Lockman, Darcy. (2019). All the Rage: Mothers, Fathers, and the Myth of Equal Partnership. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Reviewed by: Victoria Ntoni, MacEwan University.

"We mostly just wanted to be equals" (p. 113).

Darcy Lockman's book, "All the rage" is an interweaving of a meta-analysis of secondary sources, narrative research, non-structured interviews and theories stretching from vast disciplines such as psychology, biology, and sociology, to examine the unequal partnership in the private sphere. Lockman acknowledges the progress of feminism, such as more women in the labour force and higher education. Although women have made progress in the public sphere, such progress is not evident in the private realm. Gender parity is deficient regarding unpaid domestic labour in the home. To ascertain the development of labour imbalance, Lockman considers biology and the processes of the state to answer "why don't men do more?" (p. 11). She proposes 'agency' as the way for the reformation of unequal partnership towards gender-neutral labour.

An egalitarian relationship, which seems to be the expectations for couples often than not, becomes more of an ideology than reality. Men and women seem to deem their work as equitably shared up until the introduction of kids in the relationship, which is one of the factors yielding to unequal division of labour in the home. Unequal distribution of work becomes precipitated with the arrival of kids when "men's time on routine housework declines as more children are born, suggesting that the gender gap in housework time widens as the demand for time on domestic work increases" (p. 32). As a full-time working mom raising kids, Lockman is mindful of the fact that

"the way we [parents] actually live seems to have not caught up with our relatively new ideals" (p. 7). Couples unknowingly fall into traditional gender roles. "It's not just that they are startled by how the division of labour falls along gender lines, but they describe the change as if it were a mysterious virus they picked up when they were in the hospital having their baby. They don't seem to view their arrangements as choices they have made" (p. 42). Most women of varying educational levels and socioeconomic status find themselves contributing more to raising kids and house management. Upon having children, "twenty-two hours of child care" are added to women's already existing fifteen hours of housework before kids and men add fourteen (p. 10). Even though the amount of time fathers spent doing unpaid work has increased, women always do more compared to men, however.

Lockman finds that biology, a ubiquitous and present reason, is attributed to why women do more unpaid labour than men. Essentialism posits that the inherent biological differences make women more suitable sex to care for kids (pp. 59-60). Lockman lends support from naturalistic fallacy to debunk the ideology of maternal instinct in explaining why women are automatically reverted to attend to the needs of children. "The naturalistic fallacy shows up time and again in our ubiquitous commitment to the idea of mother as her baby's one and only, a convenient preposition that struggles to make actual sense" (p. 77). Selecting mothers as the primary caregiver is attributed to their biological makeup, making them better parents because it is natural, therefore assumed as good. The naturalistic fallacy is at play when men do less in the presence of mothers because mothers are perfect sex for attending to a child's needs (p. 86).

Lockman cites a 2014 study which compared FMRI data of three groups of first-time

parents: primary care mothers, secondary-care fathers and gay primary-care fathers raising babies without women. The results are suggestive of the fact that biological sex is not evident for women being the sex responsible for taking care of kids. Instead, it is "how much time the subjects had spent in intimate contact with their babies" (p. 91). Appointing the female sex as managers of the home to care and raise children is not imprinted in women's DNA. Generally, what is 'natural', 'innate,' or 'obvious is actually a cultural habit' (p. 60) which is socially and culturally constructed and perpetuated. Subscribing to this societal script of expectations for men and women, consequently increases "traditional attitudes about the home" (p. 121). Endorsing such attitudes leads to male resistance in domestic chores.

Another factor Lockman proposes to preserving unequal partnership is the lack of social collectiveness in raising kids. The problems in mothering and less contribution from fathers is a social problem, however. Lockman uses cross-cultural literature in evaluating the contributions of men. In comparing countries with firm family policies and countries without such systems, she finds that fathers spend an equal amount of time with their kids. The institutions have provided mothers with options of child care such as state-sponsored child care which alleviates mothering problems leaving mothers to contribute less than their U.S counterparts and, allows them to have careers (p. 157). Also, the structure of work for men does not let them do more at home. Women's work is perceived to have more flexibility. Women in work fields which are traditional for men volunteer and do the communal aspect of the job. "[T]he ideology of intensive mothering serves men in that women's commitment to this socially devalued task helps to maintain their subordinate position in society as a whole" (p. 221).

The unequal division of labour and sacrificing the self to be intense mothers in order not to violate expectations of gender has consequences. Although "motherhood is the most important job in the world," It should come as little surprise that, contrary to the cliches, and promises, having children tanks women's happiness" (p. 159). The inability to advance in their careers is one consequence faced by mothers. Women were not "promoted because they [have] flex time" (p. 168) to accommodate demands at home while their male counterparts move on to higher positions and incomes. "Jeopardizing one's status as a good mother" (p. 175), divorce, resentment, and psychological distress (p. 107) are other consequences mentioned by Lockman.

Agency, as defined by Lockman, is "a conventionally male trait that encompasses competence, assertiveness and independence (p. 254). Accepting the explanations postulated for the "social phenomenon" of unfairness in partnership regarding domestic work, "suggests that efforts to change the existing situation are futile" (p. 62). Lockman wants mothers and women to be optimistic about men's contributions to unpaid labour. She suggests that women should be more like men-assertive- and men more like women-nurturing and caring for others- as the way to change the old long-lasting gender stereotypes to bring about equality of shared labour in the home. "Strong gender egalitarianism means a family life free from assumptions about who does what based on activities deemed more appropriate for fathers or for mothers" (p. 276). When men adopt communalist traits and work together with women on distributing labour equally, we can achieve gender parity.

Lockman seeks to answer why and how gender disparities persist among modern-day dual-

earner families. The book illuminates on articulated frustrations about unfair labour as a social issue in hopes to foster social restructuring regarding family policies in child-rearing. Also, she calls upon mothers to communicate openly to express their opinions about the inequity faced in home management.

Lockman's intended readership is academia's in sociology, social work, psychology, and gender studies examining how social structures and social constructs induce the pervasiveness of unequal labour distribution. Furthermore, the book will appeal to the general but well-educated audience, especially couples with children or who intend to raise children.

I like the way she weaves anecdotes together with scholarly works of literature in the book. I think utilizing such a technique illustrates the issue as a social one. Lockman interviewed western women with careers who to some extent are not financially dependent on their husbands. It would be interesting to know whether the same or different outcomes will be attained if she interviewed non-Western women who are solely economically reliant on their husbands.