Re-examining Cultural Contradictions: Mothering Ideology and the Intersections of Class, Gender, and Race

Tiffany Taylor*
Department of Sociology, Kent State University

Abstract
Hays argues the dominant ideology of mothering in the United States is intensive mothering. Women embracing this ideology are completely devoted to their children and cultural contradictions of motherhood make it difficult to juggle work and family. Rothman argues further that ideologies of patriarchy, technology, and capitalism shape our notions of mothering. I explore these ideologies in this paper, paying careful attention to the labor performed by mothers – paid, childcare, and reproductive. Finally, using surrogacy as an example of how these ideologies interact, I argue that Rothman’s identifications of ideologies helps explain how the cultural contradictions of motherhood vary among mothers based on race and class.

Introduction
In 1996, Hays argued that mothers embrace what she calls the ‘ideology of intensive mothering’. Intensive mothering includes three beliefs: childrearing should be child-centered, it should be done by mothers, and it should be done by mobilizing countless resources of time, money, and energy. In her argument of intensive mothering, Hays states that working women face the cultural contradictions of motherhood where home is a haven separate from the cruel working world. Working women are expected to balance the harsh world of work while simultaneously providing a haven for her family at home. In this way, women are expected to reinforce the ‘separate spheres’ ideology and existing gender inequalities. Hays’ work has been very influential and has been cited nearly 900 times by other researchers. In many ways, Hays paved a path whereby researchers now examine mothering and the ideology of mothering.

While Hays never suggests her findings are generalizable to all mothers, she does argue that the cultural contradictions of motherhood are common among mothers, in particular among mothers engaged in paid labor. However, it is not clear that mothers experience these cultural contradictions the same. Many scholars question that there is a universal mothering ideology (Baca Zinn 1990; Dill 1994). Sutherland’s (2010) research suggests, for instance, that the experience of guilt associated with intensive mothering may vary by race. Indeed, there is more to learn about how marginalized women experience the pulls of work and family and whether or not all or most women even engage in intensive mothering. Instead of being universal, intensive mothering might be the hegemonic form of mothering (Arendell 2000) that may not be feasible for many, if not most, women to practice. Additionally, mothering ideology might change over time with social, historical, political, and economic changes. Therefore, the cultural contradictions of motherhood likely vary among mothers. Building on Hays’ work, I draw on Rothman’s (2000) theory
concerning how ideologies affect mothering. Hays (1996) cites Rothman in an endnote, saying her theory is compatible with Rothman’s. I argue that Rothman’s theory is more than compatible and that it can be used to build on Hays’ work to delineate differences in whether or not women adopt intensive mothering and experience cultural contradictions. Rothman (2000) identifies three ideologies that converge around mothering: patriarchy, technology, and capitalism. I apply her theory to various types of labor mothers perform, including paid labor, childcare labor, and reproductive labor so that we can better understand the variations in how mothers experience the cultural contradictions, and ideologies, of motherhood. Finally, I offer a cursory look at surrogacy, to illustrate how the ideologies of patriarchy, technology, and capitalism converge to create dramatically different cultural contradictions of motherhood for mothers of different races and classes. Any discussion of ideology can drag readers into the confusing world of the abstract. Therefore, I discuss surrogacy as a concrete example to show the consequences of these ideologies.

Mothering and ideologies of patriarchy, technology, and capitalism

Rothman (2000) identifies three ideologies that converge around mothering: patriarchy, technology, and capitalism. In this section, I outline Rothman’s argument of the three ideologies affecting mothers. I argue Rothman’s theory increases our understanding of the ‘cultural contradictions’ that Hays (1996) addresses in her work.

Rothman specifies the influence of patriarchy on motherhood. In patriarchal societies, paternity is the center of social arrangements. Family name, lineage, inheritance and more are passed through the father’s blood lines. The focus is not only on the patrilineal blood-line, but on the father as providing the ‘seed’ that allows pregnancy. Rothman illustrates further how in a patriarchal system with a focus on man’s seed, women are seen as holding a secondary role of carrying and caring for the children of men. In this sense, a woman’s body becomes the vehicle, or host, for a man’s offspring. Women can be replaced or substituted, but a man’s seed is seen as indispensable. The focus in a patriarchal society is on genetics and not on the behavioral act of mothering. I will offer more detail on this topic later in the paper when I discuss surrogacy.

Rothman’s discussion of the ideology of technology focuses primarily on the medicalization of pregnancy and on mind–body dualisms in which the body is viewed as a machine with various mechanisms and processes that can be maintained with medical intervention. The pregnant woman, Rothman argues, becomes like a factory and her equipment must be maintained to run smoothly. Rothman notes how ‘natural’ it has become to require extensive medical examinations during pregnancy and childbirth. The result is that childbirth and mothering are seen as a mechanical production, something to be rationalized, and is not viewed as the social transformation of becoming a mother. The ideology of technology then precedes the invention of technology that makes mothering a mechanical production. As I will argue below, paying someone with fewer resources to do childcare or to act as surrogate may also be considered more rational and efficient than a mother doing it herself.

In her discussion of the ideology of capitalism, Rothman focuses on ownership. The goal in any capitalist society is the accumulation of wealth. Workers, however, do not own what they produce. Rothman extends this logic and focuses specifically on ownership of the fetus and ownership of women’s bodies. In the debate over reproductive rights, women have rather successfully invoked the ideology of ownership. It seems reasonable to people embracing the ideology of capitalism to see women as ‘owning’ their bodies and
anything in their bodies. However she notes that it is less clear how this ideology influences mothers. I find Rothman’s concept of the ideology of capitalism to be most useful in examining the different forms of labor women perform and subsequently to examine how these differences in labor result in differences in intensive mothering among mothers.

The ideology of patriarchy illuminates gender differences in much the same way that Hays ideology of intensive mothering does. Rothman’s theory builds on this, however, by also focusing on the ideology of technology and the ideology of capitalism. The latter enables us to better understand inequalities and differences based on race and class. Further, the ideology of technology allows us to more carefully examine how technology enables these differences. Rothman’s theory helps us see how the cultural contradictions of motherhood might be different among mothers. In what follows, I apply Rothman’s theory of the ideologies of patriarchy, technology, and capitalism to women’s experience with paid and unpaid labor. In doing so, I hope to better illustrate how race, class, and gender intersect and shape how women experience the cultural contradictions and ideologies of motherhood.

**Mothering ideology and women’s labor**

*Paid labor*

Mothers engaged in paid labor experience the strains of balancing work and family. Mothers also experience the cultural contradictions of mothering due to the ideology of intensive mothering (Hays 1996). Further, examining paid labor and the ideologies of patriarchy, technology, and capitalism (Rothman 2000), shows how women experience intensive mothering differently. Women’s workforce participation has increased dramatically in the last three decades such that now women make up nearly half the workforce (Bianchi 2000). It is not just single or childless women who enter the workforce, but many mothers work, including mothers with small children (Spain and Bianchi 1996).

The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited sex discrimination, and the boom in the service economy have lead to increased opportunities for women in the workforce (Taylor 2010). Researchers of organizations and work have been examining how this increase has changed the workplace and attempted to document and explain workplace inequality. Family researchers have focused on how this change in the workforce has affected families, including how maternal employment has affected the division of household labor (Hochschild 1989, 2003; Shelton and John 1996), the relationship between maternal employment and marital disruption (Greenstein 1990), how employment has affected child well-being (Bianchi 2000), and how families struggle to balance work and family (Jacobs and Gerson 2004; also see Estes 2011 and O’Connor et al. 1999 for detailed examinations of work and family policies). Overall, this research shows that working mothers are not the downfall of society, and in fact, many positive outcomes result from mothers participating in the workforce.

Despite these positive outcomes, many women feel guilty about their participation in paid labor due to the ideology of intensive mothering (Hays 1996). Intensive mothering ideology is not the only ideology at play here. The ideologies of patriarchy, technology, and capitalism also apply. Beyond the difficulties of balancing work and family, mothers often face the ‘mommy track’ in which, after having a child, mothers get stuck in employment situations that offer little or no room for advancement (Hays 1996; Hochschild 1997, 2003; Sutherland 2010). Perhaps even more disturbing is that women are actually better off changing jobs, and disrupting job tenure, than sticking with their prior
employer. Glass (2004) finds that women who changed jobs after having a child were much more likely to experience wage growth than women who remained with their current employer. Since employers view motherhood as meaning these women are less committed to their paid labor, changing jobs may allow women to overcome the association with being a mother. Further, research (Browne and Kennelly 1999; Kennelly 1999) suggests many employers perceive all women as mothers and further think of women of color as single mothers. Not only were these perceptions inaccurate, they consequently have a negative influence on women’s advancement in the paid workforce. It is worth noting that new fathers rarely experience a ‘father track’.

The ideologies of patriarchy and capitalism enable us to see how women in the workforce provide employers with cheaper labor since women historically have been paid far less than men, even when they have the same credentials (Padavic and Reskin 2002). Further, the ideology of capitalism helps us see different paid labor outcomes among mothers. Women of color face more discrimination in the workforce and often find themselves in low-wage service sector jobs that offer little to no advancement opportunities. The ideology of technology helps uncover the value placed on different types of paid labor. Overall, women do ‘women’s work’ which is irrational, routinized work of the body, while men do rational work and make decisions. Women in professional jobs earn higher wages and have more opportunities for advancement, and thus more class power, since they perform work of the mind. In other words, the ideologies of technology and capitalism help us see differences in paid labor among mothers. Since women of different races and classes experience the labor market differently, they also experience the ideology of intensive mothering differently.

Childcare labor: paid and unpaid

There are differences in how mothers experience childcare based on the amount of resources women have or values placed on different forms of childcare (Collins 2000; Edin and Kefalas 2005; Lareau 2003; Stack 1974). Differences in childcare, like different experiences in the labor force, are likely to influence the cultural contradictions faced by mothers of different races and classes. Mothers may practice intensive mothering and still feel guilt in balancing childcare labor and paid labor. However, intensive mothering requires a great deal of resources. In this section, I examine the ways the ideologies of patriarchy, technology, and capitalism affect variations in intensive mothering strategies.

The ideology of patriarchy influences childcare. Men are slowly increasing their involvement in childcare, but the increase in men’s childcare efforts are disproportionately less than women’s increases in hours of paid labor (Davis and Greenstein 2004; Shelton and John 1996). Many women, if they can afford it, still must pay caregivers to help care for their children (Hertz and Ferguson 1995). Childcare situations can range from live-in nannies with full-time commitments to occasional babysitters. Although some families arrange for cooperative-care arrangements where families trade days and no money is exchanged, most childcare is a paid service from childcare centers and nannies (Hertz and Ferguson 1995). Further, these services are almost always provided by women and are often provided by women of color. Like I discussed in the paid labor section, we see here how the ideology of capitalism influences paid labor among women. Importantly, we see that less affluent women are paid low wages to care for more affluent women’s children.

The ideology of technology influences childcare as technological advancements have increased the number of children in childcare centers and nanny care. Electronic breast pumps and single-serving breast milk containment systems have made it easier for...
childcare centers to attract mothers who still breastfeed. At one time, the choice to put off re-entering the workforce was influenced by the choice to breastfeed. Now, mothers who are adamant about continuing breastfeeding are able to continue their efforts from work. In fact, a recent study by Bakoula et al. (2007) found that mothers who return to work are more likely to breastfeed than stay-at-home mothers. Finally, live video feeds and nanny cams have allowed mothers to monitor childcare providers, lessening women’s fear and guilt as they enter the workforce. These technological advancements are clearly related to the ideology of technology, but these advancements also reinforce ideologies of patriarchy and capitalism. Additionally, it reinforces the ideology of intensive mothering. Mothers who have the needed resources can participate in the workforce while still being able to breastfeed and monitor childcare providers.

In families with fewer resources, community members or other family members participate heavily in raising children. ‘Othermothering’, commonly practiced by many poor women and women of color, is a survival strategy in which extended kin networks are used for a type of cooperative childcare (Collins 2000; Stack 1974). It differs from the typical cooperative arrangements described by Hertz and Ferguson (1995) because these arrangements are based on necessity instead of convenience and children may stay with their othermothers for extended periods of time (Stack 1974). In these childcare arrangements it seems less likely there will be extensive surveillance of childcare providers (such as nanny cams) or the technology that enables breastfeeding mothers to work. The ideologies of capitalism and technology help us see how differences in resources lead to different childcare strategies among women.

Finally, the ideology of capitalism also influences childcare. First, only some mothers practice child-centered, intensive caregiving. Hays’ work, similar to Lareau’s (2003) shows how middle- and upper-class women practice this type of caregiving, which involves exhausting and lengthy negotiations with children. In contrast, Hays and Lareau both find that working-class and poor parents do not negotiate as much with children, but instead use a rules-based approach where ‘the rules are the rules’. Resources available for children vary tremendously from family to family. As Lareau (2002, 2003) shows, middle- and upper-class families spend a great deal of resources and shuttle children between sports, music lessons, and other activities embracing what she calls ‘concerted cultivation’. Less affluent families have fewer resources to spare. In fact, it is unclear whether or not these families would embrace this flow of resources to children, which could be viewed as excessive, even if they had the means.

Based on Kohn and Schooler’s (1978, 1982) research, we know that work lives greatly influence family lives. For most working-class or poor parents, paid work is in low-autonomy jobs where following the rules is a necessity. These workers are not rewarded for negotiating or being innovative, they need to follow the rules of their highly routinized jobs. In contrast, middle- and upper-class parents work in jobs with more autonomy and where innovation and negotiating are rewarded. In many ways, then, this is a cycle where class-based parenting, primarily done by mothers, reproduces existing class arrangements. These class differences in parenting styles are clearly related to social structures of work. Therefore, we see clearly how the ideology of capitalism influences mothering and influences differences among mothers.

Reproductive labor: medicalization, fertilization, and sterilization
The medicalization of pregnancy and childbirth came with the push away from home births with midwives (who were women) and towards hospitalized births with doctors
(who were men) (Rothman 2000; Tilly 1999). This change in childbirth was very much the result of ideologies of patriarchy, technology, and capitalism. Medicine represented a new, profitable industry, one considered best conducted by rational men. Suddenly, delivering babies was ‘men’s work’. The technology has made it possible that, instead of having a due date, women have a day they will be induced or a scheduled cesarean that fits into both their and the doctor’s schedule. But the technological advancements don’t start at the time of birth. They often start at or before conception with *in vitro* fertilization, egg harvesting, fertility treatments, and artificial insemination. Infertility has become a social problem with a medical cure.

Historically, however, White and Black women’s fertility or infertility has been viewed very differently. For example, Solinger (2000) examines perceptions of single mothers between 1945 and 1965 and finds that White middle-class single mothers were less stigmatized due to beliefs that Whites needed to reproduce after World War II and that White babies would have value on the adoption market. Poor Black women, and Black babies, were not as valued and increases in Black single motherhood were met with increased regulation of fertility coupled with greater access to birth control and abortions. Black women and their children were seen as drains on government funding. McDonald (1997) found similar sentiments in California with the unchecked problem of higher infant mortality rates and low birth weights for Black babies. Although previously seen as a problem of less viable ‘black genes’ by health administrators, activists saw this as a problem of lack of solidarity among Black women and a push away from the traditional system of ‘othermothering’ and collective movements within the Black community. Collins (2000, 2006) refers to powerful stereotypes of women of color as controlling images. These images, which include the mammy, matriarch, and welfare queen, are so powerful that some research (Baker 2009; McCormack 2005; McDonald 1997) has found that many Black women internalize a mothering ideology that emphasizes sacrifice in order to distance themselves from an association with stigmatized ‘bad’ mothering associated with receiving welfare assistance. On the other hand, some women embrace an ideology of mothering that emphasizes sacrifice as a form of activist mothering to preserve and protect their communities (Collins 2000; McDonald 1997; Naples 1992).

Collins (2006) discusses these different approaches to fertility as eugenics movements. Positive eugenics movements seek to increase the reproduction of people whose traits are valued, while negative eugenics movements seek to decrease negative traits that are seen as defective. Eugenics movements targeting Black women have changed over time based on the need for labor. Collins (2006) traces the origin of the welfare mother as a new image of the ‘breeder woman’ that developed during the days of slavery. The image of the breeder slave was the beginning of United States’ long history of controlling the reproductive rights of women of color (Davis 1983; Roberts 1997; Rousseau 2009). During slavery, Black women were forced to bear children as a means to increase the slave population. But after the use of women of color as breeders during the days of slavery, there was a major push towards sterilization after emancipation. Therefore, sterilization has been a long-held practice in the United States, a practice that has been shaped by perceptions of women of color as bad mothers (Collins 2006). Images of the ‘welfare queen’ are commonly used to support sterilization practices in US social welfare policy. Now policymakers often invoke the language of ‘family planning’ as a neutralized way of demanding the sterilization of poor women, who are often disproportionately women of color. The ideology of capitalism clearly can be brought to bear on these very different perspectives of women’s fertility. Black women’s fertility was encouraged, even forced, when they were providing free laborers into the economy. Today, based on the ideology of
capitalism and the differing value given to mothers based on class and race, poor women’s
fertility is controlled through family caps on welfare cash assistance and through sterilization.

The case of surrogacy

Surrogacy is a phenomenon where the ideologies of motherhood converge, but it is also
where different forms of labor (paid, childcare, and reproductive) converge. In this sec-
tion, I use surrogacy as an illustrative example, to show how these various ideologies and
forms of labor create very different cultural contradictions for mothers based on race and
class. Surrogacy remains understudied in sociology so some description of surrogacy is
needed. For a price, couples can buy harvested eggs or donor sperm to help with infertil-
ity. Beyond just purchasing embryos, couples can also rent a woman’s womb for a
gestation period. The United States is one of the few developed countries that allow con-
tractual surrogacy agreements. Although the sale of body parts or children is prohibited,
the law allows for the payment of surrogates to carry children for commissioning couples.
Rothman (2000) equates the practice of surrogacy to using pregnancy as an unskilled
labor that earns less than minimum wage.

Although surrogacy has a longer history, it only came under public scrutiny in the mid
1980’s as the case of Baby M was tried in the New Jersey State Supreme Court when a
paid surrogate petitioned the state for custody of the baby she had been contracted to
carry for 9 months (Garrison 2000). Since then, commissioning individuals and couples in
commercial surrogacy arrangements came under fire as exploiting women of lower class
status. This is even more evident when we examine the demography of surrogates. Altru-
istic surrogates are usually a family member or lifelong friend that is unpaid for her surro-
gacy service while commercial surrogacy involves the use of a stranger as a paid
surrogate. Surrogacy commodifies women’s bodies by allowing someone to ‘rent’ a
woman’s uterus and pay them as a ‘reproductive vehicle’ (Collins 2006; Rothman 2000).
This unregulated exploitation led to the fear that poor women surrogates would be
recruited from less developed countries and lured in with financial incentives (Roach
Anleu 1992). Today, surrogacy has entered pop culture with movies like Tina Fey’s 2008
Baby Mama mocking surrogacy arrangements that depict a career woman utilizing a less
affluent woman as a surrogate. These references make light of the exploitation of women
with less class status by the upper class.

Medical and technological advancements in pregnancy and childbirth have created a
situation where women’s bodies are becoming legally commodified. Capitalism has over-
taken women’s reproductive rights and money has become the deciding factor of who is
fit to mother a child. The new technological advancements in reproduction and fertility
treatments have paved the way for a new form of eugenics. As couples who are unable
to conceive turn to surrogacy arrangements, they are able to pick desirable surrogates
from a pool of individuals willing to enter into a contracted pregnancy. Because these
surrogacy contracts average to payments less than minimum wage for 24 h a day work
for 9 months, poor women are often used as paid surrogates. Although women of color
are likely to become gestational surrogates (carry the child to term), Eastern European
immigrant women are often recruited as genetic surrogates (egg donors, for instance)
(Collins 2006). This illustrates the preference for White children by parent(s) who seek
the services of a genetic surrogate. Recall that marginalized women are most often the
employees of childcares and nanny services, referred to as being a social surrogate. In
sum, the race and class of the surrogate often varies based on the type of surrogacy
arrangement, be it gestational, genetic, or social.
The irony of hiring women of color as surrogates is that strong stereotypes paint them as bad or ‘unfit’ mothers (Collins 2000, 2006). The ‘mammy’ image, mentioned previously, has persisted since the days of slavery and refers to submissive, hardworking servants that properly care for White children. This image shows that women of color are considered good caregivers only when they obediently care for White middle- or upper-class children as social surrogates or when they rent their womb as gestational surrogates. The ideology of technology and, subsequently, technological advancement allows the ‘mammy’ image to be extended from social surrogates to gestational surrogates. The ideology of capitalism allows this work to be paid work, in essence outsourced paid mothering. However, it is noteworthy that mothering is only paid labor when it is done for children other than one’s own.

Patriarchal systems stress the importance of males having a child to pass on their lineage and the ideology of patriarchy produces a need for surrogacy when a woman is unable or unwilling to carry her husband’s seed. The ideology of technology, and the resulting technology, has made surrogacy possible through in vitro fertilization and has also allowed couples to find surrogates through networking websites. Further, technology even allows parents to select traits prior to embryo implantation (Sutton 2009). The ideology of capitalism allows surrogacy to become a virtually unregulated form of paid labor. It is not hard to see how these three ideologies intersect in the case of surrogacy to exploit marginalized women for the benefit of the upper-class.

**Conclusion**

I have attempted to build on the literature on ideologies of motherhood by showing how those cultural contradictions vary among mothers by race and class. I illustrated how inequalities in paid labor lead to different cultural contradictions and how paid childcare highlights the class, and often race, differences in how mothers experience contradictions. As class-privileged White women enter the workforce, they often employ marginalized women to provide a number of services, including caring for their children.

In addition to contradictions around who cares for children after they are born (social surrogates), there are contradictions concerning genetic and gestational surrogates. Women considered ‘bad’ or ‘unfit’ mothers in our culture, are often employed to be social, genetic, or gestational surrogates. I hope future research will further integrate race and class analyses in their examination of ideologies of motherhood so that we can have a better understanding of how different women experience mothering and how mothering ideology influences perceptions of motherhood ‘fitness’ by race and class. I have attempted to show how the ideologies of technology, capitalism, and patriarchy affect mothers. The ideology of technology has had an increased effect on motherhood with the recent advancements in fertility treatments and surrogacy. As technology allows for more women to become mothers that previously could not, the ideology of capitalism emerges providing opportunities for women to pay to become mothers. In this way, the ideologies of technology and capitalism converge around gestational surrogacy arrangements.

The fertility crisis for more affluent White women contrasted with sterilization policies that disproportionately affect poor women of all races, highlight the intersections of the ideologies of technology, capitalism, and patriarchy. Our ideologies and policies reinforce who we consider good and bad mothers and our technology helps us enable some women to become mothers while disabling other women so they can never become mothers. When we expand our field of vision to mothers of different classes and races,
we truly see new complexities in the cultural contradictions and ideologies affecting motherhood and how these contradictions vary among mothers. In fact, it seems that powerful women’s solutions to their cultural contradictions of motherhood often rely on exploiting marginalized women, and therefore creating new cultural contradictions for less powerful women.
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