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ARLIE RUSSELL HOCHSCHILD

Arlie Russell Hochschild (b. 1940) is Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. Her interest in the impact of contemporary capitalism on everyday life is reflected in the titles of her most recent books: The Commercialization of Intimate Life: Notes from Home and Work (in which the essay below appears), The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work, and The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home. Her ability to communicate with both general and scholarly audiences has been recognized by the American Sociological Association with its Award for Public Understanding of Sociology.

For more information on Hochschild and her work, see <http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/hochschild>.

WHAT DO YOU KNOW? WHAT DO YOU EXPECT TO DISCOVER?

Before reading the essay, take a moment to consider the following questions.

1. What topics does Hochschild’s biography suggest that she is interested in? What do you know about these topics? Knowledge can come from personal experience, stories you’ve heard, other classes you’ve taken, or other reading you’ve done.

2. What does her title lead you to expect from this essay? What might the “Frying Pan” signify as a metaphor? Likewise, what might the “Fire” signify as a metaphor? Looking up and comparing the definitions of these words can help you make connections.

3. Hochschild analyzes how aspects of our jobs have reshaped aspects of our lives at home. If you have a job or have had one, think about how the job may structure one or more aspects of your life away from work. Aside from the making of money, how might one’s job revise or reshape one’s life at home?
From the Frying Pan into the Fire

An advertisement for Quaker Oats cereal in an issue of Working Mother magazine provides a small window on the interplay between consumption and the application of the idea of efficiency to private time in modern America. In the ad, a mother, dressed in a business suit, affectionately hugs her smiling son. Beneath the image, we read: "Instant Quaker Oatmeal, for moms who have a lot of love but not a lot of time." The ad continues with a short story: "Nicky is a very picky eater. With Instant Quaker Oatmeal, I can give him a terrific hot breakfast in just 90 seconds. And I don’t have to spend any time coaxing him to eat it!"

The ad then presents "facts" about mother and child: "Sherry Greenberg, with Nicky, age four and a half, Hometown: New York City, New York, Occupation: Music teacher, Favorite Flavor: Apples and Cinnamon." The designers of this ad, we could imagine, want us to feel we’ve been let in on an ordinary moment in a middle-class American morning. In this ordinary moment, Sherry Greenberg is living according to a closely scheduled, rapidly paced "adult" time, while Nicky is living according to a more dawdling, slowly paced "child" time. So the mother faces a dilemma. To meet her work deadline, she must get Nicky on "adult" time. But to be a good mother it is desirable to give her child a hot breakfast—"hot" being associated with devotion and love. To cook the hot breakfast, though, Sherry needs time. The ad suggests that it is the cereal itself that solves the problem. It conveys love because it is hot, but it permits efficiency because it’s quickly made. The cereal would seem to reconcile an image of American motherhood of the 1950s with the female work role of 2000 and beyond.

The cereal also allows Sherry to avoid the unpleasant task of struggling with her child over scarce time. In the ad, Nicky’s slow pace is implicitly attributed to his character ("Nicky is a very picky eater") and not to the fact that he is being harnessed to an accelerating pace of adult work time or protesting an adult speed-up by staging a "slowdown." By permitting the mother to avoid a fight with her son over time, the ad brilliantly evokes a common problem and proposes a commodity as a solution.

Attached to the culture of time shown in the ad is a key but hidden social logic. This modern working mother is portrayed as resembling Frederick Taylor, the famed efficiency expert of modern industry. The principle of efficiency is not located, here, at work in
the person of the owner, the foreman, or the worker. It is located in
the worker-as-mother. We do not see a boss pressing the worker for
more efficiency at the office. Instead, we see a mother pressing her
son to eat more efficiently at home. This efficiency-seeking is trans-
ferred from man to woman, from workplace to home, and from
adult to child. Nicky becomes his own task master, quickly gobbling
his breakfast himself because it is so delicious. Frederick Taylor has
leapt the fence from factory to home, adult to child, and jumped, it
seems, into the cereal box itself. Frederick Taylor has become a
commodity. It provides efficiency. Thus, the market reinforces the
idea of efficiency twice—once at a locus of production, where the
worker is pressed to work efficiently, and again, as a supplier of
consumer goods, where it promises to deliver the very efficiency it
also demands.

Quaker Oats cereal may be a paradigm for a growing variety of
goods and services—frozen dinners, computer shopping services, cell
phones,2 and the like—that claim to save time for busy working par-
ents. They often save time at home. But the ethic of “saving time”
raises the question of what we want to save time for.3 In the case
above, the photo of the happy mother and child suggests that the
mother is rushing her son through breakfast, not to race out to an all-
absorbing job at a dot-com company, but to teach a few piano
lessons. The picture doesn’t challenge our idea of the primacy, even
sacredness, of Nicky’s home. So we don’t much notice the sly insinua-
tion of Frederick Taylor into the scene.

Conventional Versus Unconventional Wisdom

If, through modern Western eyes, the Greenbergs of this ad were a
normal family, we could imagine them feeling that family life super-
seded all other aspects of life. That is, according to modern conven-
tional wisdom, a happy family life is an end in itself. Earning and
spending money are the means for achieving this end. Home and
community are primary; workplace and mall are secondary. When we
go out to work, it’s to put bread on the table for the family. When we
shop at the mall, it’s often to buy a Christmas, birthday, or house pre-
sent “for the family.” Put in other terms, we often see the home and
the community as sacred, and the workplace and the mall as profane.
We are who we are at home and in our communities. We do what we
do at work and buy what we buy at the mall.

To be sure, we make exceptions for the odd workaholic here or
shopaholic there, but, as the terms imply, an overconcern with the
profane realms of work and mall are, given this way of seeing things,
off moral limits. Sherry Greenberg fits right in. She is in her kitchen
feeding her son. She has what one imagines to be a manageable job.
It’s just that she’s wanting to hurry things along a bit.
Implicit in this conventional view of family life is the idea that our use of time is like a language. We speak through it. By either what we say we want to spend time doing or what we actually spend time doing, we say what it is we hold sacred. Maybe we don’t think of it just this way, but we assume that each “spending time” or each statement of feeling about time (“I wish I could spend time”) is a bow from the waist to what we hold dear. It is a form of worship. Again, Sherry Greenberg is symbolizing the importance of family. It’s just that she’s slightly on the edge of that conventional picture because she’s in a hurry to get out of it. The Quaker Oats ad both appeals to this family-comes-first picture of life and subtly challenges it, by taking sides with her desire to feed Nicky “efficiently.”

The subtle challenge of the ad points, I believe, to a larger contradiction underlying stories like that of the Greenbergs. Reflecting on my research on the Fortune 500 company I call Amerco, I’ll try to explore it. Increasingly, our belief that family comes first conflicts with the emotional draw of both workplace and mall. Indeed, I would argue that a constellation of pressures is pushing men and women further into the world of workplace and mall. And television—a pipeline, after all, to the mall—is keeping them there. Family and community life have meanwhile become less central as places to talk and relate, and less the object of collective rituals.

Many of us respond to these twin trends, however, not by turning away from family and community, but by actually elevating them in moral importance. Family and community are not a realm in decline, as David Popneoe argues about the family and Robert Putnam argues for the community. To many people, both have become even more important morally. We encapsulate the idea of the cherished family. We separate idea from practice. We separate the idea of “spending time with X” from the idea of “believing in the importance of X.” We don’t link what we think with what we do. Or as one Amerco employee put it, using company language, “I don’t walk the talk at home.” This encapsulation of our family ideal allows us to accommodate to what is both a pragmatic necessity and a competing source of meaning—the religion of capitalism. I say pragmatic necessity, because most Americans, men and women alike, have to work for food and rent.

At the same time, a new cultural story is unfolding. It is not that capitalism is an unambiguous object of worship. After all, American capitalism is, in reality, a highly complex, internally diverse economic system for making, advertising, and selling things. But, without overstating the case, it seems true that capitalism is a cultural as well as an economic system and that the symbols and rituals of this cultural system compete with, however much they seem to serve, the symbols and rituals of community and family. This means that working long hours and spending a lot of money—instead of spending time together—have increasingly become how we say “I love you” at home. As Juliet Schor
argues in *The Overspent American*, over the last twenty years, Americans have raised the bar on what feels like enough money to get along. In 1975, according to a Roper poll, 10 percent of people mentioned a second color TV as part of “the good life,” and 28 percent did in 1991. A 1995 Merck Family Fund poll showed that 27 percent of people who earned $100,000 or more agreed with the statement, “I cannot afford to buy everything I really need.” At the same time, between 1975 and 1991, the role of family in people’s idea of “the good life” declined while the importance of having money increased. The importance of having a happy marriage to “the good life” declined from 84 percent in 1975 to 77 percent in 1991. Meanwhile having “a lot of money” went from 38 percent in 1975 to 55 percent in 1991.5

How much of a stretch is it, I wonder, to go from the trends Schor points out to Harvey Cox’s daring thesis: that capitalism has become a religion? As Cox puts it:

> just as a truly global market has emerged for the first time in human history, that market is functioning without moral guideposts and restraints, and it has become the most powerful institution of our age. Even nation-states can often do little to restrain or regulate it. More and more, the idea of “the market” is construed, not as a creation of culture (“made by human hands,” as the Bible says about idols), but as the “natural” way things happen. For this reason, the “religion” the market generates often escapes criticism and evaluation or even notice. It becomes as invisible to those who live by it as was the religion of the preliterate Australians whom Durkheim studied, who described it as just “the way things are.”6

Capitalism has, Cox suggests, its myth of origin, its legends of the fall, its doctrine of sin and redemption, its notion of sacrifice (stare belt-tightening), and its hope of salvation through the free market system. Indeed, if in the Middle Ages the church provided people with a basic orientation to life, the multinational corporation’s workplace, with its “mission statements,” its urgent deadlines, its demands for peak performance and total quality, does so today. Paradoxically, what would seem like the most secular of systems (capitalism), organized around the most profane of activities (making a living, shopping), provides a sense of the sacred. So what began as a means to an end—capitalism the means, a good living as the end—has become an end itself. It’s a case of mission drift writ large. The cathedrals of capitalism dominate our cities. Its ideology dominates our airwaves. It calls for sacrifice, through long hours of work, and offers its blessings, through commodities. When the terrorists struck the twin towers on 9/11, they were, perhaps, aiming at what they conceived of as a more powerful rival temple, another religion. Heartless as they were, they were correct to see capitalism, and the twin towers as its symbol, as a serious rival religion.
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Like older religions, capitalism partly creates the anxieties to which it poses itself as a necessary answer. Like the fire-and-brimstone sermon that begins with “Man, the lowly sinner,” and ends with “Only this church can redeem you,” so the market ethos defines the poor or unemployed as “unworthy slackers” and offers work and a higher standard of living as a form of salvation. Capitalism is not, then, simply a system in the service of family and community; it competes with the family. When we separate our fantasy of family life, our ideas of being a “good mother and father” from our daily expressions of parenthood, our ideals live independently of what we worship at the biggest altar in town, with ten-hour days and long trips to the mall.

A constellation of forces seems to be pressing in the direction of the religion of capitalism. And while no one wants to go back to the “frying pan” of patriarchy, we need to look sharp about the fire of market individualism under capitalism. It is in the spirit of looking at that fire that we can examine several conditions that exacerbate the tendency to apply the principle of efficiency to private life.

The first factor is the inevitable—and on the whole I think beneficial—movement of women into the paid workforce.7 Exacerbating this squeeze on time is the overall absence of government or workplace policies that foster the use of parental leave or shorter, more flexible hours. Over the last twenty years, workers have also been squeezed by a lengthening workweek. According to a recent International Labor Organization report on working hours, Americans are putting in longer hours than workers of any other industrialized nation. We now work two weeks longer each year than our counterparts in Japan, the vaunted long-work-hour capital of the world.8 American married couples and single-parent families are also putting in more hours in the day and more weeks in the year than they did thirty years ago. Counting overtime and commuting time, a 1992 national sample of men averaged 48.8 hours of work, and women, 41.7.9 Work patterns vary by social class, ethnicity, race, and the number and ages of children, of course. But, overall, between 1969 and 1996 the increase in American mothers’ paid work combined with a shift toward single-parent families has led to an average decrease of 22 hours a week of parental time available (outside of paid work) to spend with children.10 And the emotional draw of a work culture is sometimes strong enough to outcompete a weaker family culture.

The Other Side of the Market Religion: Not Walking the Talk at Home

If capitalism began as a means but became an end in itself, then families and local communities must daily face a competing urgency system and a rival conception of time. Company deadlines compete with school plays. Holiday sales at the mall vie with hanging out at home.
The company’s schedule and rules have come, for workers, to define those of families. For the managers and production workers at Amerco, the company I studied for the *Time Bind*, the debut of a certain kind of product and its “product life cycle” came to prevail over personal anniversaries and school holidays. When family events did take precedence, they did so on company terms. As one woman explained, “My mother died and I went back to arrange for the funeral and all. I went for four days. The company gives us that for bereavement, and so that’s the time I spent.” In the early industrial period in Europe, whole workforces disappeared at festival time, or workers put an iron bar in the machinery, stopped the assembly line, and took a break. Company time did not always rule.

In response to the challenge of this competing urgency system, I’ve argued, many families separate their ideal of themselves as “a close family” from a life that in reality is more hurried, fragmented, crowded, and individualized than they would like. They develop the idea of a hypothetical family, the family they would be if only they had time. And then they deal with life in a contrary fashion.

Many Amerco employees came home from a long workday to fit many necessary activities into a limited amount of time. Although there were important exceptions, many workers tried to go through domestic chores rapidly if for no other reason than to clear some space in which to go slowly. They used many strategies to save time—they planned, delegated, did several things simultaneously. They packed one activity close up against the next, eliminating the framing around each event, periods of looking forward to or back upon an event, which might have heightened its emotional impact. A 2:00 to 2:45 play date, 2:45 to 3:15 shopping trip, 3:15 to 4:45 visit to Grandma, and so on. As one mother, a sales manager, said with satisfaction, “What makes me a good employee at work is what makes me able to do all I do at home; I’m a multitasker, but [with a laugh] at work I get paid for it.”

With all these activities, family time could be called “hurried” or “crowded.” But in fact many working parents took a sporting “have fun” attitude toward their hurried lives: “Let’s see how fast we can do this! Come on, kids, let’s go!” They brought their image of the family closer to the reality of it by saying, in effect, “We like it this way.” They saw hassle as challenge. In other families, parents seemed to encourage children to develop schedules parallel to and as hectic as their own. For example, the average annual vacation time both at Amerco—and in the United States as a whole—is twelve days, while schoolchildren typically have summer holidays of three months. So one Amerco mother placed her eight-year-old son in a nearby summer program and explained to him, in a you’re-going-to-love-this way, “You have your job to go to, too.” She talked about her schedule as she might have talked about a strenuous hike. She was having fun roughing it with multitasking and chopped-up time.
Another way of resolving the contradiction between ideal and reality was to critique the fun ethic and say, in effect, "Family life isn't supposed to be fun. It's supposed to be a hassle, but we're in the hassle together, and why isn't that okay?" This often carried families over long stretches of time, but it prevented family members from giving full attention to each other. Time was hurried (not enough time allotted for an activity—15-minute baths, 20-minute dinners, for example). Or time was crowded (one or more people were doing more than one thing at a time). Or it was uncoordinated. Only two out of four people could make it to dinner, the ball game, the reunion. If there was not some chronic avoidance of a deep tension, families usually also took another approach. They deferred having a good time. Instead of saying, "This hassle is fun," they said, in effect, "This hassle isn't fun. But we'll have fun later." They waited for the weekend, for their vacation, for "quality time."

But the more a family deferred the chance for relaxed communication, the more anxious they sometimes became about it. One man told me: "My wife and I hadn't had time together for a long time, so we decided to take some 'marital quality time' by going out to a restaurant to eat dinner together. We had a nice dinner and afterwards went for a walk. We passed a toy store and my wife wanted to shop for a toy for our child. But I told her, 'No, you have a different quality time with our child. This is our quality time.' So we spent the rest of the evening arguing about whose quality time it was we were spending."

Another long-hours Amerco executive seemed to take this strategy of deferral to an extreme. When I asked him whether he wished he'd spent more time with his three daughters when they were growing up, he answered, "Put it this way, I'm pleased with how they turned out." This father loved his daughters, but he loved them as results. Or rather, his feeling was "I want my wife to enjoy the process of raising them. I'll enjoy that vicariously. What I will enjoy directly is the result, the young adults." So he didn't think family life should or shouldn't be fun while the kids were small and adolescent. That was his wife's specialty. He was deferring his real enjoyment until his daughters had grown up. Even Amerco parents who spent far more time with their children occasionally justified this time in terms of future results. They were pleased at how "old for their age" their children were, how "ahead," given a limited expenditure of parental time. Perhaps, most parents held a double perspective on their children—they cared about the child as he or she was growing up and about the child as he or she emerged in adulthood. Most oriented toward the family as a source of intrinsic pleasure were women and workers in the middle or lower ranks of the company; least oriented in this way were upper management or professional men—the congregation and the priests.
From the top to the bottom of the Amerco workforce, workers were forced to answer the challenge of capitalism—not simply as a system that gave them jobs, money, and stuff, but as a system that offered them a sense of purpose and guidance in a confusing time. They had to deal with the religion of capitalism, its grip on honor and sense of worth, its subtraction from—or absorption of—family and community life. We've emerged from an era in which most women had little or no paid work to a era in which most do. Are women jumping from the frying pan of patriarchy into the fire of capitalism? Just as the early industrial workforces took off at festival time, because they were not yet "disciplined" to capitalism, maybe postindustrial ones will work out their own way of living a balanced life. There could be a balance not just between the role of piano teacher, say, and mother, but between the unpaid world of home and community and the money world of work and mall. That may be the deeper issue underlying the ad for Quaker Oats cereal. For, our cultural soil is surreptitiously prepared for ads, like that for Quaker Oats cereal, that make you spend time buying one more thing that promises to save time—which increasingly we spend earning and buying.

Notes

This essay, which has been substantially revised, takes as its starting point "Globalization, Time, and the Family," first published in German by the Institut für die Wissenschaften von Menchen, Vienna, 1998, and included in Am Ende des Millenniums, edited by Krzysztof Michalski (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2000), pp. 180–203.


2. Cell phones, home fax machines, car dictating machines, and similar gadgets are marketed, purchased, and used on the premise that these machines, like the cereal, will "save time"—so that the consumer can then enjoy more leisure. In practice, though, such technology often becomes a delivery system for pressure to do more paid work. Along with new technology come new norms. Electronic mail, for example, once hailed as a way of "saving time" has escalated expectations shortening the period of time one has before one is considered rude or inattentive not to reply.

3. Among affluent Americans, time-saving goods and services also force parents to define parenthood less in terms of production and more in terms of consumption. For example, a "good mother" in the American middle class is often seen as one who prepares her child's birthday, bakes the cake, blows up the balloons, invites her child's friends to a party. Increasingly, the busy working mother is tempted to buy the cake; in addition, new birthday services are available in American cities to help organize the party; send out the invitations, buy the gifts, blow up the balloons, and set up the food. The definition of a "good mother" moves from production to
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consumption. The "good mother" is now one who enjoys the party with the child. The gift is one of derationalized time.
7. Some commentators blame women's movement into paid work for the strains experienced at home—including the high divorce rate. But I would argue that it is not women's paid work per se, but work in the absence of the necessary social adjustments in the structure of care—male sharing of care at home, family-friendly workplace policies, and social honor associated with care—that make the difference.
10. "Families and the Labor Market, 1969–1999: Analyzing the Time Crunch." May 1999, Report by the Council of Economic Advisors, Washington, D.C. Also a 2000 report found that 46 percent of workers work 41 hours or longer, 18 percent of them 51 hours or longer (see Center for Survey Research and Analysis, University of Connecticut, "2000 Report on U.S. Working Time"). Another recent study found that elementary school teachers—those in what is often thought to be a "woman's" job—reported working ten-hour days (see Drago, Robert, et al. 1999 "New Estimates of Working Time for Teachers." Monthly Labor Review 122 (April): 31–41). Less time away from work means less time for children. Nationwide, half of children wish they could see their fathers more, and a third wish they could see their mothers more.
READING, REREADING, AND ANALYSIS

1. How do you "save time" in your life? What do you save it for?

2. What terms or ideas seem most important to Hochschild? What, for instance, is Taylorization? And what does Hochschild mean by "the religion of capitalism" (p. 217)?

3. Bring an advertisement to class that either shows the symbolic power of efficiency (speaks to the culture of time) or shows how capitalism serves as a religion.

4. Individually or in a group, make a list of positive qualities associated with the Instant Quaker Oatmeal advertisement Hochschild discusses. Also make a list of the criticisms of the advertisement that Hochschild suggests. Is her discussion of the ad an effective way to begin her essay? Why or why not? Is she reading "too much" into the ad? What are your favorite parts of her analysis of the ad and what questions might you like to ask her about her analysis of the ad?

5. What does Hochschild mean on page 217 when she says,

   It is not that capitalism is an unambiguous object of worship. After all, American capitalism is, in reality, a highly complex, internally diverse economic system for making, advertising, and selling things. But, without overstating the case, it seems true that capitalism is a cultural as well as an economic system and that the symbols and rituals of this cultural system compete with, however much they seem to serve, the symbols and rituals of community and family.

6. In a group, discuss Hochschild's contrast between the "frying pan' of patriarchy" and the "fire of market individualism under capitalism" (p. 219). Compare your findings with each group member's initial response to Hochschild's title. How did your expectations square with your reading of the essay?

RESPONDING THROUGH WRITING:
BUILDING AN INTERPRETATION

7. In four or five sentences, summarize Hochschild's analysis of the "movement of women into the paid workforce." Next, in a short essay (one or two pages), discuss connections you see between your summary and Hochschild's analysis of "Sherry Greenberg" in the Instant Quaker Oats ad.
8. Using the ad you brought in for question 3, write an analysis of the ad that models or parallels Hochschild’s approach in her analysis of the instant Quaker Oats ad. Next, write an analysis of your ad that does not mirror Hochschild’s approach. Finally, write a short essay (two or three pages) in which you compare your first analysis with your second. What are the key differences of emphasis and of approach?

9. How does the drive for efficiency affect your home or dorm life? Similarly, how does it affect your approaches to your university studies? Write an essay in which you reflect on relationships between efficiency and learning in college. In your essay, you might explore some of the following questions: Is your learning efficient? Is it supposed to be efficient? Might there be an argument that models of efficiency could be counterproductive to learning?

10. Write a short paper in which you test one of Hochschild’s premises: that increasingly the local shopping mall provides for many people a “a sense of the sacred” as a site of “symbols and rituals.”

GOING FURTHER: LEARNING FROM OTHER SOURCES

11. Use an encyclopedia or search a reference database to find out more about Frederick Taylor. How or why is Taylor celebrated, and how or why is he criticized? Do you see any connections between Taylor’s theories of efficiency and writing instruction? If so, what are the connections? If not, do you think it would be a good idea to emphasize efficiency in your composition classes? Why or why not?

12. Use a search engine such as Google or AltaVista to make the following search: “capitalism and religion.” Of the sources you find, which ones interest you the most and why? Make a list of the most common connections you find in the sources you read (examine at least six sources). In a group, compare your findings with those of your peers.

APPLYING WHAT YOU’VE LEARNED

13. In “The Lost Art of Argument,” Christopher Lasch says we are publicly unaware of so many issues not because schools are failing to teach students but because we have forsaken public debate and left important public decisions to be settled efficiently by so-called experts. Use Hochschild’s discussion of efficiency to help
you analyze Lasch's analysis of the redefining of democracy in the early twentieth century by advocates of professionalism such as Walter Lippmann.

14. Compare Hochschild's analysis of advertising—for example, how a commodity such as Instant Quaker Oats can be marketed as a "solution" to a "common problem"—with Stuart Ewen's discussion of advertising, particularly of product novelty versus style obsolescence, in "The Marriage Between Art and Commerce." Think about how perspectives on the issue of desire appear in both Hochschild's and Ewen's analyses. How is the topic of desire central to Hochschild's as well as to Ewen's argument, and what differences do you see in their analyses of desire?

15. Use Sven Birkerts's discussion of "vertical" versus "horizontal" engagement with texts to help you analyze Hochschild's discussion of efficiency and the refiguration of the sacred, home and community, on the one hand, and of the profane, work and shopping, on the other hand. In your analysis, you might also consider the following questions: What is the wisdom of efficiency? How does Birkerts's discussion of "resonance" relate or not relate to Hochschild's discussion of the "religion of capitalism"?