

Document name: Source 4: Adrian Bingham, 'An era of domesticity?'  
Document date: 2004  
Copyright information: Proprietary and used under license  
OpenLearn Study Unit: Roaring Twenties? Europe in the interwar period  
OpenLearn url: <http://www.open.edu/openlearn/roaring-twenties-europe-the-interwar-period/content-section-0>

---



## Source 4

**Adrian Bingham (2004) ““An era of domesticity””? Histories of women and gender in interwar Britain’, *Cultural and Social History*, vol. 1, pp. 225–33.**

During the 1980s and early 1990s, historians researching women and gender in interwar Britain reached a broad consensus that an earlier generation of writers had exaggerated the ‘emancipating’ effects of the First World War, and that the acquisition of the vote and the various legal reforms in the decade after 1918 did not fundamentally transform the position of women. Although some women had relished being let ‘out of the cage’ during the war, their gains were ‘for the duration only’, and once the conflict was over they were unceremoniously sent ‘back to home and duty’. A postwar ‘backlash’ meant that traditional gender dichotomies were re-established, and an ethos of ‘domesticity’ pervaded popular culture. The women’s movement – divided about its future direction now that the franchise had been (at least partially) achieved – splintered, and was unable to recapture mass support or to challenge effectively the conservative gender discourses that were becoming dominant. Historians such as Susan Kent, indeed, went so far as to claim that the so-called ‘new’ feminists of the 1920s and 1930s were actually guilty of reinforcing this conservatism. Although there were some dissenting voices, the characterization of these decades as a time of reaction and ‘domesticity’ remained widely accepted well into the 1990s.

In the last few years, however, there have been signs that this consensus is under threat. The standard interpretation is being challenged from three directions. Firstly, the effectiveness of the interwar women’s movement has been reassessed, with Cheryl Law, Maggie Andrews and Caitriona Beaumont all demonstrating the variety and vigour of women’s organizations campaigning for reform. Secondly, books and articles by Birgitte Soland, Claire Langhamer, Catherine Horwood and Ina Zweiniger-Bargielowska have, in various ways, highlighted the significance of changes in the social opportunities, leisure activities and dress codes of the young women of this period. Thirdly, my own research brings into question the common assumption that the mainstream media were hostile to single women and ‘modernity’ and that they ‘imposed’ regressive gender notions on society. These works are all very different, and certainly do not advance a single, agreed interpretation of the period. They do all suggest, however, that some rethinking needs to be done. The purpose of this article is briefly to review the implications of some of this recent literature, and to argue that although there was certainly no revolution in gender relations during the interwar era, the ‘backlash’ model employed in many histories inhibits a proper understanding of those changes that did occur at this time.

The explosion of women’s history in the 1970s and 1980s, informed by a feminist awareness of how far women still were from achieving equality with men, ensured that the claims of historians such as Arthur Marwick and David Mitchell that the ‘Great War’ had brought an important measure of

female ‘emancipation’ would be subjected to critical scrutiny.<sup>1</sup> Gail Braybon’s influential study *Women Workers in the First World War* in 1981 set the tone for the histories written in the following decade. The book documented in great detail ‘the remarkable consistency of male attitudes towards women’s work’ and argued that the war served only to deepen hostility to women moving out of the domestic sphere. There was ‘a definite post-war backlash’ which meant that by January 1919 ‘all the pretence of approval for women’s “new role” was abandoned’. This ‘backlash’ was reinforced by the restrictive employment and benefit policies of postwar governments, and the output of a media industry keen to reassert traditional gender roles. Braybon observed that ‘the 1920s saw much propaganda about the joys of domesticity and the role of the housewife’, especially in the flurry of new women’s magazines.<sup>2</sup> In 1987 the notion of a ‘gender backlash’ was given further conceptual depth and applied more broadly in *Behind the Lines*, a collection edited by Margaret Higonnet and her collaborators, which identified common European patterns of superficial advance and postwar retreat during and after both world wars. The metaphor of the ‘double helix’ was invoked to capture this ‘paradoxical’ process of ‘progress and regress’ whereby changes in women’s position are always matched by those of men, and ‘relationships of domination and subordination are retained through discourses that systematically designate unequal gender relationships’. In particular, ‘post-war notions of femininity in propaganda and the popular media were restrictive and frustrating’.<sup>3</sup> When Deirdre Beddoe published the first general history of British women between the wars two years later, she reaffirmed the ‘anti-progressive and reactionary character’ of the period. The climate of opinion was ‘anti-feminist’, she argued, and there was ‘a general tendency to ridicule or at best pity single women’. Once again, the media were accused of being responsible for organizing and sustaining the ‘backlash’:

In the inter-war years only one desirable image was held up to women by all mainstream media agencies – that of housewife and mother. This single role model was presented to women to follow and all other alternative roles were presented as wholly undesirable. Realising this central fact is the key to understanding every other aspect of women’s lives in Britain in the 1920s and 1930s.<sup>4</sup>

Works by Harold Smith, Martin Pugh and Susan Kent in the following years argued that the women’s movement was unable to counter the prevailing atmosphere of domesticity, and obtained wider support only for welfare or

<sup>1</sup> A. Marwick, *The Deluge: British Society and the First World War* (Bodley Head, London, 1965), chapters 3 and 9; D. Mitchell, *Women on the Warpath* (Jonathan Cape, London, 1966).

<sup>2</sup> G. Braybon, *Women Workers in the First World War* (Croom Helm, London 1981) pp. 11, 170, 220.

<sup>3</sup> M. Higonnet et al. (eds), *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars* (Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1987) pp. 5, 13.

<sup>4</sup> D. Beddoe, *Back to Home and Duty: Women between the Wars, 1918–1939* (Pandora, London, 1989) p. 8.

legal reforms which were connected to, and thus reinforced, women's position as wife and mother.<sup>5</sup>

It is easy to understand why historians focusing on the arenas of politics and employment painted a gloomy picture of women's progress in these years. Although women became a majority of the electorate in 1928, the number of female MPs in the House of Commons at any one time did not rise above 15 before 1945, and several studies demonstrated how men in the established political parties were repeatedly able to sideline issues of concern to their female members. The Restoration of Pre-War Practices Act (1919) and the widespread adoption of the marriage bar in both the public and private sectors ensured that wartime hopes of a transformation of female job opportunities were not realized, and although the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act of 1919 opened up several professions and public positions to women, it by no means ended discrimination at the workplace. Nevertheless, some historians examining other aspects of social activity, especially leisure and sexuality, reached rather different conclusions, and characterized the interwar period as a 'modern era' of changing expectations and wider opportunities for young women. Sally Alexander and Carl Chinn both explored how cinema and the consumer society were altering the aspirations of women growing up at this time. Although they did not seek to avoid marriage and motherhood, the women in their studies were determined that their lives should not simply mirror those of their mothers, and they resolved to have fewer children.<sup>6</sup> Such reductions in family size were increasingly possible because of the growing frankness in public discourse on the subjects of sex and birth control, typified by the success of Marie Stopes's advice manuals *Married Love* and *Wise Parenthood* (1918).<sup>7</sup> (Others claimed that this freer discussion of married, heterosexual sexuality came at the price of a greater hostility to lesbianism.)<sup>8</sup> Perhaps the most forceful questioning of the 'gender backlash' model came from Alison Light in 1991. Although she too put the home and private life at the heart of her study, this 'was not the same old private life'; on the contrary, she argued that there was a conspicuous reaction to several aspects of Victorian and Edwardian femininity, and that these years marked 'for many women their entry into modernity'. Having reviewed the existing literature, Light observed that:

it is hard to reconcile this sombre and depressing depiction of the inter-war years as a slough of feminine despond with the buoyant sense of excitement and release which animates so many of the more broadly cultural activities which different groups of women enjoyed in this

<sup>5</sup> H. Smith, 'British Feminism in the 1920s' in H. Smith (ed.), *British Feminism in the Twentieth Century* (Elgar, Aldershot, 1990); M. Pugh, *Women and the Women's Movement in Britain, 1914–59* (Macmillan, Basingstoke, 1992); S.K. Kent, *Making Peace: The Reconstruction of Gender in Inter-war Britain* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993).

<sup>6</sup> S. Alexander, 'Becoming a Woman in London in the 1920s and 1930s' in D. Feldman and G.S. Jones (eds), *Metropolis – London: Histories and Representations since 1800* (Routledge, London, 1989) pp. 245–71; C. Chinn, *They Worked All Their Lives: Women of the Urban Poor in England, 1850–1939* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1988).

<sup>7</sup> D. Gittins, *Fair Sex: Family Size and Structure, 1900–39* (Hutchinson, London, 1982); J. Lewis, 'Public Institution and Private Relationship: Marriage and Marriage Guidance, 1920–1968', *Twentieth Century British History*, 1 (1990) pp. 233–63.

<sup>8</sup> S. Jeffreys, *The Spinster and her Enemies: Feminism and Sexuality, 1880–1930* (Pandora, London, 1985), chapters 8 and 9; Beddoe, *Back to Home and Duty*, p. 9.

period. What new kinds of social and personal opportunity, for example, were offered by the changing cultures of sport and entertainment ... by new patterns of domestic life ... new forms of household appliance, new attitudes to housework?<sup>9</sup>

But while Light's discussions of interwar masculinity (typified by the 'little man', 'content with his garden, home and domestic ideals') have been very influential, her analysis of 'modern femininity' has arguably been less so, and the interwar period has continued to be characterized as a period of conservatism and retreat. At the end of the 1990s, for example, Barbara Caine and Sue Bruley both essentially restated the 'backlash' model in their histories of feminism and women.<sup>10</sup>

There are signs in some recent work, however, that the broad consensus achieved in the 1980s and early 1990s is starting to unravel. Firstly, it is becoming clearer that the women's movement was not as ineffective or unpopular as some accounts previously suggested. Cheryl Law has argued that, far from fizzling out after 1918, 'the movement gained new vigour from its franchise success, and went on to entrench its position by constructing an extended network'. Echoing a point made by Pat Thane about Labour women, she observed that the disappointment expressed by some historians that interwar campaigners pursued welfare reform (supposedly at the expense of a more challenging, egalitarian agenda) 'marks a failure to recognise the wretchedness of the poverty, dismal housing and lack of health care which burdened large numbers of women and children in particular'.<sup>11</sup> Feminists were not merely submitting to conservative discourses on marriage and motherhood, but seeking to improve desperate conditions. Harold Smith, who had previously described feminists as being, by the end of the 1920s, 'a beleaguered band very much on the defensive', seemed to revise his opinion by outlining the success of the London National Society for Women's Suffrage in putting equal pay on the parliamentary agenda in the 1930s. There is, he argued, 'evidence of intense feminist activity and significant achievement in the 1930s and 1940s', which makes it 'misleading to claim that feminism became moribund in the 1930s and did not revive until the late 1960s'.<sup>12</sup>

This reassessment of the women's movement is not just the product of fresh evidence emerging about interwar feminist activity, however: it is also the result of an increasing recognition that organizations previously dismissed as 'conservative' could in fact play a significant role in enhancing women's lives, status and sense of empowerment. Maggie Andrews has rescued the Women's Institute movement from the condescension of historians, and described its activities in positive terms as the 'acceptable face of

<sup>9</sup> A. Light, *Forever England: Femininity, Literature and Conservatism between the Wars* (Routledge, London, 1991) p. 9.

<sup>10</sup> B. Caine, *English Feminism, 1780–1980* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997), chapter 5; S. Bruley, *Women in Britain since 1900* (Macmillan, Basingstoke, 1999), chapter 3.

<sup>11</sup> C. Law, *Suffrage and Power: The Women's Movement, 1918–28* (I.B. Tauris, London, 1997) pp. 226, 229. See also P. Thane, 'The Women of the British Labour Party and Feminism, 1906–1945' in Smith, *British Feminism*, p. 135.

<sup>12</sup> H. Smith, 'British Feminism and the Equal Pay Issue in the 1930s', *Women's History Review*, 5 (1996) p. 97; his earlier comment came in Smith, 'British Feminism in the 1920s', p. 62.

feminism'.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, Caitriona Beaumont has demonstrated how organizations as diverse as the Mother's Union, the YWCA, the Catholic Women's League, the Townswomen's Guilds and the National Council of Women, despite rejecting the label 'feminist', all contributed to the campaign to improve women's position.<sup>14</sup> It has become clear that the success of these organizations should not simply be used as proof of the 'failure' of 'feminism', nor as confirmation of the triumph of reactionary discourses seeking to confine women to marriage and motherhood. Encouraging women to think of themselves as 'active citizens', these 'mainstream' women's groups sought reforms such as family allowances and free health care which could have dramatic effects on women's lives. By taking these organizations into consideration, it seems likely that, as Pat Thane has recently remarked, 'more women, from a wider range of backgrounds, were actively campaigning for gender equality in the 1920s and 1930s than before the First World War'.<sup>15</sup>

As social and cultural historians delve deeper into this period, moreover, it is becoming harder to reconcile their conclusions with the narrative of 'backlash' and 'domesticity'. Claire Langhamer's illuminating study of women's leisure has demonstrated the significance of the life cycle in structuring women's lives, and has added weight to the arguments of Andrew Davies, David Fowler and Selina Todd that there was in these years a distinctive youth culture in which young single women played a central role.<sup>16</sup> Those historians who have recently studied young women in this period have been struck by their changing expectations and self-conscious 'modernity'. Birgitte Soland, in particular, has argued that the 1920s marked 'a cultural watershed' when women 'pioneered new manners and mores that permitted [them] more personal freedom, more pleasure and more self-expression'.<sup>17</sup> Although Soland's study is based on Denmark, the activities she describes had close parallels in Britain, and she portrays this 'reconstruction of womanhood' as a phenomenon common to those societies in which a commercialized mass culture was producing new representations of femininity. It was, she argued, 'from sources such as films, fashion magazines and advertisements that young women culled many of their ideas of female modernity, cross-gender camaraderie and romantic love'.<sup>18</sup> Far from the media being consistently hostile to young single women, then,

<sup>13</sup> M. Andrews, *The Acceptable Face of Feminism: The Women's Institute as a Social Movement* (Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1997).

<sup>14</sup> C. Beaumont, 'Women and Citizenship: A Study of Non-feminist Women's Societies and the Women's Movement in England, 1928–50', unpublished PhD thesis, Warwick University, 1996; C. Beaumont, 'Citizens not Feminists: The Boundary Negotiated between Citizenship and Feminism by Mainstream Women's Organisations in England, 1928–39', *Women's History Review*, 9 (2000); C. Beaumont, 'The Women's Movement, Politics and Citizenship, 1918–50s', in I. Zweiniger-Bargielowska (ed.), *Women in Twentieth Century Britain* (Longman, Harlow, 2001).

<sup>15</sup> P. Thane, 'What Difference Did the Vote Make? Women in Public and Private Life in Britain since 1918', *Historical Research*, 76 (2003), p. 272. See also P. Thane, 'What Difference Did the Vote Make?' in A. Vickery (ed.), *Women, Privilege and Power: British Politics, 1750 to the Present* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2001) pp. 253–88.

<sup>16</sup> C. Langhamer, *Women's Leisure in England, 1920–1960* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2000); A. Davies, *Leisure, Gender and Poverty: Working-class Culture in Salford and Manchester* (Open University Press, Buckingham, 1992); D. Fowler, *The First Teenagers: The Life-Style of Young Wage Earners in Inter-war Britain* (Woburn, London, 1995); S. Todd, 'Young Women, Employment and the Family in Inter-war England', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sussex, 2003.

<sup>17</sup> B. Soland, *Becoming Modern: Young Women and the Reconstruction of Womanhood in the 1920s* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2000) pp. 169–70.

<sup>18</sup> Soland, *Becoming Modern*, p. 16.

Soland regards them as providing a repository of images of female modernity which encouraged new aspirations and expectations.

Other historians have connected new social and sexual freedoms for young women to dramatic changes of appearance. Catherine Horwood has recently described how notions of acceptable female dress and behaviour for bathing were transformed between 1900 and 1939. Whereas at the beginning of the twentieth century ‘female swimmers were largely excluded from public bathing places’ in Britain, and ‘decency kept female bathers at a distance from men at all times’, by the end of the 1920s ‘the taboo of bodily exposure had been swept away by its redefinition as an acceptable part of the new cult of health and efficiency’.<sup>19</sup>

During the following decade, cinema glamour was a significant influence on costumes and beach culture, and ‘the days of segregation and modest cover-ups were well and truly over’.<sup>20</sup> Ina Zweiniger-Bargielowska has also discussed how ‘female appearance was revolutionised’ more broadly in the interwar period. A ‘slender, supple and youthful body’ became the new ideal and was the ‘site of a “modern” femininity which was healthy, respectable and fun’, more ‘assertive’ and ‘arguably more liberated than nineteenth century constructions’. Fashion was no longer confined to a wealthy elite but ‘within reach of all’, as both J.B. Priestley and George Orwell memorably observed.<sup>21</sup> The significance of this rejection of cumbersome prewar clothing and the restrictive social proprieties that accompanied it should not be underestimated, and deserves far more prominence than it usually receives in the ‘backlash’ accounts. On the other hand, as both Horwood and Zweiniger-Bargielowska recognize, the projection of elevated ideals of feminine glamour and beauty in the cinema, newspapers and magazines could place new pressures on women: it was rarely as easy to reach these standards as advice columnists and advertisers insisted. Indeed, my own research suggests that rather than further explorations of the ‘ideology of domesticity’ in the media, it might be more profitable for historians of popular culture to investigate the increasing sexualization of the female body.<sup>22</sup>

Certainly, these changes made far more of an impact on young single women than on the older, married generation. Langhamer describes in detail how housewives and mothers generally accepted that the pleasures and freedoms of youth would be exchanged with the wedding ring for a life of duty and service to the family.<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, the marital experience for most women in this period was also being transformed by the rapid decline in the birth rate, which greatly reduced the number of years spent bearing and rearing children. As a result, even though labour-saving devices spread slowly and standards of cleanliness may have risen, as Sue Bowden and Avner Offer have suggested, the workload of many mothers is likely to have decreased.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>19</sup> C. Horwood, ‘“Girls Who Arouse Dangerous Passions”: Women and Bathing, 1900–1939’, *Women’s History Review*, 9 (2000) pp. 656, 662.

<sup>20</sup> Horwood, ‘“Girls Who Arouse Dangerous Passions”’, p. 667.

<sup>21</sup> I. Zweiniger-Bargielowska, ‘The Body and Consumer Culture’, in Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Women in Twentieth Century Britain*, pp. 188, 187.

<sup>22</sup> A. Bingham, ‘Debating Gender: Approaches to Femininity and Masculinity in the Popular National Daily Press in Inter-war Britain’, unpublished DPhil thesis, Oxford, 2002, chapter 5.

<sup>23</sup> Langhamer, *Women’s Leisure in England*, chapter 5.

<sup>24</sup> S. Bowden and A. Offer, ‘The Technological Revolution that Never Was’, in V. de Grazia and E. Furlough, *The Sex of Things* (University of California Press, Berkeley and London, 1996).

Personal relationships may also have been affected by the increasing emphasis placed upon ‘companionship’ in marriage.<sup>25</sup> Even in the domestic sphere, then, it seems misleading to portray these years solely in terms of continuity and conservatism.

Many of the ‘backlash’ accounts rely on a particular interpretation of media power and content which is also now being challenged. The media are commonly portrayed as a negative and hostile set of institutions, eager to collaborate in the reassertion of ‘traditional’ gender boundaries. Deirdre Beddoe, for example, argues that ‘women were manipulated’ by the media ‘to embrace the role of housewife and mother’, while Billie Melman describes the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Express* as being ‘extraordinarily aggressive’ and conveying a ‘welter of misogyny’.<sup>26</sup> Ray Strachey’s assertion in *The Cause* that at the end of the war the press turned against women workers ‘in a moment’ and lambasted them as ‘parasites, limpets and blacklegs’ is routinely repeated with little further investigation.<sup>27</sup> Even in recent works that challenge other elements of the ‘backlash’ interpretation there is an assumption that the media maintained a consistently unfriendly attitude to single women in particular.<sup>28</sup> My studies of the interwar daily press suggest that these generalizations may be very misleading. Certainly, newspapers often stereotyped and patronized women, and the women’s sections they included were dominated by fashion and domestic advice. But editors certainly could not force hostile material onto passive female readers: on the contrary, they sought to attract them with sympathetic and appealing articles. Rather than trying to confine women to a narrow domesticity, newspapers generally embraced modernity, encouraged women to become active citizens, and included careers advice for those unable or unwilling to achieve marriage and motherhood. Pioneering women, from the first female barristers to the intrepid aviators Amy Johnson and Amelia Earhart, often received generous coverage and were portrayed as representatives of a more assertive and active generation.<sup>29</sup> Elsewhere, the preoccupation with new women’s magazines focusing on domestic life has often obscured more challenging representations found in other popular cultural forms. Although assuming that the ‘ideology of domesticity’ prospered in the press and in some magazines, Billie Melman nevertheless concludes that the ‘most culturally significant phenomenon in the discourse on women, after the First World War, was the disappearance of the “home” as the locus of the female’s interests and the feminine experience of reality’. There was, she demonstrated, little concern for domesticity in the best-selling ‘desert romances’ and ‘sex novels’ of the period.<sup>30</sup> Beddoe herself concedes that ‘positive images of career women are plentiful in the cinema of the 1930s’.<sup>31</sup> Although magazines such as *Good Housekeeping* and *Woman’s Own* were

<sup>25</sup> J. Lewis, ‘Marriage’, in Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Women in Twentieth Century Britain*.

<sup>26</sup> Beddoe, *Back to Home and Duty*, p. 9; B. Melman, *Women and the Popular Imagination in the Twenties: Flappers and Nymphs* (Macmillan, Basingstoke, 1988) pp. 17–18.

<sup>27</sup> R. Strachey, *The Cause: A Short History of the Women’s Movement in Britain* (G. Bell, London, 1928) p. 371. The charge is repeated in Braybon, *Women Workers*, p. 186; Beddoe, *Back to Home and Duty*, pp. 3, 13; M. Pugh, *Women and the Women’s Movement*, p.77; and elsewhere.

<sup>28</sup> Law, *Suffrage and Power*, pp. 205, 207; Beaumont, ‘Women’s Movement’, p. 266.

<sup>29</sup> Bingham, ‘Debating Gender’, *passim*; A Bingham, ‘“Stop the Flapper Vote Folly”’: Lord Rothermere, the *Daily Mail* and the Equalization of the Franchise, 1927–28’, *Twentieth Century British History*, 13 (2002) pp. 17–37.

<sup>30</sup> Melman, *Women and the Popular Imagination*, p. 150.

<sup>31</sup> Beddoe, *Back to Home and Duty*, p. 25.



undoubtedly successful in this period, they should not necessarily be accorded the privileged status they often receive as embodying the ‘temper of the times’. It is important that historians develop a more sophisticated model of the relationship between the media and gender identities which recognizes the diversity and complexity of cultural representations and acknowledges that the media cannot ‘impose’ patriarchy on an unwilling audience. Those histories that emphasized the triumph of conservatism in the interwar period provided a salutary reminder of the huge obstacles remaining on the path to sexual equality, and successfully undermined the wilder generalizations about the ‘emancipation’ of women during the First World War. When one examines the removal of women from their wartime employment or from medical schools,<sup>32</sup> or the erection of marriage bars in various professions, it is easy to understand the attraction of the ‘backlash’ metaphor. Nevertheless, recent research suggests that the interwar period cannot simply be regarded as an era of domesticity and retreat. These years saw the articulation of a self-consciously ‘modern’ femininity that drew upon real changes in the political, social, economic and sexual position of women. The challenge now is to produce histories which not only balance these changes with the undoubted continuities, but also incorporate the findings of the studies of masculinity that are emerging in greater numbers and which have recently been surveyed by Martin Francis.<sup>33</sup> Francis’s warning that the conventional narrative of a dominant Victorian and Edwardian ‘imperial manliness’ being replaced by a more ‘domesticated masculinity’ in the interwar years is too simplistic offers interesting echoes of this account. Historians of both femininity and masculinity, it seems, need to interrogate overarching interpretative frameworks to ensure that the full complexity of the evolution of gender identities is properly understood.

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the following source:

Bingham, A. (2004) *Social and Cultural History*, vol. 1, no.2, Berg Publishers.

<sup>32</sup> On medical schools, see C. Dyhouse, ‘Women Students and the London Medical Schools, 1914–1939: The Anatomy of a Masculine Culture’, *Gender and History*, 10 (1998) pp. 110–32.

<sup>33</sup> M. Francis, ‘The Domestication of the Male? Recent Research on Nineteenth and Twentieth-Century British Masculinity’, *Historical Journal*, 45 (2002) pp. 637–52.