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SUMMARY:

Studying labour/time is an important research area, which allows us to make sense of the rhythms of everyday life of people in different contexts and societies. It is also a complex task that addresses the result of the research question, which inquires how and why people spend their time on social reproduction. Answering this question requires a systematic methodology involving both qualitative and quantitative research methods. In this Toolkit we make the argument for bringing two important methodologies that study the everyday - Time Use Surveys and Shadowing - to develop a Feminist Everyday Observatory Tool.

We discuss the strengths of Time Use Survey and Shadowing as methodologies and show where the gaps lie in their design and how to address these. We then introduce a Three Step Method that we have developed through trialling this methodology in four pilot studies - in India, Ukraine, Myanmar and Sri Lanka. We examine the challenges that our Feminist Everyday Observatory Tool method poses for researchers as well as its advantages and suggest that it is an important contribution to the methodological toolkit for researchers of the everyday and of gender structures of time, space, violence and social reproduction.
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INTRODUCTION: WHY AND HOW DO WE STUDY TIME-USE?

Time-use surveys are now standard tools for economists studying labour issues. Much work has been done on time-use surveys (TUS), and even more on ethnographic research methods. Some recent work is exploring bringing quantitative survey methods into conversation with qualitative ethnographic research - often sequentially as in Adato et al.1. While this is welcome, we suggest that bringing the two methods together into one frame, as is envisioned by ‘mixed-method’ research designs,2 would generate a more nuanced understanding of time-use. That way systematic patterns identified in TUS and demographic surveys and their quantitative analysis can suggest issues to be further examined and approached in particular contexts through qualitative methods, such as shadowing in households. Such a mixed-method approach enables the insights of both methods to inform each other during the research process, and to be used as a combined analytical force to address the same research question: what do people do, how and why to carry out household social reproduction?

What is observation and how is it a feminist method?

In this toolkit, we outline one such method that we have devised through our pilot studies of social reproduction in different contexts - feminist observation3 that is sensitive to the everyday rhythms of life of participants, that situated the surveys in their broader socio-economic and political contexts and can then be triangulated with other methods such as large-scale surveys or statistical demographic analysis to corroborate contextual findings. Feminist observation is a one-on-one ethnographic method that allows us to

- Build on a feminist and interpretative-qualitative approach to mixed-method quantitative analysis of time with sensitivity to context of the participants
- Expand the study of time to take into account space and violence where time is spent through a three-step observation method
- It treats domestic and paid work along the same time/space continuum, challenging the distinctions between productive/unproductive work
- It allows researchers to understand not only what participants do, but what they feel about what they do as well as whether they feel they and their work are valued by their families and communities. This supports a re-orientation and value of work - inside and outside the home.

We have called this methodology a Feminist Everyday Observatory Tool (FEOT) that builds on “shadowing4” and “ethnographic time-use survey.” Shadowing, helps researchers in observing and recording what participants do as they go about their everyday lives; ethnography because FEOT is sensitive to the contexts of everyday lives and uses some aspects of the ethnographic method, such as narrative interviews.

Shadowing is a recognised methodology in organisational behaviour research. It has largely been deployed in shadowing in households. Such a mixed-method approach enables the insights of both methods to inform each other during the research process, and to be used as a combined analytical force to address the same research question: what do people do, how and why to carry out household social reproduction.

As Gill notes, shadowing has the ‘potential to illuminate the happenings of organisational research and thus responds to the growing theoretical emphasis, noted previously, on organizations as late-modern or post-modern, post-industrial identities, and “messy” sites of work and interaction.5 Ethnographers also use interviews, focus groups, and surveys, key informants, logs and diaries. In terms of reflexive research, Bell has argued that ‘the problem may not be whether the organizational ethnographer is biased, but one of understanding what kinds of biases exist, how they enter into ethnographic work and how their operation can be documented’.6 These ethnographic techniques have for some time been harnessed in organisational research. Ethnographic research is a complex task; it is particularly so when it also involves analysing ever-changing flows of time. Ethnography may be considered as akin to story-telling, where the focus is the perceptions of everyday rhythms rather than an obsession with the accuracy of the facts.7

Ethnography ‘sets out to build a believable world, but [unlike fiction] one the reader will accept as factual’.8 This intimacy of the field also calls realm-specific and segmented approach to research, when what we need is an ‘all-purpose framework of experience’. It also allows, as Ashcraft notes, ‘to [newen] attention to work itself’ and “study the actual labor that people do” both in the home and outside to sustain social reproduction. As Gill notes, shadowing has the ‘potential to illuminate the happenings of organisations and thus responds to the growing theoretical emphasis, noted previously, on organizations as late-modern or post-modern, post-industrial identities, and “messy” sites of work and interaction.9

Czarniawska has shown how shadowing, as opposed to traditional fieldwork method, involves following only one person, making the field of research a more intimate and reflexive one.6 This intimacy of the field also makes shadowing necessarily intersubjective: Cunliffe argues, we coexist and are copresent with other people […] and our identities and shared understandings of our social world are shaped between us10. Ethnographic research, on the other hand, is substantiated with evidence produced through a range of methods including time-use diaries and observations. Traditionally, ethnography is marked by two characteristics - long periods of immersive research, and participant observation as a methodology. These ethnographic techniques have for some time been harnessed in organisational research. Ethnographic research is a complex task; it is particularly so when it also involves analysing ever-changing flows of time. Ethnography may be considered as akin to story-telling, where the focus is the perceptions of everyday rhythms rather than an obsession with the accuracy of the facts.12

Our approach learns from ethnography in two ways: - it logs the details of everyday lives of people through observing and recording their time-use, and we use long, narrative interviews as well as photography in our three-step FEOT method. FEOT differs from the ethnographic method in not requiring long periods in the research site; however, by paying close attention to details of everyday life - time as well as spaces that participants occupy, and conducting narrative interviews with them, we deepen our understanding of the context as well as substance of the research questions. As Devaki Jain (Bawin) said at a seminar in New Delhi, ‘short and dirty’ research can be helpful so long as it serves the purpose of challenging women’s oppression and empowering them.11

In this Toolkit, we explain how we can bring together two important methodological strands - Time-Use Surveys and Shadowing - together in an innovative way to help development research. This Toolkit provides a framework for the following sections: in the first section on Time-use Surveys: importance and limitations, we discuss the gaps in the standard methodology. In the second section on the Feminist Everyday Observatory Tool we outline the techniques of this new methodology through a three-step research design. In the third section on Methodological considerations we reflect on the training needs of the researchers and in the Conclusion, we examine some of the challenges that this methodology presents and how we have approached these.

WHY ARE TIME-USE SURVEYS IMPORTANT AND WHAT ARE THEIR LIMITATIONS FROM A FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE?

Time-use surveys are one of the few methods that can provide sound data on unpaid care work. Time-use surveys ask participants to report everything they did during a given period along with some indication of when they began and ended those actions. Most time-use studies include, at least in basic form, a pre-questionnaire and a time use diary. Some TUS use interviews to provide additional demographic, economic, and social information about households and individuals. For example, in the UK TUS 2014 -15, someone in the household was selected to take part in an interview after the collection of the data. “Time-use surveys may ask participants to report everything they did during a 24-hour period along with some indication of the starting and stopping times of those actions.” This chronological reporting procedure avoids many pitfalls that other estimation procedures encounter and is less subject to distortion due to “social desirability bias.”

Finally, feminist work on TUS has developed techniques to take into account the overlapping character of time use in the home; they have, for example, made a distinction between the ‘24-hour minute’ where multiple tasks carried out within the same time frame were given equal weight, as opposed to the ‘full minute’, where only one task was carried out in a period of time (Hoskyns and Rai, 2007). This enables an accounting for and counting of “multi-tasking”, as it is commonly known. While important, these distinctions are not made in most TUS.

So, the attraction of a TUS is that it provides –:

- A large-N study of time;
- A detailed analysis of how people spend their time;
- Survey can be gender and age sensitive - we know from the data the sex and age profile of the surveyed and therefore who spends time on what.
- Produces data on the patterns of time use that is comparable across different locations and countries that can be useful in analysing a range of issues including gender divisions of labour and how to make them more equitable, the barriers to women’s formal employment, the impact of crises on time spent on social reproduction and so on;
- Greater accuracy claims - interviews do not match the TUS diary as people tend to over-report the time activities take in interviews.
- Focusing on time in this way also demonstrates the interdependence of paid and unpaid work.

However, as most methodological frameworks, a TUS has some limitations:

- Higher illiteracy rates and limited statistical budgets prevent study in some countries and locations.
- It is a laborious exercise and presumes a level of cooperation, literacy and time commitment of those who take part.
- It is aware of the macro socio-economic trends in different contexts. Attention to context is also important in identifying and dealing with the distortions in data that a “social desirability bias” may bring about.
- TUS is expensive to run for governments or other organisations; they tend not to be run by poor states and are only run regularly by very few rich states (see the UK Time-Use Survey, 2014).

We would argue that we need to situate the survey in the broader issues facing the participants; this can allow us to ask better questions, to interpret the answers in a sensitive manner and ensure that the comparative work is aware of the macro socio-economic trends in different contexts. Attention to context is also important in identifying and dealing with the distortions in data that a “social desirability bias” may bring about.

To address some of these limitations of the traditional TUS, let us now outline our methodology - Feminist Everyday Observatory Tool.

WHAT IS THE FEMINIST EVERYDAY OBSERVATORY TOOL AND HOW IS IT A REFLEXIVE METHOD?

What does FEOT entail?

In order to address the TUS gaps, we have developed a reflexive approach to time-use that allows us to understand the time spent on paid and unpaid work as well as to explore what those who do these tasks think about it. As noted above, this is not a new method but we have developed it in the context of studying time-use in social reproduction. FEOT involves a researcher documenting the use of time with potentially lesser impact on the research participants than requiring them to complete diaries. As our pilots in Sri Lanka and Myanmar show, such an approach may also contribute more reliable (and therefore comparable) data. It allows us to map the space/time negotiations that people make in their everyday lives in a gender-sensitive way. This allows us to see the physical effects of negotiating space/time (rather than just time as in a TUS). Finally, an important contribution of this methodology also allows us to know about how participants feel about their work, their position within their families and communities, the systems of support that they can rely on. As such, it not only provides us with data - qualitative, thick description, reflexive - but also allows us to ask different important questions about the way in which people spend time, in the spaces that they occupy - both public and private, and what they feel about their life-worlds and how they make sense of them. FEOT allows a space to be created where people can speak about specific moments in the day when they felt tired, stressed or joyful, which can give us clues to what they feel can support them and what depletes them.

Based on our methodological reflection on large scale TUS in the UK and Australia, and two pilot studies we conducted in New Delhi, India and four different locations in Ukraine, we outline the specifics of this methodology. We are testing the methodology in Sri Lanka and Myanmar.

- Time-use survey also does not tell us much about what the diarists feel about the work that they do and how they understand their position within their families and communities, the recognition of their labour, the systems of support that they can rely on, and the subjectivities that develop over time that they can relate to? How does this affect their work? Moreover, TUS does not give research participants an opportunity to interpret the time use themselves and be engaged in analysis. It treats participants as ‘objects’ rather than ‘subjects’ compared with narrative qualitative approaches.
- TUS is expensive to run for governments or other organisations; they tend not to be run by poor states and are only run regularly by very few rich states (see the UK Time-Use Survey, 2014).

Gillies correctly identified the reflexivity of the researcher as important in shadowing (2013), we return to this issue below.
WHAT ARE THE METHODOLOGICAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN ADOPTING SHADOWING/ETHNOGRAPHIC TIME-USE STUDY DESIGN?

We need to pay attention to several important considerations to ensure that the quality of research and the wellbeing of researchers. These include:

What Sample Size is needed?: consider the sample size based on the research questions. Consideration of recruitment should also be made - how will participants be recruited? What networks will be recruited through to access an appropriate sample of participants? Who - which gatekeepers - can assist with selecting participants according to criteria set out?

Box 1: In the field

The fieldwork was carried out over 5 weeks, in both Sri Lanka (8 January - 17 February) and Myanmar (26 January - 2 March). The researchers undertook fieldwork in three different sites in each country: 1) 'directly conflict-affected', 2) 'proximate to conflict' and 3) 'relatively stable/distant from conflict'. In each location, the researchers spent a day each with three different women, to understand how they spent their time and what their various types of work involved. The researchers documented this time-use in a fieldwork diary, where the women's activities, and researcher observations, were written down every 15 minutes, for the full day. A full working day could start as early as 5.45am and finish as late as 10.30pm. A short (half hour) pre-interview was carried out with each woman before the observation day. A longer ‘post-observation interview’ (1.5 - 2 hours), to discuss significant aspects of the day and the conflict environment, was carried out with each woman as soon as possible after the observation day. The researchers worked with local assistants for translation/interpretation across the course of the fieldwork. (J Lingham; researcher ‘Inclusive Economies, Enduring Peace pilot project)

What are the Staffing requirements?: Consideration should be given to

- How many field researchers will be necessary and practicable to cover all locations/participants?
- Will researchers be bilingual and able to record their notes in Working English or will an interpreter be required?
- How many field researchers will be necessary and practicable to cover all locations/participants?
- How do we allocate and organise time?

Strategies to ensure researcher wellbeing as well as that of the participant could include paying attention to time needed on the ground such that there is enough gap between the shadowing of individual households. Normally, participants need to be observed on weekdays for approximately 12-16 hours.23 Because of the intensity of the method, however, this length of observation may need to be significantly shorter recognising the impact of such intensive research on both the researcher and the participant. However, depending on the research needs circumstances, and access, observation can also be increased to 2 or more days - especially spanning weekdays and weekends, although keeping in mind that the concept of the weekend might apply differentially in various contexts. This would also depend upon the resources mobilised, ensuring the wellbeing of the researcher and the obtaining informed consent of participant and taking into account the wellbeing of the household. Additional time may also allow researchers to build trust and rapport in communities and with potential gatekeepers to communities before engaging in the shadowing research.

Post-observation narrative interviews can cover the period not observed through careful questioning.

Some studies are longitudinal with on-going periodic follow-ups so that a pilot ethnographic survey may be used as a baseline for future surveys to track change over time, especially if related to a key event such as conflict or a disaster or an economic crisis and so on.

What training is needed?: Researchers will require careful and thorough training and detailed guidance notes to direct their research observations. Training will need to include sensitivity to the context of research, especially to constraints upon participants and safety of the researcher. Training should also include developing reflexivity regarding the position of the researcher especially in contexts of poverty and violence - public or domestic (or an insider - depending upon the circumstances). In situations where local researchers are employed; training will need to pay particular attention to ensuring the anonymity of participants by emphasising protocols around confidentiality and privacy. Preventing shadowing in households where the researcher and research participant are known to one another will be important. In large scale, situations where there is a research team, a train-the-trainer approach should be adopted including for assistants, interpreters and partners.

Attention should also be paid to the safety of the researcher. This will usually be part of institutional human subject ethical research processes, which generally require a risk assessment and safety plan for high risk contexts. However, researchers will often need to go beyond these standard procedures to ensure their own safety and protection and that of their teams.24 We recommend an internal project safety plan in addition to meeting institutional commitments that take account of situational awareness and the need to make continual practical judgments on the risks while engaged in shadowing.

Providing guidance to researchers via a template in the form of extensive in-built questions may make diary comparisons and coding easier after the data collection/shadowing. But the limitation of using templates is that it runs the risk of creating conditions for tunnel vision and/or a box ticking approach to research. Training of researchers needs to alert researchers to this risk while emphasising the need for a systematic approach in the recording of observations of activity during the designated time periods.

Should we consider participant incentives?: We should offer some compensation for participants time and/or an incentive to participants wherever possible. Time is resource; we need to be aware that we do not burden the participants with our research demands without some form compensation. Whilst some (middle class participants, for example) may not need to be compensated materially, other forms of recognition may be considered. For those who are materially poor, we should consider compensation in terms of financial contribution, contribution towards mitigating their everyday needs. Sometimes incentives could be collective - contributing to women’s groups working to mitigate depletion of those carrying on social reproductive work, for example. Consultation with contacts on the ground on what is a usual and/or appropriate type of compensation that addresses ethical issues of fairness within communities will be necessary. Sometimes consultation with the participants to address this issue of compensation may be appropriate, as in would they prefer a gift of cash or goods of equivalent value.

How do we prepare for FEOT Research?

For FEOT research the scope of fieldwork should be carefully mapped out before starting.

How do we select Research Variables, Sites and Sampling of Households?

Which factors should we consider and pay attention to? Which issues do we want to generate evidence on? For example, if there is an interest in gender relations in conflict contexts specifically, then researchers should assess how much more time adult women spend on this unpaid work than men. Thus, researchers should be attentive to how much more time that care work and social provisioning takes in the households in conflict contexts? How much more time women in conflict-affected areas spend than women in stable areas on care and social provisioning?

Why is Purposive and Targeted Sampling preferable? The participant sample should be feasible because observing a research participant’s time over 12–16 hours with a pre-survey and post-observation interview is labour-intensive! For a feasible, qualitative study, we suggest around 25 participants in each research site would be a good starting point.

FEOT uses a form of non-probabilistic sampling guided by grounded theory and the exploration of research questions. It involves in-depth analysis of a small-N purposive sample to identify patterns and causal mechanisms through ‘theoretical saturation’ that are both time and context-specific. In a small-N ethnographic study, the locations/sites of study will also need to be well-defined to study the selected factors, to try to isolate them to some extent from the many other factors that influence labour-time/space and that might be of interest. For example, in True’s study of the impact of conflict on time-use in Ukraine the following were targeted: 50/50 men and women; 33/33/33 conflict/grey zone/non-conflict.

Other factors such as the age composition of the household, and the differences between rural and urban contexts could be considered. However, it is not possible to consider all factors and an ethnographic TUS should delimit which aspects are of most interest to focus on.

How do we schedule the study? Will the study coincide with any extraordinary events such as seasonal changes, natural disasters, conflict, festivals or fasting that may alter general practices? What might be the best time of the year for conducting the research? If in rural areas, sowing or harvesting seasons might present challenges in gaining participant attention. Rainy season in some contexts (monsoons in Sri Lanka for example) might not be a good time to conduct research; similarly, very short days in winter in some countries may present challenges. In conflict affected areas, attention should be paid to the disruption of routines; eruption of conflict would of course affect the scheduling of research and may require the selection of another location where a ceasefire holds.

Are intersectional identity indicators relevant? Class, gender, religion, caste, sexuality, age are all important to consider when selecting a sample. Of course, the focus of research may prioritise some indicators over others, but an intersectional approach that takes into account the multiple identity markers of participants should be developed.

Are geographical locations important? Everyday life in households in urban, peri-urban and rural locations may vary greatly. Consider the importance of location to research and aim for maximum variation if this is of research interest.

What ethics and consent issues are involved? The anonymity of participants and confidentiality and privacy of the data must be ensured – and communicated clearly to the participants; they need to feel safe being observed, recorded and photographed. As this is a rather intrusive methodology, it is vital that the participants’ wishes are taken into account, negotiated with them and respected. Attempts are made to explain carefully and fully how the data will be used and informed consent obtained for using it publicly. If the participant refuses the public use of photographs even without faces or attribution, for example, then photos could be used for internal use only and/or only observation/recording should be carried out. Storing date safely is critically important; all files, photographs or documents including personal names of participants need to be treated confidentially as per research site regulations.

Below, we explain how this methodology can be used through a three-step method; we also explain the different elements of each method.

**The FEOT Three-Step Method**

FEOT is accompanied by a pre-questionnaire, observation of time-use and a post-observation interview where researchers take detailed ethnographic notes.

**Step 1: Pre-questionnaire:** The first step is a pre-questionnaire to avoid interfering with the participant’s routine behaviour during the time-use survey observation, as well as to contextualise the participant in their environment - cultural, social and economic. This should also allow us to ascertain key demographic information about the household being observed. This overview provides context and enables comparability across sites.

**Step 2: Observation:** The second step is shadowing or conducting the ethnographic observation through completing a time-use diary, every 15-20 minutes for one day consisting of 12-16 hours. During this day, the participant and the researcher can also take photographs (with consent) as part of observation.

Based on some of the potential issues highlighted in the literature, two spreadsheets can be created for the researcher: One to document the activities each 15-20 minutes; and the other to register ethnographic notes based on questions asked after the observation.

**Box 2: Pre-survey questionnaire:** Based on our research approach and discussions we decided the following demographic-type factors should be recorded through a survey pre-questionnaire:

- Household composition - How many members? List the age range in the Household approximately e.g. 3-60 years. Are there children? Are there persons with disabilities or injuries?
- Occupational status of different members of the household and approximate total family income and individual income (to indicate 1) poor, 2) average or 3) better-off socioeconomic status
- Location of residence. Is this an Internally-displaced household? Urban or Rural?
- Religious, cultural markers of the household - a majority or minority religious/caste group?
The second spreadsheet allows for recording ‘ethnographic notes’; this can be expanded as required by the researcher using it. The researcher also takes photographs of the participant going about her business to visualise the activity/use of time; the participant can also take pictures as part of the photovoice methodology, which can be incorporated in the research design.29

Figure 2: Sample Spreadsheet 2:

Day 1
Activity 1: Example: Prepared Lunch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>Where was the activity done?</th>
<th>Who was your main activity? Include all activities</th>
<th>Who was this activity for?</th>
<th>What else were you doing at the same time?</th>
<th>Where were you?</th>
<th>Who was with you?</th>
<th>Who benefited?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Box 3: Examples of time-use recording:**

8.15am - Natasha fed the children breakfast, and checked their schoolbags for the necessary books, and homework. At the same time, she controlled the atmosphere between her three sons, preventing a quarrel among them.

8.30am - She helped the children with their clothes and gave them each some vitamins.

8.45am - She then walked the children to school, and dropped older children at primary school.

8.45am - She takes her younger son to kindergarten and walks to the city market.

Jane had 3 friends in her kitchen to help prepare a casserole that would later be distributed to victims of the 2014 conflict. Injured community members are not supported by the state. Without volunteers like Jane and her friends these people, who are otherwise isolated, would often go hungry because they are unable to work and earn an income. Jane’s 8-year-old daughter and 13-year-old son played with the other women’s children beside the house during this time. They required little active supervision, though one of the other Mums made occasional checks on the children.

**Ethnographic Notes: Conflict-affected city**

In addition to feeding themselves and the children, the women prepared 21 hot meals for lunchtime delivery

**Observable Labour Outputs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Example: Prepared Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 12:15</td>
<td>Local Community Group by ... name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive child minding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the research participant’s home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 other women from said community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 local community members injured in 2014 conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Should we use photography as an aid? Photography** can be a powerful method of recording time-use; visual methodology can be an important element of participatory research action and democratic knowledge production. Ethnographic time-use methodology uses photography in different ways:

Photovoice: Participants can either be given cameras to record their day, or they can use their phone cameras; the emphasis here is not on the quality of the photo but on the recording of time and mood. Wang and Burris note in their path-breaking study of public health (1997), photovoice can help ‘identify, represent, and enhance’ the community of the participants through taking pictures of themselves and their environment: ‘As a practice based in the production of knowledge, photovoice has three main goals: (1) to enable people to record and reflect their community’s strengths and concerns, (2) to promote critical dialogue and knowledge about important issues through large and small group discussion of photographs, and (3)

to reach policymakers 30. However, some scholars have questioned this technique: “the ‘user-friendliness’ of photovoice can lead to its misuse as a ‘quick-and-easy’ replacement for long-term ethnographic engagement and immersion in fieldwork contexts," argue Gubrium and Harper 31. Such concerns can be addressed by not depending entirely on this technique; we suggest using this as part of a bundle of methods to ensure against short-cuts to complex research.

Photographs by the researchers: Recording time-use through photographing the participants as they go through their daily business can provide us with important data, as well as being important prompts for the interviews – do you remember what you were thinking about at this time? You look very busy here – what were you thinking? Recall can be helped through visuals that are familiar (their lives) but also at a distance (once removed).

Box 4: Photography: The photograph shows the work that the New Delhi-based participant did during her day; this photograph allows us to examine the nature of work (washing clothes), how it is done (by hand), which tells us about the gender and class position of the participant and (combined with the time notations) the length of time that this work takes. We can also prompt the participant to look at the photograph to recall their feelings about doing this work, whether it was stressful for them, physically tiring, we can also ask them about the frequency of this work and about who helps them with this work or not.

Both kinds of photography can be used to enrich our understanding of the daily lives of the participants. However, it is most important to ensure that the participants are aware of the need for this method of research, consent to it and are able to refuse consent if they so wish, without being made to feel that they are impeding the research. Attention should be paid to photograph the activity rather than the individual – if photos can be taken from an angle that does not focus on the face, for example. Taking photos of children should be avoided where possible (although faces can be obscured in the photographs if need be).

Step 3 Post- Observation Narrative Interview: The third step consists of a post-observation interview/ discussion with the research participant. Here, the time-use records of the observation with the participant can become prompts as well as memory aids. The interview is narrative oriented – the questions are prompts but participants are allowed to reflect on their day at length, in a way that and where it suits them. Interruptions for childcare, household chores or work pressures need to be accommodated. In our research on social reproduction, for example, the researcher would typically ask the participants to reflect upon the various aspects of the recorded day – what made them happy/tired/angry/sad on the day? When were they most/least stressed? b) what were their sources of support - family/friends/colleagues? What, for example, were male members of the household doing at that time? c) do they feel that they and their home-making work are valued - by the family? The community? d) Who benefits from the particular activity that they engage in everyday? e) What would make their lives better on an everyday basis?

At the end of interview, all participants are given the opportunity to reflect on the questions asked and give any suggestions for improving it and share any feeling about their participation in the study.

HOW DO WE ANALYSE OBSERVATIONS IN A GENDER-SENSITIVE WAY?

We use time use data generated through FEOT observations to analyse social reproduction and its impact on the depletion of labour especially women’s labour and the financial, social, physical and emotional costs in the everyday and over time. This involves some key methods of analysis, most importantly:

- Gender and intersectional analysis of the time-use data requires us to analyse across households who carries out social reproductive work, who benefits from it and why. Analysing observational data for the power relations at stake in how work and its benefits are allocated and distributed with what impacts is crucial.

- Comparison of patterns of time use across households is another important analytical strategy. In our recent and current study for example, we expect that women’s unpaid care labour in households would be directly affected by the proximity to conflict, and therefore, that this labour would be greater in terms of the time spent on it in those households within the conflict area compared with those proximate to conflict or in relatively stable areas. In other shadowing time-use studies different key factors may be part of the research design and therefore of the analytical perspective.

- Triangulation of shadowing and time-use observations with secondary research, data and information on the available social infrastructure will be crucial in the analysis phase. We need to embed our time use observations of the everyday routines of individuals and households in the mapping of social infrastructures including government policies, state services, and responses of NGOs and non-state actors. This is crucial in order to surmise whether or not depletion through social reproduction is present, increasing without support, or decreasing with or without the support of social infrastructure.

CONCLUSION

With the data collected and analysed through the Feminist Everyday Observatory Tool we are able to research everyday rhythms of life, how these are affected by intersectional identity markers, what participants feel about the way they spend their time, and what they feel might support them to improve the balance of their life.

We are aware of the fact that FEOT is necessarily a small-N study mixed methodology, involving primarily qualitative analysis but we think it allows us to ask important questions about the everyday of our participants which can help us to sensitise policy analysis and outcomes. FEOT can also generate narratives from the ground of people’s lives that can help us to more accurately interpret and triangulate macro survey-findings or to design large-N quantitative studies based on a more nuanced assessment of key issues from the perspective of gendered households and women’s lives in particular. Through this method there is an opportunity to generate data to support policy changes to mitigate or transform the depletion of women’s labour for instance, and also to make visible the work of social reproduction in general whether done by women or men – leading to future collective action at community, national and international levels.
