

Corinne Rusch-Drutz

Stage Mothers

A Qualitative Analysis of Women's Work Experiences as Mothers in Toronto Theatre

Despite the fact that the representation of patriarchal motherhood has been ubiquitous in dramatic literature as it continues to be reified, codified and upheld as one of—if not the most—central relationships in the nuclear family, making it a much studied element of early human development and leaving it well documented in the annals of theatre history, mothering remains, with the exception of a handful of references, a topic that has been all but absent from writing on women's theatre practice. There are reasons for this dearth of scholarship, to be sure. Ostensibly, patriarchal divisions of the public and private spheres of life have deliberately relegated women's theatre practice as external from their domestic responsibilities by seeing childrearing as women's work that is separate from any they might perform in the public realm. But as Adrienne Rich (1986) and other feminist theorists (i.e., Peters, 1997; Abbey and O'Reilly, 1998; Fox, 1998; Duffy, Mandell & Pupo, 1989) have taught us, motherhood is a part of the paid labour force and is present in each and every work sector in which women participate. As feminist sociologist Bonnie Fox notes:

Arguments about the state's control of women's roles as biological and social reproducers have been made by social historians. The focus of these arguments range from laws prohibiting reproductive choice to "experts" advice to mothers. Details about social control and exploitation aside, these arguments are important for their structural approach. The effects of motherhood are dependent upon the social context in which it occurs, so it is important to understand that context. Moreover, it is significant that since the development of a capitalist labour market, motherhood—at least women's position in the home—has defined the position of all women in that marketplace. (1998: 161)

Theatre, institution and motherwork

While certain analyses of motherhood have found a place in Women's Studies scholarship—the ways in which women have balanced motherhood and paid labour in the professional world come readily to mind—there is not one published study of the ways in which feminists have sought to interweave their mothering with contemporary theatre practice. This is not to say that there is no theory devoted to mothering in the theatre, but rather that it has been dedicated to literary analysis of motherhood in playwriting, either by women or otherwise. Part of the problem is that theatre is very rarely seen as a site for institutional inquiry. The prevailing notion in this country of an art for arts' sake ideology has allowed for a distinctly un-institutional approach to theatre studies scholarship, which fails to see it in relation to the ruling apparatus. And while feminist intervention in relation to issues of job parity for women as actors, playwrights and directors, and more laudably, canon formation, performativity and representation of women, both on the stage and in everyday life has been given considerable critical attention, women's roles in relation to the institutional order of theatre have yet to be fully addressed. As feminist theorist Sue-Ellen Case (1988) notes, "The seemingly dramatic standards which select the playwrights in the canon are actually the same patriarchal biases which organize the economy and social organization of culture at large" (534). This is not to suggest that theatre as a major socio-cultural institution has never been critically addressed, but its functioning is more than a mass producer of cultural texts, and it deserves to be scrutinized as such, which sometimes means separate and apart from its artistry.

As women's contribution to the cultural locus has been devalued in relation to the seemingly more important tasks of men, researchers have been slow to document women's work in relation to theatre practice, much less the work of motherhood, which outside of its dramatic representation is seen as beyond the realm of theatre proper. The purpose of this paper is to look at the ways in which feminist theatre practitioners have balanced their professional work and motherhood. In this analysis I wish to bridge these two non-disparate elements of women's lives by examining feminist theatre practitioners' experiences as mothers in relation to their work in Canadian theatre. By exploring the concepts of motherwork¹ and identity, I will look at the ways in which the social conditions of motherhood, childcare, and the emotional labour of motherwork interact with theatre as an institution in immediate and central ways.

My findings are based on research conducted for my doctoral thesis² which was a qualitative analysis of women theatre practitioners in Toronto, in which I investigated a group of twenty-five professional women theatre practitioners³ about the ways in which they operate within theatre as an institution. Through the use of qualitative research tools and Dorothy Smith's (1987) approach to institutional ethnography as an investigative methodology (as laid out in her book *The Everyday World as Problematic*), my analysis questioned what it means

for women to work in the theatre and examined the social, political and economic conditions that enable and/or hinder them to gain work. Part of my investigative methodology was to analyze what constitutes “work” in theatre and the ways in which the term is delineated by institutional discourse, which can blur the lines between women’s public and private lives.

With my goal of investigating the concept of “work” in theatre practice, I knew from the outset of my research that I would be asking my subjects about their experiences as mothers and the ways in which their mothering intersected with their paid labour. This seemed a natural line of questioning as over half of the women I interviewed were mothers. But I had no idea that this material would become so central to my findings. Certainly, I anticipated that of those participants who were mothers a number would have some interesting stories to tell about balancing their double duty; I was not, however, prepared for the overwhelming response to the topic. Even the more seasoned practitioners, who in some cases were rather accustomed to being interviewed professionally, commented on the fact that they had *never* been asked about the relationship between motherhood and their work, and were thrilled to share with me stories about their children, their partners, breastfeeding, diaper changes, daycare and finding baby sitters and all-night drugstores while on tour. One woman, so delighted to talk about her children in reference to her work, relayed the details of the homebirth of her first child after a rather unusual opening night, leaving us both in tears by the story’s end. Indeed, the subject matter began to take on a life of its own and became a surprising and rich discovery.

As I took the term theatre practitioner in its most generous sense by considering all manner of work in professional theatre, my interviews were not limited to theatre’s usual suspects such as actors, directors and playwrights, but designers, technicians, stagehands, theatre educators, archivists, council officers and administrators. With a strong working knowledge of my subjects’ histories, I began by asking general questions about family and home responsibilities and was then able to tailor my questions to the specific nature of the participants’ work using the feminist research strategy of the semi-structured open-ended interview.⁴

Results

Motherhood is tricky business in the theatre, often seen as a private and self-contained aspect of family life that has nothing to do with women’s professional work. As Karen, a director and arts manager notes, by and large children are rarely seen if ever heard about in Toronto theatre. When asked about her experience she is surprised but pleased with my inquiry. She responds:

[I feel] that it is very difficult to have children in this community and I have three. I find that people are really not tackling that as subject matter for work. And certainly at the International Women’s Playwrights Congress which I was at, I was yet again disappointed that there wasn’t more

discussion . . . as to what that means, the bearing and raising of children and family means to artists. But that's a personal thing, of course. I mean, not every feminist is a mother and not every mother is an artist. But it's interesting. It's a question that is never really dealt with.

Karen's narrative documents the absence of parenting discourse in the theatre community in a number of ways: in its exclusion as a topic for dramatic and performative work; its omission as an issue among theatre artists in general and the ways in which it has been by-passed as a topic for feminist theatre practitioners in particular; and its lack of address at the institutional level. Karen's experience as a mother is excluded from the Congress design, as it is peripheral to theatre organization, placing her work as a mother/artist outside the documentary practices⁵ of the institution.

How to account for this? Later in the interview Karen assesses the lack of attention paid to women and children's needs within the theatre as part of a reticence to regard women as mothers in a male-oriented profession. She references her thoughts to the historical exclusion of women from early Toronto theatre,⁶ suggesting that the theatre has allowed women to become part of its community but only in a strictly professional context. As she comments:

I think . . . and this is very personal . . . that there was a definite desire to be recognized as men or as men were recognized. I think that there is something about the way a woman relates in our society to having a family that is different from the way a man relates to it. Now that is not true for all women or all men . . . but there are women who see . . . their work as something that has no bearing on their lives as mothers.

In this narrative Karen elucidates the male institutional standard in theatre, drawing a connection between women's lived experiences as mothers and comparing them to the notion of the single male artist to which they should aspire. Here we see one of the ways in which the gendered accounting practices of theatre organization (that is to say, theatre's method of allocating and identifying work processes) are neutralized: women may enter the cultural locus of artistic creativity, providing they identify with male experience and represent themselves in a similar fashion. Aside from the fact that men are the protagonists in the myth of the theatre artist as bohemian living in esoteric cafes off cigarettes and coffee, there are other more concrete, monetary explanations for the notion of the female, and to a lesser extent male, artist who is seen as childless, as Lissa, a writer, producer, choreographer and mother of two asserts:

I know that certainly in the movie industry, where there is more ready income at a certain point, you know, you can hire people to raise your children. It's very difficult to do that in theatre because you don't have

enough money. So as a mom you're sort of more on the front lines of parenthood in that way, which also takes you off the front lines of theatre, because theatre is a demanding lover who wants you to spend every single minute of your waking hours with him or her.

Lissa's observations about childcare options available to those in the film versus the theatre industry denote a conceptual distinction between not only the higher fiscal earnings of those working in film, but the distinctive nature of the time commitment necessary to theatrical work and productivity, which functions to limit choice. The language used to describe her position on "the front lines of parenthood" demarks her conflict with the wage discrepancies between the arts, placing her in discord with institutional practice, which she refers to as a "demanding lover." Moreover, Lissa's comments speak to the traditional division of labour between women and men in the home—whether or not mothers are responsible for primary child care—which becomes fundamental to the creation of art in the public sphere.

In addition to the uncertainty of long-term work and the unusual hours, theatre is a physically demanding vocation requiring late nights during the run of a performance, spurts of binge work prior to the opening of a show and extended absences from home during tours, putting the distinctive nature of the time commitment necessary to theatre making at odds with child rearing. As Maxine, a playwright, activist and performer recalls:

It's interesting to think about now that I've got [an] empty nest. Well, when my son was still small it meant that no matter how involved I was in a piece or in rehearsals or during tech week, I still had to think about a person. I could never become totally immersed in what I was doing to forget about this other little person. Now, he'll probably tell it from another point of view. He often felt neglected and left behind. You know, he never saw me if I'd be away touring. He resented the people that I'd left him with or ... but he also got to meet a lot of neat people. So it's been, you know, both sides of that.

Maxine's description of the ways in which she has managed her work and mothering is useful. No matter how involved she is in the work process of a production, she cannot allow herself to become fully immersed, as she is responsible for her son. Conversely, his resentment over being left with a caregiver while his mother goes on tour illustrates the blurring of work boundaries that are particular to the local course of action of touring. As only her work in the theatre proper is accountable within the institutional order, Maxine's mothering is seen in conflict within the work process of performing.

Yet this conflict, while speaking to one of the obstacles she has had to overcome in relationship to her work and motherhood, also speaks to the gendered characteristics of the situation. Though Maxine is married, she

maintains the primary responsibility of finding childcare for her son, forcing her to leave him with people other than his parents, making him feel “neglected and left behind.” Accordingly, raising her child becomes a gendered act in both the structure that organizes it under patriarchy and the division of labour that she and her husband bring to it, as in this case it remains her responsibility for arranging childcare. Maxine’s experience of juggling childcare with her work in the theatre offers an understanding of the gendered organization of caring as both an activity and an emotion (McMahon, 1995: 191). Caring for her son is characterized in the day-to-day responsibility for his well-being in which she notes both the costs and rewards; because of her specialized work in theatre, her son “got to meet a lot of neat people.” Joan Peters (1997) sees this type of caregiving as an all-fulfilling aspect of idealized motherhood (that mothers experience even when they themselves are not always performing primary caregiving), which she calls “sacrificial motherhood,” a notion that many working women buy into because they have been conditioned to feel solely responsible for providing childcare needs, even if they themselves will not be staying at home. At the crux of this predicament is women’s inability to share responsibility for childcare needs with partners, family and/or paid caregivers (41-42).

Samantha, an artistic director, director and educator offers her experience in relation to the time commitments necessary in theatre practice:

We’re devoting so much to [the company] to keep things going, that... Well, this anecdote can suggest the level of commitment in my own case. I had a c-section on a Monday morning and I went to a rehearsal on Saturday afternoon. A caesarean is not just having a baby—it’s also major surgery. I was begging them on Friday to let me out of the hospital and take out my stitches because I wanted to get back in the rehearsal hall. Well, is that balanced?! It certainly isn’t. Some called me a workaholic based on that one, and I think that “passionately committed” is a much nicer way of putting it. But I’m not the only one who’s done something like that in the company.

Here Samantha describes a number of dilemmas in relation to her attempt to balance motherhood and theatre. In order to maintain both the economic structure of her theatre company and the artistic well being of the production in which she is involved, she decides to ignore the standard recovery period necessary for a c-section in order to return to the rehearsal hall and ensure the success of her play, a move she acknowledges is unbalanced. She cites a similar level of commitment on the part of other women working in her theatre company, all of whom are attempting to maintain the viability of an organization in jeopardy. While Samantha’s example of her “passionate commitment” to her company is exceptional, it acts as a useful insight into the social relations of theatre in Toronto with regard to gender. The company, a now-defunct feminist theatre group which specialized in popular theatre by bringing productions about women’s issues to non-traditional venues like shelters, rape

crises centres and schools, folded when their Canada Council and Ontario Arts Council funding was slashed in the late '90s, though these granting bodies continued to fund other alternative theatres on par with Samantha's company. Upon deeper investigation, this anecdote serves to illustrate what feminist institutional theorist Anne Marie Goetz (1997) terms "a gendered dynamic" which shapes institutions. The closure of this feminist not-for-profit theatre is an example, as the private sector could not make up for the deep economic loss of public arts funding, while the public institutions failed to include women equitably amongst the "public" that they serve (Goetz, 1997: 5). The result is, as Goetz notes,

These gendered preference systems are more than discriminatory attitudes or irrational choices on the part of individuals, or unintended oversights in policy. Nor are they deliberate policy outcomes. They are embedded in the norms, structures and practices of institutions. (5)

While Samantha's example indicates one of the ways in which the arts in general have not historically been hospitable to women, the theatre with its unusual hours, flexible scheduling, and broad spectrum of work opportunities allows for many of its members to very often lead double lives. The ubiquity of young actors posing as waiters is only one case in point. Beyond the glamorous lure of acting, many writers and designers, whose work isn't solely physically located in the rehearsal hall, find that they have some flexibility to accommodate their childcare needs, as Christine, a playwright and author, observes:

Well, I only have one child so it's quite different than having three or four or five children. But I'm also married to an actor and he doesn't get up in the morning and go off to work and leave me with the child ... But then he's only one and it's easier if you're a writer because you don't have the same kind of time pressures and the same kind of going to the office pressures and whatever—if I were an actor, though, and didn't go to rehearsals, that would be a problem ... If I were an actor, I wouldn't have been able to pay any attention to him because I would have been on stage. But as a writer I sit there watching and I can stop watching.

Christine's experience as a playwright with a partner who shares in the parenting responsibilities supports her working environment, as her husband's line of work allows him to care for their son. Moreover, her position within the accounting practices of theatre grants her the opportunity to be both present and absent from rehearsals, conditions that can virtually only be enjoyed by a writer or one with a flexible role within the social order of theatre-making.

Working from home, however, is not without its own problems, as Linda, a Toronto-based set designer with two young children, observes:

There simply aren't enough hours in the day. Part of the problem is wearing too many hats. As a designer so much of my work is initiated in my home studio. That's where I come up with my initial designs and work out what this piece is actually going to look like. But with two little ones running around, it's hard to tell them, "Mommy's working." They don't really get it. They know that I'm closing the door and all of the sudden they're out. Years ago I suppose it wouldn't have been a problem because I'd be the one at home not working. Now home means working too and the lines can get blurred.

Linda's articulation of the inherent problems that come from working at home is certainly not unique to the theatre, but speaks to the nature of contingent work in theatre practice. As Linda's work in design is contract-based, she is hired on a project basis, with her work circumstances constantly changing. Her job is dependent on her ability to produce designs in a relatively short period of time so that they can be implemented in the production with a quick turnaround. Her double duty as primary caregiver complicates her working conditions, as her two young children do not understand her divided attention, which blurs the lines between mothering and her work at home.

In addressing motherhood and parenting in theatre one recognizes engendered practice many women continue to experience, even if much of their work is generated at home. As Linda comments, "Well, of course consciously as a woman I know that I shouldn't feel guilty about taking so much on. But it's so hard when both things really don't accommodate the other." For Linda, shifting the boundaries between her public and private life becomes a difficult mediation, one that ultimately disempowers her through guilt. Linda's experience resists any kind of neat separation between the emotional relations of motherwork, paid work, maternal identity and theatre practice. Given the conflicts that are built into her life, the expectations of her family and employers, the nature of her contingent work, the ideology she harbours about what motherhood entails—both real and romanticized—it's hardly surprising that she feels guilty and confused about her motherwork in relation to theatre practice. While the documentary practices of the institution require Linda to divide her time between mothering and working, the particulars of her situation prohibit this kind of strict separation and she is caught trying to "wear too many hats."

While the theatre has established itself as an informed context for work about women's issues, a performative space where all manner of subjects may be represented, reproduced, deconstructed and reformed, it still operates within a gendered context, as feminist dramatic theorist Sarah Werner (1998) notes,

There is a desire to see theatre as a place that is all about taking risks, a place that is about experiment and not stasis. But clearly theatre is

a place that allows for certain types of chance taking and not others; it is possible for theatre to be a world that pushes boundaries, but leaves some intact. There is still a strong sense that theatre is male. (111)

Though often touted as a neutral space in which to practice art, that theatre as an institution continues to be male dominated has long been recognized by feminist dramatic criticism, but as its social relations—that is to say, the concerting of its work processes as social courses of action—continue to go understudied, theatrical discourse fails to recognize that theatre practice is predicated upon the work of women’s labour in the home. Here Janet, a costume designer, comments on the ways in which she wishes her work would accommodate her parenting, rather than ostracize her family commitments:

I would like to make my children part of my work without it being a subculture. We’ve fought for women’s issues not to be a subculture, not to be ghettoized and I think parenthood is seen as a very large minority, [though it is] possibly the majority. It is common among people, but it is almost silent. Not talked about. You join it when you become a parent and all of a sudden some of your time is spent [dealing with] issues that other people’s isn’t, in your immediate circle of workers. But it’s almost done on the side, as a hobby, and certainly it’s considered thus.

In this narrative Janet identifies the notion of parenthood as a separate social activity which is seen outside of the mainstream of theatre and disconnected from its practice entirely. And yet the work of mothers is part of the theatre’s actuality in that the social relations of theatre extend to the private organization of the family; nevertheless, the effort of mothering is often neutralized and rendered unaccountable. Thus, in looking at artistic practice in its entirety it is necessary to take into account the ways in which generalizing systems have preconditioned individual actors as social agents, highlighting gendered modes of organization that uphold the dominant culture while placing limitations on the ways in which work is perceived within the documentary practices of the institution.

In this section of our interview Karen sums up her anger about the way she feels Canadian theatre sees women with children:

I spend a lot of time working for changes in Equity, Canadian Actor’s Equity, through international organization along with ACTRA, surrounding the conditions for women. There was a lot of resistance among many women who seem to feel having children was a choice—that if people make it, well, “good for them,” but it was rather like choosing to have a Great Dane puppy who needed a lot of walks and food and attention, and then complaining that somebody else should help you deal with the Great Dane when you went on tour. That’s how it was approached. I know that

there was a whole group who did not want to have any special treatment for women who chose to be parents, and interestingly enough, it was spearheaded by women. But not only women, but men as well, take part in child care and the costs. But it was as though, "that's your choice if you have children." So there is an intrinsic anti-family, anti-child stance within theatre in Canada.

As women's positions as mothers within the community are seen as outside the accounting practices of the institution, the lack of discourse on parenting in the theatre becomes regarded as an individual problem, not one of structural inequity. Moreover, Karen maintains that the "intrinsic anti-family, anti-child stance within theatre in Canada" is "spearheaded by women" who don't "want to have any special treatment" for those who choose to be parents. In this backlash scenario women with children are posited as those who have decided to reproduce at the cost of other women's well-being within the community. As a result, one group of women is always bound by their choice to be mothers, which privatizes their distinct needs and suppresses their appearance as active agents within their local work settings as they undergo a constant balancing act between their commitment to both childcare and theatre, of which the former does not outwardly appear as legitimate work. McMahon (1995) observes that the relational aspects of women's experience as mothers often disguises the work involved. "Because it is so often seen as an extension of caring, as an expression of love, women's daily practical caring for others is frequently not recognized as real work" (192).

Conclusion

How then to account for motherhood within the conceptual practice of theatre? As Susan Bassnett (1998) reminds us, "[a]ny discussion of the changing status of women in theatre needs to take into account the wider cultural context" (87). Therefore, we need to consider the work of mothering, the organizing, administering and maintaining of the orderliness of everyday life as it intersects with the institutional process of theatre. And while this functioning would not ordinarily be thought of as work, much less in relation to any art form, it is a vital part of theatre's economy. Women often inadvertently perpetuate their own entrapment by taking on greater amounts of work and by failing to see motherwork in combination with their paid labour, forcing them to manage more contradictory demands on their time, and accept greater stresses in their day-to-day lives (Duffy et al., 1989: 106). Though understanding the ways in which women's motherwork contributes to their professional lives is a critical project within a number of feminist communities, it is an issue that scholarly work in Canadian theatre has yet to tackle. Opening up the concept of mothering as a place for critical intervention in the theatre will help us unearth the neutralized male ideologies inherent in theatre's structures and practices and will allow us to enrich

current theatrical culture by improving the lives of its practitioners both on stage and off.

¹Molly Ladd-Taylor (1996) defines this term as an example of both “child rearing in the home, and the maternalist reform activity characterized as ‘social motherhood’” (2). Nancy Mandell (1989) also refers to it as the “energy-depleting” and “emotional work” of coordinating the lives of others (37).

²Interviews for this article were obtained as part of research for my doctoral dissertation, *Interviewing the Mothers of Invention: A Qualitative Analysis of Women Theatre Practitioners in Toronto*, and were taken in the years between 1995-2000. All of the participants’ names have been changed.

³Of the 25 interviewed, 16 were mothers, all of whom continued to work in theatre after the birth of their first child. All of the women described themselves as feminists, with the exception of two in particular who aligned themselves to feminist principles but refused to support what they feel is primarily a white woman’s agenda. The majority of the subjects were white women with the exception of five who were black, one who was Native, and one who was Korean. Three women openly discussed their sexuality with two self-identifying as lesbian and one as bisexual.

⁴The semi-structured open-ended interview, based on feminist standpoint theory, is the data gathering process used in institutional ethnography, which takes a materialist feminist approach. The purpose of this methodology is not to compare or contrast the subjects’ narratives or to make generalizations about the data and then draw conclusions based on the findings, but, as Smith (1987) outlines it, the research begins from the standpoint of women and is a “project of creating a way of seeing, from where we actually live, into the powers, processes, and relations that organize and determine the everyday context of that seeing” (9).

⁵Here I am using Smith’s (1987) term to denote theatre’s institutional processes, divisions of labour, conceptual practices, discourses, taxonomies, etc. The documentary procedures of theatre recognize some experiences and local practices as valuable and essential to the functioning of the organization while failing to take into account those experiences that are necessary to it but do not enter its accounting system, that is to say, theatre’s method of allocating and identifying work processes.

⁶In making this statement, I am alluding to the rise of women’s *professional* participation in Toronto theatre which began about the same time as Canadian nationalism began to take hold in the late ’60s, and grew alongside the rise of the alternative theatre movement. As I note elsewhere, prior to the alternative movement, which began in 1968 with the rise of Theatre Passe Muraille and was soon followed by the Factory Theatre Lab, the Tarragon Theatre and Toronto Free Theatre, at the time English-Canada’s professional theatre, consisted primarily of regional theatres run entirely by men. For a more detailed

account of women's experiences during the early years of the alternative movement, see Rusch-Drutz (2001) in *Framing Our Past* and Hale (1987) in *Work in Progress*.

References

- Abbey, Sharon and Andrea O'Reilly, eds. 1998. *Redefining Motherhood: Changing Identities and Patterns*. Toronto: Secondary Story Press.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1998. "Introduction to Part Three." in Lizbeth Goodman with Jane de Gay, eds. *The Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance*. London and New York: Routledge. 87-91.
- Case, Sue-Ellen. 1988. *Feminism and Theatre*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Duffy, Ann, Nancy Mandell and Norene Pupo. Eds. 1989. *Few Choices: Women, Work and Family*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Fox, Bonnie. 1998. "Motherhood, Changing Relationships and the Reproduction of Gender Inequality." in S. Abbey and A. O'Reilly, eds. *Redefining Motherhood: Changing Identities and Patterns*. Toronto: Secondary Story Press. 159-174.
- Goetz, Anne Marie, ed. 1997. *Getting Institutions Right for Women in Development*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Hale, Amanda. 1987. "A Dialectical Drama of Facts and Fiction on the Feminist Fringe." in Rhea Tregobov, ed. *Work in Progress: Building Feminist Culture*. Toronto: The Women's Press. 77-99.
- Ladd-Taylor, Molly. 1986. *Mother-Work: Women, Child Welfare, and the State, 1890-1930*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Mandell, Nancy. 1989. "Juggling the Load: Mothers Who Work Full-Time for Pay." in Ann Duffy, Nancy Mandell and Norene Pupo, eds. *Few Choices: Women, Work and Family*. Toronto: Garamond Press. 17-43.
- McMahon, Martha. 1995. *Engendering Motherhood: Identity and Self-Transformation in Women's Lives*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Peters, Joan K. 1997. *When Mothers Work: Loving Our Children Without Sacrificing Our Selves*. Reading: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Rich, Adrienne. 1986. *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc.
- Rusch-Drutz, Corinne. 2001. "Feminist Theatre in Toronto: A Look at Nightwood Theatre." in Sharon Ann Cook, Lorna R. McLean and Kate O'Rourke, eds. *Framing Our Past: Canadian Women's History in the Twentieth Century*. Montreal and Kingston; London; Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press. 271-274.
- Smith, Dorothy. 1987. *The Everyday World As Problematic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Werner, Sarah. 1998. "Notes on Sharing the Cake." in Lizbeth Goodman with Jane de Gay, eds. *The Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance*. London and New York: Routledge. 108-112.