the different aspects of the work of the home manifest and nurture those relationships.

The conference brought to light the intrinsic relationship housework has to the individual, and consequently to society. As such, the work of the home is a multifaceted reality that has a significant impact on economics, law, biology, sociology and business.

It is simply undeniable that the work of the home is one of the most universal human experiences as becomes evident by typing ‘housework’ or ‘homemaking’ into a search engine. Whether people do it for themselves, for members of their family or for clients, we all engage with it in some way. Put simply, the work of the home keeps us going as human beings.

But what does this all have to do with sustainability? Sustainability, in its various meanings and contexts, has become a buzzword of modern society. In its most radical forms it has transformed into a strict regime or ideology that must be followed at all costs. For most of us, however, it is how we come to terms with the idea that the world we live in – which encompasses our social struc-
It is precisely that human aspect that links the work of the home to sustainability or so argued the experts at the Sustainable Living conference. If the home is our fundamental experience of order, harmony, justice and interdependence then we must start to acknowledge how much of that experience is due to housework. Furthermore, studies suggest that housework plays a crucial role in productivity, employee satisfaction and real-life economics.

The papers you will read in this e-book explore these topics from a variety of perspectives ranging from Economics and Business to Sociology and Biology. The value Home Renaissance Foundation has seen in publishing these papers is twofold. On one hand the Foundation would like to celebrate the quality of the papers presented at the conference. More importantly, however, we hope that these papers will help us raise awareness of this important topic and encourage others to carry out further research on it. Growing in our understanding of the value of the work of the home is fundamental for creating the cultural change which is so urgently needed to ensure that we create a sustainable society.
The words excellence and home resonate in everyone’s mind and heart. Excellence is an attribute we all aspire to in our personal and professional endeavours, and home, as T.S. Eliot wrote, is ‘where one starts’. Home is not simply a physical location; it is where we come from and where we go to, it belongs to the essence of our lives and it is where we belong. It is so enshrined in the desires and needs of human beings that without a home, it is hard to live a fulfilled life. For most people ‘home’ is a place that recalls happy memories and feelings of warmth, acceptance, comfort and care. It is also a place where these basic human needs are met in a way that respects their human dignity and enables them to develop to their full potential, be it socially or professionally. Yet, despite its extraordinary importance, the work of the home has often been taken for granted. In an effort to bring greater societal awareness of this work, Home Renaissance Foundation (HRF) promotes and develops greater recognition of the importance of the work required to create a home which meets the fundamental needs of human beings (both individually and in family, as a basic underpinning of society).

This book brings together the contributions by a distinguished panel of speakers, including academics, economists, business executives and journalists, who gathered at the third Home Renaissance Foundation conference at the Grocers’ Hall, in March 2011. This interdisciplinary and international conference – with the same title as the book – aimed to shine light directly on the work of the home. Previous HRF conferences approached the work of the home from the perspective of a particular academic field or profession: in 2006 it was the impact of a healthy diet on a balanced life, and in 2008 it was the role of architecture and urban planning to transform a house into a home.

The word sustainability has become a fashionable term in political and economic circles, nationally and internationally. Whether it is in relation to the environment, to the economy or to the legal system, sustainable practises are now advocated, with regard to all aspects of development. Indeed, we owe it to future generations: to pass onto them a sustainable world. We should not burden our children and grandchildren with such an intergenerational debt. One key dimension of sustainability which has often been overlooked refers to the work in the home, since at the core of our existence, a sustainable society is grounded upon well rounded people nurtured in a home. Roots and wings is what we get in a functioning home: roots to know where we come from and wings to be able to fly and discover new horizons. And a functioning home requires competence and professionalism in the work of the home.

As writer, broadcaster and lecturer Charles Handy reminds us, the home is a school for life. And in this school, we must consider the
relationship between the home and the family, which are typically intertwined in our lives. Legislation must look after both. This means that we need adequate laws to protect the family as a key foundation of our society. A number of ‘tangible issues’ ought to be included in the legislation, such as the safeguard of the role of women in the workplace, providing greater flexibility not only in the initial stages (birth of a baby) but also in the raising and education of children (which often implies a readjustment of the time horizons of women’s careers), or the professionalisation and training of domestic service, to empower both the profession and the people who dedicate their life to this dignified work. But in addition to these tangible issues, we must also consider the ‘intangible’ aspects, such as the nurturing of human beings, which brings about the much used (and sometimes abused) notion of love and loving care. Loving care is certainly needed by everyone but in particular by those that are more fragile such as the very young and the very old, or disadvantaged through sickness, disability, poverty or some other reason. The problem of course is that laws alone cannot provide for this. No amount of prescriptive rules (each regulatory perimeter brings its own shadows and loopholes) can compensate for the general principles of fairness, justice and non-discrimination that should permeate all laws. And this brings us back to the ethical dimension and the dignity of the human being, and to the principles of natural law. Many of these principles have found worldwide acceptance in the UN Declaration of ‘human rights’. But a lot remains to be done and the need to foster and teach these principles and values should be an essential part of education. Hence the importance of an ethical and religious upbringing where words such as compassion and mercy have a real meaning beyond the rules of the market or the positive laws of the State.

During Day one of the conference, Professor Sergio Belardinelli of the University of Bologna suggested that modern culture should put more emphasis on the family and the home as opposed to the individual. While acknowledging some of the benefits that the neo-liberal society places on individualism, such as “an end to the subjugation of women”, he also emphasised some of the great costs to a society that places less value on family ties. He called for a rebalancing in favour of the family and the home: “If it is true that the human being must be at the centre of every society and that the family represents the best environment in which this person grows and develops independence and social potential, then it is necessary to ensure that work carried out by family in that respect is also recognised and promoted socially. The family must not be left alone.”

Helen Kersley, a researcher at the think-tank ‘The New Economics Foundation’, suggested that the work of the home is a “core economy” that needs to be rewarded better. She pointed out that despite the family and the community being so fundamental to our society, the current economic system fails to reward them
adequately since often they are not included under market activity. The journalist and presenter of Channel 4’s How Clean is Your House, Aggie MacKenzie addressed the more practical question of how housework can be transformed into more valuable work in its own right.

During Day two of conference speakers and panellists - Professor Mauri Ahlberg of the University of Helsinki, Dr. Michael-Burkhard Piorkowsky, a professor of household economics at the University of Bonn, Professor Peggie Smith of the University of Washington in St. Louis, Missouri, Dr. David Prendergast of Intel Corporation - explored the important role the homemaker plays in social sustainability. Important as they may be for our well-being, the home’s contribution to our lives is not only emotional. Although it is rarely acknowledged, household production also contributes significantly to the economy. Professor Peggie Smith pointed out that the poor working conditions domestic workers face (long hours, low wages and no benefits to name a few) are linked to the little value given to women’s unpaid work in the home. ‘One of the major problems is that domestic service is seen to rely on a woman’s innate skills rather than on training. It is considered to be an extension of women’s unpaid work in the home.’ This requires appropriate training, compensation, recognition and reward. As a mother of four children and a professional woman, I believe that the value of domestic housework is not something we should economise on.
One of the immediate findings of the conference is that the value of good domestic role models is immeasurable. Further research and consideration are clearly needed and the Excellence in the Home conferences are a step towards acting as a catalyst that renews the culture of the home.

I personally learnt the culture of the home from my grandmother. ‘Abuela Teo’ (as we lovingly called her) had run a hotel in her home – in a village in Spain called Piedrahita - as a business and, as my mother recalls, she had made the guests in her hotel ‘feel at home’. But it is the memories of her in her kitchen - where I learnt one of the arts that make a home - that most reverberate in the fabric of my life. She knew how to bring dignity and love to the work of the home. She died last year at the ‘young age’ of 99 (she was born a few weeks before Titanic sunk) and it is to her memory that I dedicate this foreword.
I have been asked to talk about a very sensitive and complex issue: The influence of the home in social dynamics. I will start off with the question posed by the organisers for my paper: How is the home, and specifically the work at home, a crucial factor in the way society works and develops?

The question, in my view, contains a paradox. It supposes, in fact, quite rightly, that the home, the work of the home, represents a “crucial factor” for the life of society. I would say that the large majority of men and women in our western world would fully agree with this. And yet – here is the paradox – our public policies do not seem to reflect this fact. The work of the home is considered to be a work of secondary importance. Everyone, like it or not, is beginning to realise that a large part of the resources of a community, including “civic” resources, depend on the family, on the home; and yet we consider the work of the home simply as if it were a question of cooking, cleaning, washing the dishes and making the beds. Not to mention the dominant culture, which tends increasingly to consider the Home, the Family, as an eminently “private” matter. And yet, as Home Renaissance Foundation suggests, a great deal more is at stake. The way in which the whole of society “works and develops” is dependent on this work. In other words, it is important to recognise the “social subjectivity” of the family – i.e. the fact that the family represents, yes, a private sphere, but also the place where a society elaborates its ethos, its fundamental values, the values that are essential for ensuring an ordered civic life. I am thinking, for example, as I will examine later, about trust, respect, a sense of responsibility and common good. But recognising this would lead to radical changes for the “subjectivism” which dominates our culture and the conception of our systems of welfare. This is the reason why it is preferred to allow the paradox to remain or, at least, why there is a failure to resolve it.

With a certain spirit of provocation, I would say that our public disinterest in the work of the home, in the importance that a patient construction of satisfactory family relationships has upon social relationships in general, is almost reminiscent of the Greek world where, in effect, the oikos, the family, the domestic economy, was no more than a place for the servants and the women, the place where the polis was limited to reproducing its citizens and providing what was necessary for their survival. But real life, the really human life, took place outside the home; it was what went on in the agora and in the academy: the political and philosophical centres.

Curiously, what has been happening over these last thirty to forty years is rather reminiscent of the low respect the Greeks had for family life. The way in which women enter the world of employ -

1. Professor of Sociology at the Universita di Bologna
ment, almost as if they can achieve true “self-realisation” only by leaving the walls of the home, denotes a dramatic tension between family life and social life. The so-called “middle-class family” which has emerged from modern processes of industrialisation, the family based on the rigid distinction of roles between man and woman – one required to work outside the home to provide for material necessities and the other confined to the home to look after the house and children – this family, while creating an unjustifyable imbalance between men and women, nevertheless recognised the social and symbolic importance of work at home, especially insofar as the education of children. And yet, as soon as work outside the home seems destined to become the true means of self-fulfilment for both men and women, we find that there is no more time for work in the home. Family life and the job world become almost two conflicting environments; where there is one, there seems to be no more room for the other. To the detriment, obviously, of work at home and the children, but also with serious disadvantages for both society and family relationships. Here we think, on the one hand, of the population crisis (perhaps the most dramatic problem in Europe today) and, on the other hand, of the growing dissatisfaction on the part of many men and women who would like to bring more children into the world, but decide not to do so for fear of having insufficient time to look after them.

I will not talk at length about the countless studies, past
and present, into this worrying and complex phenomenon. I will merely observe that it is necessary to start off from this very point for a new consideration of the family, in terms of work as well as social life in general, which is capable above all of recognising their interdependence. In other words, we must carry out some sort of major reconciliation between family and work, between family time and work time, with an awareness that the life and work of the family are reflected in the life and work of society. And so I now reach the question I have been given.

The great challenges we face – from bioethics to biopolitics, from problems of population to those of immigration, from the crisis in traditional educational institutions to problems among the younger generations and the reform of our welfare systems – all seem to focus on the family. Whatever issue, whether of anthropological, social, political, ethical or even theological relevance, must necessarily take into account the institution of the family, demonstrating its undoubted centrality both in the life of the individual as well as that of society. Despite this, a certain dominant culture today seems to have great difficulty in recognising this centrality, apparently wanting even to remove it, reducing the family to something eminently “private” and subjecting it to a series of attacks which give rise to considerable concern.

From being the primary factor in the life of society, the family seems to have become, in effect, simply one factor, no longer of particular importance, in the life of the individual. The increase in the number of divorces, the reduction in the number of marriages, the increase in the number of single people and unmarried couples, the reduction in the number of children and medically assisted reproduction are some of the many signs of a profound socio-cultural change, one of whose main conditions of possibility, resulting from the modern culture, is the “movement towards individuality”, as Simmel described it. Like most historical changes, this is a process which has obviously brought both good and bad, producing negative repercussions, as I have already indicated, but also having many positive aspects. The end of women’s subjection to men, the development of family relationships which are more clearly marked by reciprocal responsibility and reciprocal respect, a greater awareness of the responsibility involved in bringing children into the world and in their education – these are just some examples of factors which have had a positive effect. It is therefore quite wrong to interpret the modern process towards individuality purely in terms of progress or purely in terms of decline. As I have already indicated, it is a question of being able to see both sides. In philosophical terms, it is ultimately a question of deciding whether we are facing a process where human reason and freedom have to be interpreted in an individualistic and relativistic sense, with the risk of it backfiring on man himself, or in a sense which, recognising reality as their measure and limit, protects them from dangerous inhuman excesses. And it is precisely
at this level, for reasons which I shall explain, that the great socio-cultural relevance of the family emerges as a “point of intersection between public and private” even as primary factor – let’s admit it – in the life of society, as a relationship of fundamental importance, as a means of safeguarding the many benefits which have accompanied the development of modern awareness in terms of personal independence, freedom and dignity.

But, it will be asked, what kind of family are we talking about? Is it not true that there now exist many types of family, recognised and encouraged by the official documents produced by the United Nations Organisation, by the European Community and by the legal systems of many countries? In effect, this is true. But if we look at concrete reality, we notice that, especially today, this reality does not entirely match up with the cultural categories which have inspired these documents. In fact, not only do we find that, alongside the growing pluralisation of family forms, there is an undoubted persistence of what we shall call the “traditional” family set-up; but more importantly, it seems that there are now no practical equivalents to certain social functions carried out by the “traditional family” and those functions are increasingly important for the development of a civilised society worthy of that name.

At this point it has to be recognised, in effect, that the term “traditional family” contains within it a substantial ambiguity, due to the fact that the adjective “traditional” refers to the past, to the by-gone family, to a type of family which in many respects no longer exists: the so-called “extended” family with many children, grandparents who lived under the same roof, rigid separation of roles, a more or less clear subordination of the woman, fairly linear intergenerational relationships, generally pre-determined social roles, carried out on a sort of automatic basis. But if what Levi Strauss stated is true, namely that the more or less permanent, socially approved union, of a man, a woman and their children is a universal phenomenon, present in all and every type of society (Levi Strauss 1952), then the adjective “traditional” could also refer to what constitutes a sort of constituent element of the family, a permanent relationship immune to the wear and tear of time, and essential to enable us to continue talking about the family; something therefore which, while depending upon the choice of the individual, is such by nature: something whose possibilities are for this reason endless; a “social relationship” which, in the various historical forms that it assumes, involves more or less every aspect of human existence – biological, psychological, economical, social, legal, political, religious – and which for this reason is capable of adapting to all changes, even of the most radical kind.

Apart from the many transformations which have taken place in the family, especially in recent years, in terms of structure as well as roles, aside from the widely proclaimed pluralisation of family forms as a characteristic and liberating feature of society
today, I believe that it is still possible, indeed necessary, to establish criteria capable of distinguishing the family – what we can still call the “traditional family”, provided that the term is not misunderstood – from other forms of social grouping. Following Levi Strauss and without wishing in any way to bring into question the legitimacy of other forms of cohabitation, this criterion, in very general terms, could be formulated as follows: a true family exists only where there is at least one heterosexual couple whose cohabitation is ratified by a public pact of a religious or civil kind, or a parent-child relationship.

III

In what follows, I will try to show that today this kind of family represents a public resource, a social and individual asset of inestimable value.

I am obviously well aware that modernisation has transferred many responsibilities from social institutions (including the family) to individuals, and that it is individuals who represent the fundamental point of reference in terms of the risks and opportunities of our society. But this individualistic organisation of life does not respond to people’s relational needs, especially the needs of those who have to look after families, and in particular children. Contrary to what is claimed by current variegated forms of individualism, “no man is an island”. The nature of man is relational, and the most natural form of relationship is the family. The family encapsulates the human being’s anthropological significance. Failure to take into account this “relational” or “familial” nature produces an individual who is abstract, hypothetical, de-naturalised – an individual who in reality does not exist. Liberal culture and institutions must therefore be revitalised in order to highlight the importance of the family, showing that the family truly represents the primary and fundamental factor of society. In any event, a pluralistic and liberal society cannot survive on contractual relationships alone. Contracts certainly signify independence and freedom; the same can be said about laws, the legitimacy of which is no longer determined from on high, as happened in the past, but from free discussion and agreement between those concerned. Nevertheless, it cannot be forgotten that, in order for discussion and contractual agreements to take place, society has to be infused with a particular spirit, consisting of trust, a sense of the common good, tolerance, responsibility, and mutual understanding. This spirit cannot be produced contractually, but only through that slow process of socialisation which begins in the family itself and then continues in the school and in all other institutions and social relationships. In this sense, despite the difficulties that it faces, the family is certainly an important training ground, where children can learn from an early age how to relate with others, how to deal with conflict, with differing interests and points of view, allowing children, from the very beginning, to understand the need for tolerance, the need for agreement, so that we feel unity and love, a sense of living
in a world which, despite all its problems, has the appearance of a home, a home for everyone. It is in the family that the relational nature of mankind emerges, in other words, the fact that others are an essential and fundamental part of our personal being and our freedom. As John Donne stated, no man is an island.

Among the reasons why the family is considered to be an important public asset is its capacity to produce trust in the world and in life.

In a memorable passage in her book The Human Condition, Hannah Arendt writes: "The miracle that saves the world, the realm of human affairs, from its normal, “natural” ruin is ultimately the fact of birth, in which the faculty of action is ontologically rooted. It is, in other words, the birth of new men and the new beginning, the action they are capable of by virtue of being born. Only the full experience of this capacity can bestow upon human affairs faith and hope, those two essential characteristics of human existence which Greek antiquity ignored altogether. [...] It is this faith in and hope for the world that found perhaps its most glorious and most succinct expression in the few words with which the gospels announced their ‘glad tidings’: ‘A child has been born to us.’” (Arendt 1958).

Every child who is born is a sign of hope, of faith with regard to world and life; it is the sign that, despite the decrepitude that inevitably pervades our individual and social reality, something new is always possible, and with it, the freedom, the opportunity of starting something which otherwise would never begin. But if this is true, then it is necessary to recognise that the so-called “demographic winter” is much more than a social problem; it is instead a genuine symbolic tragedy which is destined to reflect negatively upon a whole range of aspects of society. By this I mean that our birth-rates are close to zero, the reversal of the so-called demographic pyramid (many grandparents, few grandchildren, rather than many grandchildren and few grandparents) is having and will certainly continue to have dangerous social effects (which I will consider later), but their most profound significance is another: they demonstrate above all the dangerous lethargy which is gradually taking over our hearts, the widespread indifference towards renewal and freedom, our ill-concealed, worrying complicity with death.

If it is true that today we live in a complex society, in a society where almost all of the automatic assumptions of the past have been destroyed, including that of marriage and bringing children into the world, the gain in terms of freedom and capacity to choose increasingly personalised lifestyles must not be paid in terms of lack of interest in life, since this paradoxically numbs our freedom; it renders us increasingly individualistic, increasingly alone and therefore increasingly exposed to the risk of exploitation. If yesterday our freedom suffered from an excess of
social ties, today it suffers from an excessive lack of them and people are finding it more and more difficult to construct satisfactory relationships with themselves and with others.

Here emerges, once again, what is certainly one of the most important social functions of the family with children and of the work which has to be done within the family with children: the capacity to promote in society the sense of the relationship with others and, consequently, the sense of common good.

Today, as is well known, there are frequent references to a society which is gradually losing the sense of its own tradition as well as faith in the future. The younger generations in particular seem to find it difficult to feel a sense of being “generated” and, in turn, a capacity to “generate”. Whatever might be the reasons for this incapacity, which are certainly connected with the individualism, narcissism and fragmentation that pervade our society, one thing is certain: the family is capable of representing a special place for safeguarding the sense of the generational chain. Quite simply, it could be said that it is difficult for someone living in isolation to feel part of a shared story. The practice of living with others, of sharing a home, objects and emotions, strengthens both the relationship with the local community as well as the capacity for emancipation as an independent individual. The independent identity of every person depends in fact on the capacity for personal expression, for each person to express their own story through being a part of other stories. In the very fine and profound words of Alasdair MacIntyre, we could also say that the narrative of anyone’s life is part of a series of interconnected stories (MacIntyre 1984), without which our stories would be autistic, non-stories, therefore transient, disconnected stories of no importance. Our individualistic era seems to have lost sight of their meaning, but the interminable genealogies of certain pages of the Bible were there to provide a clear indication of the generational chain along which our identities are rooted. Forgetting this chain doesn’t make us more independent or more free; and our young people are well aware of it. They have often been brought up in a context which is historically (and therefore ethically) neutral, often without brothers or sisters, with parents who themselves feel lost and, like their children, are desperately searching for roots. I believe that it is also for this reason that today we are once again beginning to feel a certain need everywhere for family; and the family with children, indeed with many children, from being a sign of cultural backwardness, is becoming a sort of status symbol in the collective imagination.

As soon as the family strengthens intergenerational links, it performs a very important social function: it safeguards a community’s tradition. After a long period of suspicion and hostility, the concept of tradition is rightly regaining a certain prestige within western culture. We are beginning to realise that it
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has little or nothing to do with so-called “traditionalism” and much to do, instead, with memory, identity and hope for the future of a community. In a very fine passage, dating back to the 1930s, the Portuguese writer Fernando Pessoa noted that he belonged “to a generation which has lost all its respect for the past and all belief and hope in the future” and that therefore he experienced “the present with the hunger and anxiety of one who has no other home” (Pessoa, 2002). It must be recognised however that with the growth of this “anxiety”, there has also been a new growing awareness; an awareness, thanks to which we feel the need to reconnect our own home with that of our parents and with that of our children and grandchildren. In this way, together with the importance of the “generational link”, we also regain a new sense of our individual reality. The family relationship recalls both memory (grandparents) and future (grandchildren). And this is where the true sense of tradition lies. This is certainly not expressed, as some suggest, in the often narcissistic nostalgia of the past, but rather in the awareness that the horizon in our life doesn’t end with our own self. History does not end with us; it precedes us and survives us: this is what tradition means. We are not worlds unto ourselves, closed in upon ourselves, but open worlds, communities, which also constantly embody us, an “us” that in a certain sense includes those who have gone before us, as well as those to come.

If what is written above has any plausibility, it is not in fact paradoxical that a society which is ageing, like ours, finds it difficult to safeguard its sense of tradition. This tradition is a link with the past, but in a living rather than a “traditionalistic” sense, with a vitality that is above all a projection towards the future. Young societies are those which can make true use of their traditions; ageing societies wear them out and, in the end, kill them off.

Let us take as an example our democratic traditions. No one until now would have ever dreamed of seeing a nexus between democracy and demography; and yet it is precisely the birth rate which is revealing another important and perhaps unexpected social role of the family with children: the support which families with children offer for the continuation of normal democratic dialogue. The Catholic Church has indeed been saying for a long time that behind the problem of birth rates which are too low in the West (and too high in the poorer countries of the world) lies a cultural catastrophe of immense proportions but, so far at least, it certainly cannot be said that world public opinion has given it any credit on this point. If anything, the opposite has happened: there has been (and still is) a unilateral attempt to exploit the so-called “demographic bomb” argument, exclusively for the purpose of ensuring that the governments of so-called developing countries give prime importance to “population control” at domestic and international level, often without any regard for human dignity. Think of the many attacks levelled against the family in Western countries, of the increasing difficulties, especia-
ly for young people, when it comes to bringing children into the world; but think also of the sterilisation campaigns conducted in India by Indira Gandhi in 1977, of those conducted in the 1970s in Ceauşescu’s Romania, or the population policies of the current Chinese government, or the fact that aid from rich nations to developing countries has often been made conditional upon drastic measures for population reduction. Everything seems to have militated against life. Today, however, especially in the West, we see the explosion – if I can put it this way – of the other aspect of the “bomb”, in other words the drop in the birth rate.

This explosion doesn’t, at present, seem to be producing much noise; if we are worried about it, this is primarily for the economic consequences it brings. For example: who will pay our pensions? Will the children of our immigrants be sufficient? But the economic aspect is only one part of the problem. The consequences at political level are, in my view, far more alarming. In an ageing society, in fact, the more conservative forces inevitably tend to dominate and, in the long-term, the conflict between the great majority of the population (the elderly) and the ever decreasing number of young people could become explosive. In the end, even now, safeguarding pensions is considered far more important than creating new job opportunities; I have already said something about lack of interest in the family, which is indeed penalised when bringing children into the world; added to this are the priorities which our public policies allow to those who are, as they say, already “inside” without worrying too much about those who remain “outside”, most of whom are young people, and I think that the picture is then sufficiently clear as to the danger that the falling birth rate could have on the liberal democratic culture and institutions. In order to function fairly, a democracy needs a balanced demographic structure. The demographic winter could also become the winter of democracy. Here too we see the powerful and unexpected emergence of the great social value of children and of the family which brings them into the world and cares for them. This confirms, as I suggested at the beginning, that the family, and the educational role it plays, represent one of the principal “social assets” of our civilisation.

IV

On a more strictly cultural level, all of this means that the moment has arrived to leave behind the “ethical neutrality” which has characterised our liberal democratic culture over the past decades. As Charles Taylor (1992) has shown, we have gradually seen the principle of equal dignity of all people before the law transformed into a recognition of personal individuality, in other words personal “difference” in whatever form that might be, into the growing indifference towards any idea of “good” which might be described as “shared”, any “common good” which is to be encouraged. This is the explanation behind the modern drift towards individualism as well as the phenomenon of the pluralised forms of family (for some people even a woman with a dog
is a family). But if all of this extends the space of freedom for some individuals, it is by no means certain that it ensures a more liberal society; in the long-run it compromises the regulations and social institutions which are essential for its support. And this, I believe, should worry us.

The liberal State, in itself, cannot obviously be a “moral state”; it cannot think of carrying out any “good” against the wish of its citizens; but nor can it be morally neutral, so that one lifestyle is more or less the same as another. In this case, in fact, perhaps without wishing to do so, it would end up promoting forms of life which are only “hypothetical”, “indifferent”, “contingent”, which are, in turn, not capable of promoting those virtues (as described above) that are essential for the State and for society to remain pluralistic, liberal and respectful of personal independence.

Ulrich Beck claims that our society, “precisely because it is individualised”, can no longer be guided by spiritual or moral norms which are not in themselves individualistic (Beck 1994). So be it. Without questioning the right of every individual to de-codify (if I can put it that way) for themselves all that circulates around them in terms of moral and spiritual values, the problem remains as to whether this search for a “new individualistic form of morality” can truly absolve a parent or society from presenting certain models, certain lifestyles, rather than others, undertaking and working to ensure that their children assimilate them. Obviously the answer to this question can only be one: neither the family, nor society, can avoid pursuing certain preferential choices, even if they wanted to. The truth is that even when they say they want to be neutral, in fact they end up holding up indifference as a model. But this certainly doesn’t strengthen the ethos of a liberal and democratic civilisation. Suffice it to observe the growing malaise among young people and the “normality” which forms the background in their lives. The stories in films, television or advertising, through which our society portrays itself, go in effect towards a sort of aesthetic of exception (and dissolution); political models tend to follow the same line; socio-educational institutions seem increasingly unable to “teach” and increasingly orientated towards accepting the endless numbers of “exceptions” which now surround us. There is, in short, a prevailing idea of “normality” which, being indifferent to everything, seeks to engulf everything, and is in danger of succeeding. In this respect, however, we also begin to see how difficult it is, especially for young people, to succeed in that “inner search” which is so dear to us. As I have already partly suggested, empirical studies tell us that many young people seem not to exist as a “generation”; they have no sense of belonging to something or someone; they have no feeling of “upbringing”, nor do they feel they have anything significant to pass on. They are, one might say, rootless and without a future.

I feel able, therefore, to end with a fairly obvious conclusion: if it is true that the human being must be the centre and heart of...
every society, if it is also true that the family constitutes the special environment in which this person grows and develops his or her individual and social potential, then it is necessary to ensure that the work carried out by the family in that respect is recognised and also promoted socially. The family cannot be left alone in this immense task. Public policies and civic society must be more decisive in supporting the work carried out at home (Belardinelli 2009). Mankind, as I said at the beginning, is an essentially “familial” being and this means that only a healthy family enables society to reproduce the fundamental conditions for its liberality and therefore for its positive individualisation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I do not think I know anybody who would honestly say that they do not want to live in a healthy environment at home. What I have seen, though, are a lot of homes that are definitely not healthy environments. I think that if people knew how important the home environment is for everyone in the household, then perhaps attitudes would change and everybody would get involved in running good, healthy homes. Through my work on the show How Clean is Your House? and my recent involvement in Lord Best’s housing panel, I have been able to witness, time and again, how closely linked a person’s home environment is to their well-being. During my six years co-presenting How Clean is Your House? both in the UK and America, the homes we dealt with were extremely filthy - beyond belief in many occasions. In this paper I would like to use some of my experiences from the show to illustrate the impact our overall health can have on our homes and vice-versa.

On the show I had the role of ‘Dirt Detective’, so I investigated the science behind the dirt, ranging from fecal matter to salmonella. Those things were pretty common and they were not a surprise to anyone. It was just usual grime. It was not unusual to go into a room and not be able to see the floor. In many places you could not even see furniture because there was so much clutter in the rooms. Some of our contributors had permanent coughs or skin infections, but on the whole a person living in a dirty environment will actually build up immunity to the bacteria present. However, the same is not often the case for people visiting the house from outside. I remember one occasion when we were visiting a young man’s house in Nottingham. He worked on a landfill site and he was also an amateur dramas person. He saw everything at work as a potential prop, so he would just bring things home from the landfill site, including bits of rotting food. It made me very sad to see that because the junk and rubbish in his living room was halfway up the wall. You could not actually stand on the floor. We filmed in the summer time and it smelled as if there was a dust cart inside the house. We used to have a microbiologist on set for every episode and on this occasion he told us that the air quality was so poor in the house that nobody should go in without wearing a mask. Of course, you cannot present a television show wearing a mask, so we all ended up on antibiotics with really bad chest infections and sore throats.

The question is, how do people get into such a state? In most cases, the state of the volunteers’ homes reflected something that was going on internally for them. There was never enough of an opportunity on the show to get to the back story of the contributors, but time and time again from talking to these people it was
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evident to me that many of them had been emotionally deprived in their childhood. They seemed to feel worthless and that they did not deserve anything better. In other cases people had gotten into debt or were suffering from other traumas or losses. Others were just generally depressed. Inside their heads they were experiencing this mess and chaos and that was clearly played out in the chaos and mess around them. This lack of self-respect was also being inevitably passed on to the children and other members of the household. It had reached a point where no matter how unhappy people were about the state they were living in, or rather the state they existed in, they seemed to be at a loss as to how to help themselves. It had got so bad that they were simply stuck and paralysed. For some people it almost became a comfort to have all this stuff around them and to be stuck in this static place. I got the impression that they thought that they were protecting themselves from the possibility of anything getting worse by allowing themselves to be stagnant in these environments. That just seemed like madness to me and there was, definitely, a sense of madness.

Nonetheless, we still had plenty of volunteers for our show. Even though it is really quite humiliating and shameful to stand up and say, ‘I live in a filthy house,’ the way the producers put the show together did make it very upbeat. We would come in as fairy godmothers in our chariots and with our magic wands (i.e. our feather dusters), clean the place up and it ended with everybody living ‘happily ever after’.

One thing that we were able to experience was the impact a clean and orderly home had on the people living in it – even people with deeper underlying problems. I remember one family in particular made up of a mum, dad and three boys. They lived in a hellish state but there was a real sense of love in that family. It was very clear to see that they were very close and there was a really nice collegiate feeling within the family. The house was hopeless, though. There was laundry all over the kitchen floor, in fact again, they had to trample over clothes to get to the filthy cooker that was just thick with grease. You could see that the parents had just lost the will to look after things. The mother spent most of her time outside the house – she was not working, the father was – doing charity work because she could not bear to face the chaos inside the house. It took us three days to just clear the house out and clean it up. When the family came back, you could see them coming alive and their eyes lighting up when they saw it. Their eyes brightened with possibilities. We went back eighteen months later and it was so lovely (this was the best bit of the job!). The house was in good shape, it was clean and they had not gone back to their old ways. The mum had joined a slimming club and had lost a lot of weight and she was also doing a college course. The kids were also doing really well at school. It was just really lovely to see them all. It was an ideal outcome of the show.
People often think that this is a problem of the so-called ‘lower classes’ but I know for a fact, because I have seen it, that this problem cuts right across the classes. It is much more about what is in people’s heads than what is in their bank accounts.

I would like to point out that, contrary to popular belief, I am not actually a clean freak. My own cleaning knowledge is taken mostly from my mother and tips that I picked up from working at the Good Housekeeping Institute. Cleaning to me is a bitter sweet necessity: you have to put in the hard work to get the pleasure. If you want to live in an ordered environment, in a healthy environment, you have to put in the effort. Every obsessive cleaner I know does not have any children and I do not think there is any coincidence about that. As soon as you become a parent there is an endless round of thankless tasks to be done, many of which involve cleaning and clearing up after often ungrateful others. You get back to the ordered state only for the mayhem to recommence. I also think that in the past, Spring cleaning was done once a year because we all had coal fires and there was a layer of coal dust that had to be removed. Washing was also always done on a Monday and once it was done then that was it finished. So certain tasks were done on certain days and it was all part of more of a routine. But now, who Spring cleans? We talk about it, but I do not think I know anyone who Spring cleans or washes on a Monday. It is more of a never-ending cycle because there is always stuff to be done. I think that sometimes you can become too enslaved. I think you need to be very careful about getting the balance right.

However, having said that, there is a study that was carried out in 2006 on household chaos and its links to parenting and child behaviour. It was not a very big survey, it was only 180 families questioned (all children were under 10) but children from disorganised homes with a lack of routine are more likely to be rude or antisocial – no surprises there. Crowding, that is inadequate space in relation to family size, is linked to problem behaviour. However, what is interesting from the study is that chaos is not more common in poorer families but rather, it overlaps with the way parents relate to their children. From the responses given, it seems that carers of small children from chaotic homes are significantly less responsive when relating to their children. They are much less involved and less vocally stimulating. They use more physical punishment and are inconsistent with how they discipline their children. We know that this sort of behaviour has a lifelong negative effect on children. Again, in these chaotic homes there is less parental warmth and enjoyment and a lot more anger and hostility.

5. The Good Housekeeping Research Institute (GHRI) is the product evaluation laboratory of the Good Housekeeping magazine, with a staff of scientists, engineers, nutritionists, and researchers dedicated to evaluating and testing numerous products.

Positive parenting did not reduce the negative impact of chaos. Chaos clearly has an independent effect. As we all know, children need boundaries and a chaotic home not only makes a child feel insecure but it also isolates them from other children. They might get invited to sleepover at a friend’s house but that can never be reciprocated because children feel ashamed and humiliated about living in some environment that is not normal and out of control. They can see how other people live and they know that the way they are living does not match up. They then carry around a sense of shame about being a part of that family and that is a bad start in life. It is obvious: small children need to be safe and loved and they need to have order.

I think that what is happening now is that there has been a cultural change that we have not quite come to terms with. In my mother’s day looking after the house was her job. She was in charge of keeping it clean and putting food on the table. Partly because of women’s emancipation (around 80% of women now have jobs outside the home), and the increase to the cost in housing people have a different sets of priorities. Children have so many activities after school these days and as adults we have our own commitments as well. There are only so many hours in the day and with jobs, family, social life, homework, getting food on the table and all the rest of it, something has to give and often that thing is housework.

I am always advocating to people, as I did in the show, that as parents we should teach our children, particularly our boys, how to clean and tidy up after themselves. Everyone in the home needs to be involved in looking after it and the next generation of parents, both male and female, need to be equipped to undertake daily household tasks. We have to start training our children when they are very young and teach them the benefits of being well-organised and having pride in a home that is clean and ordered. They should know that everybody needs to ‘muck in’. It should become an expectation. Children need to see that this is part of everyday life: things get put away before something else gets pulled out. Children who do not tidy their toys often have too many and do not even know what they have. It is almost like the hoarding problem. There is too much to see. I think that if patterns are set very early on in childhood then they set. So the earlier you can set good patterns and good behaviour, the better. But parents have to be so rigorous about it. It is hard work but in the end it is worth it.

I have two boys and unfortunately I have not followed my own advice at all. I regret it, though. Like many working mothers I have a residual guilt about never having really been there enough at home. The cleaner comes home once a week and the last thing I want to do is nag the boys about doing stuff but I know it is not right. What we then do is sit on the cycle of children growing up not knowing anything about domestic skills, not knowing how
to clean and not knowing the basics. At the end of the day, the truth about housework is that it is invisible and you do not know it has been done until somebody does not do it.

The question of why we clean and how we know what to clean is actually rarely addressed but the cleanliness or otherwise of homes is implicated in our health and comfort. Domestic dirt is little examined yet it is something that we all have to deal with on some level. Some people would simply say it is matter in the wrong place, which is a lovely way of looking at it. I think that ever since housework has been distinguished from other labour women have always been responsible for most of it. Even today, studies show that we are still the people who have to deal with it. We still carry out the vast majority of housework but fewer people would claim that that is our natural role and increasingly men and women say they believe that household tasks should be shared. Men contribute to the work of the home more now by taking on shopping and but they are still least likely to do cleaning. In this sense, things have not changed so much in the last few decades.

We need to think about what the right balance between a warm loving home and a tidy, organised one is. That is the crucial thing. On the one hand, according to the study mentioned above, it would seem that no amount of hugging is going to compensate if your house is a tip and the child has no idea when he is going to be getting supper or where the clean school uniform is. On the other, making your house a germ-free zone ruled by a military schedule is not the answer either. We have to strike a balance between what makes a home both healthy and happy. In short, I believe a house needs to be clean enough to be healthy and dirty enough to be happy.
**Introduction**

To talk about the situation of domestic service as it is at the moment is to describe a paradox in society. The contradiction may be summed up in the following statement: ‘domestic service is both vital and sustaining and demeaned and disregarded.’ As work that is vital and sustaining, domestic service is one of the fastest growing economic sectors in Europe, in the United States as well as in many other parts of the world. The increase in demand for domestic service workers reflects a host of sea changes including the steady movement of women into the paid labour force, the ageing of the population, as well as the inadequacy of policies to enable workers to better balance the pressures of work with their family obligations.

Increasingly families are inviting paid domestic service workers into their homes to help perform activities such as childcare, homecare for elderly relatives as well as tasks such as cleaning, cooking, laundry and shopping. Consequently, domestic service is an enormously important source of employment. For many women it is a growing source of employment, especially for women in developing countries. There are men who also perform domestic service work, but by far the statistics across the world show that it is overwhelmingly women who are doing paid domestic service. There are country-specific exceptions, like India for example, where you will find far more men engaged in paid domestic service. However, despite the fact that this is a critically important job, it is also a job that is demeaned and disregarded.

Despite the growing demand, however, the domestic service workforce, in particular those domestic services workers who are providing home healthcare, in the US has an annual turnover rate of between 30%-50%. In other words it is becoming increasingly challenging to have a stable workforce of people willing to do this work and interviews with the workers clearly reveal why they are leaving the job: the conditions are really poor. In the debate over improving the conditions of domestic service, it is important to appreciate that it is not just about the workers. Improving the working conditions of domestic workers is worthwhile not only because they are workers with their own families, but also because these measures will create a stable workforce that will ultimately inure to the benefit of the people who actually need care.

I define domestic workers or domestic service workers as they will be referred to in this paper, as paid household workers. They perform activities within the private household for compensation and in particular domestic activities that are necessary to maintain and sustain family life as well as a productive labour force. This definition excludes those workers who perform domestic type activities in an institutional setting.
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The domestic service workforce is made up overwhelmingly of women, especially low income and poor women. They are women who are at an economic disadvantage because of their sex and class status and in some instances because of their racial status. The working conditions that prevail in domestic service highlight the sense in which this work is demeaned and disregarded. There are country specific differences with regards to these working conditions, but throughout the world domestic service is poorly paid, wages are often below statutory minimum wages and frequently there is no provision for overtime payments. In addition, benefits are all but unheard of in domestic service. Domestic service provides little if any skills, training or career development and workers are not provided with access to healthcare or benefits such as retirement pensions. Furthermore, workers are subject to abuse and discrimination as well as exposure to health and safety hazards.

Lastly, there is the problem of pay and career development. The work is characterised by exceedingly long hours with studies showing that many domestic service workers labour for up to 16 hours a day. This problem is particularly acute for those workers who live-in and who are often subject to the beck and call of their employer at any time of day or night. To add insult to injury, workers often face delayed or irregular payments for the work they do. This paper will focus on the conceptual and legal challenges that need to be addressed in order to improve the economic and social conditions of paid domestic service workers and specifically the exploitative working conditions workers are especially vulnerable to because labour legislation in many countries denies coverage to domestic service. It is against this backdrop that extending labour rights to domestics should be deemed as crucial – crucial both from the standpoint of the workers but also crucial in light of the renewed and growing emphasis in terms of the demand for paid domestic service work in the home.

The Heterogeneity of Domestic Service

There are a number of activities that fall under Domestic Service: cleaning and washing, providing care (that could be childcare, care of the elderly, care of those who are sick and disabled), cooking and serving, gardening/landscaping and driving/chauffeuring. With the exception of gardening/landscaping and driving/chauffeuring, most of these tasks are carried out by women. Interestingly, cooking and serving is carried out by either men or women depending on the society one is in. With regards to the specificity of domestic service, it is important to bear in mind that this is a job that is performed throughout the world. There are important social and cultural differences but despite those differences, paid domesticity has a number of essential features that transcend national boundary lines and that serve to distinguish domestic service work from most other types of paid labour. Some of those characteristics include, importantly, the fact that domestics work in the privacy of individual homes and that
they usually work alone. While there are some household employers who employ a number of domestic service workers, it is uncommon. Most individual domestics work by themselves.

Another distinguishing characteristic is the highly unequal relationship between workers and employers. There are no doubt exceptions, but generally speaking a lot of domestics depend on the good or the bad will of their household employers. Often times differences in class, race and citizenship between employers and employees will exacerbate the inequality that domestic workers face.

Thirdly, domestic service is often considered invisible because it occurs behind closed doors, a fact that makes it especially difficult to regulate this work. Because it is hidden, policy makers often take the work for granted and dismiss it as a form of legitimate labour that is appropriate for regulation. Moreover, even when domestic service is regulated, enforcement can be difficult because of the fact that the work occurs in the privacy of individual homes.

Finally and unfortunately, because of its close association with women’s unpaid work in the home, domestic service is devalued and underappreciated. Regarded as women’s work, domestic work suffers from the perception that its successful performance depends not on skill but on a woman’s innate ability. These are all specific characteristics that complicate the effort to regulate domestic service.

**Domestic Service Employment Relationship**

In order to regulate the conditions in domestic service work it is important to allow for the varied workplace arrangements that domestics might have. There are a lot of domestics who work part-time as opposed to full-time and it is also common for domestics to have a lot of employers. A domestic worker might be employed by three clients for three days of the week and another five for the rest of the week.

Domestic workers may also be live-in or live-out workers. Live-in workers face particular problems of isolation and long working hours. They also often have to confront inadequate accommodation as well as payment in kind and sexual abuse within the home.

In the case of migrant workers, they often deal with abuses in the recruitment process and have to confront very high fees that have been paid on their behalf in advance. In some circumstances they even have their passports and wages withheld. In addition, because they are migrant workers they may have to deal with harassment by both immigration officials and police authorities.

Aside from these complexities regarding different types of domestic service work, the question of who is the employer con-
tributes significantly to the employment challenges of domestic work. Many domestics are hired directly by individual private households. That is the traditional one-on-one relationship that we tend to think about when we think about this as an employee relationship. Some domestics who are employed directly by a household or a client may be formally employed. There may be a written contract but in most cases of individual relationships between a household or a client and the worker there is an informal arrangement. There is always some kind of understanding of what the relationship is but more often than not people do not actually know what it is because it is not committed to paper. Those informal arrangements may reflect the preference of the household employer but they may also reflect the preference of the worker. It might reflect the preference of both to keep the relationship in the grey market and under the table.

In other cases domestics may have a defined employment relationship with a third party contractor such as a home healthcare company or a cleaning company. In the traditional ‘maid-for-hire’ situation, the homeowner relies on a third party contractor to supply a domestic worker. These types of employment relationships are typically much more formal than the kind of relationship the worker will have when she is employed directly by an individual household. As a result, they tend to be more distant and de-personalised.

In some instances the employment relationship is obscured by the fact that domestic service workers are self-employed contractors. Every country has its own tests for who is and who is not an employee and generally speaking, these tests focus on the level of control and supervision that the putative employer has over the worker. The classic example is that of a cleaning woman who lets herself into her client’s house with the key she has been given, brings her own cleaning supplies, cleans and then leaves. This domestic worker is an independent contractor. In the case of a live-in worker who is under the constant supervision of the client or the household, the worker is an employee. Nine times out of ten, home healthcare aids are employees rather than independent contractors. It is important to recognise who the employer is and whether there is actually an employment relationship at all because in most countries it is only employers who must abide by applicable labour and employment law. It is crucial therefore to be able to establish who the employer is in each circumstance and to ensure that there is an employment relationship.

Obstacles Faced By Employers

Employers are also an increasingly heterogeneous group. Traditionally the people who employed others for domestic service were considered especially privileged but this is no longer the case. Today domestic service employers, particularly those employers who are home owners or individual clients, can come from any class, race or income bracket. We have to allow for the
Another important observation in terms of the employers is that some domestic employers, especially those individual homeowner employers who are elderly or disabled individuals, may have little experience and knowledge in the rules of employment law. When it comes to whether an employment relationship exists, and enforcing that relationship, there has to be some kind of education because a lot of people who are household employers have absolutely no appreciation of the kinds of obligations that they must comply with as employers.

Another important issue regarding the employing class is that some individuals who employ domestics, here again especially those individuals who need a domestic for purposes of home healthcare as well as those individuals who are low-income and who need childcare, may not be financially positioned to pay workers decent wages or to provide them with benefits. The implication of that for regulating this relationship is that if providing increased benefits and wages to workers is going to come at the hand of low-income employers, then it may not be able to garner public support. It is not possible to start a campaign to improve the working conditions in domestic service if the people who are going to have to pay for that do not have the financial ability to do so. Consequently, increased public support and funding for care services, especially those services on behalf of children, the elderly as well as the disabled is of the utmost importance. Ultimately, to push for the improvement of working conditions for domestic workers, there has to be a greater awareness and recognition that this care ought to be treated as a public responsibility. The reality is that we have a huge political battle to wage at a time when State governments are facing incredibly tight budgets.

Another important point to appreciate when talking about the domestic service relationship is that this is a relationship that is extremely personal depending on the kind of domestic activity that is being provided. This is particularly relevant in childcare and home healthcare. Unlike a lot of manufacturing jobs, domestic service activities require personal service with the workers who are interacting directly with clients and customers who are acting as care recipients. Relative to many other occupations such as manufacturing jobs, for example, that line between employer and employee is incredibly indistinct. As a result, the kind of relationship that these workers sometimes have with their employers may be understood as personal and collaborative as opposed to adversarial. Oftentimes when you speak to somebody who is working as a childcare worker she will describe her work as an act of mothering. She has an incredible bond with the children she is looking after. The same is true with home healthcare aids who are looking after elderly individuals. They will often form a personal relationship with the people for whom they are providing care. Strategies to regulate domestic service need to take this
into account and avoid adopting an adversarial approach that assumes there is hostility between labourers and employers because, in fact, there may be no hostility whatsoever.

In addition to the already complex nature of many domestic service employment relationships governments are starting to recognise that there is an imbalance between supply and demand of domestic work and are beginning to compensate family members to provide care for relatives who need it. It is not just a subsidy that these governments are providing, they are actually treating family members as State employees. One has to think about whether there are any disadvantages of having a formal contract relationship between the care recipient and the family member providing care. What does it mean for a person to, for example, look after their mother, get compensated by the State and have an employment relationship between that person and their mother. What does that do to the expectation that most people ought to do that kind of care out of a sense of familiar obligation and out of love?

**Regulatory Challenges**

Domestic workers are covered de jure under employment and labour laws in some countries. Interestingly, in many countries where domestic workers are covered under the law they are not actually covered de facto. There is a clear distinction between what is on paper and what happens as a matter of reality.

As an initial matter, there is a reluctance to extend labour laws and regulations into the private realm of the household. Many individual private homeowners who are employing domestics do not see the need for formalising the relationship with their domestic service worker. Some individual household employers believe that in the setting of the home, all services, including those services with their domestic workers, should be exchanged out of respect, affection or duty. Of course, it is acceptable to expect these attitudes from family members but even though some households regard their domestic workers as members of the family, it is important to appreciate that they are also workers with their own families. It is also important for employers to appreciate that when they invite a stranger into their home to work, they necessarily forgo some measure of privacy. Furthermore, the government has a legitimate interest in protecting the welfare of all workers, including those who work in the private sphere of the household.

Another problem that complicates regulation is the fact that many individual household employers fail to see themselves as employers. They do not appreciate that there is a need to comply with employment and labour laws when they have employed a domestic service worker. In some instances, that failure stems from a lack of knowledge. In other instances that failure might stem from confusion as to whether an employment rela-
A relationship exists in the first place. This is particularly a problem when homeowners go to a recruitment or a placement agency to find a worker. Usually these recruitment agencies simply facilitate contact between the worker and the homeowner so that the homeowner is the employer in this situation. What often happens, however, is that the homeowner is not aware of this and they believe the recruitment company is the employer. In addition, it is necessary to mention that this problem is not only on the side of the employers. Some workers fail to see themselves as employees and some do not want to be employees for any of a number of reasons including not wanting to have to comply with the tax implications of being an employee or out of a desire to avoid detection by the authorities. This is especially a problem with workers who are undocumented.

Another significant problem is that the regulatory model being applied to domestic service was designed for employees who work in the public space of the market rather than a model designed for employees who labour in the private space of individual homes. The reality is that the regulatory framework for employment and labour law in most countries came into existence at a time when nobody was thinking about domestic service workers. These models then do not always work when it comes to domestic service. How do you regulate, monitor and enforce laws in the private sphere of individual homes? It is a difficult question to answer. On the one hand, the performance of domestic work in private homes may not pose any special obstacles to implementing some laws. There is nothing about the home setting that should prevent a household employer from complying with minimum wage standards. On the other hand, however, the very nature of domestic service complicates certain processes such as collective bargaining. Those laws are based on the principles of workers acting in concert to bargain with their employers over the terms and conditions of the labour relationship. It is exceedingly difficult to see how this could be possible when the employers are not organised. It is difficult to see how this could be achieved when workers have five different employers. In some instances, then, it is necessary to think outside of the box and recognise that although some of the existing laws may fit domestic service there are going to be times when the specificity of domestic service requires that we come up with new ways to regulate the job.

**Advancing Decent Working Standards for Domestic Workers**

This consideration of the legal challenges comes at a particularly pivotal moment. For the very first time the International Labour Organisation is meeting this summer in Geneva⁸ to consider adopting a specific labour standard on behalf of domestic ser-
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vice workers. The standard is known as the proposed ILO convention concerning decent work for domestic workers. What it will do is provide countries with norms and standards on how to create regulation in this area. In considering a specific standard for domestic service workers the ILO has been especially cognizant of the fact that domestic service workers will sometimes have work-related interests that are common to all workers but at other times adequately protecting domestic service workers requires an appreciation of the unique aspects of domestic service work. This phrase dynamic is captured wonderfully in the phrase ‘domestics are workers like any others and workers like no other.’

I would like to discuss a couple of provisions in the convention that is being considered by the ILO starting with written contracts. A particularly difficult area in terms of regulating domestic service is that domestics tend to work without any written contract. We may think that the same is true for a lot of workers but it is especially problematic for domestic service workers for a number of reasons. There are a lot of activities that fall under the heading of domestic service and so you have the problem of the domestic service worker who one day is cleaning and shopping and the next day is shovelling snow. Thus, even though all workers could benefit from written contracts, it has particular relevancy for domestic service workers. Article Six of the proposed convention has in it a requirement that all member states should take measures to ensure that domestic service workers are informed of their terms and conditions of employment in a verifiable and easily understandable manner, preferably through written contracts. Obviously written contracts will not suffice in some situations. The real impetus here is to ensure that workers have a clear understanding of the terms and conditions of the labour relationship, therefore it requires that employers tell the worker what the type of work to be performed is and that there is language with regard to the remuneration, the frequency of payments, normal work hours etc. This article is very optimistic, but it is going to be an uphill battle because despite the promise of that provision, household employers are incredibly resistant. The ILO conducted a survey of individual household employers and they wanted to find out how receptive employers were to the idea of providing their workers with a written contract. 48% of individual household employers opposed having written contracts for their employee. Another 45% of household employers opposed the very idea of having specified hours of employment. Many household employers have a notion that they are entitled to an unlimited amount of their employee’s time and that is an attitude that needs to change.

The convention also includes a useful article with regard to health and safety, which is particularly important because the home is usually assumed to be a safe space. The general opinion is that domestic service workers do not confront issues related to health
and safety because they are in the home. The reality, however, is that the home is not necessarily safe for everyone. Domestic service workers are subject to occupational health and safety issues like most other workers. Some of the challenges that they confront include exposure to toxic cleaning chemicals as well as sexual and physical harassment. Domestic workers who do home healthcare are particularly exposed to overexertion because they spend their time lifting and moving clients when they have not been adequately trained in how to do that type of activity.

There are a couple of challenges for occupational health and safety for domestic service workers in the home. First of all, who is going to provide the training? In the case of individual households it is not possible to assume that individual clients have any knowledge about how to train workers. Another concern about health and safety is monitoring and going into individual homes to inspect the workplace. People are particularly opposed to that because it is going into private homes. It may be considered controversial but I would argue that employers need to allow inspections in their private homes before they place an individual worker in the home. It is not just a question of worker safety but also a question of safety for the homeowner. In home healthcare, for example, inspecting a home to ensure that the work can be safely done protects not only the worker but the client. When that worker is helping a client and trips and falls because the home is not a safe enough environment for the job, it is not only the worker who suffers but also the client. Inspections already take place to ensure that the home meets the healthcare needs of the client so it would not be a big leap for these inspections to go a bit deeper and also take the health and safety of the domestic worker into account.

I would also like to refer back to the issue of collective bargaining. The proposed standard does provide an article that calls for providing domestic workers with an opportunity to engage in collective bargaining. The big challenge here, as I mentioned above, is that even if the workers organise themselves, the individual household employers are not organised. There have been some successes in this area. In a number of countries there have been negotiations at a national level between unions and associations of employers and in some countries there are organisations of employers that have helped to facilitate bargaining. Also, in the United States unions have effectively organised and entered into collective bargaining agreements on behalf of those workers who provide publicly subsidised care. The way unions have done this is by recognising that if the care is publicly subsidised, then the State needs to be targeted. These organisations have managed to get legislation passed and the unions are engaged in the negotiations with a representative of the State because it is the State that ultimately controls how much money the workers actually get.
Many people are familiar with the definition for sustainability as stated in Our Common Future, commonly called The Brundtland Report: ‘development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.’ As a biologist, I would argue that the best way to achieve this definition of sustainability is through sustainable use of biodiversity. While many people would not agree and would opt for ambitious recycling and energy saving policies, I claim that sustainable use of biodiversity is the core of achieving sustainable development. However, what the Brundtland Committee and this specific definition of sustainability achieved was to make the idea of sustainable development popular. Furthermore, they brought the issue of ‘needs’ to the fore of the debate on sustainability. What I would like to argue in this paper is that sustainable use of biodiversity is rooted in an appreciation of real needs. I will use the interrelated nature of the natural environment as a framework for exploring the systemic needs of man as a social and psychological being.

I will begin with my viewpoint of biology as an integrating science. There are three mainstream approaches to biology at the moment: the atomistic approach, the holistic approach and my preferred approach, the systemic approach. This approach is based on scientific systems and I would also call it integrative. From the point of view of science, human beings are part of nature. It does not take much effort in observation, however, to notice that man is part of the biosphere and he is constantly transforming it. So there is a natural system, the biosphere, or more locally the ecosystem, that man is a part of. As social and political beings, however, humans are also part of smaller human systems such as society. It is through society that we are all interconnected, an idea which was first explored in Frigyes Karinthy’s Everything is Different and popularised by John Guare’s Six Degrees of Separation. Even though everybody is unique and different, our personal narratives are in many ways linked and the overarching link we all have is with the biosphere. It is therefore fitting, I think, to discuss human needs within the framework of the system, biological or otherwise, that man finds himself in.

From the framework of interconnected systems we move to needs and it is at this point that I would like to introduce the Aristotelian concept eudemonia. This term is sometimes vaguely translated as ‘happiness’ but ‘human flourishing’ would be a more precise definition. It is an idea that is supported by biological evidence. Every organism has needs and when these needs are met to the right degree, the organism flourishes. It is important to stress that it is not only that needs are met, but that they are met in the correct amount. We may think, for example, of a cactus that, like other plants, needs moisture, but a very small amount. If a cactus is given
too much water it suffers the same consequences as a tropical plant that is not watered at all. The same analogy also applies to human beings. You can have too much affection, for example, so that you cease to feel anything. Human beings also flourish, achieve well-being and are happy in optimal conditions.

The problem with human beings, though, is that sometimes whims get confused with real needs. We could look to the world of fashion and trends for innumerable examples, but we can also think about other resources such as food, energy and space. It is important, then, that we know what our real needs are as human beings.

Within the constant framework of systems, it is undeniable that human beings form complex systems that enable them to achieve higher standards of well-being. We need organisations. For instance, when a person is born, there are usually experts within an organisation that help during the birthing process. Without organised society and its institutions modern life would be impossible. Small may be beautiful, but in real life many laws and regulations protect us from tyranny, unnecessary accidents, injuries and deaths. Society is full of organisations that provide empowerment by offering resources that answer an individual’s needs. Schools and universities, for example, help meet our need to learn. Furthermore, humans have a need to use and develop skills within the context of their society. According to the empirical research of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi\(^{13}\), the people who are happiest are those who reach the highest of their capabilities, through the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use them to serve the wider community. The most fulfilled person he claims to have found was a mechanic who worked in a very demanding environment but who served the whole local community.

Within society it is still possible to reduce our ecosystem further and it is here that we find the home. The home is interesting because it is the first point of contact between the individual and a social system. Thus, I believe that the most important aspect of the home is the people in them and the relationships between them. If we are considering the well-being of the individual, which then translates to the well-being of a society, the home is crucial. Nowadays there is plenty of research on emotions and they are extremely important for a meaningful life as well as for mental health. Care and love between spouses and between generations is very important. Having these kinds of relationships and emotions is fundamental for well-being, as positive psychology suggests. In positive psychology the person is encouraged repeatedly to call to mind things about their life that make them happy. Personally, the thoughts that make me happy are those that relate to the person with whom I always feel ‘at home’. Furthermore, I think this is a common human experience.

and we can observe it on its most basic level in babies. A baby does not have an understanding of what a physical home is or what it is to possess anything. However, they do have a sense of security and well-being which is based on their relationship to their mother. At the heart of this relationship is the love between the mother and the baby which is expressed by the care the mother gives the baby. Once again, this care is a type of service where skills are used and improved and where a person benefits. It is therefore linked back to social nature of human beings.

To conclude I would like to apply these arguments to the agreements reached in Rio de Janeiro (1992) and Johannesburg (2002). These two summits asserted that it is necessary to integrate ecological, economic and socially sustainable development to every aspect of life. I would make my own addition and say that it should also be integrated into our personal life, that is, in our home and in our community. Human flourishing on its personal and social levels leads to an understanding and achievement of real needs which leads to sustainable use of biodiversity and sustainable development. Because the relationships in the home (the needs of the individual) link to society and the needs of the collective in turn link to the biosphere, achieving a sustainable lifestyle at home based on real needs is at the core of achieving sustainable development.
With this paper I would like to give an overview of how business supports the household and how I have seen it support the household in different parts of the world. As you can see from my brief CV I have travelled 5.2 million miles for work and lived in numerous countries. I grew up in North America and have lived in Europe for a long time as well. In the West, society has become very individualistic. I work with a lot of Indian and Chinese colleagues, however, who are very community and family oriented. I think that perhaps we have evolved into a very different definition of family. I will give a quick overview of my point of view of the American household and SEARS’ relationship as a company with the American family. I will then share some thoughts on businesses’ role and conclude with thoughts on what happens after what happens next?

I have worked with most of the major consumer companies and retailers in the world: Tesco, Kingfisher, Boots, Carrefour, El Corte Ingles and Inditex among others. But SEARS is very interesting because it is an American icon. At one point in time – I think around the year 1980 – the statistic was that one in every five Americans had at one time worked for SEARS. It is incredibly woven into the fabric of America. Like many companies that are part of the twentieth century growth model, however, SEARS is not doing so well these days.

Sears started as a mail-order business and really hooked up to the railroads, which was key to commerce in America during the 19th century. It quickly evolved into a retail operation. The Big Book that came out in 1887 is interesting because it was literally five inches thick and you could buy a beehive, a car engine or a house from the catalogue. In fact, many of the houses that were purchased were basically pre-cut, delivered to the desired lot and are national historical monuments today. These buildings were bought through the book in the twenties and thirties.

I was still living in the United States in the early nineties when we closed the book in 1993. Eddie Lampart, who some consider a younger Warren Buffett, bought K-Mart out of bankruptcy and now Sears so he owns the Holding Company which includes Lands End and many other American retailers. So it is about 50 billion dollars in turnover and about 4,000 North American Locations as well as locations in Israel and India etc.

In terms of how business helps the American household, I would say that it is clearly through technology and retail. We started out with a corner store model, which still exists in many parts of the world today. You walk outside and you are 100 meters away from a place to get your bread, detergent, etc. It is a very intimate relationship between business and the consumer and therefore, the household. If you did not have any money, you would get store credit. They would loan you money and put stickers on the wall and
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you would simply pay it when you got your pay-cheque later in the week. In this way, retailers played an active part in the everyday running of the home. There was a real relationship between stores and the members of the household who ran the home.

What has happened in the West and now to a greater and greater degree in the East as well, is that we have superstores that leverage volume logistics and volume sourcing and we end up with broader assortment and better prices. The household now has to consider the ease of walking fifty meters but paying more at a local, family-run establishment versus getting in a car or public transportation and going to a Carrefour or a Tesco or a Wal-Mart.

What we have seen recently is a merger of those two concepts: the intimacy of a corner store with the pricing of a global logistics consumer aberration. Where this really comes to play is through the internet. Right now, as sad as it sounds, 4.6 billion people have cell phones but 2.4 billion people do not have access to toilets.

The ways in which business interacts with families is worth considering. You cannot, for example, drive around Mumbai even if you wanted to. First, you could not get insurance for the car and secondly because you would not want to. Because traffic is so bad in Mumbai, particularly during monsoon season, Future Group (which is a business owned by Pantaloon owner Kishore Biyani who is probably the Sam Walton of retail in India) has set up corner kiosks in Mumbai so people can walk down, order what they want and have it delivered to their homes. The reason that does not work in the West is that labour here is very expensive. It is called last mile logistics: you can never pay for that last mile in a way that allows you to deliver to someone at home and make money on it. Of course, the further East you go, the cheaper the labour is. So they have basically gone back to a corner store model in Mumbai with access to literally thousands of items – essentially everything the household needs – and which will be delivered to you within 4 hours from a local depot. It is a way in which business models in the East are more efficient now than businesses in the West.

When it comes to technology, we have inherited the original legacy technologies of the 60s, 70s and 80s and 90s, that is, big computer systems. As the economies in the East have matured, they have moved directly to mobile retailing. That is why landlines are not being set up in India for telephones. Everything is mobile and Reliance and some other companies have really jumped on that. The way in which the household interacts with business is changing dramatically and probably more innovatively from East to West than ever before.

In terms of how a business interacts with a household, there are several things that a stay-at-home-mom or dad or head of the household will take into account when considering interac-
How business interacts with the household is really across those dimensions. If as a business you are not recognised as one of those, then you are in the middle of mediocrity and if you are really bad at it, you are bankrupt. That is actually the history of K-Mart’s bankruptcy. Lampart bought K-Mart out of bankruptcy in 2003 and Sears would have been bankrupt if he had not bought it in 2005. So you have these two American icons that are part of every American’s fabric of life that would have gone completely away. Today, having a relationship with the household as a business does not guarantee anything in respect to success. You have to run efficiently on the one hand and be effective in building that intimacy with the household so that they trust you and in some cases be willing to pay more for the convenience of certain services or products than they would otherwise.

What happens after what happens next? I think we are in for dramatic disruption of the relationship between business and household. We have started to see it in the last six to eight years and I think it will accelerate. We will see a lot of dead corporations on the side of the road as consumers and households begin to dictate the terms in which they will engage with businesses. It is no longer going to be ‘push’ it is going to be ‘pull’. We are going to choose, as a head of a household, how I want to interact and who I want to interact with. Those companies that can give me what I want – whether it is price or fashion or speed or ease – are the companies that I will do business with. It is a new definition of loyalty that we are seeing in the market.

I would capsulise this idea as follows: to understand, anticipate and inspire. If you are a business and you want to touch and help households you will think of how you can help, for example, a dual-income household with children. They do not have a lot of time together during the work week so they need a value proposition for helping them in the evenings when both parents are home and children are back from school. They have about two
and a half hours, so what are you going to provide? Is it going
to be downloading movies for them? Is it going to be games?
Look up on the internet how many, literally, billions of hours are
spent on gaming. It is one of the strategic initiatives that I am
working on now. People will voluntarily stay up until midnight to
play World of Warcraft™ or some game, but they do not want to
stay up until midnight to work.

I think that right now consumers are looking for technologies and
products that will open up conversations with their loved ones
and bring them together at home. Households are interested in
products that will make their homes more sustainable and make
them feel more ‘at home’ in their homes after a long day at work.
Human beings, it seems, are very orientated towards a gaming
relationship with certain things. So how do we take gaming as a
philosophy and bake it into the more mundane things that we do
at home so that we get the family to act more cohesively?

It really is a relationship between needs driving businesses’ res-
ponse and how the business responds enabling those needs. The
one caveat I would add to this is that nobody told Steve Jobs to
create a device people could put their music on. Nobody told Bill
Gates, either, to do that work in the 80s on Windows. Nobody
told Gap, back when Gap was a great retailer, that people would
spend $30 on a t-shirt. Sometimes you can create a brand with
the product. It is unarticulated demand and sometimes there is
an articulated demand that you can respond to quickly enough
and close that loop. It starts from both sides.

Something I see as both a risk and an opportunity is global in-
dividualism. I think the fact that the individual has moved into
the centre is very powerful, but it is also losing the edges. I sen-
se that some of the ways in which business interacts with the
household being very destructive and pushing people more and
more into isolation over the coming years.

I would also like to point out that the past is not an accurate
predictor of the future. I truly believe that. The egg has no expe-
rience that the future will be different to the past because in the
past, the past futures were the same as the past to the egg, until
it cracks open. Butterflies are a good metaphor for this concept:
for the butterfly in the past is very different to its future. Both of
those entities would answer no to the question for totally dif-
ferent reasons.

To conclude I would claim that the key is convergence, collabo-
ration, content and communication. If, as a business entity, you
are not focussed on doing that for every single one of your cus-
tomers, hopefully it is all 6.5 billion of us, then I think you are
missing a trick in terms of how you can help households work
together more efficiently.
In this paper I will be discussing the value of the work of the home from a policy perspective rather than a business perspective or with a particular focus on the labour market. There are about six programme areas in New Economics Foundation (NEF), but what binds those different programme areas together are three overarching principles for our organisation: environmental sustainability, collective well-being and social justice. Although we cover a wide range of areas, what our work looks at are the overarching challenges for society today which are probably about the environmental crisis (climate change in particular) and also what is happening economically.

My approach to the topic is from the point of view of what can be said about sustainability with an understanding of the three economies. These three economies, which tie in with the overarching principles I have mentioned above, are a natural economy, a market economy and a core economy. By the core economy we are talking about human and social resources, that is, humans as assets in whatever sphere they occupy. Effectively the natural economy has a fixed size. There is not much we can do about that. We might do a bit of exploration and find some new resources but we cannot expand it. Because of the limitations of the natural economy, we are limited to the extent that we can grow the market economy. We are getting to the point where the pursuit of growth is probably not going to be sustainable in anything like the long-term. So what do we do about that and how do we move on? If what we are all after achieving is greater well-being, which in a sense is what I think in our individual lives what we are looking for, how do we deliver that? What we are looking at and the work we are doing is about how do we grow this core economy? This is something that really can grow. We can really grow the idea of people doing more for themselves, people doing more for each other and in what circumstances.

The core economy really does underlie the market economy. It is where our children are brought up, where old, frail and disabled people are looked after. It is that caring relationship. That is what really underlies the whole of our ability to function in the market as well as in society.

Our analysis at NEF suggests that there are various ways in which we can grow the core economy around things like employment policy, income support, childcare and how the family functions. The perspective that I come at it from, my area of work, is the system evaluation that we attach to that core economy. Our analysis suggests that if we are going to grow the core economy, we need to rethink the distribution of income and time. Family time is precious and there is not an awful lot of it, especially in some economies. We seem to have a bizarre situation where people who are very well paid tend to work incredibly hard and barely have
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any time with their families while there is a group of people who have no work at all. It is a strange distribution and it is a very overarching thing. How you solve that is clearly complex, but I think that nevertheless it is helpful to state it simply in those terms.

We are doing a lot of work on how we can, even in a conceptual sense, distribute income, time and, given our current situation, carbon to achieve the best that we can and grow that core economy which is how to prevent problems from arising in society. It is how you can help sort out issues of public service provision where funds might be getting tighter. In this country we have a public service provision that is about fixing problems once they have happened, rather than preventing those problems and preventing the harm starting in the first place. We all know that the first place you are going to prevent that harm is in the home. How do we build that? How do we make sure that all households have the resources they need, which is not just money but time and relationships? We need to be able to grow that as far as possible.

I head the Valuing What Matters Team at NEF and this is only one part of our work, but what we are doing is looking across policy areas to say ‘what are our systems of value and are they right? What can we do about those?’ Essentially what we are used to, particularly in the West, is a system of cost-benefit type analysis where we will value economic productivity partly because that is what actually counts when you are focussed on GDP and partly because it is actually quite hard to measure a lot of the other things that are not tangible and are not traded within the marketplace.

How do you attach value to a person’s confidence or growth in their self-esteem or an increase in their well-being? It is really hard and because it is hard it does not get done. The problem there is that often you are valuing the short-term as well as the economic and you are forgetting about the long-term. So we talk a lot about the false economies of perhaps cutting spending now to increase efficiency of public services – but what does that do for long-term costs? In an intelligent system, you would be able to take account of those things. That is not to say it is easy, but nevertheless, it is worth striving for.

Just over a year ago we used our system of evaluation to look at the issue of pay and value in society and occupations. As a result, we produced a report called A Bit Rich just before Christmas bonus season in 2009. We have a methodology that is like cost-benefit analysis but it is effective in bringing in all those really hard to measure outcomes from any activity. Anything we do is likely to have some kind of environmental consequence and some kind of social consequences. The field of economics would
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say the most efficient economic system is the one that brings in all those impacts so that the full costs and benefits are revealed. In that way you incentivise activities that are good for society and perhaps disincentivise activities that are less good for society. We were very interested in looking into this from the point of view of different occupations because so much in our Western world of status and opportunity is attached to what you earn. Inequality starts with wage inequality, effectively. What you earn will then allow you to do what you can do and it will also confer status. We were very interested in the question, ‘how far does the current pay structure reflect the value that is being created in society by different occupations?’ It was intended to shine a light on this and so we purposely took some controversial jobs, three high paid jobs and three low paid jobs. What we found is that by looking at the externalities, in economic parlance, and looking at the wider and indirect effects of these different occupations and putting a value on them we were able to say, ‘okay, a City banker will generate a large GDP and pay a lot of taxes, but what else are they responsible for? What other costs need to be brought onto the books? What other benefits need to be brought onto the books?’

We looked at various low paid occupations as well and particularly a hospital cleaner and a childcare worker and the analysis that we produced suggested that you were looking at a lot more value creation from a hospital cleaner or a childcare worker than was being paid to them in their pay packet by quite a large multiple. We used very conservative assumptions – and it is assumptions based – to find that a hospital cleaner will generate around £10 in value for every £1 they are paid. Meanwhile, a banker or a tax accountant is generating a lot of value for the people they work for and helping them not pay so much tax, which is perfectly legal, but nevertheless there are costs to society for doing that. So they were destroying more value than they were creating. The obvious example now is that of the banker because of the recession we are in and the cuts to public spending. The idea was just simply to say that what people are paid does not necessarily reflect their worth to society and we need to talk about that.

This work had a huge media impact and I think the reason for that is it is something many people feel very strongly about. It was something that resonated with a situation that people feel uncomfortable with. By putting numbers on it, it was a different way of accessing that debate. It was not just in the UK that there was interest but further afield as well.

I will use the example of the hospital cleaner which was one of the ones that was picked up most particularly to illustrate the point about pay not reflecting value. It is not just that they clean the hospital, their role – and this will be confirmed by any of them as well as their hospital managers – is about good health outcomes for patients. They are part of the trust mechanism of
the National Health Service. They are the people who will make a cup of tea and sit with a relative. They are not just there to clean, but this part of their work is not valued in their pay packet. Therefore, you could argue that if you were to really look at their value and reflect that in their pay, they should be earning substantially more than they are. This really matters because a lot of these kinds of jobs are the glue of society. Moving back to the idea of the household and the core economy, we undervalue it. It is not paid although there is a whole debate going on about whether or not it should be paid. At the very least the very fact that it is not paid has an implication for how we think about its value. These are the kinds of issues that we are trying to uncover.

It is important with the core economy because of what that means for inequalities. There are whole issues here around the gender pay gap and the fact that it is mainly women who carry out unpaid work. Even now when most women go out to work, studies have shown that it is still women who do the bulk of housework but they are more constrained in time than male counterparts who are perhaps doing less in the home. It is about looking at the way in which we can confer the resources required to properly underpin the core economy and make sure that we have healthy outcomes and make sure that this has a sustainable implication for society and that we prevent social problems arising.

There is also the whole issue of the relationship between the household and consumption mechanisms and how you can change consumption patterns that mean that it is more environmentally sustainable. Nudging behaviour within a framework where people are very time-limited and perhaps resource-poor is perhaps not the best way to go about it. If you really want to tackle those issues of sustainability you need to tackle it systematically and pull apart the drivers of inequality and the lack of sustainability, which is the framework we are all operating within.
I am very pleased to be able to share with people from around the globe the Hong Kong Housing Authority’s model of implementing sustainable development strategies in order to create homes within the community. In a way similar to what HRF suggests the homemaker works with both material resources and relationships to optimise the potential of both, I believe the Hong Kong Housing Authority’s strategies to develop homes galvanises both the environmental resources at our disposal and the communities we build for. Our aim is twofold: on the one hand we strive to build housing that will not only respect but nurture socially sustainable communities while on the other we work to create quality housing that makes the most of the environment.

First of all, I would like to highlight that Hong Kong is very different from other cities because we live in a high-density high-rise environment. We have 1,100 square kilometres of land of which only 25% has been developed – the rest is countryside, parks and hills. 4% of our land goes towards residential uses. We have to house 7 million people in Hong Kong. I work for the Hong Kong Housing Authority where we provide public rental housing for families with a lower income. We provide around 30% of the population with low-cost, rental residential homes. We now have a stock of around 700,000 rental flats and we are building at a rate of about 15,000 new flats per year. On average, the living space is about 12 square meters. Our standard for allocation is only seven square meters. In the past we have sold over 430,000 subsidised sales flats.

We help all families in need gain access to affordable and adequate housing. The Hong Kong Housing policy is that nobody be left homeless so we provide affordable housing for those in need and have cost-effective and rational use of resources. Above all, we have a competence-dedicated and caring culture for our team members and apply our core values (being caring and customer-focussed, creative and committed) to all the work we do. We do this from planning and design to building and all the way through to management. From cradle to grave: we take care of the entire community from the very beginning (from before we build) until after they move in.

How do we achieve this while caring for the environment as well as for people? We know we have to build and develop in a way that enables us to create a sustainable community. We have to balance environmental, social and economic needs in all aspects of our work.

Because we are a relatively humble and poor developer, we have to make the best use of the natural environment. If we are building homes for people with lower incomes, then we have to make the best use of nature as the tenants do not possess the economic resources to pay expensive energy bills for their new homes. We strive to achieve sustainability by taking proactive measures in the
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implementation of our public housing programmes. Throughout the planning, design and construction stages, we give due consideration to factors such as functional performance and cost effectiveness of the buildings, as well as environmental concerns like greening. Our aim is to provide functional, safe and comfortable public housing, thereby raising the living standard of our tenants.

We apply a scientific approach, using studies on climate conditions to make best use of these natural environments. We have to achieve better permeability and partition levels. We also create natural ventilation inside the home and in public areas and in the open space. We are able to provide public areas in our designs with a draught of about 1.8 meters per second during the summer.

Consultation and public engagement are also top priorities for the Hong Kong Housing Authority. We have to engage communities from the planning stage and the design stage right through to the occupation stage. We have to listen to their views, not only those of the tenants, but those of the neighbourhood and the community at large. The way we do it is by aiming to enhance social cohesion. We organise workshops, talks and discussions with all groups of people. Sometimes we also use community art and greening to engage the people throughout these processes. “Action Seedling” is an initiative we have started to implement whereby we distribute seedling plants to participants who will nurture the plants at home until they are fit for transplanting into the planters of the new estates. We carry this initiative out with the help of Estate Management Advisory Committees, local schools and community organisations and apart from creating a greener and more pleasant environment, the programme also helps foster a greater sense of belonging among the residents and the community.

Upon completion, we sometimes invite people who lived in old estates in the past, such as celebrities, to celebrate the new construction. When we plan a park, again, we engage the community and the whole neighbourhood. After completion, if there are comments or views about the design of the estate, we will listen to them and carry out improvement works afterwards.

Throughout all the project stages we work together and we have partnering workshops with our contractors and sub-contractors to make sure we all have a common goal for the projects. I would like to show how we implement these processes through a case-study: Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate redevelopment, stages two and three. We have created happy homes for a lot of people when they move from the old estate to the new one.

We face two major challenges in the building of new estates. The first is to create a comfortable living environment despite the very high density and maintain social ties between tenants when they move. We generally move people from an old estate
to a new, modern one and this has to be done in stages. The first is the reception estate, which usually houses around 4,500 families with a population of about 12,000. We try to create a community that can enjoy natural ventilation throughout the central spine by putting blocks on two sides and creating a wind corridor that runs through them. We improved the planning of this estate within this originally very high density living environment and create a better space for them with natural environments. We also determine what would be the best position of the buildings and we use studies to improve the design. We enhance wind circulation in our buildings as well so the building is permeable. For the corridors, we have windows that allow the wind to penetrate although visually it looks like a wall. We have to ensure that tenants can enjoy the environment on the pedestrian level, so where there are some windy spots we provide a window canopy to keep the draught away from the pedestrians. By using passive design for the living space and public areas we enhance daylight penetration which can in turn save up to 15% on energy bills.

Another significant area of work we do is to engage the community when we need to re-establish old ties after people move to new estates. Many people have been living in the old estates for a few decades and when they move to the new estates, they will be rather anxious and not know what to do. From the period of 2002 to 2009, that is the seven years from planning to completion, we have been engaging them in numerous activities, including exhibitions on heritage to encourage them and show them what they can give us through show pieces that they have collected. We also engage them with various workshops. In one workshop, for example, our architects, social workers and tenants jointly build models of the flats to get them to understand how to use their interior spaces and how they can arrange the furniture within the home. After going through these stages, they have a better understanding of what they can expect in the future.

It is also important for our architects and tenants to exchange views because architects may not always be right. Sometimes a design that architects delight in does not prove to be practical for the tenants, so it is important for them to listen to what the tenants will really need. They draw sketches with the tenants to illustrate how they can use the space. The designs, drawings and models they were shown helped them to select their own flats and put in their own furniture. We have video-clips from various views and angles so that they will know how to move from corner to corner as they manoeuvre through the estate.

Sometimes, as was the case in this case-study, tenants want hand-rails, guided paths and seats so we add them to the design in order to allow tenants to enjoy their open spaces. There is also a shuttle lift in this estate that stops at different levels to meet the needs of the elderly and the disabled. Handrails were also added in all the corridors because about 30% of the tenant population...
are elderly people. We have a policy of designing with universal accessibility at the Hong Kong Housing Authority which means we have to design for all ages and all abilities.

We also incorporated the views of the tenants for the lobbies by providing a seating area that enables them to sit and mingle between them. In the community workshop, the joint design has lead to an exercise area for the elderly and a heritage gallery with a leisure sitting area. We also designed a cafe for the tenant community where they can go and even bring their own food and drink if they like. In the heritage exhibition, the artefacts that they have donated will transform new displays in the estates.

“Tenants want hand-rails, guided paths and seats to enable them to enjoy their open spaces.”
HOME IN THE COMMUNITY

We provide a 30% overall green ratio. This can prove difficult in very densely populated areas, but with forty stories in height we have managed to create an open space with 30% green coverage and we have preserved a tree as well. This reflects the overall aim of our designs: designs with nature and with people. We have been applying this design concept since 1998. It is a design concept that enables people to age in one place because they can live in their homes safely and comfortably from youth to old age.

“We provided the tenants with a seating area that enables them to sit and mingle”.
Most of us have at least a rough idea of the state the planet is in. As a generalist, I know a little bit about a few things in our business. I like the simplicity of the model below which is a graph at the bottom with a timeline, biocapacity for the planet on the left arc, the green line indicates what the planet can actually sustain and the red line indicates what we are doing as a species. In this paper I would like to look at some of the things IKEA is working on within the discussion about consumption and how retailers are part of that model. My presentation, then, is the practical side of how a retailer works in its shops, but also how we try and engage with our customers.

The area of Southern Sweden where IKEA began in 1943 is associated with thrifty people who make the most of their local resources. In that sense, sustainability has been part of the company’s DNA from the very beginning. Flat-packing came, not from an environmental initiative but from the logic that fewer assembled items of furniture fit in a delivery van than flat-packed items. In other words, flat-packing enabled IKEA to deliver more to the market more efficiently.

What I would like to suggest in this paper is that it does not really matter whether the focus is on financial benefits or environmental awareness because being frugal with resources has a positive effect on both. IKEA’s vision ‘to create a better everyday life for many people’ came out in the 1970s as a manifestation of the
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company’s aim to offer a wide range of well-designed home furnishing products with prices that are affordable for as many people as possible. We want to be the leading home furnishings company - that is our ambition as a company. We can and we should lead on environmental issues too. I am really proud of the company I work for. The planet has a population of around six billion people right now, of which two billion have got disposable income and live in nice homes. Four billion people live in poverty. In the next 10-15 years another two billion people are going to want to consume at the same level we are consuming today which is why governments and retailers have to start to work in a better way with the limited resources on the planet.

Statistics really illustrate the point of how easily we waste resources in the world. One out of four shopping bags of food that we carry into our homes ends up in the waste bin. We import beef and soya into the West from Brazil, a country that is suffering from Rain Forest de-forestation to meet the demand of these products, and then we do not eat them. We throw them away. That is over four million tonnes just in the UK which is the equivalent of taking up to 40% of the cars in the UK off the road.

One of IKEA’s strengths is the fact that the company has a sustainability mission. A lot of companies are only starting to produce them now, but IKEA’s first environmental policy was written in 1991. Our current environmental policy, which is a few years old now is: ‘IKEA’s business shall have an overall positive impact on people and the environment.’ It was developed with interested parties, retailers, suppliers, NGOs, journalists and various others. The policy before that was, ‘IKEA will always strive to minimise its impact on people and the environment.’ The new policy is a much bigger statement because rather than agreeing to try and rectify the overall damage of production, this statement forces the company to balance the scales through its actions. If on the one hand there is forestry, production and transportation, on the other there is sustainable forestry, responsible sourcing and using energy efficiently in our buildings. Both sides balance each other out.

Forestry is very important, especially for us at IKEA. 60% of our product range is wood or wood fibre which is very renewable and easy to recycle. The difficulty is that only 5% of the total volume of forestry out there is Forestry Stewardship Council. We therefore work with the logging companies, and with our suppliers so that we can source directly. We set very stringent standards with regards to what we want them to achieve.

It is also crucial to take social responsibility. Wherever we operate, both at the supply end and where our stores are, the company aims to be a good social partner. Most of all we want our customers to shop with confidence. There are a lot of brands with a wide range of standards and we want people to trust the IKEA brand.
A way in which the company tries to work in all three areas of sustainability is by striving to offer a range of products that are more sustainable. There is a model that IKEA International uses in Älmhult (where they design the products) that measures up variables such as energy efficient production, recyclable material, use of renewable energy etc. That information is stored and used to make sure that by 2015, 90% of our products can be classified as ‘more sustainable’ than their predecessors.

We want to protect our lead role in the low-carbon economy by turning waste into resources and reducing our carbon footprint. Society is in a cycle of consumption and it is very important that we break out of it, so IKEA is hoping to lead by example by working on turning the end of use of our products into new products. A big issue in the UK is how to get rid of home furnishing at the end of its life. We conducted research on this and 40% of Londoners do not have a car and they live in a small flat on the third floor. A lot of people live alone. When a person of this profile wants to buy a new bed they need to get rid of their old one, and this can become a problem. We did two things to help. First of all, we linked with a charitable organisation and made leaflets with contact information for local charities available at each checkout. This process allows IKEA to act as a conduit for the customer to look, find the charity and contact them with little impact for us as a retailer. On the various pages for beds, kitchens and sofas on the IKEA website there is a link that takes customers directly to an umbrella organisation called the Re-use Network. We launched it in September and by February we had 10,000 hits a month. That is 10,000 customers who have said, ‘I have a problem and IKEA have offered me a solution.’

We have also discovered that being clever about design and day-to-day processes can save us money and resources. Wooden pallets are a wonderful transit aid to get products to the store but they are also, once they have been unloaded, an extra transport expense. As an alternative, we have developed loading ledges and a plastic band that goes around the product and holds them together with a locking device so that all of the handling happens in one place. We then send the pallets back to the centre where the damaged ones are recycled and turned into a raw material.

There is also the question of how the brand communicates with the customer. We want to solve customers’ problems and customers’ problems differ from area to area and from country to country. In the UK we have really low recycling rates, around 40% and depending on where the customer lives they will have different issues. In some places customers are given six or seven bins and they have to sort things accordingly. We can provide solutions for these kinds of issues, but we also try to lead by example: we now have stores with 86% recycling.

How do we pass energy saving ideas onto the customer? One of the ways we do this is through the products we offer such as the
NUTID range, an induction hob that will save 40% of a customer’s energy consumption in cooking. We also, once again, lead by example. In our stores we are starting to use solar panels, wind power, ground source heating – things that might not be practical for the customer or that the customer may not have considered as practical before. By using these technologies in our stores we are sending the message, ‘this is what IKEA is doing, maybe you can consider doing it as well.’ I also write a blog where I do not talk mainly about environment, but I give a lot of money-saving tips. These tips are actually environmental tips, but I call them money-saving tips because they are both.

Many stores in the UK still have plastic bags, but prompted by IKEA International, we phased them out of our stores around five years ago. Giving bags away cost the company money, so getting rid of them saved us around £400,000. Staff also welcomed the change because they knew about the issues involved and even customers proved to be happy with this solution. Initially we thought we might receive complaints from customers used to receiving free bags, but we did not. I think we did two things that encouraged customers to embrace the change. First we started charging for the bags that we were giving away and that money went straight to forestry so that it was not corporate IKEA making money, but rather a local organisation getting donations. Secondly, since we were not loading boxes of bags onto the checkout, we got faster checkout times. This model was copied by the US and they were really worried because they were a real service based organisation, but they still had the same results.

Social responsibility is also very important for us and one of our main concerns is working to help children. We welcome school tours and bring local children into a store to show them our sustainability actions. The children have little jackets with ‘eco-warrior’ written on the back and have a wonderful time. Of course, this is free PR for us, but it is also good for our co-workers and for our local communities. Another children’s initiative we work on is The Soft Toy Campaign. Through this initiative, which takes place in every European IKEA country, IKEA donates a Euro for every toy bought around Christmas. So far we have collected nearly 24 million Euros through this one campaign. This money goes out to areas of deprivation and so far we have reached out to over eight million children through over fifty projects. We also work with Unicef and Save the Children.

It is also very important to link to local communities because although people appreciate the work we do in India and Pakistan with cotton projects for example, they also want to know we are doing something locally. We have an initiative called the Foots of Forest Campaign whereby every time a person swipes their IKEA Family Card, we create a foot of woodland for them. We have just passed the one million pound barrier donated, so we have created a million square feet, which is the equivalent of the size of
the new Olympic Village. I mention the Olympic Village as a comparison because it is important to make it real. If you are going to raise environmental awareness, you have to make it tangible. I do not know what a tonne of CO2 looks like so it is important to try to make whatever communications we use real to the customer. The trick is not to come up with a very complicated technical solution, even though you do need to have that, but to come up with a way to communicate it to a customer that is not really interested in the environment. If customers believe in what we are doing then we can start trying to engage them in it.

In this paper I have referred to the idea of leading by example as one of ways in which IKEA aims to carry out its environmental mission. As businesses, and especially retailers, interact so directly with households and the way households can bring sustainable practices into their homes, leading by example is not only important but necessary for any business that takes sustainability seriously. For IKEA this is made even more imperative by the vast numbers of IKEA customers. In order to get an idea of the scale of our business, one can simply consider that if every IKEA customer replaced one 60 Watt bulb with a low-energy bulb, it would be equivalent to taking 750,000 cars off the road. It is very exciting to work with a big retailer like IKEA because the effects your business policies can have are so huge. It is something more businesses should aim for.
Protection of the environment is seen by many as one of the main challenges we face this century. I would like to examine the other great challenge of the 21st century, the changing demographic. I say challenge, but I think it is also a great opportunity too. It is a complex topic and although I will discuss technology and ageing, what I would like to focus on is a fairly neglected element in gerontology, certainly within the area of home care and health care technologies for the home. A lot of things have developed, including the way we think about health and about acute or chronic care, but one thing I have noticed is that there has been a steady degradation of companionship care. This is something my research team and I have been working on a lot to see how we can start addressing these problems of social isolation and how we can start thinking about social care technologies.

I joined the Health Research and Innovation Group in Intel Corp around five years ago and I lead their European Social Science & Design side of things. One of my hats is that I am a principal investigator in a research centre we set up in Dublin called the Technology Research for Independent Living (TRIL). We set this up with a couple of Irish universities and a teaching hospital. Intel, and later GE, became funding partners along with the Irish government. The aim is to explore the role of technology as a means of helping older people remain in their homes for as long as possible. We had a dual-track approach to this. The first cardinal rule that we set up right at the beginning was that we did not want to push technology and end up having to find uses for the technology we had developed. That is a typical engineering approach and we tried to break away from that. We started off immediately by setting out to understand people’s needs and practices before we even tried to think about developing the technologies. So we have a dual approach to our research. On the one side, we have a team of clinicians and psychologists. We run a large clinic in Dublin where we do a full bio-psycho-social assessment of older people who come through there. To date we have seen 625 of these older people and it gives us a really good overview of some of their issues. At the same time we also have teams of sociologists and anthropologists who go into older people’s homes and spend several days with them. They sometimes develop a relationship with them over a much longer period of several years. This is essential because we have all these broad findings that we gather in the clinic on the medical side but on the social side we are going into homes and we understand people’s needs within what we might call the messiness of everyday life. As a result we know what happens at 3 o’clock in the morning or during the lulls in the day when a person’s energy levels are not particularly high.

We do a lot of medical and ethnographic research around a topic then we bring together designers, engineers, psychologists into
the lab, start developing the prototypes with large groups of older people. Then we test them and re-test them and improve them. We also test them over time in people’s homes. We do not just go into a person’s home for two or three days. We will actually go for ten weeks and see what happens and whether usage drops off after a while.

Between 2006 and 2008, some colleagues and I ran a large anthropological study on the experience of ageing in seven European countries. We spent a lot of time in older people’s homes and I would like to share one of the cases we came across. Erik is a case study from Sweden. At the time of the study he was 83. He was born in 1928. He had nine siblings, two of whom were surviving, and he was a farmer. Like many farmers, he reached retirement age but did not really retire, he started cutting back. As his physical dexterity declined, he went out to his more distant fields less and less. He then started renting these fields off or selling them off. As the years went by he decided that he was going to stop a lot of his farming and was going to start market gardening, so he started doing a lot of growing in his garden and his greenhouse. After a while, he felt he could not manage that anymore. His world kind of came in and in and narrowed and by the time I visited him, which was 2007, he was living in his kitchen. He was living alone. He had a very large farmhouse but most of the house was closed off and was full of dust. He just heated his kitchen and his bedroom and that was it.

I will give you a bit of background for this man. Erik was widowed in 1994. There are not very many houses around his, but the neighbours he has do come in and see him every morning just to check if he is alright. He lost his driver’s license, as is often the case (this is a major issue). He wakes up in the morning at 4am. This is partly because of his farming background but mostly because of the cramps in his legs. Once he is awake he cannot get back to sleep so he gets up, dresses, makes himself some breakfast and then waits for his neighbour. His neighbour comes over at around 5.30am and drops off the newspaper which is delivered to the end of a very long lane which is too long a walk for him. He reads the newspaper etc. and at 11 o’clock he has some coffee. At 12.30 his meals on wheels comes and a nurse and home help person also come in at around that time. In the afternoon he has a favourite radio programme that he listens to and although he has a television, he rarely watches it because he finds that it hurts his eyes. He is in bed by seven o’clock because he has nothing else to do. That is his life.

He told us that he had lost interest in taking on new hobbies, but his one lifeline is his telephone. He says that he loves to be on the telephone. He has his daughter in Stockholm who he speaks to and a number of friends that he likes to call. So he spends a lot of time on the phone but he says he is restricted by the fact that he gets charged. As a consequence he needs to watch how long
he is talking for.

Cases like Erik are very common. I have met people like him in all of the seven European countries I have worked in. I see it all the time in Ireland and I have seen it a lot in the work I have done in the UK as well.

There are some statistics from Help the Aged that are rather interesting.

- Half of people aged 75 and over in Britain live alone.
- 12% of older people report feeling trapped in their own homes.
- 3% of older people never go out.
- Almost 5 million people consider the TV as their main form of company.
- Over a million UK pensioners ate Christmas dinner alone.

These statistics are astonishing. They are simply sad and unnecessary. Also, if you look at the United States, the figures are reflected very much there as well.

I tend to use the de Jong Gierveld loneliness scale. I like it because it is developed for older people specifically. It also allows loneliness to be divided into two main constructs: social loneliness, which is really about loss of social network or not having a social network, versus emotional loneliness which is that lack of an emotional attachment normally due to loss of a significant other. Often as a result of bereavement you will be emotionally lonely as rather than socially lonely.

What our research does is divide the two constructs into four quadrants: People who are neither socially nor emotionally lonely versus those who are socially lonely, those who are emotionally lonely and those who are both. If a person classifies as both socially and emotionally lonely on the de Jong scale they really are in the red zone. It is at that point that people need to have really severe intervention. A person in this emotional situation tends to be in the highest risk categories with regards to health. There is a higher risk of falls, anxiety scores are very high, worse sleep, fear of falling, lowest ADL (activity daily living) scores, higher depression scores etc. As you can see, this is a really important element.

With all of this in mind I would like to talk about some of the work my team is working on. We had two aims. We set ourselves the question, can a well-designed information communication technology help reduce risks of loneliness and social isolation? If so, how might it do that? If you are dealing with populations who are not used to using a computer, how do you develop something that would be intuitive for them to use as individuals?

Some really interesting studies have been carried out on the loneliness interventions that have been done up to date and Mima Cattan at Northumbria University came up with a very good systematic survey of all of these. Her team found that group interventions, that is bringing people together, whether they are...
physically remote or gathered in person is by far the most effective means of intervention but only if there is some other reason for being there. She found educational content to be the most effective, although I think entertainment and game playing could be other ways to do that. We used this as a central concept when developing what we call the TRIL Building Bridges system.

The following is based on a video on the Building Bridges system:

1) Intro
   - According to a study by Help the Aged, 1.4 million older people feel socially isolated in the United Kingdom. Of these, 300,000 have gone a full month without speaking to any family or neighbours.
   - The Building Bridges project, which is part of the TRIL Centre research programme, explores new ways that communication technology can help reduce risks of loneliness and social isolation in older people.
   - The Building Bridges project aims to develop communication technology that can be easily used by people with little or no experience with computers. It has been developed in conjunction with older Irish people who tested, criticised and improved every version of the prototype.

2) Overview of the device
   - The Building Bridges system consists of an admin console which is hosted on a server and which manages all

“The in-home device is a touch screen computer with speakers and a handset.”
broadcasts and communications between Building Bridges Devices. It also stores research data from devices and uses voice-over IP technology.
- The in-home device used by the older person is a touch screen computer with speakers and a handset.
- The Building Bridges system consists of an admin console which is hosted on a server and which manages all broadcasts and communications between Building Bridges Devices. It also stores research data from devices and uses voice-over IP technology.

3) Making a call
- The user can contact one or more people at the same time for a chat. You can invite up to six people at a time on your call.
- You simply select call participants from your address book and ‘drag and drop’ them into the green call circle.
- During the conversation, the screen will show who has entered and left the call, the names of the other people, and a speech bubble to help follow who is talking.
- People sometimes find it difficult to break into the middle of a multi-person conversation so the building bridges system has an interrupt button that makes an avatar jump up and down, indicating intent to speak.

4) Messaging
- Building Bridges users can also send short messages to the other people using a simple touch screen keyboard.
- As well as sending greetings and personal messages, this helps with scheduling calls and leaving message for people when they are not online.

5) Broadcasts
- The Building Bridges system also offers the opportunity to listen to radio or video programs, potentially provided by external organisations, such as a healthcare provider, entertainment channel, church or active retirement group.
- Broadcasts are played several times a day. These include such things as the news, documentaries, stories, music, and health related broadcasts.
- The user can view a screen that lists upcoming broadcasts. When they see a live broadcast they are interested in, they press the screen to join and sit back and listen.
- During the broadcast, the user can see who else is listening. Once the broadcast is over, an automatic 20 minute conference call is created so all they need if they want to join a discussion is lift the phone handset and have a chat with the group.

6) Tea Room
- The Tea Room is a chat room that is open at all times, day or night. Up to 20 users can enter the tea room any time and chat with any other people who happen to be there.
- The tea room also provides a Window on the World, this is linked to web cameras in various outdoor locations.
7) Family and friends
- A PC friendly client version of the Building Bridges Software has been developed to extend the usage of Building Bridges.
- This means that the older person can easily add people, such as family members, friends and neighbours, to their contact list.
- When the system is not in use and enters sleep mode, it doubles as a digital photo frame. Family members and friends are able to send digital photos which can be displayed on the system.

8) Design process
- The concepts and interface design have been developed through the ethnographically informed user-centred design approach, a hallmark of TRIL Centre research programmes.
- Potential users have been involved in each step of the development, working to ensure the system is simple and easy to use.
- This has helped develop a system that is well suited to older people who may not be familiar with computers, and who may benefit from increased social engagement - a device that helps build bridges between older people, their family & friends, their health and social systems, and their communities.

We co-developed the Building Bridges project with over 150 older people in different parts of Ireland and a lot of
those concepts came from them. They came up with many more, but we boiled them down to some core concepts, took them out as story boards, and had them critique the ideas. It was a process we repeated many times. We have done a lot of trials with this. What we found is that the people who score highly on social and or emotional loneliness used the system greatly. Obviously there are also people who the system just would not suit, but we generally found that results were very positive for that group.

We are doing a whole range of things at the moment. We have been approached by a ‘meals on wheels’ organisation in Ireland that wish to look at using a system like this around mealtimes to put together a large network of their members and their volunteers together. We have also been approached by many of the dementia societies out there. We are doing a study at the moment with caregivers of people with dementia and it has been really interesting to see what some of the needs of those caregivers are and how these systems can be used, especially for peer support. They often say to us that there are several things you want as a caregiver. First of all, they need to be able to vent, and not necessarily to family members and obviously not to the person you are there looking after. They also need good and timely information, not always from a medical professional who does not know what you are going through. What really does stick is what they learn from other caregivers and their stories. These caregiver support systems, although not a definitive answer, might prove to be a step forward in starting to think about how some of these things may work. It is about combining the technology with real social impact. To me, a metric of success for a system like this is that people use these systems and then arrange real-life meetings outside these systems. I have seen that start to happen with some of our trials and that, to me, is a real success.
There is a lot of debate on the under-valuation of households and families. The same holds true for the natural environment, maybe on common grounds. I have arranged my presentation to look at the reasons for this and try to contribute to a solution. My interest today is to stress the influence of contemporary mainstream economics on the under-valuation of household and family work as well as of the natural environment. Economics is one of the most important sciences and provides a frame and a structure for a common understanding of the economy and society and thus of households and families.

In mainstream economics as well as in the common sense, households and families are viewed as mere consumers of so-called consumption goods and services, and their productive functions are neglected. On the other hand, firms are seen as producers and their consumption of labour, raw material and parts of the natural environment is neglected. Production is seen as valuable and consumption is seen as non-valuable or less valuable. The question we must ask is whether there is evidence and theory to paint another economic picture? If there is, can we overcome the myopic view of households and families?

A new economic perspective might contribute to a new understanding and consequently support change. This is the issue and main line of this paper. I will begin by examining what micro and macro economics tell us. We will then look at household and family functions in real-life economics. From these results I will discuss the required competences of housework — because it is only possible to assess the competences of housework only after we have considered what is necessary to fulfil household and family functions. Lastly, I would like to present a new household economics model of the economy.

What picture does economics provide? I begin with two micro economic models. The most common model is the traditional theory of the household as a consuming unit. In this model it is stated that household members are employed in the market to earn a monetary income that is spent on perfect consumption goods which need no further household production. Decision making is not a productive activity in this model. Therefore, there is no household production according to micro economic theory as it is presented in standard textbooks.

On the other hand, we have the very ambitious work of Gary Stanley Becker, the world-renowned economist who received the Nobel Prize in 1992. He has drawn another picture of households and families as productive units. He argues that the production process does not stop at the doorstep of the household. Households are like small factories. They combine capital goods, raw materials and labour to clean, feed, procreate and otherwise.

---
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produce useful commodities. Thus, economics has failed to see that households not only have to allocate money, but – more fundamentally – they also have to allocate the time of the household members. Time means in fact mental and manual activity and production means resourceful production of basic household commodities that cannot be bought in the market place, like a cosy home and well fed and educated children. This process is also called housework.

G. S. Becker wrote his famous article on A Theory of the Allocation of Time in 1965 – 40 years ago. It was a revolutionary work in Economics and it was an economic rehabilitation of household work. However, we still do not find this in basic economic textbooks and, of course, it is only a piece in the puzzle.

What does macro economics tell us? The basic model you find either explicitly or implicitly in every macro-economic textbook is the so-called circular flow model. The problem with this model, however, is that we only see economic flows and related stocks if money is involved. This means, in fact, that if there is no money flow or no monetary stock, there is no economic activity displayed. What is wrong with this circular flow model that dominates our common understanding of the economic system? This model shows a theoretical and empirical reduced picture of the economy in the light of real-life economics.

Figure: the circular flow model
First, we do not see the start-up of the institutions besides the market. As you know the market raises from the interrelation of demand and supply. Where firms (supply) are coming from and where households (demand) are coming from is being neglected in this model. Second, we see no household work and family functions because there is no money involved. Third, we see no non-profit organisations. They do not exist in such a model. You see no voluntary workforce, not only is it invisible within the home but also in non-profit organisations. Fourth, we also do not see hybrid systems, that is, small interlinked systems like small family businesses and small self-help groups. They are neither pure households nor separate firms and formal associations respectively. Fifth, the circular flow model gives the impression that firms are big in terms of employees and turnover on the one hand and households are small on the other hand. The reality, however, shows another picture: most enterprises all around the world, even in so-called developed countries, are small in terms of employees, a great deal of them have one employee who is self-employed. Sixth, formal organised free associations and self-help groups do not exist either in this model. Seventh, there is no interdependence of the economy, the society and nature. The economic process looks like a self-sustaining monetary cycle. There is no social embeddedness. And there is no natural environment. Eighth, we do not see what economists call the structural identity of production and consumption. Structural identity means that production and consumption is nothing else than the transformation of matter and energy which we get from the natural environment into investment goods, consumption goods, household commodities and all the residuals as waste, global warming etc. that goes back earlier or later into the natural environment. Ninth, as a result of this the fundamental function of the household and family sector for the macrostructure of the economy and society is neglected. Hence, in market economies with democratic political systems it is the individual in his primary context who is the driving force of all economic and social activities.

This brings us to the household and family functions which are developed outside of the traditional body of economics and sociology. It is clear that we see economic functions. Households have to form themselves and organise themselves. They have to allocate resources and contribute to market, public and household production. There is the regeneration function which is essentially recreation and tension management. We take biological reproduction into account as a function and this is the procreation function. We see the socialisation function as a process, namely enculturation and ongoing formation. We have a political function, in modern societies of course, the economic activities are not restricted to the market or to the household but extended to the public sphere as well. This includes provision of collective and public goods or being involved in the collection and production of public goods, e.g. going to the polls and being politically active. We also have something that we might consid-
er as an ecological function. We are condemned to use the natural environment, there is no escape from this, but we have the responsibility to do it in a safe and sound way. Saving matter and energy means less consumption which in turn means less production and trying to get by with less material turnover. This has to be fulfilled in a personal, satisfactory and socially responsible way and this leads to welfare production for household members, to the family and therefore to the whole society because all members of society are related primarily in the private household. By fulfilling these functions we are shaping the structure of the economy of the society.

There is statistical evidence to underline the thesis that the household sector provides a structuration function for the economy and society. First, if we look at GDP we see that expenditure on private goods accounts for approximately 60% of GDP, which means that we pay in cash what we want to have. This is produced and reproduced for the market and, thus, leads to production, investment and employment. Second, time use studies in several countries like Germany, Britain or the United States, show that household production is not a diminishing task in modern societies. In Germany about 63% of total working hours are related to family and household production, and 37% are related to paid work. Third, enterprise start-ups do not start at the stock-exchange. In Germany – as well as in other OECD countries – we see very small housework related enterprise start-ups and businesses. Normal small businesses are not a separated unit, but they are interlinked and mixed with the household and family sphere of the founder, because the functions and structure of the household and the firm are interrelated. Carefully counted we can say that 50% of all firms in Germany are hybrid systems that cannot be separated from the household and family sector. Fourth, human capital is produced primarily in the family. The primary investment for education in terms of money and in time is done in the family and not in the public sphere. There is no alternative to the family with respect to building human capital. Fifth, public goods are legitimised by political voting, i.e. potentially by all adults – not with bills like expenditure in the market place but with ballots. Environmental damage, the dark side of our economic activity, has been estimated at 50% after buying the market goods, e.g. the washing machine and the car.

What competences are required to fulfil all these functions on the micro-level and contribute to the macro-level?

1. Self-perception as a resourceful economic factor,
2. Insight into the social, economic and ecological nexus,
3. Setting up responsible life goals,
4. Generating and allocating resources carefully,
5. Understanding money as a means not as an end,
6. Staying informed about economic and social data,
7. Starting and running a household and a family and maybe a business.
8. “Making the house a home” and

The figure below shows how we can incorporate this in a new household economics model of the society in a very simple approach. We start from a circular flow model in economics to draw a welfare production model. We see firms as producers. We see households as consumers and we add their function as producing units. We also add associations and non-profit organisations as well as hybrid systems. We put everything on the right foot so that the household is the basic institution where decisions and actions are the driving forces and all other institutions are derivative institutions. We put a social frame around it all and add a natural frame around that. Now we are aware that we have an input coming from this natural environment and an output that goes back to nature but in a degraded state.

Figure: Households as basic socio-economic units and embedded in the economy, the society, and the natural environment.
Modern society has elevated the family and household matters from their formerly private position to that of concerns of the political institutions. The emergence of society, seen by Hanna Arendt in the rise of housekeeping, its activities, problems and organisational devices, has moved the home from the shadowy interior of the household into the light of the public sphere. It has not only blurred the old borderlines between private and political, but has also changed almost beyond recognition the meaning of the two terms and their significance for the life of the individual and the citizen (Arendt, 1958:28). Housing policies, management of households and professional rules of home workers are a few discrete examples of how the institution of the society interferes in the matters and system of the home. Hence, we are entitled to pose the question as to how far the institution of home is relevant to the professional life of our contemporary society. This was one of the questions addressed by the third international conference of the Home Renaissance Foundation Sustainable Living: Professional Approaches to Housework.

In a world where it seems young professionals have completed their takeover of the core of our cities and declared their dynamic centres a family-free zone, the individual-centric urban core is no longer supportive to institutions such as the family and the home. This would confirm the predictions Jane Jacob made five decades ago: the harsh environment of modern cities, the priority of the individual over the family and finally the loss of moral values within our urban environment (Jacobs, 1962). The spatial proximity of work and life has been broken and the spatial transformation of the modern city is becoming a reality that is forcing families to live outside its urban core (Massey, 1994).

A quick look at the housing layout of most European cities shows clear signs of accelerating displacement of the family from their urban centres towards the peripheries. There is increasing segregation and distance between places of work and living spaces, lengthier daily journeys between work and home. In the search for good careers, young people live in shared accommodation near their workplaces in the centre. People with families have to live at greater distances from work and provide alternative means of caring for their house and children, especially if the wife goes out to work. Such spatial segregation between where people work and live has resulted in a decline of support from within the family and has increased the demand on outside care services, be it domestic workers, childminders, or care for elderly people. Hence, other forms of professional relationships have been brought into the home at a time when homeowners are experiencing a greater distance between work and home. Therefore, we should not make the mistake of saying that the institution of home is in decline, and neither can we afford to ignore its presence and needs.
However, to take this issue seriously, we need to be clear about what we mean by home. Home is an everyday notion that carries subjective clarity as well as collective ambiguity. Are we talking about the home of the family, the home of the collective group of individuals, or are we talking about larger institutions such as the community? In the subjective sense, the home could be where you stay at night, being part of a family, or not. Maybe it is your work desk or your laptop (with all your private photos, files, Facebook access, internet chat rooms or online TV channels) and multi-facility iPhone with endless links to friends, news and chat lines. We are living in an ever more dynamic and mobile environment where our activities overlap and the traditional boundaries of privacy have become blurred regarding where a certain activity stops and another starts. There is one fact about the modern way of life, namely that there is no one form of home, but rather a multiplicity of homes, of which some are not such private domains as they used to be. Homes could host professional and work activities or provide medical services. Contemporary homes are about living; particularly sustainable living.

In the light of this understanding of the New Home, the papers presented at this conference were instrumental in emphasising the urgent need to revisit our conceptions of the home, family and work. Professional approaches to housework are essential to our sustainable living and to survival of the home in a time when mobility is of the essence. In their own ways and from their different fields of expertise, the speakers suggested that we can no longer live at home in isolation from our professional lives or, when at work, ignore our responsibility towards the home and housework. Recent studies have provided evidence that domestic responsibilities and housework affect the income of the household and therefore their standard of living. What this conference and its proceedings try to underline is that we are living in a world that is continuously changing, and hence we can no longer afford to ignore the fact that homes are places of living and working, intimacy of private life and public interaction through professional relationships.

Following the two previous successful Home Renaissance Foundation conferences, the focus on professional approaches to housework as a catalyst for sustainable living was a timely step further forward from the sociological and spatial investigations of the 2010 conference, From House to Home. The home promoted by HRF is a complex organisation, it is more than an institution; it is a realm that encompasses professionalism and ethical values as well as a sense of belonging, support and protection. It is the home of a family that reflects the needs of a progressive society in the face of an increasingly aged population. Hence, the home emerges as an institution of human experience that is capable of recreating itself within its boundaries, rather than falling prey to obsolescence.
The conference papers largely acknowledged the depth of the challenges facing our changing society and the way housework, despite its connotations of private life, has redirected the home towards a new frontier of social, legal, and political worlds. The economic consequences of this development have become even more significant in a society marked by the centrality of economic power. The conference addressed the new challenges that face our future homes lucidly which can be provisionally categorised under three headings: socio-political issues, economic and legal frameworks; and technological aspects.

Sergio Belardinelli’s keynote speech focused primarily and succinctly on the central position of the family within society, stating that the family encapsulates the human being’s anthropological significance. Failure to take into account the “relational” or “familial” nature of the individual results in the creation of a being who is abstract, hypothetical, de-naturalised – an individual who in reality does not exist. He was vocal in his criticism of public policy, the illusive vision of individualistic modernity and its negative assertion of liberal society as rooted in the individual’s liberal rights, and divorced from the institutions that enable it to thrive. Belardinelli’s analysis represents a call for public policy to be decisive in its support and even promotion of work at home and the familial nature of mankind. For him, the family and home are institutions that are crucial to ensuring that the ethos and values of a liberal and democratic civilisation are strengthened and perpetuated from one generation to another. The individual-centric view of modernity and the subsequent pluralised forms of family have devastating consequences of fragmentation, nexus between democracy and demography.

With regard to practical considerations of the role of the family and home within society, Belardinelli asserts, “In any event, a pluralistic and liberal society cannot survive on contractual relationships alone.” Ignoring the centrality of home would have a detrimental effect, as strategies to build self-sustaining societies through integration of local and macro organisations and their shared interests would cease to be affordable, especially in the light of dwindling national and governmental resources.

Evidence to support Sergio Belardinelli’s argument could, perhaps, be best seen in Aggie MacKenzie’s account of her show How Clean is Your House? which in effect highlighted the relationship of housework to the values and social behaviour of family/household members. On many occasions filth and dirt in a house were a reflection of the family’s lack of hope, will or belief in a better future. Changing such a mentality and providing hope within the family could turn the lives of its members upside down, and change their attitudes towards their association and participation within their communities and the larger society: “Children from disorganised homes with a lack of routine are more likely to be rude or antisocial.” Mackenzie’s message
is simply that home matters and housework have to be organised and managed collaboratively, with the participation of all family members, especially young children. Home is where children learn and develop skills and positive or negative attitudes towards others and towards society. The experience of a chaotic home is reflected clearly in the behaviour of the carers, who are significantly less responsive and less vocally stimulating towards their children, leaving a lifelong negative legacy.

The professional consideration of the social aspects of house planning and design in Hong Kong was illustrated in Ada Fung’s introduction of Hong Kong’s experience of community participation, planning and development in a high-density, high-rise environment, where the focus was on developing an authentic sense of home with real residents. It centred on enhancing social cohesion through workshops, talks and discussions aimed at all groups within the society, which then informed the development of shared community spaces with seating areas that enabled them to sit together and mingle, an exercise area for the elderly and a heritage gallery with a relaxation area to encourage the community to form the habit of enjoying collective meal times.

While the socio-political discussions on change were placed rationally within the mainstream views of modern culture and current public policies, the discussions about economic and legal frameworks for the sustainable future of homes and housework were both quite radical and genuinely serious in requesting significant changes to the existing systems. Helen Kersley, researcher in the Valuing What Matters Team at the New Economics Foundation, suggested that the home is crucial in preventing social problems from happening and proposed a rethink of the distribution of work and time in order to prevent the incurring of a very high bill later down the line. She challenged the commonly accepted view that work should be valued proportionally to the payment it is rewarded with and claimed that as part of the core economy, housework deserves greater recognition. Professor Michael-Burkhard Piorkowsky continued this theme and argued that other important functions of the household, such as regeneration, recreation and socialisation, and human capital, are produced primarily, if not exclusively, in the home.

There must also be consideration of the house as a place of professional activities such as hospitality, nursing of elderly people, or domestic work. In particular, domestic workers face poor working conditions with long hours, low wages and no benefits, according to Peggie Smith. It was really informative to learn of the significant contribution of domestic work to the national economy, and the prospect of it becoming one of the major sources of employment in the years ahead. However, the absence of clear contractual and legal frameworks for such professional work in the home is problematic and renders domestic workers vulnerable to poor working environments and conditions. The absence
of pension schemes for domestic workers is a big drawback in this type of employment, leaving many ageing workers without financial resources after retirement, especially immigrants from abroad. In general, training must be provided for people involved in domestic duties and/or work, whether paid or unpaid.

The third theme dealt with the role technology could play in enhancing people’s quality of life and their attitudes to their homes. A number of strategies were presented for sustainable housing design and materials while other contributors discussed innovative research and technology designed specifically to improve the social experience at home. David Prendergast, a lead researcher of Intel Corp., presented a comprehensive socio-cultural investigation into problems associated with care of the elderly, which is becoming of critical importance due to the ageing population. To allow a greater level of companionship for the elderly, visual communicative devices have been developed to allow immobile elderly citizens to communicate with their friends and family and to develop local social networks. Where sociable home environments are unachievable due to inaccessibility of friends and family members, online social networks such as Facebook have been seen to provide viable alternatives. If ‘home’ is a feeling, as Mauri Ahlberg suggested, then it is one brought about by being in the company of people who make us happy, around whom we are comfortable and who we trust to look after us.

The diversity and broadness of the papers presented at the conference confirm that the home is still relevant today to discussions of our lives. It is, despite the apparent simplicity of its meaning, a very complex concept, and further research and investigation is required. Evidence presented from the fields of sociology, psychology, architecture, anthropology, law, economics, public policy, technology, hospitality, media, political science, and social policy confirmed that the influence of the institutions of family and home cuts across almost everything we do on a daily basis. Despite the low profile accorded to them in today’s world, the home and the family are powerful assets and vehicles for development of sustainable and progressive societies.

Looking to the future, the intellectual discussions and practical investigations of professional approaches to housework can be summarised in a preliminary manifesto to provide an urgently needed agenda for the new home; the home that is suitable for the twenty first century, venue for modern social relationships, flexible and resourceful enough to host a combination of activities, including work, studying, housework and family interaction. The new home is dynamic, sustainable and responsive. Bearing that in mind, the most discrete conclusion, it must be said, is to call for open societal discourse to agree on what we will require from our future homes in terms of their capacity and response to emerging needs. How can we support the professional approaches to housework that play a crucial role in sustaining the
lives and resources of the family and the household?

Hence, if we are to consider an agenda for the new home, it should address the following basic issues:

- The position, role and capacity of the family as an asset in modern societies and its influence on building sustainable communities and a just social system.

- Possible means of financial and technical support for home-based professions, businesses, and self-employment.

- The ability of technology of future homes and systems to support the needs of disadvantaged households/individuals and minimise the burden on public services.

- The legal systems and frameworks that are required to cover the special professional relationships at home.

When the chairman of the Home Renaissance Foundation, Bryan Sanderson CBE, said in his opening speech that the role of housework in our society needs a fundamental rethink in order for it to be recast as a professional activity and a valuable resource, the aim was to address the need for a deep and coherent understanding of home as a venue of sustainable living: “The word housework does not have good connotations in the world. For the work in the home to be recognised as a vital part of our society there will need to be much thought, study and discussion, which does not happen very often.” In the late 1980s, the sociologists Peter Saunders and Peter Williams called for a new agenda for the home, a reappraisal of what home means and how it really works in modern society (Saunders & Williams, 1988). Three decades later, it seems policy makers are yet to realise that home has become a need and prerequisite to the survival of Western society.

In conclusion, the above three themes were explored through empirical research papers and professional discussions whose coverage deserves much more space than this short summary can offer. This conference provided an invaluable theoretical and empirical base for the new home, a home that, while supporting the importance of the family and its position within society, encompasses innovative approaches to domestic work, activities and relationships.
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