

## **Caring Together: The Politics and Practices of Social Reproduction in Community-Oriented Housing Arrangements**

### **Abstract**

The inequality of social reproductive labour remains a central issue in contemporary feminist discourse, highlighting persistent gender inequalities and structural challenges in capitalist societies. While existing research has largely focused on the role of welfare states and policy interventions, this paper explores alternative care arrangements within community-oriented housing models in Vienna. By employing a qualitative research approach, this study examines the challenges and opportunities in the distribution of care work in cooperative housing, co-living, and social housing projects. Through semi-structured interviews with residents of community-oriented housing, the study captures lived experiences and collective practices of care, addressing themes such as fairness, chances, and mental load. The findings indicate that these housing arrangements offer potential pathways for a more equitable distribution of care work, challenging traditional gender roles and fostering communal responsibility. By analyzing the interplay between social reproduction and communal living, this paper underscores the transformative potential of community-oriented housing in addressing systemic inequalities in care work distribution.

### **Introduction**

In line with feminist scholars like Silvia Federici and others this paper aims to make the private political again. In doing so, the concept of social reproduction is used to show the labour of maintaining and sustaining life (Bhattacharya, 2017; Federici, 2020) and present this as the backbones of capitalist growth and economic wellness. This research aligns with a critical tradition of scholarship rooted in Marxist thought, which interrogates the socio-economic structures of capitalist societies. Drawing on this theoretical framework, community-oriented housing arrangements like cooperative housing, co-living, and social housing projects are examined as practical alternatives to the individualism and commodification inherent in capitalist modes of living. These housing models are conceptualized not only as responses to housing needs but also as socio-political spaces that challenge the dominant logic of privatization and promote collective, solidaric forms of life. They hold potential for a more

equitable distribution of social reproduction tasks and contribute to ecological sustainability by facilitating the shared use and redistribution of resources. For this paper resources are mainly to be understood as time and energy as well as emotional capacity and attention. However, other resources like space, tools, vehicles, and knowledge can be collectively managed in ways that support both social justice and environmental transformation.

This research contributes on multiple levels. Theoretically, it bridges feminist care ethics and critiques of neoliberalism to develop a nuanced understanding of care work as a socio-political and economic phenomenon. Societally, it highlights the potential of community-oriented housing to address systemic challenges in care work distribution, offering alternative frameworks that move beyond traditional familial or institutional models.

To explore the mentioned topics, the research question leading through this paper is: What challenges and opportunities arise in the distribution of care work within community-oriented housing arrangements in Vienna? By addressing this question, the study contributes to ongoing debates on the intersections of care, housing, and social reproduction, shedding light on both the possibilities and limitations of alternative care arrangements in contemporary urban contexts. The approach to this will be by qualitative research using semi-structured interviews with a sample of people living in different community-oriented housing in Vienna, thereby gaining important insights into the realities of organizing and dividing care tasks in these specific cases. This paper is structured into five main sections. The literature review will examine key aspects and differing views on social reproduction. The Methodology section will give a comprehensive look at the used methods and the analyzing framework. Afterwards the findings will be discussed in detail, and the discussion will put the findings into context with the existing literature. The conclusion as the final part will summarize the key messages of this paper, evaluate the research process and give further interesting points to investigate in the future.

## Literature Review

Social reproduction has been a key concern in feminist research for decades. Scholars such as Nancy Fraser, Silvia Federici, and Tithi Bhattacharya have critically illuminated the multifaceted role of social reproduction in capitalist societies, particularly its gendered dimensions and the ways it shapes and is shaped by the lives of women\*. There is a myriad of definitions of the

term, but I find Bhattacharya's understanding of social reproduction as "life making" instead of the capitalist "profit making" very intuitively understandable (Bhattacharya, 2017). In this thesis, I will employ the terms social reproduction and care (or care work) to refer to a broad range of activities, relationships and systems. The terms are obviously not synonymous however they are very closely connected. For example, care work is to be seen as a form of social reproductive labour. For me and in this thesis, the term care is a lot broader and can mean many different things and doesn't necessarily link to a specific theory whereas social reproduction can be clearly linked to Marxist scholars and is an inherently political term, therefore ideologically more interesting to me. What makes the concept of social reproduction (SR) particularly compelling is its analytical versatility and relevance across a wide range of pressing societal issues. It offers a lens through which the interconnections between everyday practices of care and broader socio-political and economic structures become visible. For this reason, SR forms the central theoretical framework of this thesis. As Mezzadri et al. (2025) argue, social reproduction allows us to trace "gendered histories as co-generated by histories of colonialism, racial capitalism, planetary migrations, and struggles over legal status." Furthermore, considering the escalating ecological crisis, SR must also be understood in relation to "planetary crises, of life and capital," where, ultimately, "life itself is in peril." This multidimensional perspective positions SR not merely as a framework for understanding care and reproduction, but as a critical tool for analysing the ongoing crises of our time.

### **Care Crisis**

Previous research has established that the so-called "care crisis" and broader global challenges have led to a depletion of resources required for social reproduction. The contemporary care crisis is the outcome of multiple, intersecting socio-economic and demographic transformations. The increased labor market participation of women, coupled with the aging of populations and the ongoing erosion of welfare states, has led to a structural reorganization of care. As public responsibility for care has diminished, households and individuals (mostly women) have borne the intensified burden. Neoliberalism's response to this crisis has been the commodification and marketization of care, promoting privatized and often precarious care arrangements while systematically removing funds from collective infrastructures. This shift reveals what Nancy Fraser (2016) describes as a deep contradiction between capitalism and care: while social reproduction is essential to sustaining labour power and thus capital

accumulation, capitalism's relentless pursuit of profit destabilizes and devalues the very reproductive processes upon which it depends. Silvia Federici (2020) similarly highlights how capitalist accumulation has historically relied on the unpaid or underpaid labour of women, framing reproductive labour as both invisible and indispensable. Nancy Folbre (2001) underscores the collective dimensions of care work, arguing that its benefits extend beyond individuals and households, yet its costs remain largely privatized and feminized. These tensions are further compounded by global care chains and migration flows, as analyzed by scholars such as Rhacel Parreñas (2001), who illustrates how transnational care work reproduces inequalities along lines of gender, race, and class. In sum, the care crisis is not simply a matter of unmet needs, but a structural feature of contemporary capitalism, that exposes the fragility of life-sustaining systems and demands a fundamental reevaluation of care beyond market logics. In response to the care crisis, Emma Dowling highlights the connection between care and democracy. She explains that capitalism's so-called "care fix" merely commodifies care, making it profitable without alleviating the crisis. Instead, care is outsourced, while underlying issues such as gendered and racialized inequalities remain unaddressed. Consequently, Dowling critiques these supposed solutions and advocates for an alternative approach. She emphasizes the need to consider care within the broader organization of society and as a fundamental component of a "more radical transformation" that is both socially and ecologically just (Dowling, 2018, p. 339).

### **Welfare state**

Many studies in the field of social reproduction have focused on the role of the welfare state, which is certainly an important discussion to have. Research on gender and the welfare state has developed along two main perspectives. The first, the women's employment perspective (Gornick & Meyers, 2003; Gornick et al., 2009), argues that stronger ties to paid employment benefit women, challenging earlier mainstream welfare state theories. The second, the care or caregiver parity perspective (Kilkey & Bradshaw, 1999), criticizes social policy scholars for undervaluing unpaid care work and failing to recognize the role of women caregivers. Feminists aligned with the second perspective argue that employment feminists link citizenship and sociopolitical rights too closely to paid employment, ignoring the specific contributions of caregivers (Leira, 1992). These perspectives naturally clash in policy debates: while the first seeks full gender equality in the workplace, the second advocates for the right

to choose caregiving roles while receiving adequate support (Gornick & Schmidt, 2010). Silvia Federici, a proponent of the wages for housework movement, has shifted her stance in recent years, moving away from monetary compensation and instead advocating for "communing" as a transformative alternative (Federici, 2019). Supporting this, Emma Dowling writes about the dangers of letting the state step into this debate because in the past this has often led to the capitalist production system simply being reconceived. She says that attempts to make social reproduction visible and "make it count" have in fact concluded in making care commodified and marketable (Dowling, 2016).

### **The role of housing**

This paper argues a connection between care work and the locality where that work takes place: the home. Care work is deeply embedded in social structures, including housing arrangements. The most common form of living arrangements in Europe remains a one-family household. German architect Jan Engelke argues that the one-family-house is a sexist form of living. He tracks the emergence of this back to the 50s and 60s when gender roles were clearly divided in a working husband and the "non-worker" woman staying at home to take care of the house and the children. Engelke argues that all the major features of a one-family house are pushing the sexist agenda for example by having no private room for the woman, but a home office for the man and playrooms for the children. Also, the kitchen is usually very small so only one person can cook in there with a clear division from the living spaces so the household labour remains out of mind for the rest of the family meaning they don't have to acknowledge it happening (Bund et al., 2024). While Engelke is not a social science scholar, I do find his argumentation interesting when we think of the sluggish development of the wage gap in many European countries. What if the way in which we live at home is one of the most determining facts of how equal care tasks are divided, in line with "the private is political" (political slogan from the students and feminist movements in the 1960s). In contrast to the individualistic one-family unit, there are numerous possibilities for "commons" regarding living arrangements, but two are particularly relevant to this paper: co-housing initiatives and house or flat-shares.

Co-housing initiatives in Europe have gained popularity in response to economic uncertainty, rising inflation, and the limitations of the nuclear family model. These initiatives vary from pragmatic to idealist approaches (Tummers, 2016) and disrupt traditional family structures,

challenging gender roles in the domestic sphere (Vestbro, 2010). Notably, interest in co-housing initiatives is higher among women than men, suggesting that women may experience a stronger need for communal support. Sangregorio (2010) views Scandinavian women's interest in co-housing as an effort to gradually transform daily life rather than radically reshape society. Women-only housing projects, such as Les Babayagas in France and Beginenwerk in Germany, exemplify this ongoing trend (Sangregorio, 2010).

A second form of alternative housing is shared housing arrangements. While some individuals view communal or purpose-driven co-living as a temporary phase, an increasing number embrace it as a long-term lifestyle choice (Maalsen, 2019). This shift reflects changing housing preferences and a growing interest in alternative, collective ways of organizing everyday life. In the Netherlands, a severe housing shortage has led many students to remain in shared flats long after entering the workforce (Uyttebrouck, 2020). The rise of alternative housing models is closely linked to broader structural shifts, including the decline of the European welfare state and the individualization fostered by modern capitalism. One-family households remain the norm in European spatial planning, reinforcing an isolated approach to housing (Jarvis, 2011). Housing policies often fail to account for the political implications of living arrangements, limiting the potential for collective and equitable forms of care work.

Despite growing interest in co-living arrangements as a response to urban housing challenges, research on their social dynamics, particularly in Vienna, remains limited. While studies have examined affordability (eg. Garciano, 2011 and Tummers, 2016), sustainability (Scheller & Thörn, 2019) and architectural design (eg. Jarvis, 2015), the distribution of care work within these communities is often overlooked. Existing research fails to address how gender and capitalist society influence the potential of co-living to foster equitable care practices. Additionally, little is known about the long-term viability of these arrangements as inclusive alternatives to traditional housing models. Addressing these gaps is crucial for assessing the transformative potential of co-living in Vienna's housing landscape.

## Methodology

This study adopts a participatory qualitative research approach to explore the lived experiences of individuals engaged in care work within community-oriented housing models in Vienna. The use of qualitative methods is intentional, as these allow for a deeper understanding of the emotional, relational, and subjective dimensions of care that cannot be adequately captured through quantitative data alone. The research challenges the dominance of data-driven, decontextualized knowledge production in the social sciences and argues for a pluralistic and reflexive methodological landscape that values proximity to participants and context-rich analysis.

To gather data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with two participants recruited through convenience and snowball sampling. While efforts were made to include diverse perspectives in terms of gender, socio-economic background, and living arrangements, full representation was not achievable due to the small scale of the study. The two interviewees live in distinctly different communal housing settings in Vienna: one in a multi-generational household on the outskirts of the city, and the other in a close-knit, urban apartment setting. Both women shared their experiences of how care work is organized and distributed in their daily lives.

The interview design followed a semi-structured format, allowing for flexibility while maintaining a clear alignment with the research questions. An interview guide was carefully developed to move from general, less personal questions toward more emotionally sensitive topics, fostering a trusting environment. Questions were divided into core (Set A) and optional (Set B) groups, which enabled adaptability during the interviews depending on the flow of conversation. Despite time constraints and organizational challenges, the interviews provided rich qualitative data.

For the data analysis, the study initially considered grounded theory but ultimately chose thematic analysis for its suitability in identifying patterns and variations in participants' narratives without the need to construct a new theoretical framework. The interview data was then further examined using Philipp Mayring's qualitative content analysis, following a systematic seven-step model. This included paraphrasing, abstraction, content reduction, category development, and validation against the original transcripts. An inductive approach to category formation was chosen to remain open to emerging themes. The final category

system comprised ten thematic areas: (1) Living arrangement, (2) Definition of care work, (3) Opportunities, (4) Challenges, (5) Task division, (6) Motivation, (7) Societal perceptions, (8) Fairness, (9) Mental load, and (10) Conflict resolution.

Interviews were transcribed following Kuckartz et al.'s transcription guidelines, focusing on clarity and relevance while noting significant non-verbal cues only when analytically meaningful. In this method dialects are standardized unless specific language use is deemed relevant to the study. The transcription process, though time consuming, was essential for ensuring the accuracy and richness of the data.

Instead of the three criteria common in quantitative research, reliability, validity and objectivity, Mayring presents six differentiated and general quality criteria of qualitative research: procedural documentation, argumentative validation of interpretation, regularity, proximity to the subject, communicative validation and triangulation (Mayring, 2016). These were a constant part of my reflective process during my study.

## Findings

The empirical findings of this study are based on a qualitative content analysis of two in-depth interviews with individuals living in community-oriented housing settings in Vienna. Using a mix of deductively and inductively derived analytical categories, the research aimed to uncover the opportunities and challenges in the distribution of care work within these alternative living arrangements.

Although the theoretical foundation of the study is based on the concept of social reproduction, the interviews intentionally employed the more accessible term “care work”, as it better resonated with the participants and focused more directly on interpersonal and household-level practices.

The participants lived in distinct communal housing models. One lives in a multi-generational household with extended family, and the other in a single-family apartment embedded in a network of close friends. These different settings influenced how care work was shared, experienced, and understood. While Participant A's familial ties often led to her acting as a mediator during conflicts, Participant B described a more intentionally chosen setup based on shared values with like-minded peers, resulting in fewer emotional entanglements.

Participants offered personal definitions of care work, highlighting both visible and invisible tasks, including emotional labor, planning, and mental load. A recurring theme was the importance of time—not just as a resource, but as a key component of caregiving itself.

The motivation for communal living also differed. Participant A's arrangement emerged more out of practical considerations and evolved over time, particularly during pregnancy, into a more deliberate sharing of care responsibilities. In contrast, Participant B and her partner intentionally sought a collective model from the beginning, aiming to alleviate the burden of parenting through cooperation with other families.

Both participants reported a conscious effort to divide care work fairly, though this did not mean an exact 50/50 split. Rather, fairness was based on flexibility, communication, and mutual understanding. When imbalances occurred, they were usually addressed through discussion. A central challenge for both was effective communication and both cited time pressure as a persistent source of stress, particularly when unexpected caregiving needs arose.

In terms of mental load, both participants described how certain responsibilities especially planning, coordination, and emotional labor, tended to fall unevenly. In Participant A's case, she handled much of the communication within the extended family network, while her partner took on administrative tasks. For Participant B, coordination across households was limited, with most of the mental workload managed within each nuclear family unit, aside from shared childcare logistics.

Conflict resolution was approached through empathetic, face-to-face communication, with both participants emphasizing emotional awareness and teamwork during disagreements. Strategies included recognizing vulnerable moments (like hunger or fatigue) and focusing on collaboration rather than blame.

Despite the challenges, both participants highlighted the benefits of communal living, particularly the availability of spontaneous support, stronger social ties, and shared parenting experiences. These advantages fostered a sense of resilience and mutual care, especially in everyday situations like childcare emergencies.

Finally, both participants expressed frustration at the lack of societal recognition for care work. Participant A criticized the inadequate support and symbolic value placed on caregiving by state structures, especially in the context of parental leave. Participant B emphasized the need

for intrinsic motivation, acknowledging that external validation especially for women is often lacking.

In summary, the findings reveal that care work in communal settings is complex, emotionally charged, and shaped by both structural and interpersonal dynamics. While such living arrangements offer tangible benefits in terms of support and flexibility, they also demand intentional communication, value alignment, and a willingness to navigate ongoing challenges. The study contributes valuable insights into how care responsibilities are shared and negotiated in alternative housing models, pointing to both their potential and their limitations in creating more equitable care systems.

## Discussion

The findings suggest that the division of care work in alternative housing arrangements is deeply influenced by both practical considerations and the nature of interpersonal relationships. For instance, familial ties can lead to more unequal distributions of care work due to the mental load of caring for family relationships often being carried by those who are closest to the respective family members. This can be connected to the idea that social constructivism is central in understanding care relationships since gender roles are heavily proclaimed. On the other hand, living arrangements that are based on close friendships can allow for more equal divisions of care tasks and a clearer, mutual understanding of responsibilities also because there the same old paths that usually exist in the nuclear family unit cannot be used. Furthermore, participants' emphasis on communication as a tool for managing care tasks highlights the importance of ongoing dialogue in maintaining a balanced 24 workload. These results suggest that alternative living arrangements provide opportunities to challenge the traditional gendered division of care work, but they also reveal the complexities involved in balancing personal relationships and practical responsibilities.

The results of this study matter because they offer insights into how care work is organized in non-traditional living setups, which have been largely underexplored in previous research. The study highlights the potential for community-oriented housing to provide a more equitable framework for care work distribution, particularly in contrast to the conventional family model. By acknowledging the mental load and time commitments associated with care work, the study also contributes to ongoing discussions about gender roles and societal expectations.

While not being the solution to the care crisis we are facing, community-oriented housing can, depending on the way it is utilized, alleviate some of the pressing burden on the shoulders of women\*.

Moreover, the findings underline the need for greater societal recognition as well as the role of policy in encouraging more equitable care arrangements and actively investing in the welfare state. These insights could inform both policy discussions around family and care work and design considerations for future housing projects, particularly those aimed at fostering sustainable and supportive communities. The findings of this study are significant in at least two key aspects. First, based on the insights drawn from my small sample, collective housing arrangements appear to foster a more equitable distribution of care work compared to traditional household structures, particularly in relation to childcare. These forms of cohabitation have the potential to alleviate some of the burden typically shouldered by individual caregivers, especially women, by enabling shared responsibilities and mutual support.

However, the second finding complicates this initial optimism: the reality of collective living is far from straightforward. The effectiveness of shared care arrangements depends heavily on the specific constellation of individuals involved, their willingness and capacity to contribute, and, crucially, the quality of interpersonal communication. No universal formula exists for successful communal care practices; rather, these arrangements must be negotiated and cultivated continuously within each unique social setting. 25 These insights point to several open questions. What do care arrangements look like in other collective forms such as cooperative housing, co-housing initiatives, or intergenerational living models? How are these spaces experienced by different groups, including men, children, and older adults? Future research should engage with a broader spectrum of communal living experiences and adopt an intersectional lens to capture the diversity of perspectives involved. Finally, considering persistent housing inequalities and the ongoing care crisis, there is an urgent need to promote and support alternative living arrangements beyond the one-family household model. Collective living spaces, if adequately resourced and socially supported, could play a vital role in creating more just, sustainable, and resilient care infrastructures.

## **Limitations**

While the study offers valuable insights into care work distribution within community-oriented housing, it also has several limitations. First, the sample size was small, focusing on only two individuals with specific living arrangements, which limits the generalizability of the findings. In terms of diversity the study is severely lacking, because availability and access to interview partners was more difficult than anticipated. Since the study was limited to people living in privately organized systems, it was not possible to assess the situation in larger housing projects that exist in Vienna. The results therefore cannot provide a comprehensive view of care work distribution across all types of community-oriented housing or other socio-cultural contexts. Furthermore, the study did not examine the intersectionality of care work, such as how factors like race, class, or disability might affect the distribution of care tasks. The focus was also primarily on the lived experiences of the participants, without considering how larger social structures, policies, and economic conditions may shape the division of care work. Therefore, these results do not offer a full picture of the broader structural forces at play in the organization of care.

## Conclusion

By building on the work of thinkers like Bhattacharya, Fraser, Federici, and Dowling, I have shown how social reproduction is not just about the maintenance of life but is deeply entangled with global systems of capitalism, patriarchy, colonialism, and racialized inequalities. Understanding care work through the lens of social reproduction enables a broader, more critical view of the systemic contradictions between life-making and profit-making, and how these tensions manifest in everyday practices, policies, and spaces: especially the home.

The empirical findings illuminate the complex and multifaceted nature of care work within community-oriented housing arrangements. By drawing on participants' lived experiences, the study reveals how care responsibilities are not only distributed according to practical needs but also embedded in emotional, social, and often gendered relationships. The flexible and informal structures of these alternative living arrangements offer space for creative approaches to care, where responsibilities are shared based on trust, mutual understanding, and adaptability rather than strict planning or formal agreements. At the same time, the findings highlight the persistent challenges that accompany such models, especially around communication, time constraints, and the balancing of personal and collective needs. Mental

load and emotional labor emerge as central, though often invisible, aspects of care work, reinforcing the importance of recognizing these contributions both within and beyond the household. While participants generally perceived their arrangements as fair and supportive, they also acknowledged the continuous effort required to maintain balance and address emerging tensions.

Crucially, these insights demonstrate that communal housing can indeed foster more equitable and sustainable care practices, but only under conditions where open communication, shared values, and flexibility are actively subscribed to. They also point to the limitations of relying solely on informal systems of care, especially in the absence of broader societal recognition and support. These findings underscore the need to not only rethink how care is organized at the household level but also to challenge the systemic undervaluation of care work more broadly.

This research has deepened my belief that reproductive labour is not peripheral but central to how our societies function and that it should therefore experience higher levels of recognition. As the care crisis spreads across Europe and the world in total, it is crucial to question who carries the costs and how care is organised, distributed, and valued. Future research should center the voices of more diverse individuals who can report on the racialized and gendered practices of care as well as explore solidarities across borders, and push for policy alternatives that treat care not as a private burden, but as a collective and shared responsibility

## Literature

Bhattacharya, T. (2017). *Social reproduction theory: Remapping class, recentering oppression*. Edited by Tithi Bhattacharya, Pluto Press, 2017

Bund, Kerstin, et al. "Interview: „Das Einfamilienhaus ist eine sexistische Wohnform“" *Süddeutsche.de*, 23 Dec. 2024, <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/projekte/artikel/wirtschaft/immobilien-wohnen-hauseinfamilienhaus-e423295/>.

Dowling, E. (2016). Valorised but not valued? Affective remuneration, social reproduction and feminist politics beyond the crisis. *British Politics*, 11, 452-468.

Dowling, E. (2018). Confronting capital's care fix: Care through the lens of democracy. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 37(4), 332-346.

Federici, S. (2019). Women, Reproduction, and the Commons. *South Atlantic Quarterly*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-7825564>

Federici, S. (2020). *Revolution at point zero: Housework, reproduction, and feminist struggle*. PM Press

Fraser, N. (2016). Contradictions of capital and care. *New Left Review*, vol. 100, no. 99, manchesteropenhive.com, 1 Aug. 2016, p. 117. 31

Folbre, N. (2001). The care penalty. *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*. New York, NY: New Press: Distributed by WW Norton.

Garciano, J. L. (2011). Affordable cohousing: Challenges and opportunities for supportive relational networks in mixed-income housing. *Journal of affordable housing & community development law*, 169- 192.

Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (2003). *Families that Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Jarvis, H. (2011). Saving space, sharing time: integrated infrastructures of daily life in cohousing. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(3), 560-577.

Jarvis, H. (2015). Towards a deeper understanding of the social architecture of co-housing: evidence from the UK, USA and Australia. *Urban research & practice*, 8(1), 93-105.

Kilkey, M., & Bradshaw, J. (1999). 'Lone Mothers, Economic Well-Being, and Policies.' In D. Sainsbury (Ed.), *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuckartz, U., Dresing, T., Rädiker, S., & Stefer, C. (2008). Qualitative Evaluation in sieben Schritten. *Qualitative Evaluation: Der Einstieg in die Praxis*, 15-57.

Leira, A. (1992). *Welfare states and working mothers: The Scandinavian experience*. Cambridge University Press.

Maalsen, S. (2019). I cannot afford to live alone in this city and I enjoy the company of others: Why people are share housing in Sydney. *Australian Geographer*, 50, 315–332.

Mayring, P. (1991). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse* (pp. 209-213). Beltz-Psychologie Verl. Union.

Mayring, P. (2016). *Einführung in die qualitative Sozialforschung: Eine Anleitung zu qualitativem Denken* (6., überarbeitete Auflage). Beltz.

Mezzadri, A., (she/her), Rai, S. M., (she/her), Stevano, S., (she/her), Alessandrini, D., (she/her), Bargawi, H., (she/her), Elias, J., (she/her), ... Wöhl, S., (she/her). (2025). Pluralizing social reproduction approaches. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 27(1), 6–33.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2024.2447594>

Parreñas, R. S. (2001). Mothering from a distance: Emotions, gender, and intergenerational relations in Filipino transnational families. *Feminist studies*, 27(2), 361-390.

Sangregorio, I. L. (2010). Collaborative housing from a woman's perspective. *Living Together: Cohousing Experiences around the World*, 114-124.

Scheller, D., & Thörn, H. (2019). Autonomy vs. government: Consequences for sustainability in co-housing. In *Contemporary Co-housing in Europe* (pp. 97-119). Routledge.

Tummers, L. (2016). The re-emergence of self-managed co-housing in Europe: A critical review of cohousing research. *Urban Studies*, 53(10), 2023-2040.

Uyttebrouck, C., Van Bueren, E., & Teller, J. (2020). Shared housing for students and young professionals: evolution of a market in need of regulation. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 35(4), 1017-1035.

Vestbro, D. U. (Ed.). (2010). *Living together-cohousing ideas and realities around the world: proceedings from the International Collaborative Housing Conference in Stockholm 5-9 May 2010*. Copenhagen: Division of Urban and Regional Studies, Royal Institute of Technology in collaboration with Kollektivhus NU.