


Borro, Danila Lorena

 **Danila Lorena Borro**
dborro@sociales.uba.ar
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

PSOCIAL
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina
ISSN-e: 2422-619X
Periodicity: Semestral
vol. 7, no. 1, 2021
psocial@sociales.uba.ar

Received: 15 June 2021
Accepted: 07 July 2021

URL: <http://portal.amelica.org/ameli/jatsRepo/123/1232225007/index.html>

Abstract: The present empirical study inquires on the relations among sexism, gender role ideology and domestic and care work in heterosexual women who share a home with their couples and at least one child, in CABA and GBA (Argentina) in 2019. Two previously existent (Moya, Expósito & Padilla, 2006; Glick & Fiske, 1996) and validated in Argentina scales were used, and a new scale for measuring domestic and care activities was created. A correlational and transversal study with a quantitative approach was carried out, and the data was recollected through an auto-administrated evaluation instrument sent by Facebook and Whatsapp social media. The sample includes 437 cases. Regarding the constructed scale, reliability, exploratory and confirmatory analysis were performed. Additionally, a moderate positive correlation among the dependent and independent variables was identified. It is possible to suggest that the hypothesis presented in this study is partially corroborated, that is, that the domestic and care work type of division is explained by the level of adhesion to the Gender Role Ideology.

Keywords: Ambivalent sexism, Gender Role Ideology, domestic work, care work, heterosexual couples.

Resumen: El presente estudio empírico indaga respecto a las relaciones entre el sexismo, la adhesión a la ideología del rol de género y la división del trabajo doméstico y de cuidados en mujeres heterosexuales que viven en pareja y tienen al menos un hijo compartiendo el mismo hogar, en CABA y GBA (Argentina) en 2019. Se utilizaron dos escalas existentes (Moya, Expósito y Padilla, 2006; Glick y Fiske, 1996) previamente validadas en Argentina, y se construyó una escala nueva para medir las tareas domésticas y de cuidado. Se realizó un estudio correlacional de corte transversal con un abordaje cuantitativo y los datos fueron recolectados a través de un instrumento de evaluación de índole autoadministrable mediante las redes sociales Facebook y Whatsapp. La muestra estuvo compuesta por 437 casos. Se realizaron los correspondientes análisis de fiabilidad, exploratorio y confirmatorio para la escala construida. Asimismo, se identificó una correlación positiva moderada entre la variable dependiente y las variables independientes. Es posible sugerir que se corrobora parcialmente la hipótesis planteada en este trabajo, es decir, que el tipo de división del trabajo doméstico y de cuidados se explica por el nivel de adhesión a la ideología del rol de género.

Palabras clave: Sexismo ambivalente, Ideología del rol de género, trabajo doméstico, trabajo de cuidados, parejas heterosexuales.

INTRODUCTION

During the last decades, the study of the multiple oppressions inscribed in the vital trajectories of women has been widely approached by feminist theories. Within the diverse currents, emphasis is placed on the articulation of different dimensions that allow to understand power relations from more complex frameworks. The first criticisms in this regard were raised by Radical feminism in the 1960's. From this current, they have denounced women's traditional role and the attribution of different personality traits due to their sex, determining domestic and care tasks as female responsibilities (Millet, 1973). Likewise, they give the nuclear family a fundamental role in ensuring and perpetuating the oppression of women (Dixon, 1973; Dunbar, 1973; Randall, 1973). On the other hand, they have pointed out that even though in the post-World War II period women joined paid work on a massive scale, they continued to be those who were mainly in charge of domestic work, thus falling a second shift on them (Dixon, 1973; Randall, 1973).

Furthermore, from a materialist feminist conception, Delphy (1982) suggests that domestic work should not be defined from the type of tasks performed, but rather as all work performed for other people within the framework of the home or family and that is not paid. In this manner, it is understood within the framework of the social relations of production, including women as a class. According to Federici (2013), the recognition of the central role of reproduction and domestic work in capitalist accumulation—a product of women's struggles during the 1960s and 1970s—has favoured the understanding that the private sphere can be understood as an arena for relations of production and for fighting against capitalism, supported by a certain model of family, sexuality and procreation.

In other words, the division of domestic work, problematized and linked to other axes of oppression, is studied by feminist theories from different perspectives. For its part, Latin America has not been oblivious to the conceptualizations coming from these mainly born in the United States and Europe currents. Various empirical studies on the division of domestic work carried out in our region have identified a trend towards these tasks mainly being performed by women, even among those who also work outside the home for a salary and regardless of social class, age or educational level. It has also been pointed out that the different household tasks are not homogeneously distributed between women and men, but rather that it is possible to observe trends towards less masculine participation in certain tasks—such as cleaning the house and washing and ironing clothes—and a greater in others—such as small home repairs—(Gómez Rojas, 2013).

This means that, just as it was denounced by radical feminism in the 1960s in the framework of the first feminist struggles against reproductive work, a double shift continues to fall on women (Rodríguez Enríquez, 2014; Casique, 2004; Carbonero Gamundí, 2007; Esquivel, 2012; Ariza y de Oliveira, 1999; Sosa y Román, 2015; Campillo, 2000; Wainerman, 2009; Gutierrez, 2007; Federici, 2013). In Argentina, Rodríguez Enríquez (2014) points out that 90% of women carry out unpaid work, while for men the participation is 60%. Likewise, not only is the participation rate of women in domestic work higher, but they also spend twice as much time as their male counterparts, deepening the difference when it comes to children and the elderly care.

On another note, Goldberg (2013) points out that in cases where spouses have similar incomes, women continue to do the most of domestic work, since this implies both a way of expressing their femininity and of affirming the masculinity of the man. In the light of what is indicated by this perspective, understood as “doing gender”, and of the scarce democratization of domestic and care tasks appreciated in heterosexual couples, arises the interest in studying how perceptions of gender stereotypes and the division of unpaid work within households are linked.

It is then that the general objective proposed for this work consists of knowing the links between the level of ambivalent sexism, the level of adherence to the gender role ideology and the domestic and care work type of division in heterosexual women who share a home with their couple and at least one child, in Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires (CABA) and Gran Buenos Aires (GBA) in 2019. Within the specific

objectives, firstly it is expected to describe the domestic and care work type of division according to the level of ambivalent sexism and the level of adherence to gender role ideology. Secondly, to study if the level of Ambivalent sexism predicts the domestic and care work type of division. Thirdly, to inquire if the level of adherence to the Gender Role Ideology predicts the domestic and care work type of division. The research was guided by the following hypothesis: it is expected that the level of sexism and adherence to the gender role ideology explain the domestic and care work type of division.

METHOD

Design

To answer the inquiries of this research, a cross-sectional correlational study was carried out, with a quantitative approach (Montero & León, 2007).

Participants

The sample selection was intentional, non-probabilistic. A total of 437 women who live with their couples and have at least one child sharing the same home, residents of CABA and GBA during 2019, participated in the study.

Instruments

Data was collected through a self-administered evaluation instrument sent by Facebook and WhatsApp social media, ensuring the anonymity of the participants. It included the following scales: Domestic and Care Work Division Scale —of own elaboration for this research—, Gender Role Ideology Scale and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. Besides, socio-demographic information was requested —gender, age, number of hours worked per week, among other variables—.

Firstly, to investigate the domestic and care work type of division within households, an evaluation instrument constructed ad hoc was used. For this purpose, it was developed a scale that measured the level of traditionality in the division of unpaid work. It was understood that a task is carried out in a traditional way if it is the woman of the couple who mainly performs it, except for those that are frequently masculinized, such as small home repairs (Gómez Rojas, 2013). On the opposite side of the scale, the task distribution was considered less traditional when the male is frequently in charge of it. In this sense, perceptions about the frequency of relative participation in each of the domestic and care work tasks by the surveyed person and their partner were recorded, through the implementation of 18 items answered with a Likert-type scale of 5 anchors.

As an example, one of the items is: 'In my couple, the man takes care of our children when they get sick' —the original item in Spanish is: 'En mi pareja, el hombre es quien se encarga de cuidar a nuestros/as hijos/as cuando se enferman'—. The rest of the items can be read in Table 2. The 5 anchors of the Likert-type consisted of frequency levels —never, almost never, sometimes, almost always, always—. The items were written in such a way that the highest score corresponds to a higher level of traditionality. For this reason, some items were correspondingly inverted. Also, as it will be seen later, it is noteworthy that the original version of the implemented scale contained 18 items, 11 of which were subsequently eliminated in the reliability analysis.

Furthermore, the Gender Role Ideology scale, elaborated in Spanish by Moya, Expósito & Padilla (2006) and validated by Ungaretti, Etchezahar & Simkin (2013) in Argentina, was applied with the purpose of

studying the presence of gender stereotypes among women. The reduced version consisting of 12 items was used. Likewise, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, created by Glick & Fiske (1996) and validated by Vaamonde & Omar (2012) in Argentina, was used to appreciate the phenomenon of ambivalent sexism. It consists of two factors —hostile sexism and benevolent sexism— and has 22 items.

Procedure

The subjects were invited to participate in the research on a voluntary basis, requesting their consent. Before responding to the evaluation instrument, the participants were informed that the data derived from this research would be used exclusively for scientific purposes, under National Law 25.326 on the protection of personal data.

Data analysis

For data analysis, the following procedures were used. The psychometric property of reliability was analyzed through the Cronbach's Alpha test, the psychometric property of content validity was determined by means of an exploratory factor analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis was carried out in order to assess the data fitment to the model proposed, and also correlations and linear regression were performed. All of these procedures were carried out through the SPSS and EQS analytical tools.

RESULTS

Items analysis and internal consistency of the scale

Initially, the descriptive statistics for the Domestic and Care Work Division Scale items were analyzed, together with the corresponding Cronbach's alpha (see Table 1)

TABLE 1
Cronbach's alpha, Items, Mean, Standard deviation, Item-Total correlation and Cronbach's alpha if the element is suppressed.

	Ítem	M	SD	r _{ix}	α _{-x}
Domestic and Care Work	6	13,3	14,25	0,41	0,62
Division Scale (α = 0,66)	7	13,94	13,89	0,37	0,62
	8	13,48	14,36	0,33	0,63
	10	12,74	12,92	0,36	0,63
	13	13,72	13,81	0,46	0,60
	15	14,16	14,56	0,26	0,66
	17	13,85	13,57	0,44	0,60

Note. α: Cronbach's alpha; M: median; SD: standard deviation; r_{ix}: item-total correlation; α_{-x}: item-total correlation if the element is suppressed.

In general, all the items contribute to the scale, each one presenting a relatively high correlation with the total. As was previously mentioned, the scale originally contained 18 items, 11 of which were eliminated after

a first reliability analysis. The results presented hereinafter correspond to the final version of the Domestic and Care Work Division Scale, which consists of the 7 items detailed in this section.

Construct Validity Analysis

An exploratory study by main components with one factor was carried out with the 7 items that compound the Domestic and Care Work Division Scale. The factor loadings of the items are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Principal Component Analysis of the Domestic and Care Work Division Scale

Item	Factor 1
6. En mi pareja, el hombre es quien se encarga de cuidar a nuestros/as hijos/as cuando se enferman	0.64
7. En mi pareja, la mujer limpia el baño	0.56
8. En mi pareja, el hombre es quien lava y cuelga la ropa	0.50
10. En mi pareja, es la mujer quien principalmente cuida a los/as mayores de la familia	0.57
13. En mi hogar, cuando los/as chicos/as tienen un problema o están tristes, en general se acercan a la madre más que al padre	0.68
15. En mi pareja, el hombre es quien plancha la ropa	0.42
17. En mi pareja, la mujer es quien asiste a las actividades o reuniones del colegio o jardín de infantes de nuestros/as hijos/as	0.66

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

From the results obtained in the exploratory study, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was carried out in order to know the data fitment to the model proposed. In the Table 3 the non-normed fit index (NNFI), the comparative fit index (CFI) and the Bollen incremental fit index (IFI) are presented, with values above 0.90 being indicators of a good adjustment (MacCallum & Austin, 2000). Although the values of CFI and IFI are within these conditions, the same does not happen for the NNFI. However, in some investigations the value of 0.80 has been accepted as a more flexible limit (Yucel et al., 2020). Likewise, the mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) yielded a value of 0.07, whilst a score less than 0.08 could be accepted as an indicator of an adequate fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993).

TABLE 3
Fit indexes of Domestic and Care Work Division Scale

	NNFI	CFI	IFI	RMSEA
One factor	0.85	0.90	0.90	0.07

* $p < 0,001$

Descriptive statistics for the ad hoc constructed scale, Ambivalent Sexism and Gender Role Ideology scales are presented below. From Table 4 it can be seen that in terms of the domestic and care work division, the mean score on the scale is 2.27 points for all respondents —it should be noted that, in order to obtain

comparable magnitudes, the scores of all the scales were normalized to a total of 5 points—In other words, the level of traditionality in the division of household labor is, on average, relatively low in the present sample. Secondly, it is observed that the mean for the level of Ambivalent Sexism is 3.65 points. It could be said then that the surveyed women present a high level of ambivalent sexism. Thirdly, the average obtained for the Gender Role Ideology scale was 4.07 points. This scale is which presents the highest scores for the sample studied. This means that the women participating in this study show a high level of adherence to gender stereotypes.

Moreover, it is noteworthy that only for the Domestic and Care Work Division Scale extreme values of the lowest possible score can be found. Conversely, for the Ambivalent Sexism and Gender Role Ideology scales, extreme values with higher scores are present. In turn, the range of the first mentioned scale is 3 points, lower than those corresponding to the sexism and gender stereotypes scales —3.45 and 3.25 points, respectively. Regarding the standard deviation, it can be seen that the highest value is presented by the Ambivalent Sexism scale, while the lowest is for the case of the unpaid work. However, calculating the coefficients of variation, it is found that in the first case this is 22.2% compared to 26.4% in the second. In other words, the results corresponding to the scale constructed in this work show a slightly higher heterogeneity.

TABLE 4
Descriptive statistics for all of the study scales

	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Domestic and Care Work Division	1.00	4.00	2.27	0.60
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	1.55	5.00	3.65	0.81
Gender Role Ideology	1.75	5.00	4.07	0.72

Subsequently, the correlations among the Domestic and Care Work Division Scale, Ambivalent Sexism—differentiating the two factors that compose it— and Gender Role Ideology variables were calculated (see Table 5). In this sense, a high positive correlation between Ambivalent Sexism and Gender Role Ideology stands out ($r = 0.731$). Likewise, there is a moderate correlation, also positive, between the Domestic and Care Work Division and the Gender Role Ideology ($r = 0.344$), as well as between the Domestic and Care Work Division and the Ambivalent Sexism ($r = 0.308$).

TABLE 5
Correlations among Domestic and Care Work Division, Ambivalent Sexism and Gender Role Ideology

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Domestic and Care Work Division	—				
2. Benevolent sexism	0.318 **	—			
3. Hostile sexism	0.236 **	0.680 **	—		
4. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	0.308 **	0.888 **	0.935 **	—	
5. Gender Role Ideology	0.344 **	0.691 **	0.636 **	0.731 **	—

** .p < .01; * .p < .05

Regarding the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable, the B statistic allows to inform about the extent to which the division of domestic and care work varies with respect to ambivalent sexism and gender role ideology. The Beta coefficient was used as an estimator of the magnitude in which the independent variables were predictors of the variability in the division of domestic and care work as a dependent variable. In a first analysis, it was observed that Ambivalent Sexism does not present a statistically significant relationship ($p = 0.067$) as an independent variable within the linear regression model. Therefore, a new model was generated, excluding this variable, to analyze the effect of the Gender Role Ideology on the division of domestic work (see Table 6). According to the results reported in Table 6, it can be observed that the Gender Role Ideology is presented as the explanatory variable that integrates the model. In this case, the adjusted R^2 value is 0.116. In other words, 11.6% of the variance in the domestic and care work division is explained by the gender role ideology.

TABLE 6
Regression coefficients of the model

B	CI	95%	SE	b	t	p
Constant	1.083	[0.775, 1.392]	0.157		6.895	0.000
Gender Role Ideology	0.024	[0.018, 0.030]	0.003	0.344	7.643	0.000

DISCUSSION

The main objective of this work consisted of knowing the links among the level of ambivalent sexism, the level of adherence to the gender role ideology and the domestic and care work type of division for heterosexual women who live with a partner and at least one child. With this purpose, a scale that would allow to assess the type of division of unpaid labor in households was constructed, in order to be able to appreciate the correspondence between people's perceptions and the tasks they actually carry out. The Domestic and Care Work Division Scale is made up of 7 items: 3 correspond to domestic tasks and 4 to care tasks. The distribution is considered to be mostly of a traditional type if it corresponds to an arrangement in which women are mainly who carry out housework and care work. This situation is consistent with a higher score on the aforementioned scale.

It could be seen that all the items presented contribute to the scale, which presents a Cronbach's α of 0.66. Likewise, from the exploratory study by main components it appears that it is composed of a single factor. Based on these results, the AFC showed that the CFI and the IFI have a value of 0.90, whilst the NNFI is 0.85. On the other hand, the RMSEA value was 0.07. In other words, the data presents a good adjustment to the model proposed, with an adequate mean square error of approximation. In turn, when studying some descriptive statistics, it is found that the level of traditionality in the division of household labor is relatively low in the present sample (2.27 points). For the level of Ambivalent Sexism, the mean was 3.65 points. Likewise, the respondents show a high level of Gender Role Ideology (4.07 points).

Regarding the correlations among the different variables in this study, a high positive correlation ($r = 0.731$) was found between the Gender Role Ideology and Ambivalent Sexism, as well as between the first variable and both components of the second. These results are not surprising, since it is expected that those who understand gender identities within rigid and limited frameworks are also those who present a higher level of prejudice towards women. On the other hand, a moderate positive correlation was found between the

Domestic and Care Work Division Scale and the Gender Role Ideology ($r = 0.344$). In other words, those who show greater adherence to gender stereotypes tend to be also those who have a mostly traditional division of labor within their homes. In the same way, a moderate correlation was also found between the constructed scale and Ambivalent Sexism, although weaker than in the previous case ($r = 0.308$). This means that among women with higher levels of ambivalent sexism there is a slight tendency to present a traditional division of domestic work. It is then possible to suggest that, to some extent, there exists a relationship between people's perceptions and the activities that they actually carry out in the same direction.

Finally, regarding the regression analysis of the proposed model, it was appreciated that Ambivalent Sexism does not present a statistically significant relationship as an independent variable. When proposing an alternative model, linking the Domestic and Care Work Division Scale with the Gender Role Ideology as the only independent variable, the latter is presented as the explanatory variable that integrates the model. The adjusted R^2 value obtained is 0.116, which indicates that 11.6% of the variance in the division of domestic and care work is explained by the gender role ideology. It is then possible to suggest that the hypothesis proposed is partially corroborated: the domestic and care work type of division is explained by the level of adherence to the gender role ideology. In other words, a higher level of adherence to gender stereotypes corresponds to a greater tendency towards a traditional division of labour within the households.

In closing, some limitations outlined in this study should be noted. Firstly, the type of instrument used does not allow investigating the senses that can lead women and men to participate in a different way in domestic chores, which could be done using a mixed methodology that allows the implementation of a qualitative approach in addition to the application of scales. Secondly, the unit of analysis comprised only women, whereby the incorporation of the male voice is pending. In turn, in light of the results presented in different Latin American studies, it is worth asking about the links between the participation of people in domestic and care work and other variables such as participation in paid work, social class, hiring a domestic employee and the age of minors present, among other possible incident factors. As indicated at the beginning of these lines, feminist theories focus on studying the different ways in which multiple axes of inequality overlap in women's lives. In this way, numerous questions remain open to be explored in future research on the division of domestic and care work in Argentina.

REFERENCES

- Ariza, M., y Oliveira, O. d. (1999). Trabajo, familia y condición femenina: una revisión de las principales perspectivas de análisis [Work, family and feminine condition: a revision on the main analysis perspectives]. *Papeles de Población*, 5(20), 89-127. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/112/11202005.pdf>
- Browne, M. & Cudeck, R. (1993). Single Sample Cross-Validation Indices for Covariance Structures. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 24, 445-455.
- Campillo, F. (2000). El trabajo doméstico no remunerado en la economía [Unpaid domestic work in the economy]. *Nómadas*, 12, 98-115. Universidad Central. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=105115263011>
- Carbonero Gamundí, M. A. (2007). Intersecciones de género, clase y poder: políticas y prácticas de cuidado en la Unión Europea [Intersections of gender, class and power: policies and care practices in the European Union]. In M. A. Carbonero Gamundí & S. Levín, *Entre familia y trabajo: Relaciones, conflictos y políticas de género en Europa y América Latina*. Universitat de les Illes Balears/Homosapiens.
- Casique, I. (2004). *Poder y autonomía de la mujer mexicana: Análisis de algunos condicionantes* [Power and autonomy of Mexican women: Analysis of some conditioning factors]. UNAM.
- Delphy, C. (1982). Un féminisme matérialiste est possible. [A materialistic feminism is possible]. *Nouvelles Questions Féministes*, 4, 50-86.
- Dixon, M. (1973). El por qué de la liberación del segundo sexo [The reason for the liberation of the second sex]. In O. Vainstok (Ed.), *Para la liberación del segundo sexo*. Ediciones de la Flor.

- Dunbar, R. (1973). La liberación femenina como base de la revolución social [Women's liberation as a basis for the social revolution]. In O. Vainstok (Ed.), *Para la liberación del segundo sexo*. Ediciones de la Flor.
- Esquivel, V. (2012). El cuidado infantil en las familias. Un análisis en base a la Encuesta de Uso del Tiempo de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires [Child care in families. An analysis based on the Time Use Survey of the City of Buenos Aires]. In V. Esquivel, E. Faur y E. Jelin, *Las lógicas del cuidado infantil. Entre las familias, el Estado y el mercado*. IDES.
- Federici, S. (2013). La reproducción de la fuerza de trabajo en la economía global y la inacabada revolución feminista [The reproduction of the workforce in the global economy and the unfinished feminist revolution]. *Revolución en punto cero. Trabajo doméstico, reproducción y luchas feministas*. Traficantes de Sueños. <https://www.traficantes.net/libros/revolucion-en-punto-cero>
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexim. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70 (3), 491-512.
- Goldberg A. (2013) "Doing" and "Undoing" Gender: The Meaning and Division of Housework in Same-Sex Couples. *Journal of Family. Theory and Review*, 5(2), 85-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12009>
- Gómez Rojas, G. (2013). Clase social, género y división del trabajo doméstico [Social class, gender and division of domestic work]. In F. Nievas (Ed.). *Mosaico de sentidos. Vida cotidiana, conflicto, y estructura social*. Estudios Sociológicos Editora.
- Gutiérrez, M. A. (2007). *Género, familias y trabajo: Rupturas y continuidades. Desafíos para la investigación política* [Gender, families and work: Ruptures and continuities. Challenges for political research]. CLACSO. <http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/grupos/gutierrez/>
- MacCallum, R. C., & Austin, J. T. (2000). Applications of structural equation modeling in psychological research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 201-206. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.201>
- Maya, M., Expósito, F. & Padilla, J. L. (2006). Revisión de las propiedades psicométricas de las versiones larga y reducida de la Escala sobre Ideología de Género. [Review on the psychometric properties of the Gender Ideology Scale on its long and shorts versions]. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 6 (3), 709-727. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=33760312>
- Millet, K. (1973). Política sexual [Sexual politics]. In O. Vainstok (Ed.), *Para la liberación del segundo sexo*. Ediciones de la Flor.
- Montero, I. & Leon, O. (2007). A guide for naming research studies in Psychology. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 7(3), 847-862. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=33770318>
- Randall, M. (1973). La conciencia es una prioridad [Consciousness is a priority]. In O. Vainstok (Ed.), *Para la liberación del segundo sexo*. Ediciones de la Flor.
- Rodríguez Enríquez, C. (2014). El trabajo de cuidado no remunerado en Argentina: un análisis desde la evidencia del Módulo de Trabajo no Remunerado [Unpaid care work in Argentina: an analysis from the evidence of the Unpaid Work Module]. *Políticas públicas y derecho al cuidado*, 2. ELA. https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/bitstream/handle/11336/34802/CONICET_Digital_Nro.0d0828bc-d5d1-455c-9b1d-59cdd40cb35d_A.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=2
- Sosa, M. V. & Román, R. (2015). Participación y tiempo en actividades cotidianas de hombres y mujeres vinculados al mercado laboral en México [Participation and time in daily activities of men and women linked to the labour market in Mexico]. *Sociedad y economía*, 29, 63-89. http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1657-63572015000200004&lng=en&nrm=iso
- Ungaretti, J., Etchezahar, E., & Simkin, H. (2013). El prejuicio sexista hacia la mujer desde la ideología del rol de género [The sexist prejudice towards women from the gender role ideology]. In B. Kerman & G. Micheline (Eds.), *El impacto de la investigación en la Universidad sobre la Sustentabilidad Social y Ambiental*. Universidad de Flores. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271706508_El_prejuicio_sexista_hacia_la_mujer_desde_la_ideologia_del_rol_de_genero
- Vaamonde, J. D., & Omar, A. (2012). Validación argentina del inventario de sexismo ambivalente [Argentinian validation of the ambivalent sexism inventory]. *Alternativas en psicología*, 16(26), 47-58. http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1405-339X2012000100005&lng=pt&nrm=iso

- Wainerman, C. (2003). La reestructuración de las fronteras de género [The restructuring of gender boundaries]. In C. Wainerman (Ed.), *Familia, trabajo y género*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Yucel, S. C., Ergin, E., Orgun, F., Gokçen, M. & Eser, I. (2020). Validity and reliability study of the Moral Distress Questionnaire in Turkish for nurses. *Rev. Latino-Am. Enfermagem*, 28(3319). <https://doi.org/10.1590/1518-8345.2960.3319>