HER WORK, HIS WORK AND THEIRS:
THE HOUSEHOLD ECONOMY AND THE FAMILY
IN NEW ZEALAND, 1900-1925

Claire Toynbee

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Sociology at the Victoria University of Wellington

March, 1986

ABSTRACT

This thesis is primarily concerned with integrating some of the theoretical and empirical themes beginning to emerge around the academic and feminist literature on work, household and family. It examines some of the complex interacting variables influencing the form and content of different forms of work, both paid and unpaid, directed at achieving the means of subsistence in family households in New Zealand in the first couple of decades of this century. Oral histories provide the primary source of evidence.

The thesis is also concerned with the gross and subtle variations in household divisions of labour based on hierarchies of age and sex, and with the ways in which new forms of domestic ideology became adopted or rejected by families in different social groups around this time. It will be argued that these ideologies were associated with the privatisation of the family in New Zealand, and with the formation of local status groups.

New Zealand during the early decades of the twentieth century is a particularly fruitful location for such research because of the wide variety of family types to be found in a society with a low level of structural complexity, minimal class structuration, a rather poorly developed economic infrastructure, but nevertheless modernising rapidly.

Local economic and social conditions favoured the retention of patriarchal domination and subsumption of wives and children in farming families whose household economy was preindustrial in character. At the same time, local urban

conditions favoured the emergence of smaller families, isolated domesticity, protected childhood and a new form of male domination, masculinism. The trend towards a new family form was probably stimulated by the dearth of paid work for married women in New Zealand and the relatively high wages earned by their husbands. Furthermore, a general shortage of domestic servants favoured a narrower gap between the conditions of work of urban bourgeois and proletarian women than that found in other Western societies.

A socialist-feminist framework was found useful in respect of explaining differences in the gender-based division of labour, and in identifying the forms of male domination and control observed in different kinds of households. However, it was rather limited when trying to analyse the demands and social controls experienced as a result of competition and reciprocal obligations with other women in closeknit neighbourhoods, or as a result of kinship relationships. It was also necessary to extend or modify the framework to account for variations in the power/desire of women to control their children's time and energy, explaining which children should be involved in household or farm or earning extra money, or accounting for strategies used by husbands and parents to handle and control potential conflict of interests. These limitations may eventually be overcome as new research leads to clearer conceptualisation and theory building.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The enormity of the task involved in producing a thesis concerned with the relationships between 'the private' and 'the public', between work and family, between labour and leisure, has inevitably sensitised me to their essential artificiality.

My first acknowledgement and most special gratitude goes to those who have so gracefully accepted the incursion of my work into their home, the piles of books and papers on their dining table, the burning of the midnight oil, the years of preoccupation with unMum-like pursuits - my family. To Robert for introducing me to the microcomputer; to Steve for his beautiful maps and infinite patience with the mysteries and frustrations of hardware and software; to Susan for her enthusiasm - to all my family, my grateful thanks for their patience, encouragement, and the practical help which has made it possible for me to finish it.

Methods textbooks provide little warning of the personal gratification derived from interviewing. I am much indebted to my informants who spent so much time and trouble on behalf of myself and Mr Gavin Buckley, my research assistant, during the period of interviewing. Thanks to Gavin, too, for his interest and enthusiasm.

During the days of fieldwork I had much reason to be grateful to the staff of Eastbourne Borough Council and to

the Eastbourne and Petone Public Library staff, who not only provided the names of the first interviewees but also provided a haven for rest and recreation for us between interviews. Later, the staff of the Alexander Turnbull Library, the Wellington Public Library and particularly, those at Victoria University of Wellington provided me with a great deal of help on a whole range of matters, always willingly and often going to much trouble on my behalf.

I am indebted to fellow members of Wellington Apple Users' Group and to others who have offered their technical expertise on special problems and who lent me some of the equipment necessary to produce the 'hard' copy.

My thanks also go to Judith Fyfe and Hugo Manson, founders of the New Zealand Oral History Archive and to the Department of Internal Affairs for access to other interview material. I am also grateful to the many friends, students and colleagues at Victoria University who have taken the time and trouble to provide emotional support and practical help in the form of information and ideas.

Lastly, I wish to thank my supervisors, Professor Jim Robb and Dr Nancy Pollock, for their continuing support over the years, for making this project an invaluable learning experience and for their generous gifts of time and trouble making possible the completion of the project.

CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Contents	v

PART I: BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: New Zealand as a Social Laboratory	11
An Historical Sketch	14
Demographic Change and the Family	25
Population Distribution and	
Internal Migration	28
Variations in Time and Space	31
Social Relations and Organisational	
Complexity	36
Summary and Conclusions -	
Main Themes	40

PART II: APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF THE FAMILY,
THE HOUSEHOLD AND WORK

Chapter 2: Some Functionalist Approaches to the Study of the Family	46
Bias in Social Theory	48
Parsons and Functionalism	50
The Family Division of Labour	52
Women's Employment	54
Functionalism and Conflict	58
Kinship	63
Summary	67
Functionalist Theories of Social Change	69
Industrialisation and Change in	
New Zealand	69
Functionalist Treatment of Women's	
Work	72

Kinship and Industrialisation	75
Origins of the Modern Family	76
Capitalism or Industrialisation?	79
Some Implications for Analysis and Interpretation	82
 Chapter 3: Marxism and Feminism	 86
Production and Reproduction	89
The Debate on Housework	90
Reproduction	92
The Contribution of Radical Feminism	96
Summary	102
Capitalism and Patriarchy	104
Dual Systems Approaches	106
Single System Theories	110
Patriarchy, Paternalism and the Household Division of Labour	118
 Chapter 4: Household and Work	 127
Family versus Household	129
Household Composition, Present and Past	132
Economic Context and Household Strategies	139
Work	145
Social Relations of Work	151
Scholarly Treatment of Women's and Children's Work	155
Implications for Analysis and Interpretation - Summary and Main Concepts	160
The Means of Subsistence	161
Daily Maintenance of Workers and Future Workers	162
Reproduction of the Labour Force	163
Social/Cultural Reproduction	163

PART III: HER WORK, HIS WORK AND THEIRS

Introduction:	167
The Sample	167
Location of Families	168
Origins of the People	169
Class	170
Occupation	175
Family Size and Household Composition	176
Chapter 5: Her Work, His Work and Theirs	179
Farming Households	180
Women's Work on Farms and Smallholdings	181
Farm Work of Women and Girls	186
Men's Work on Farms	191
Boys' Work on Farms and Smallholdings	194
Farms with Employees	197
Some Life Cycle Strategies	197
Other Labour Strategies	202
Summary	204
Non-Farming Households	206
Women's Domestic Work	208
Women's Non-Domestic Work	211
Girls' Work in Non-Farming Households	213
Summary	218
Men's Work - Employment	220
Men's Work - Household	225
Boys' Work in Rural Areas and Towns	228
Children's Work	234
Summary	239
Discussion	241
Different Types of Household Labour	
Organisation	242
Women's Employment in Britain and New Zealand	244
Values - Collectivism and Individualism	248
Yeoman Values and the Household Economy	253
Women's Values and the Wage Economy	257
Women's Values and the Consumer Economy	260
Decline in Productive Functions of Households	262
Demographic Variability	268
Summary	271

Chapter 6: Patriarchy, Masculinism and the Household Division of Labour	276
Patriarchy, Masculinism and Gender	279
Patriarchy, Masculinism and Housework	287
Servants	291
Some Subjective Aspects of Housework	293
Class and Gender	295
The Household Division of Labour by Age	301
Propriety and Pragmatism	305
Summary	308
Power Relations and the Family	310
Power and Dependency	312
Power, Control and Deference	314
Paternalism and Deference in Society	317
Implications	320
 PART IV: HOUSEHOLD, FAMILY AND COMMUNITY	
 Chapter 7: Kinship and the Household Economy	322
Some General Observations about	
Kinship	323
Kinship Contact	324
Economic Activity Among Kin-Related	
Households	326
Farmers	328
Kin and Family Businesses	333
Kinship, Aid and Life Cycle Crisis	340
Long-Term Coresidence with Kin	346
Intergenerational Aid without	
Coresidence	347
Working-Class Families	351
Discussion and Conclusions	353
 Chapter 8: Community, Sociability and Leisure	367
Definitions of Leisure	367
Rural Sociability and Leisure	371
Community Life in Rural Areas	373
Urban Families	382
Urban Business and Upper Class	383
Working and Lower Middle Class	389
Differences Among Men	392
Family Based Leisure and Children's	
Play	398

Community and Status	401
Social Networks, Status and Control	409
Group Formation and Social Control	412
Patriarchy, Masculinism and Leisure	418
 Chapter 9: Some Aspects of Power and Control:	
Family, Community and Change	423
 Husbands and Wives	425
Powerless and 'the Drink' in England	427
Struggles over 'the Drink' in New Zealand	429
Status Group Formation and Privatisation	434
Public Issues and Private Troubles	436
Parents and Children	444
Another Public Issue, Private Trouble	447
Parental Control	451
Resentment and Exploitation	452
Control, Class and Gender	461
 Chapter 10: Re-Making the New Zealand Family:	
New Roles for Old?	470
The Modern Family	471
Homecentredness and Privatisation	473
Domesticity as a Social Issue	476
The Emergence of the Modern Family in New Zealand	480
Networks, Status and Esteem	490
 Conclusions	501
New Zealand as a Social Laboratory	502
Some Implications for Theory	508
Sociological Theory	508
Stratification, Status and Power	510
Feminist Theory	511
Implications for Theory and Praxis	514
Limitations of the Research	514
New Research	516

PART V: APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Research Methods and Interview Guide	520
Research Methods	520
Oral History and Some Problems of Evidence	521
Sampling	524
The Interview	526
Data Manipulation, Analysis and Interpretation	527
Interview Guide	530
Appendix 2: Listing of Sample Families	534
Appendix 3: Tables	552
Appendix 4: Maps	561
Appendix 5: Photographs	564
BIBLIOGRAPHY	571
AUTHOR INDEX	605

P A R T I:

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there have been increasingly insistent suggestions from scholars working in a range of disciplines, that there is a need to focus on the household, rather than 'the family', if a number of important issues concerning the relationship between family and economy are to be resolved.

The most persistent voices come from feminists who consider present theory inadequate in explaining the oppression of women in the family and elsewhere. Some see the failure to explain effects of historical and material transformations on women's lives, or their contemporary situation in terms of the tendency to conflate the analytically separable concepts of family and household. In addition, many feminist writers have commented on the ideological assumptions which are inextricably fused into theories purporting to explain the relationship between family and economic life and interrelationships within the family in Western societies. They consider that such theory not only serves to obscure, but also perpetuate assumptions about the nature of social life which are detrimental to women. Just as the economic aspects of family life are confused with the affective and the ideological, so too is the nature and content of women's work misunderstood and devalued relative to that of men.

Historians and others have been concerned with the effects of the transition to capitalism and industrialisation on family structures (Anderson, 1980a: Harris, 1983). At another level, they have also raised interesting questions about the precise nature of the relationship between the family, kinship, the household and the community (Wall, 1983: Smith, 1984: Hareven, 1982: Joyce, 1980: Netting et al. 1984: Medick & Sabeau, 1984).

Despite the length of time separating their empirical interests from those of historians, some radical economists, geographers and anthropologists have observed that traditional patterns of household and work organisation still persist within the structures of advanced capitalism (Long, 1984). These forms of labour commitment cannot be readily explained within existing frameworks. In this area, there has already been significant new research and reconceptualisation in terms of divisions of labour within households by Pahl, a sociologist (1984).

The growing literature on the household has also captured the attention of sociologists concerned with the historical development of the family. Summing up his recent investigation of the interrelationship between the family and industrial society, Harris suggests that

... if the place of the family in industrial society is to be better understood ... [what is required] .. is that a new generation of studies comes into existence which examines the pattern of relations between the private and the public domains and regards the household as the site of their articulation. (1983, 246)

The primary object of this thesis is to bring together some of the necessary building blocks for constructing a theory of the family household as an economic and as a procreative and childrearing unit (Harris, 1983, 247). An understanding of the relationship between 'the public and the private' domains requires recognition on the part of the analyst that the conjunction of household with family is the product of historical development. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between the domestic and the familial. This can be done by using concepts which clarify the nature of the links between economic activities and the socially constructed categories which define how these activities are defined by age, gender and class within any particular historical formation. It is hoped thereby to be able to help understand the processes through which the instrumental activities of men, women and children within households evolved during a period of industrialisation/modernisation. Neither non-Marxist nor Marxist theory can account for this adequately, nor can they account for other aspects of social life which depend on socially constructed notions of gender.

At an empirical level, the thesis is concerned with the household economy in the period 1900 to 1925 in New Zealand. Although the focus is on women and girls, their relationships with husbands and fathers, sons and brothers will be considered in depth. Different patterns in the social relations of work, in varying economic and social contexts will be analysed, in terms of age and gender and related hierarchies of power. Attention will also be paid to the wider social context within which household members were involved with kin and neighbours in their daily lives.

Around the turn of the century, New Zealand was experiencing the effects of modernisation. While New Zealand shared many economic and social characteristics with other Western societies, it was nevertheless different, most specifically in regard to its colonial status and the particular nature of the modernisation process. As a wool and food producer for Britain, New Zealand has always been dependent on the mother country. It can be seen as a giant farm, and as such, the nature of its industrialisation varied substantially from those societies deriving their wealth from manufacturing industry. The process will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 1.

These broader changes were important in forming the economic contexts within which the household economy operated. Change proceeded at an uneven pace as it did elsewhere in Western society. Households owning their own

means of production in the form of a viable farming unit were largely self-sufficient in terms of food, at least. Rural and urban households relying on wages for their survival needed to devise a range of strategies for maximising their resources.

The special nature of the modernisation process in New Zealand has important implications theoretically both in terms of raising questions about existing theory and, concomitantly about its use when applied to New Zealand historical conditions. There are two areas of major importance here. First of all, the economic and structural importance of the family farm, and secondly, the lack of demand for paid female labour except as domestic servants. While women and girls living on farms commonly contributed their labour to the family enterprise, there were few opportunities for paid female employment up to the turn of the century apart from domestic service (see Chapters 1, 5 and Appendix 3). The range of work skills used by women in New Zealand households, then and now, and their high degree of commitment to domesticity can be seen in terms of their relation to the mode and means of production and reproduction, the real and socially constructed needs of family members, as well as to women's response to changing ideologies about their proper place.

The workings of the household economy and associated ideas about women's place in it owe much to the cultural

baggage which the pioneers brought with them to New Zealand in the nineteenth century and which survived in residual form into the twentieth. Three broad, and sometimes overlapping images of women can be distinguished. The first was that of the 'really useful woman' whose many-faceted contribution to the household was necessary to survival.² This was associated with pioneering conditions particularly, but also survived in working-class and some middle-class households. The second, was of women as the 'moral guardians of the hearth', the 'natural' repositories of virtue and godliness, able to restrain the passions of men for 'the drink' and other undesirable proclivities and thus lead them into the paths of righteousness and respect in the community. The third was the image of women commonly associated with the Victorian middle class, a submissive, clinging, dependent and childlike creature, an image peculiarly alien given the living conditions in New Zealand where the level of domestic technology was low and domestic servants scarce.

Images may not, however, bear much resemblance to reality. While these images of women brought by immigrants from Britain may have been relatively consistent in their original social contexts, they were to be modified, recreated and synthesized in New Zealand. They appealed differently to different social classes, in different types of locations and they helped shape the emotional quality of

interrelationships within families. In sociological terms, they can be seen as ideological constructs with important social consequences.

Lacking a basis for power, adult women did not share equally with men or children in the benefits resulting from modernisation. The evidence which best exemplifies women's lack of power relative to their husbands is that of disposable income and disposable time. Men used their power as men to seize their advantages, while material conditions and ideologies about the proper place of wives and mothers combined to further encapsulate them within the ever-narrowing confines of domesticity in the service of both husbands and children. As far as children were concerned, it was boys, rather than girls, who benefitted most from the changes taking place in society, changes which included a dramatic revolution in material organisation of household life, and lagging behind, in conceptions about the nature of childhood.

Apart from an attempt to develop a theory centred on the importance of the household as the nexus of family and economy, this thesis should be seen as a contribution to the sociological literature in a number of ways. It is an attempt to grasp the essential characteristics of the household division of labour in New Zealand in the early decades of this century. There is little sociologically based empirical work of a historical nature within the

mainstream of sociology of the New Zealand family (Koopman-Boyden, 1975, 1982) or in the feminist literature (Bunkle & Hughes, 1980). The literature dealing with the history of the New Zealand family is largely speculative, relying on personal documents, literary sources, official reports and statistics.³ Further research is urgently needed.

The thesis is also peripherally concerned with the development of 'the modern family' by the very nature of its subject matter and an attempt will be made to identify the most salient concepts needed for a sociologically informed account of the process. In particular, it will be argued that the nature of the articulation of household, family and community is of critical importance (Harris, 1983, 246).

There is much to be gained by incorporating the work of oral historians into efforts to explain change in family life (Jamieson, 1983: Roberts, 1984: Thompson, 1983). Since the settlement of New Zealand was relatively recent (see Chapter 1), it is still possible to speak with men and women who themselves experienced pioneering in remote areas as children. The primary data on which the thesis is based was gathered through interviewing over eighty men and women born before 1918 who spent their childhoods in New Zealand. They were originally children of both rural and urban dwellers. Some of them came from very large families, a few were only children. A sprinkling were not born in New

Zealand, but were brought here as small children with their parents who had emigrated from Britain to find a better life in New Zealand. Together, their interviews provide a rich composite picture of the domestic economy in New Zealand in the period around 1900 to 1925, with considerable and systematic variation in terms of their position in the class structure. Further details about the sample will be given in the section which introduces the New Zealand material, Chapter 5, and Appendix 1.

In the next chapter, a brief historical account of New Zealand's settlement will be sketched. This will be followed by a sociological commentary on economic and social conditions around the turn of the century, more specifically those relating to its low level of structural complexity, low level of population and population density and smallness of scale, factors which created a modernisation transition different to that experienced in Britain. In Chapters 2, 3 and 4, a literature review will be undertaken in which theoretical work relevant to the study of the family, the household and social change will be reviewed.

The productive and reproductive efforts of household members within different social and economic contexts will be described along with analytical comment in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 is concerned with the household divisions of labour. Chapter 7 shows some of the ways in which

Introduction

extended kinship and economic life were linked, either in everyday lives or as a result of crisis.

Kinship is one aspect of ways in which households and families were articulated with the community. Another was the nature of links in different kinds of community networks. This is first dealt with in Chapter 8, in which sociability and leisure are examined. There is a hidden agenda here however, since the emergence of leisure is analysed in terms of inequalities between men and women expressed in terms of free time and the use of money. This will be the focus of the second part of Chapter 9.

Chapter 9 is concerned with power and control and outlines the ways in which male and parental domination changed over time. It deals essentially with conclusions reached on the basis of this exploratory research using oral histories. The unique economic and social context of early twentieth century New Zealand offers a wider range of family forms than those usually available for study, making it possible to view more clearly the most important elements associated with changes in work in the household economy and family. It also makes it possible to confirm some of the ideas emerging in the overseas literature on these interrelated aspects of social life, and to offer insight into areas as yet uncharted.

Introduction

FOOTNOTES

¹ As will become apparent later, the use of the term 'the family' is hazardous. In the past most writers have used it in an unproblematic way. Because of its ideological implications it must be treated with care (see Chapter 3). Harris views 'the modern family', 'the isolated nuclear family' and other such tags as representing not a "structural feature of a stable societal system, but as a moment in a process not yet completed" (1983, viii, ix). He considers the term 'the family' as an analytic category, 'an essential tool in analysing the groups and relations that grow up around the universal human activities of procreating and rearing' (1983, 246). It will be used in this way when reviewing the work of others unless otherwise indicated.

In terms of the theoretical framework to be adopted however, 'household' or 'family household' will be used when referring to the economic organisation of a domestic unit, activities associated with production, reproduction and consumption. The term 'family' is reserved for historically specific and socially constructed sets of social relationships and roles which to a great extent determine patterns of behaviour within households in regard to their power relationships and divisions of labour.

² I am indebted to Allison Kirkman for drawing my notice to her ancestor's book for intending migrants. In this book he remarks, "Every intending migrant to New Zealand should provide himself with a really useful woman for his wife. Those who settle with such a partner are sure to succeed" (Adam, 1874, 36, italics in original).

³ There are two standard textbooks dealing with marriage and family in New Zealand (Houston, 1970: Koopman-Boyden, 1978). Both provide some material of an historical nature (see for instance, Houston (1970, 21-40), Gilson (1970, 41-65) and Olssen and Levesque (1978, 1-26), McDonald (1978, 44-56). There is also one unpublished thesis concerned with ideology and the New Zealand family (Roth, 1980). Research on the sexual division of labour in contemporary families is reviewed in Koopman-Boyden (1984).

CHAPTER 1:

NEW ZEALAND AS A SOCIAL LABORATORY

New Zealand has claimed considerable attention as a result of the vigour and nature of its social policies especially during periods of reform. In the 1890s and the late 1930s, the new Liberal and first Labour governments enacted sweeping legislation which attracted the attention of contemporary overseas scholars who saw the society as a natural social laboratory, small enough and flexible enough to resist and overcome the social evils associated with the impact of capitalism. One of the more dramatic and potentially far reaching of these reforms was the extension of suffrage to women in 1893. New Zealand was indeed the first nation to enfranchise women.¹ It should not be assumed however, that the values and ideologies of the times favoured a high degree of equality of women with men either in domestic or public life, but rather a recognition of their part in the founding of a new society and of their importance as wives and mothers, as the 'moral guardian of the hearth', and colonial helpmeet (Dalziel, 1977).

Similarly many of the reforms of the 1930s mirrored current ideologies about the family. For instance, in 1936, the New Zealand Government enacted the Industrial

Conciliation and Arbitration Act which, among other measures, empowered the Arbitration Court to provide for a forty-hour, five-day week for the majority of the employed and to fix for all Industrial Awards a minimum living wage sufficient for a man to maintain himself, his wife and three children 'in a fair and reasonable standard of comfort'. The Act also required the Court to fix maximum hours of work at no more than forty per week, to exclude Saturday (Woods, 1963, 133-4).

In their time, these reforms and others like them were considered radical by their opponents in New Zealand and overseas, the products of socialism. They were also a public manifestation of deep-rooted and widely accepted ideas about the nature of family life.

New Zealand is the newest of the new societies founded by British settlers (Hartz, 1964), a 'fragment' of Victorian Britain, containing within itself at the moment of its creation, the seeds of its future, potentially open to adaptation, change and separate development. At its moment of creation it also carried with it the capitalist mode of production.

Visitors to New Zealand have seen it as a 'Britain of the South'. George Bernard Shaw considered that New Zealanders were still recognisably Victorian. Asked by a newspaper reporter about whether he thought they had developed national characteristics he said he thought not.

The British had changed, while New Zealanders retained the characteristics of the nineteenth century Englishman. Shaw visited New Zealand in 1934 (Keith, 1984, 10).

Let us identify some of the basic features of this developing 'fragment', and some of its special characteristics, a task which will occupy most of this Chapter. First of all, a very short account of New Zealand's history will be given. This will be followed by a statement of the most important demographic trends in respect of the family. We will then consider some of the more sociologically interesting aspects of New Zealand society in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, especially those associated with smallness of scale. They are particularly important in understanding the sociohistorical conditions of the period under investigation in terms of the life and labour of ordinary families.

An Historical Sketch²

The first settlers of Aotearoa were the Maoris who established their own flourishing culture long before European explorers made landfall in the late eighteenth. For half a century there was little interest in the 'newly discovered' land except as a base for missionaries and for whalers and other South Pacific adventurers (Sinclair 1959: Oliver, 1960).

New Zealand society in fact offers opportunities for the study of two quite distinctive types of kinship systems and forms of household organisation. The Maori system was, and is, based on lineages. Household organisation, and the working of land, the gathering of the fruits of the forest, sea and rivers were also part of an infrastructure based on kinship in the period with which we are concerned.

It should be understood, however, that the arrival of the European coincided with the beginning of a persistent attack on Maori culture and society which was to accelerate with the Land Wars of the 1860s. Earlier, some tribes parted from traditional ways, for example, through trading with Europeans, through wage labour and by providing fruit, vegetables and flour milling facilities for European settlers. Alienation of land and decimation of the Maori population through European-introduced disease, internal strife and defence of their tribal lands made serious inroads, almost destroying the Maori as a people. In the twentieth century, population numbers revived but their proletarianisation started to proceed rapidly with rural-urban migration after World War II especially. In the 1980s there has been a renaissance of Maori culture and identity.

This thesis is concerned solely with European settlers and their descendents.³

Systematic colonisation as conceived by Edward Gibbon Wakefield took place in Wellington, Nelson, New Plymouth and Wanganui in the 1840s with Canterbury following in 1850 (Gardiner, 1981, 60-62). The founders of these provinces were predominantly English in origin. Otago was founded in 1848 as a Scottish settlement. The establishment of the new colony was conceived partly to relieve population pressure, to help dispel political discontent and also to provide investment and trading opportunities for British investors. On the basis of his experience of other colonies, Wakefield organised a scheme in which land would be made available to settlers 'at sufficient price', in order that the labouring classes would be obliged to take employment for a time before purchasing their own farms. This would ensure that labour would be available for prospective employers. It also meant that revenue from land sold to small farmers could be used to bring out more workers (Marx, 1976, 931-940: Sinclair, 1959: Oliver, 1960).

What sort of people came to New Zealand and why did they come? A few came with a great deal of capital to invest in pastoralism, in banking, business and speculation establishing themselves early as a colonial élite. However, most writers agree that the colony attracted a middle range of British society leaving behind both the most prosperous and the very poorest sections of society. Immigration was controlled in the early years of settlement, so that only

those who had capital or specific occupations and were considered able to contribute to the new colony were welcomed as settlers. In contrast with the United States, Canada and Australia, whose governments provided assisted passages and cheap or free land, the poorest sections of the British population could not afford to come to New Zealand where emigration schemes were less generous. It was only during the 1870s that free passages and cheaper land were made available to agricultural labourers in order to populate the interior of the North Island (Arnold, 1972, 1981). In that decade, the population almost doubled as a combined result of immigration and natural increase.

Evidence suggests that those who left Britain were spurred by the belief of a better life for themselves and their children and that they expected to have to work hard to achieve this (Toynbee, 1979a). Many would also have been motivated by their economic vulnerability as a result of the new factory system and the violent swings of capitalist economics. In the 1870s, many agricultural labourers and their families escaped from the hardships of lockouts by the farmers of South-Eastern England (Arnold, 1981). It is also likely that many immigrants would have been members of Disraeli's 'anxious classes', thrifty, aspiring and determined to achieve in New Zealand what they could not in the Old World.

Land was for many the main attraction for emigration. By earning enough money to buy land, stock, seeds and other necessities for self-sufficiency and eventual profit, many settlers fulfilled their dreams of independence. In doing so, they became the colonial embodiment of the 'honest yeoman' ideal. As Mingay points out (1977, 57) this proud independent owner-cultivator was more "a figure of fiction than reality" in England. This was probably also the case in New Zealand where farmers' dependence on distant markets and local bank managers must have clashed with ideals.

However, in many cases, the sons of the pioneers inherited farms from them or followed the arduous career path of wage labouring followed by ownership of a small farm (Toynbee, 1979a). According to Arnold (1976, 10) the 'honest yeoman' had become a dominant motif in New Zealand rural society in the 1890s, supplanting the 'gentry' ideal lying behind Wakefield's vision. Two implications of this should be noted. First of all, the structure of New Zealand rural society differed markedly from the English in which a three-tiered hierarchical system of landlord, tenant farmer and labourer was characteristic. Secondly, the strength of the Liberal Government in New Zealand which came into power in 1891 and remained in office for twenty years, lay in its support by the yeoman farmer and the town labourer. Taken together, there is strong evidence that New

Zealanders desired a very different kind of society to that which they or their parents had left behind.

The family farm operating as a production unit has always been - and is still - a social entity of critical importance to a high but gradually decreasing proportion of the New Zealand population. Men, women and their children worked these farms together, maintaining a high degree of self sufficiency. As late as 1915, fifteen per cent of males over the age of fifteen actively engaged in the labour force, were assisting relatives (mostly their fathers), that is they were not employees, not necessarily earning wages and were involved in a mode of production to all intents and purposes pre-industrial in its everyday organisation. By 1926, 60 per cent of farmers hired no labour, outnumbering rural labourers (Brooking, 1981, 229).

Settlers whose livelihood did not depend on their land, were primarily wage and salary earners, living a very different kind of life to the farmers. Those who came with capital, skills and work experience as artisans did well too, if we consider their achievement in relation to that of their fathers who remained in Britain and if we measure that achievement in terms of moving from a situation of being an employee to becoming a self-employed tradesman or small employer. For those who had capital there was money to be made in business and land speculation in New Zealand (Toynbee, 1979a). For the sons of the early immigrants and

for later arrivals there were also opportunities for upward mobility, but the nature and range of opportunities were changing.

One of the ways in which nineteenth century New Zealand differed quite substantially from Britain was in its relatively low degree of class structuration (Giddens, 1973). Many immigrants arrived as labourers and acquired their own farms and businesses as we have seen while others were able to take advantage of conditions of shortages of labour and commodities to increase their material condition. As in the United States, there existed a strong ideology stressing individual opportunity and egalitarianism and a belief in an open, mobile society.

Despite its relative lack of structural rigidity and widely held egalitarian ideas, New Zealand has never been a classless society (Pearson & Thorns, 1983: Pearson, 1980). Each of the major settlements reflected something of their origins including their class structures. Nevertheless in the voyage out to New Zealand, on the struggling sheep stations and farms, in tiny settlements and larger towns, survival necessitated a degree of cooperation between classes which did not exist in Britain. In Old New Zealand, 'gentlemen' dirtied their hands and 'ladies' sweated over makeshift cooking ranges preparing food and other necessities of life when they were obliged to do so (Drummond, 1960: Simpson, 1940). Domestic servants were

always hard to find and hard to keep because young women were in high demand, especially by farmers needing a 'really useful woman' as a wife. Their strong bargaining position made them bold in their demands too and many colonial mistresses bewailed the impertinence and impermanence of their servants.

Many early working class settlers brought with them ideas deriving from Chartism, and were able to put them into practice as a result of the demand for their labour. However, towards the last decades of the nineteenth century, New Zealanders were discovering that their New Society was beginning to manifest some of the worst characteristics of capitalist, industrialising Britain, for instance in the 'discovery' of sweated labour in Dunedin. It was at this time that class structuration was beginning to become more rigid (Toynbee, 1979 a, b).

By the 1880s, the country was feeling the effects of economic depression and pressures on land, the latter as a result of a doubling of population in the 1870s, the former through New Zealand's historical and continuing economic dependence on British investment and on selling its produce to the United Kingdom. However, New Zealand's economy based on farming was on the brink of its own special kind of economic take-off and industrialisation.

In a narrow sense, 'industrialisation' refers to a process in which a predominantly agricultural economy is

transformed into one where manufacturing of goods increasingly contributes to total output. There is also the more general transition called 'modernisation' encompassing changes in the movement of the population to growing cities, an increasing degree of structural complexity demonstrated in new forms of production and distribution, a more skilled and specialised division of labour and the declining influence of religion. In the case of farming, modernisation involves the application of scientific principles to increase productivity. In this sense New Zealand, which derives 77 per cent of its export earnings from agricultural produce today is an industrialised country (Mann, 1983).

By the late nineteenth century there were some indications that modernisation was taking place. Olssen writes

... a new society was emerging, characterized by towns and cities, bureaucracy, specialization and organization. The social structure became more complex, the division of labour more intricate, the distinction between urban and rural more obvious. Although these changes occurred at different speeds in different areas they converged to integrate the fragmented regions and localities of the 1870s into modern New Zealand by the end of the 1920s (Olssen, 1981, 250).

In 1882, the first cargo of frozen produce was sent to England, opening up trading opportunities. By the 1890s, refrigeration made possible the export of dairy produce which in turn helped develop the North Island, and

stimulated the use of mechanisation in farming, and the widespread establishment of dairy factories.

There was also a demand for workers of a new kind, men to service and repair the new machinery coming on to the market, men to develop the transport system, men to work in the new private and public bureaucracies (Olssen, 1981, 250-278). In all this, there were new jobs for women, single women obliged to earn their living until they married, jobs which provided an alternative to the narrow range of occupations open to them previously (Olssen, 1980: Simpson, 1940). Employment had been available since the 1880s in domestic service, dressmaking and the woollen industry. Later, jobs for waitresses, cooks, clerks, typists, nurses and teachers created new options.

Nineteenth century statistics on labour force participation of New Zealand women are remarkable for the small numbers of women involved. The only occupations in which the numbers exceed the hundreds are nurses, teachers, dressmakers, machinists (in 1891) and domestic servants. But if paid work was open to women, it was as an interlude between school and marriage. It was uncommon for married women to be employed in New Zealand, at least in the sense of being 'actively engaged in the labour force' and thus included in Census Statistics. It was not until the 1920s that disaggregated tables showing women's employment by marital status were available. In 1926, the proportion of

married women in employment was 3.5 per cent. Tables for earlier periods broken down by age are provided in Appendix 3 (see also Chapter 5).

The question of the very low level of women's involvement in socialised production raises doubts about the Marxist view that the economic marginalisation of women is a necessary concomitant of the transition to capitalism. The answer hinges on how production is defined.

It is interesting to note that in the Census for 1874 domestic work done within the home for one's own family was classified as an occupation. By 1891, 'occupation' was defined in terms of paid work, while all those who were not paid were recorded as 'dependent'. This is clearly symbolic of the changes taking place in women's position in New Zealand society at that time (Novitz, 1976, 50).

The field of women's education seems to have been brighter in terms of opportunities than that of occupation. Girls' secondary schools were established in several towns in the 1870s and 1880s forming the basis for tertiary education. Women were admitted to Universities without the serious difficulties they encountered elsewhere. The first woman Bachelor of Arts and the first woman Honours graduate in the British Empire were New Zealanders. By 1914, slightly over one third of graduates of Canterbury, then a College of the University of New Zealand, were women (Hughes, 1980; Fry, 1985).

The first flush of promise was to be overtaken by domestic feminism which had won the vote, not on the basis of equality with men, but rather on women's 'special' qualities as wives and mothers, a topic to which we will return in the last Chapter.

In the period with which we are most specifically concerned, major shifts were evident in the structure of the total labour force. In 1896, 42 per cent of those actively engaged in the labour force worked in the primary sector, that is in farming, and in a range of extractive industries. By 1926, this had declined to 30 per cent, most of ^{the} decrease being due to a shift towards the tertiary sector. A table is shown in Appendix 3.

Other evidence of change was also beginning to be apparent, suggesting new trends in family life associated with modernisation.

Demographic Change and the Family

New Zealand's early demographic history resembles that of other colonial societies in that in the early period there was a significant imbalance in the age-sex structure of the population. This can be attributed partly to the attraction of the frontier for young, single men looking for adventure and fortune on gumfields and the goldfields. The ratio of women to men was low in the early decades of

settlement especially in rural areas. Single women were much in demand by farmers and other settlers whose prosperity depended on a 'really useful woman' (Toynbee, 1984b) to bear him strong sons and daughters, manage his household, cook, clean and help on his farm or in his business.

At the time of the 1861 census, there were only six females to every ten males. By the turn of the century the age structure had stabilised, partly as a result of natural increase, and partly as a result of a better balance in the sexes of new settlers. However, there was still a surplus of males over the age of fifteen in rural areas (Olssen, 1981, 251-2), silent testimony to the solitary fate of the aging bachelors of the largely conquered frontier and lack of attraction for the harsh existence of the isolated farmer's wife on the part of marriageable women.

The imbalance in the proportions of females to males meant that marriage was not possible for many males in the early period. As in other Western societies, the European marriage pattern (Hajnal, 1974) was in evidence with the characteristic high age at first marriage. Men who were born between 1866 and 1871 married on average at 28.4 years and women at 25.5 years. The corresponding cohort for 1911 to 1916 showed a decrease to 27.7 years for men, and a very slight drop for women at 25.2 years (Vosburg, 1978, 32a). It is probable that female age at marriage was lower in the

initial period of settlement. For the period after the turn of the century, age at marriage continued to decline slowly (except for the Depression) beginning a rapid decline only in the years following the start of World War II.

There are no disaggregated official statistics available for comparison of the family size of different occupational groups in New Zealand. However, Vosburgh has calculated the average completed family size in New Zealand to be 6.5 children for the 1880 marriage cohort, and 4.7 children for the 1891 marriage cohort. The corresponding statistic is 3.7 children for 1913 and 2.4 children for the 1925 marriage cohorts respectively.

Allowing for the average age of my respondents, variations in their place in the family, and for the fact that some of those whose mothers married around 1880 would not have completed their childbearing until well into the twentieth century, the average size of families in the sample is somewhat higher than the average for New Zealand as a whole. Further data about the family size of my respondents will be presented in the introduction to Part III. A table showing the size of sample families is provided in Appendix 3.

In both Britain and New Zealand, the decline in family size can be seen as resulting from urbanisation. In town, children are not only economically less productive, but they create higher costs at least until their education

is completed. Added to this is the possibility that fertility decline is also related to rationalization, that is in the ability to make decisions, to plan and effect one's goals. In the case of family planning this involves an absence of fatalism, an ability to communicate with a spouse and continued cooperation over a long period.

Given the low degree of structural complexity one might have expected that the decline in New Zealand's birth rate would have started at a much later period. In fact, aggregate statistical material indicates that the long term decline in the New Zealand birth rate started not far behind Britain's and continued to show the same trends although New Zealand families have always been rather larger on average. Vosburgh (1978) explains this in terms of socio-cultural inheritance, that is in relation to the high proportions of British working- and lower middle class colonists who emigrated when the average family size was much greater, that is they would have been influenced by the fertility norms current at the time of their departure.

Population Distribution and Internal Migration

Apart from demographic change related to fertility, we must also look briefly at density of population, nativity and population movement associated with urbanisation. According to the New Zealand Census,⁴ the total population (excluding

Maoris) in 1911 was only just over a million people of whom two thirds were New Zealand born (69.74 per cent). About a fifth were born in the United Kingdom (22.69 per cent) and five per cent in Australia.

In the same Census year, the population defined as urban, that is the proportion of the population living in settlements over 2,500 persons, was forty eight per cent. By way of comparison, the comparable statistic for England and Wales was seventy nine per cent. Only ten per cent of the New Zealand population lived in towns over 100,000 persons compared with forty four per cent of the population of England and Wales. In the case of New Zealand, there was only one town including its suburbs, which exceeded 100,000, Auckland. Other large towns at this period were Christchurch with 80,000, Wellington with 71,000 and Dunedin with 64,000 if the suburbs are added in each case.

Differences in scale and density between Britain and New Zealand are also indicated in the growth of towns and cities. Between the 1890s and 1920s towns and cities grew in both size and number. At the time of the 1896 Census over a quarter of the population lived in the four main centres of Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin. Only one other town exceeded 8,000 population. By 1926, over a third of the population lived in the four cities while half lived in towns larger than 8,000 (Olssen, 1981, 253).

A particularly interesting feature of New Zealand's population density is the absence of towns of intermediate size. A table comparing the population density of England & Wales with New Zealand is presented in Appendix 3.

The character of these towns and cities varied considerably from those in Britain too, in that market gardens and livestock were commonly found within city boundaries and many houses were surrounded by empty sections (Olssen, 1981, 253, see photographs in Appendix 5). These sections allowed stock to be grazed, horses kept and open space for children's play even in relatively industrial areas, close to small factories, meatworks and other enterprises. Arnold writes of New Zealand towns as "a sprawl of vegetable gardens, orchards and hen-runs" (1976, 2), while an Australian visiting Auckland in 1906 commented that

The city looks unkempt, dishevelled, as if it had not yet made up its mind whether to rise to the height of a metropolis or sink to the depth of a village ... (quoted in Arnold, 1976, 2)

The point being made by Arnold is important in grasping the essential nature of New Zealand in the early decades of the twentieth century, for New Zealand's "founding colonial stock were predominantly villagers in upbringing, and ... the sprinkling of townsmen among them included many who were

emigrating because they hankered for a return to rural life" (1976, 2: see also Fairburn, 1975).

Arnold's point is supported by my research on the mobility history of nineteenth century male immigrants. Only twenty per cent of them had their birth registered in British cities, and a further fifteen percent in large county towns. A considerable proportion of their fathers were agricultural labourers, suggesting that the migrants, many of whom became farmers in New Zealand, were essentially rural or village dwellers (Toynbee, 1979a, 71-73).

Variations in Time and Space

The relationships between time and space, between the physical environment and the social relations within that environment, are not always clearly distinguished by scholars interested in the history of the Western family. Sociologists have sometimes been guilty of exaggerating the extent of industrialisation, and therefore the degree to which families were affected by, and obliged to respond to, or resist change, in the society of which they were a part.

Large scale social change is not only concerned with chronological time it is also associated with tremendous regional variation (Kumar, 1978: Pahl, 1968, 47: Smith, 1984). In his evaluation of the work of the founding fathers of sociology, Kumar clearly demonstrates their

enthusiastic appraisal of the cataclysmic changes taking place in the European society of their time, but that very enthusiasm - whether positive or negative - created images of industrialising society which did not necessarily match the reality, whether they were dealing with the nature of the organisation of work, the transformation of social relationships or other aspects of social life. Manchester was not Lancashire, Lancashire was not English society. The horrific description of the lives of the working class in British towns, particularly in Manchester by Engels is a case in point (1969). The disruptive effect resulting from the exploitation of wage labourers and their dependents was limited to areas where industrialisation was already established. This is not to deny that workers unaffected by industrialisation were not also oppressed (Pahl, 1984, 41-62).

The physical separation of home and work in Britain took place on a much smaller scale and over a much longer period than implied by most writers. The work of anthropologists and sociologists in communities in Britain demonstrates the persistence of old forms of household organisation in rural districts. For instance, the domestic organisation of the rural Irish peasant family in the 1930s has been shown to resemble that of other peasant societies (Arensberg & Kimball, 1940). More recently, Humphreys (1966) has demonstrated that these rural family patterns

continued till the early nineteen fifties, while others have discovered similar continuities in the nineteen sixties in the Shetlands and other remote parts of the British Isles (Cohen, 1982).

It is important to establish at the outset that the household organisation of New Zealand farming and rural families particularly, was heavily influenced by the low level of technology and infrastructural development in the early decades of the century. Geographic isolation, either as a result of distance from neighbours or the poor state of some roads, meant that most farming families had to be self sufficient in terms of such necessities of life as food, warmth and shelter. They relied on their own produce in the form of eggs, milk, butter, cream, meat and vegetables. Supplies of flour, sugar, tea and other goods not produced on the farm were often ordered in bulk and transported to the homestead either by the farmer or by the merchant or stock agent as little as twice a year.

Isolation also affected the range of goods farms were obliged to produce for the needs of the household. It affected what goods could be produced for exchange. Furthermore, any travel was likely to involve muddy, unstable roads, liable to slips and other hazards associated with horse drawn vehicles. This set limitations on social as well as economic activities. Nevertheless, evidence to be presented later indicates that rural communities were

highly cohesive in terms of social relationships (Chapters 8 and 9).

Related to the question of regional differences is the extent to which the character of social relationships have changed. According to Kumar (1978), the writings of some classical theorists and closer to our own times, Wirth, and other authors, have exaggerated the importance of *gesellschaftlich* relationships in modern life, forgetting or neglecting the persistence of strong primary group relations among family, kin, neighbours and friends even in the daily business of getting a living.

A rural-urban framework is useful in the sense of providing an organising device⁵ for distinguishing certain factors affecting opportunities for women's work. Some of them are associated with the location of natural resources to be exploited, the degree of penetration of industrialism and capitalist enterprise and with modification, the nature of social relationships likely to be associated with settlement especially those relating to economic life (Frankenberg, 1966). Under some conditions, for instance, in rural settlements largely untouched by modernisation, the profit motive may be somewhat less salient in making decisions about the nature of work to be done, than survival with a modicum of comfort.

As an organising device for the New Zealand material, a rural-urban framework is also convenient for helping alert

the researcher to the possible presence of environmental factors such as resources like firewood, an important source of fuel necessary for cooking, heating water and providing warmth in the general absence of electricity and especially important to families in the lower socio-economic strata. Where access to bush and sea is easy, where wild life abundant, and where use of natural resources is not controlled, as in New Zealand, fishing, hunting and gathering might also be used by some people to help provide some food and allow them to supplement their income. Because of the low density of population, and the smallness of most communities, access to environmental resources was both easy and important to many families in the early decades of this century in New Zealand. These conditions made it possible for women and children to contribute to the support of the family as a whole.

Moving towards the urban end of the continuum, it should be noted that for many families living on the outskirts of New Zealand towns, even in 'industrial' areas, the products of bush and beach were a source of economic good. In addition, most houses were built on sufficiently large sections of land to provide opportunities for vegetable gardening. Whether they chose to work them for the use (or indeed, exchange) value they produced, is a topic of considerable interest which we explore later in connection with the empirical material. In the meantime,

let us consider some of the links between social relations and organisational complexity.

Social Relations and Organisational Complexity

Analysis of the New Zealand data suggests that not only have identifiable forms of household organisation been systematically related to economic opportunities and constraints within the locality but also that many families had ties with kin, neighbours and friends which were of an economic as well as a sociable nature. Strategies for earning a living were broader than those contained within the household unit and the formal economic system. For farmers and married women, especially rural and working-class women, the workplace extended into the neighbourhood through direct and indirect reciprocal services. Those who engaged in this sort of work did so partly driven by economic need, partly by a sense of reciprocity. The same patterns of mutual support have been observed in nineteenth and early twentieth century Britain (Roberts, 1984: Ross, 1983: Humphries, 1982: Anderson, 1971).

In New Zealand, men and children too, had their social networks which overlapped with those of the women. Furthermore, these social networks were used not only for

reciprocal services on a day-to-day basis but also provided sociability. Social networks can also be viewed as potent sources of social control. For instance, Bott's work suggests the importance of social networks as a factor influencing conjugal roles (1971). More recently, Harris has isolated social networks as one of the crucial modes of articulation between the private and public domains (1983, 1969, 165-75). In addition to Harris, other writers have suggested that mono-sexual networks may be an important predictor of the degree of segregation in the household tasks of husbands and wives (Lee, 1978). Others again have suggested that the relation between network connectedness and conjugal role segregation may be contingent on the extent to which network structure favours group formation (Harris, 1969: Morris, 1985). In any situation in which there is a high degree of group cohesion, there is likely to be a high degree of normative agreement.

Social relations at work in early twentieth century New Zealand, both hierarchical and lateral, were likely to be personal rather than impersonal, in small workshops or offices where the employer might be a relative, a neighbour or a friend of the family. The reason for this is that the proletarianisation of the labour force, already well advanced in Britain by the first decades of the twentieth century, was less marked in New Zealand. This was partly a result of the economic importance of the primary sector,

what had become a tradition of family farming in which so many made their living, and also because of the smallness of scale and low level of organisational complexity even in towns.

Closer to the present time, the importance of self-employment and the small enterprise has been noted. Because of smallness of scale, New Zealand is the 'self-employed society' par excellence (Franklin, 1969). This is not to deny that in the early decades of the twentieth century many men and women were employed under conditions of work similar to those found in the same period in Britain, that is, their relationships with employers were likely to be confined to the labour-wage contract.

The key to the relationship between the family and community lies in (a) the degree of interdependence in the sense of reliance upon others, and (b) individual perception of social standards of acceptability and responsibility and (c) in evaluation of social performance by others. Needs for self-esteem are largely met in social participation, through conforming with, or competing for status (Janeway, 1971, 169-173; Rogers, 1980, 31).

In his treatise on roles, Banton (1965) writes that sociologists have long appreciated and discussed the contrasting social relationships of rural and urban communities (see also Banton, 1966, especially the contributions by Mitchell and Frankenberg, and Frankenberg,

1966). In small communities, in rural areas, and in towns where people work in close physical proximity in their own neighbourhoods, the mechanisms for ensuring that order prevails are far more important than in those localities where goals are achieved through single-stranded economic contracts with employers based on universalistic standards.

Although closeknit communities may be composed of relatively homogenous individuals (families or persons), close conformity to norms cannot be assumed. Nor can we assume that standards are uniform in different communities. Moore's historical study has demonstrated decisively that the moral standards of his pit-man Methodists, were more a product of community life than religious prescription (Moore, 1974).

Related to flexibility in local norms and the active creation of moral standards as part of community life, is the possibility that behaviour in small and close-knit communities may also be used as a basis for providing contrasts in the means by which status is evaluated (Plowman et al., 1962). In such communities, status is earned by individuals who are directly evaluated by others on the basis of their personal qualities. Conceptualisations of a 'good mother' or 'good wife' will vary according to different kinds^{of} community-set standards and in the degree to which individuals feel themselves constrained by social controls within the community. These qualities are

typically demonstrated through participation in community affairs, but above all by performance in adult roles associated with their gender, that is, as husbands and wives and as parents. By contrast, it may be suggested that in a locality in which residential mobility is the norm, where people have been unable to 'put down roots', evaluation must be based on external characteristics, such as the fruits of conspicuous consumption, or on the prestige accorded the breadwinner's occupational level (Chapter 9).

Since self-esteem depends partially on status, acknowledgement of one's success as parent or spouse must be earned in ways deemed acceptable in a particular social milieu. A more extended discussion of women's status in early twentieth century New Zealand communities will take place in Chapter 9. In the meantime, we will proceed to examine the literature concerned with the household, work and family, paving the way for constructing a theoretical framework for the investigation and interpretation of empirical data.

Summary and Conclusions - Main Themes

We are now in a position to outline the main themes of the thesis in a more systematic manner than was possible in the introduction. The first of these themes is the emergence of modern New Zealand society. As we have seen, in the

early years of the twentieth century, there was a marked movement towards modernisation from the last quarter of the nineteenth century. During this period, New Zealand started on its own particular path to becoming an industrial society. The establishment of British markets for new kinds of agricultural produce, the development of secondary and tertiary sectors of industry, bureaucratisation, and innovations in the technology and organisation of farming, and distribution of products was accompanied by urbanisation. We should note, however, innovation is not the same thing as diffusion, that economic change - as well as social - is likely to affect different regions unevenly. We should note too, that a relatively high proportion of the population still lived in rural areas and small towns, and that many of those 'actively engaged' in earning a living, were employed in small establishments or on a self-employed basis.

Around this period too, the birth rate was declining quite rapidly, and the age/sex structure which had been so uneven in the early days of settlement, had stabilised. Signs of growing maturity were also evident in the greater proportion of the population having been born in New Zealand. We have noted that although there were employment opportunities for women as a result of urbanisation and bureaucratisation, the vast majority - according to official statistics - were engaged in unpaid

household duties or domestic service. New Zealand women were the first in the world to get the vote, but they did so as an acknowledgement of their work as wives and mothers.

Above all the thesis is concerned with the work of women and girls within the household. Given the historical and social conditions, the descriptive and analytical emphasis of this exploratory work must lie in the household and the family. It will be argued in Chapters 2, 3 and 4, that household and family must be treated separately in order to avoid problems arising from assumptions which are deeply rooted in modern society.

The household will be viewed as an economic unit, as a form of social organisation in which strategies for subsistence throughout the life cycle are met through the activities of its members. The definition of 'economic' used in this thesis is a very broad one. As Pahl says, "The unit for getting by is the *household*, whose members can use their own labour in distinctive ways (various forms of work or resource options) and can draw on distinctive sources of labour from outside (1984, 126). Therefore we must be careful to distinguish the household, or family economy, from the formal economy. Given the low level of structural complexity and social conditions in New Zealand, we must also make allowance in our analytical battery for other forms of paid and unpaid work characteristic of small and stable communities (see Chapter 4).

One of the notable features of New Zealand society in the nineteenth century was its relatively low degree of class structuration (Giddens, 1973). Many small communities appear to have been relatively socially homogeneous, at least compared with Britain. Low density of population, pioneering conditions in some areas and the prevalence of family farms probably served, at least initially, to inhibit the emergence of the sort of major chasms which divided British rural society. Nevertheless, among some sections of the urban population class lines were clearly drawn, and working and middle status divisions were marked. These divisions had important implications for household organisation, for women's work and for the quality of family relationships generally. More specifically, as a result of the economic and social conditions of New Zealand's brand of modernisation, the 'really useful woman' started to become obsolete.

I will argue that the process through which this happened had its origins in Victorian domestic ideologies (Hall, 1979), but started to 'take-off' as local communities became more socially differentiated and relative egalitarianism gave way to status striving. As part of this process, more and more women removed themselves socially from the communities of which they were a part, from the reciprocities which bound them into local networks as women rather than wives. In doing so, they lost the very basis of

personal evaluation retaining status only through their husbands.

Modernisation created the conditions for the devaluation of housework and childrearing. Along with greater material comfort for all, it also created enhanced opportunities for recreation and leisure for men and children within the family home and elsewhere. Furthermore, increasing rigidities in class structuration were accompanied with clearer divisions between the public and private spheres, and within the household, as children became less likely to contribute to the economic well-being of the unit.

FOOTNOTES

¹ While New Zealand was the first nation to extend suffrage to women, Wyoming and Utah gave women equal voting rights with men in 1870, Colorado and Idaho in 1873 and 1896 respectively. The first dozen States to grant women suffrage were all in Western frontier states a fact of considerable significance (Wertheimer, 1977, 260). Comparing the situation of the United States with that of New Zealand, Sutch also draws attention to the importance of family farming and lack of rigid class hierarchies in these American States (1973, 42).

² There are two general histories of New Zealand, presenting two competing interpretations. Sinclair (1959) depicts an essentially frontier society emphasising attempts to resist the establishment of the English class structure in New Zealand. Oliver (1960) is a case study in cultural transmission bearing the motif of the inherited nature of New Zealand society. *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (Oliver, 1981) is an up to date collection of essays by a range of scholars on different aspects of New Zealand history. An important work is Pember Reeves' *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand*, originally

published in 1902. Condliffe's *New Zealand in the Making* (first published in 1936) is particularly useful for the modernisation period. A collection of essays in historical geography selects some developments particularly concerned with the farming sector (Watters, 1965). An American visitor's impressions of New Zealand in the late 1950s is Ausubel's *The Fern and the Tiki*, a study in New Zealand national character.

³ It should be noted that far more scholarly attention has been given to Maori kinship and family than to the European. Social anthropologists have been particularly active in this field (see for instance, Metge, 1976: Kawharu, 1975: Hohepa, 1964: Webster, 1972).

⁴ Unless otherwise stated, all statistics in this section have been extracted from the New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings for the appropriate years.

⁵ The origins of the rural-urban continuum lay in Toennies's *gemeinschaft/gesellschaft* polar typology and others proposed by the founding fathers of sociology. Frankenberg (1966) provides a model of social change drawing on several of these analytical devices each of which concentrate on different aspects of social reality, listing them, together with the most important of their analytical dimensions in his book (1966, 286-92).

In his trenchant critique of the rural-urban continuum (1968), Pahl observes that the temporal aspect of the process of urbanisation has been inadequately stressed. He proceeds to argue that we should be thinking of reconsidering the rural-urban continuum "not in terms of geographic, demographic or economic indices but rather on the basis of *changing social relationships*." (1968, 278, italics in the original). The dominant tradition has been to stress the content of roles rather than their interrelationships.

P A R T I I :

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF THE FAMILY,

THE HOUSEHOLD AND WORK

CHAPTER 2

SOME FUNCTIONALIST APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF THE FAMILY

Having sketched in broad outline some of the special features of New Zealand society at the beginning of the twentieth century, it is now time to review the relevant sociological and other literature dealing with family, household and work. This will occupy this Chapter and the next two.

A major theme linking the concepts of 'the family' and 'work' as used in both scholarly and general parlance, is that they are ideologically related to each other. Indeed they reflect historically constructed notions of gender. As Bernardes has argued,

'gender ideology' seems to reconcile the contradictions between the very powerful ideology associated with wage labour and the ideology of motherhood and housework ... [D]espite a widespread emphasis upon work and instrumentalism, the labour of a huge number of women is neither recognised as 'work' nor rewarded by wages. (Bernardes, 1985b, 278).

A recent collection of papers emphasises the point that in order to understand both the family and the economy in modern society it is essential to grasp the links through which they are intimately interdependent (Close & Collins, 1985, 1). As the editors observe in their introduction both Marxist and functionalist accounts of the relationship between the two make unwarranted assumptions about the demise of the family as a unit of production. Similarly they tend to perpetuate notions that work is to be equated with employment. We will be concerned then with an examination of different approaches to the study of family and economy with a view to a more fruitful reconceptualisation.

The review and critique will begin with a short section on bias in male-dominated contemporary sociology. This will be followed by a discussion and critique of functionalist theories about the family and women's work. Chapter 3 is a review of Marxist and feminist approaches to the study of women's oppression in the family. In Chapter 4, we will be more deeply concerned with the household than 'the family' as such, especially with its organisation in past time. Chapter 4 will conclude with a section laying out concepts and definitions with which we will be most concerned in presenting the New Zealand data on the household.

Bias in Social Theory

Male-centredness is apparent in the work of those who dominated the development of sociology in the mid nineteenth century. For instance, Spencer, Comte and Durkheim believed that women were biologically and temperamentally best suited to the domestic domain (Novitz, 1982). Whatever their personal opinions about the place of women in society, their writings which form the very foundations of sociology are almost exclusively concerned with the public sphere. This can be partly attributed to their specific concern with the cataclysmic changes taking place in Europe. The work of Engels is a major exception and his contribution will be considered below, together with Marx's indirect influence on feminist thought.

The androcentric legacy of the founding fathers was noted at the 1982 Annual Conference of the British Sociological Association with the theme 'Gender and Society' (Gamarnikow et al. 1983a, b). Indeed, the previous year, Stacey commented that contemporary sociologists tend to split their interests into the public arenas of class, industry and work on one hand, and the private one of the domestic, on the other (Stacey, 1982, 407). However, much is being done to challenge the split (Gamarnikow et al., 1983a, b).

Modern divisions of labour in sociology are also reflections of the fact that sociologists are themselves participants in society. To a greater or lesser degree, they endorse the view of the biological, 'natural' basis of the family. Marxists and functionalists both tend to assume that because all women are 'naturally' capable of bearing children, they are also the proper persons to rear them. Marxist theorists have treated the procreative functions of the family as a biological constant. This helps account for their general lack of interest in the private domain, and until recently, in the reproduction of the labour force. Functionalist assertions about the universality of 'the family' and its functions are based on assumptions that biology is destiny.'

Feminists have drawn attention to the implications of androcentrism for sociology as a discipline. For instance Spender (1981, 1) has argued that most knowledge about society has been produced by men, for men, using theoretical frameworks which perpetuate the invisibility of women. This knowledge is then passed off as human knowledge. It is therefore important to rebuild our theory, indeed our integrity, by a sustained effort to 'bring women (back?) in'. Feminism has a major contribution to make by re-uniting macro- and microsociology, through new perspectives and reconceptualization (Smith, 1974).

Our thinking can be clarified by adopting Oakley's useful distinction between sex and gender (1972). Sexual divisions are those which apply to physiological differences between males and females such as genitalia and reproductive functions and capacities. Anthropologists have shown the tremendous variation of gender-based behaviour between, and within cultures (Rosaldo & Lamphere, 1974: Tiffany, 1984). Reviews of the literature amply demonstrate that apart from procreative and domestic activities, women are everywhere dominated by men. The observed range of forms of behaviour correspond not to sexual differences *per se*, but to culturally prescribed, socially constructed notions of behaviour considered appropriate to a particular society. Such gender-based differences are then associated with masculinity and femininity and must be seen as being culturally and historically specific (Bilton, 1981, 320).

Parsons and Functionalism

One of the most influential writers in the area of the sociology of the family is Talcott Parsons. A review of Parsons' theory of the family is *de rigeur* in any work of this kind because of his immense contribution both as an original writer and a catalyst. The importance of his work for this thesis lies more in the theories and research which

have arisen out of his original formulations than in his own writings.

Parsons is known for his general theoretical work as well as his contributions to the area of the family. At the most general level he produced his theory of society and its interrelated systems couched at a high level of abstraction. This has been much criticised most particularly for its doubtful utility, its inadequacy in terms of dealing with conflict and social change and with the ideological assumptions with which it appears to be imbued (Turner, 1974, 28-59). Parsons' conceptualisation of the modern family is as a sub-system linked with other systems with the same structural and functional properties as other systems and can be challenged on the same bases as his general scheme.

Parsons has also been known for his evolutionary approach to broad social change in which the family is seen as having been stripped of its former functions. As a result of the process of social differentiation, other institutions are now responsible for religious, educational, recreation, governmental, and economic functions. The nuclear family of modern society has only two specialised functions, the socialisation of children and the stabilisation of adult personality (Parsons, 1956).

According to Parsons, the family is clearly differentiated in terms of both leadership and functions

(Parsons, 1956). In this view of American family relations, mothers are allocated the expressive functions, concentrating their energies on maternal and caring tasks. They have primary responsibility for managing, in Parsonian terms, the problems of integration and tension management. Fathers are instrumental leaders, with primary responsibility for goal attainment and adaptation through wage earning. It is through their employment that the family is linked to the economy.

As we will see later, values appropriate to the private sphere of family (and kinship) conflict with those appropriate to the public sphere. The tension between the two is resolved through the strict segregation of roles within the conjugal family. Conflict or tension between kinship ties and occupational success are eased as a result of cultural preferences for independence of adults from kin, creating the freedom necessary for social and geographical mobility. The conjugal family has evolved its characteristic structural and functional properties as a result of its successful adaptation to the demands of economic life. Let us first concentrate on the division of labour within the family.

The Family Division of Labour

The division of labour is one which 'fits' well with the rest of society. Those best suited to fill their role in terms of their biological characteristics also carry out the tasks associated with that role. It is 'fitting' that the father is the one who should be faced with the problems of gaining a living since his instrumental role brings him into contact with the values of modern society, values which are antithetical to those governing family life. His son as a future breadwinner, will be required to adjust himself to shifting his identification with mother and home, into the world of achievement, universalism, affective neutrality, specificity and orientation towards self. His daughter need not do so; her adult role as wife and mother awaits her in her future home, the complement of her husband. Should either fail to adopt these gender appropriate value orientations there is likely to be conflict (Morgan, 1975, 25-39).

Parsons' conception of 'the family', is narrowly conceived, confined as it is within his grand conceptual scheme, leaving little room for explaining the economic aspects of marriage, women's labour within the household (Beechey, 1978) or their employment. In addition, his scheme neglects the operation of power within the family, as

well as conflict and change. Let us look at these problems in a little more detail.

For Parsons, it is her biological characteristics which make the wife the 'natural' choice for the role of childrearer and housewife, the expressive leader of the family. He shows little appreciation of the nature of women's work (Oakley, 1974) or for the expressive aspects of parenting, conjugal affection and sexuality on the part of husband/fathers. Neither does Parsons appear to consider that father's employment may itself be a manifestation of his affection for family, nor a mother's domestic labour an expression of love. The analytical overlap of expressive and instrumental behaviour has been developed more satisfactorily by others such as Scanzoni who has examined both husbands' and wives' instrumental and expressive behaviour in their respective roles (see below).

The most important deficiency of Parson's scheme for this thesis is that his conceptualisation of the division of labour, including his use of the expressive-instrumental dimension allows no room for analysing the family as a place of women's work or for making any valid interpretation of changes in that work in terms of empirical reality (Morgan, 1975, 35-38: Beechey, 1978, 161).

Women's Employment

While Parsons acknowledged that many women were in paid employment in America, he considered that few married women did so. Furthermore, he claimed that a paid job for a wife was likely to introduce undesirable competition into the household leading to tension in the marital relationship. Even if she was employed, the nature of the wife's paid work was unlikely to provide serious competition for her husband as the primary status-giver for the family, drawing attention to the secondary nature of wives' labour force participation (Parsons, 1956). Parsons himself appeared to recognise that women's interests were sacrificed in favour of others but left the matter untheorised.

When functionalist theory has been applied to the employment of women, it has also been inadequate in explaining their lack of occupational success. The concept of the dual role of housewife and worker, a later functionalist modification of Parson's concept of the role of married women, foundered because of its emphasis on the tensions between private and public roles for individual women, considering her subordination in the family unproblematic. A good example of this approach is Myrdal and Klein's, *Women's Two Roles* (1970).

While the concept of the dual role was a useful one in its own time, stimulating a great deal of research, it

is limited. A full explanation of the employment of women requires structural analysis of the economic system and the relationship between that and the domestic one. It is essential to theorise at a macrosociological level, and where appropriate, to use a historical perspective which is aimed at isolating which elements have affected the behaviour of women, generally, e.g. the new demand for labour in service industries in the 1950s.

Further, the likelihood that women will be employed also depends on ideological factors. World War II stimulated, indeed, required the employment of millions of women throughout the world. They were urged to contribute to the war effort in New Zealand as in other Western societies on farms and in industry. Most of them lost their jobs when the troops returned. The period immediately after the war was marked by a dramatic reverse in women's labour force participation as a result of propaganda encouraging women to do their duty by raising families and generally devoting themselves to the domestic domain (Cook, 1985). This was followed by a rise in female labour force participation dating from the early 1950s.

Other evidence of propaganda can be seen in the efforts to seek the support of women in rationalising their roles as wives and mothers, to make them better able to provide comfortable homes and a healthy environment. Reiger has documented this for late nineteenth and early

twentieth century Australia (1985). Others have investigated the position of New Zealanders, either in regard to what is now called the 'professionalisation of motherhood' starting with the work of Sir Truby King in the early years of the twentieth century (see Bunkle & Hughes, 1980) or on other aspects of ideology aimed at keeping women in their 'proper' place (Ehrenreich & English, 1979; Wearing, 1984).

Parsons, of course, does not deal with ideology when conceptualised as a tool serving the interests of dominant groups in society in which a superordinate group or individual is able to influence or determine the desires of others

shaping their perceptions, cognitions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can see or imagine no alternative to it, or because they see it as natural and unchangeable, or because they value it as divinely ordained and beneficial' (Lukes, 1973, 26).

Instead, Parsons gives considerable weight to 'cultural' norms, distributed evenly through society. His theoretical approach is therefore inadequate in locating sources of conflict and dissension within and between social groups and obscures variability within societies.

Taking into consideration such factors as the varying demand for labour and the effect of ideology it is hardly surprising that investigation of 'sex-roles' in the family

and society generally, has been theoretically barren (though empirically prolific).

The intellectual inheritance of functionalism is noticeable in the hundreds of American studies which have addressed the question of 'sex-role' differentiation. A recent review covering books and articles written since the mid 1970s is interesting in that, apart from a few articles, it excludes any radical theoretical approaches such as Marxism or feminism (Miller & Garrison, 1982, 257). These American studies appear to have tried to come to terms with the pervasiveness of the division of labour, but have failed to do so because they spurn the analytical tools with which to treat the material and ideological characteristics of capitalist society which together condition and reinforce the differential experience of men and women.

Functionalism and Conflict

We should note that Parsons' conception of the family is one in which conflict and contradiction are virtually absent. Indeed, the assumptions of order and stability inherent in his work preclude this. This can be seen in the continuing neglect by later functionalists of the operation of power within contemporary marriage, through their insistence on concepts and methodology which lead them to write uncritically about 'companionate marriage' and

'egalitarianism between spouses' (Thorne, 1982). Such writers also tend to see the modern employment of married women and the assumption of limited domestic duties by their husbands as a sign of approaching symmetry in the domestic division of labour in which wives are likely to be responsible for breadwinning and husbands for housework and childcare (Young & Willmott, 1973). Others would take issue with this notion of symmetry. Both Oakley and Hartmann interpret women's domestic labour in terms of their subordination as women. Oakley's empirical study of housework as work (1974) and Hartmann's review of research on the hours of household labour and employment of both husbands and wives present a contrary view and will be discussed fully later (1981, see also Edgell, 1980, 5-13 for a useful critique).

It may be that the degree of segregation in the household division of labour may be *per se* a poor indicator of domination and inequality in marriage. Edgell (1980) suggests that given the requirements of earning a living in capitalist society, it is to be expected that the vast majority of couples favour a strategy in which wives remain responsible for housework and childrearing and their husbands for earning a living.

Edgell (1980) in his study of segregation, domination and inequality in marriage, further suggests that there is no necessary correspondence between egalitarianism in

decision making and the sharing of household tasks. According to his view, it is theoretically possible that couples whose domestic division of labour is sharply segregated may share equally in decision making, while those who share domestic labour and wage-earning responsibilities may be sharply divided in access to resources, with the wife effectively excluded from control. Christensen (1977) has developed a conceptual scheme for analysing the separate dimensions for marital inequality, suggesting much the same as Edgell.

Not all those who betray functionalist influences have been neglectful of power. For instance, Scanzoni has produced a range of publications on power, negotiation and conflict in marriage (1978, 1981). Unlike other writers, he has also attempted to bring historical perspective into his formulations of exchange in marriage, concentrating on the changing balance of rights of husbands and wives and therefore, the relativities in costs and rewards of marriage to partners in the exchange. His treatment of the instrumental/expressive dimensions in the roles of both husbands and wives also moves far from Parsons' conceptualisation (1978). In this work, however, he is concerned with the normative level rather than observed behaviour.

Scanzoni explains the apparent gains made by married women in decision making in terms of the greater bargaining

power they have acquired vis-à-vis their husbands, as a result of their labour force activity. This would seem to be theoretically untenable since it is not resources which create power, but power which creates the potential to amass resources and dispose of them (Bell & Newby, 1976). That employed women appear to have more power than housewives, may be more a function of the ways in which traditional authority is handled on a day to day basis, than a reality.

A pervasive notion in the work of functionalists generally, is that of the family as a refuge for the breadwinner, a 'haven in a heartless world' in which he can shed his tensions and within which his economic dependents can be protected from the undesirable elements of public life (Lasch, 1977). This notion, which dichotomises the areas of social life which we call 'family' and 'economy' serves to obscure the links between them as we shall see. Functionalists are not alone in this. Marxists, in general, tend to see the home as a safety valve where the tensions generated in employment can be diffused - or dumped, where they will cause least harm. In doing so, they, like the functionalists, view the family in terms of its functions for capitalism, its 'fit' with the industrial economic system. A more critical approach is taken by such writers as Scanzoni, by Laing, Cooper and other critical

theorists, by Harris (1983) as well as by feminists of many varieties.

Functionalists, generally, appear to take for granted the notion that the husband is head of household. As a result, they approach problems related to household organisation on the basis of this assumption. Variations on this theme are regarded as aberrations and pathologies. However, we must be careful of who is defining a 'social problem' and the assumptions shaping these definitions. Anthropologists have drawn attention to contemporary societies in which women are household heads. For instance, studies of the Caribbean draw attention to the statistical predominance of consanguineal families in which affinal ties are absent. As a result of unemployment or low-paying jobs requiring the migration of men, it is women who are the household heads in the majority of cases. Here, the father role is economically and socially marginal, the product of local circumstances and cultural heritage (see for instance, Gonzalez, 1969: Pollock, 1972: Smith, 1956).

More recently, feminist and working class historians have been asking questions about power relationships involving the head of household in past time, questions which have not yet been satisfactorily answered because of lack of reliable data. Issues related to differing balances of power and responsibility will be raised again in Chapter 9.

Let us now consider some of the broader aspects of structural change in the links between family and economy originating from functionalism, or from critiques of that approach.

Kinship

Parsons' writings on kinship have also been influential. For him, the American kinship system is 'open, multilinear and conjugal' that is, the emphasis is on the marriage bond. Furthermore, there is no structural preference for any particular type of kin. On marriage, a couple is expected to form an economically independent household, physically separate from relatives (Parsons, 1956: Parsons, 1943).

According to Parsons, status is based on membership in a kinship unit, achievement, and to a somewhat lesser extent on personal qualities, possessions, authority and power. In modern society, achievement in occupational life clashes with the demands of kinship. The contradictory demands can be resolved through the conjugal family in which normative support for its independence to move, to act autonomously is built in.

In Parsons' view, the 'needs' of the industrial system require that positions be filled on the basis of vocational achievement and on universalistic standards. It is also essential that its personnel be free to move if

required. The nuclear family must therefore be free of ties to kin which might obstruct residential or social mobility. The structural 'isolation' of the modern nuclear family on kin make it the form best suited to the industrial system.

In addition, values associated with successful performance in the economic sphere are as inconsistent with close ties to kin as they are within the nuclear family core. Both are spheres of social life where values of ascription, particularism, diffuseness and affection are appropriate contrasting with achievement, universalism, specificity and affective neutrality in the world of business.

The keynote of Parsons' theory of the family, at least for the present thesis, is that viewed historically, there has been an increasing trend towards structural isolation resulting in the characteristic conjugal family of modern (North American, white, middle-class) society.

Parsons acknowledged that not all families fitted his model, for instance, elite, rural and working class ones.² The implications of this variability are twofold. First of all, we need to allow for analysis of differences in the household division of labour and secondly, in the possibility of variation in links between households linked by kinship. Let us take these in turn.

Edgell (1980, 3) has made a useful contribution to reconceptualisation of the modern family, using Bott's work

as a basis. He argues that Bott (1971) is an empirically grounded extension of Parsons' theory which takes into account the fact that the industrial system does not have the same effect on all families. Bott observed that her closely studied sample of twenty London families varied substantially in the degree to which husbands and wives shared their work and leisure. The degree to which their conjugal roles were considered joint or segregated varied with the nature of the links between the couple and the community of which they were a part. Couples who tended to perform their work tasks independently or in a complementary way also tended to belong to closeknit social networks, those in which their friends all knew each other. Those couples who performed household tasks together, or in which there was a degree of overlap, tended to have friends who were unacquainted with each other.

The nature of social relationships in different kinds of communities has already been discussed in Chapter 1. Bott's concepts reappear in Chapter 8 where the leisure patterns and community networks of family members are discussed.

Social networks may consist of neighbours, friends and kin. Variability may also exist in the degree to which the balance between these three kinds of social partners may also vary. Allen (1979) has researched this topic among middle and working class subjects in contemporary England.

Let us look at what Parsons and his protagonists have had to say about kinship in modern society.

Parsons' model of the 'isolated' nuclear family has been interpreted by many to mean that we would expect to find minimal contact between adult children and their parents, siblings and other relatives. However, scholars in Europe and the United States have produced a mass of evidence to the contrary. There is a great deal of evidence of visiting, mutual aid of a daily and regular nature, specially between generations at vulnerable stages of the life cycle in contemporary society. Even where parents and their adult children do not live close to each other, efforts are usually made to keep in touch whether by duty or most usually, a combination of the latter and personal choice. An excellent review is provided in Morgan (1975) and in Allen (1979). Another review of sociological accounts of the effects of social networks (including kin) on the family in Britain and North America is provided by Lee (1978).

It should be noted that Parsons himself acknowledged that extended kinship networks were still important in modern society, but that kinship rarely provides structural principles underpinning non-familial relationships. For instance, in complex Western societies there are no specified rights, duties and obligations between distant kin. He also notes that under the impact of increasing specialisation and differentiation, that the degree of

selectivity allowed in establishment and perpetuation of social relations with kin in economic, political, educational and recreational activity is probably greater than in earlier times (Parsons, 1980, 225-228). A few other writers have published works on this theme. For instance, Bell has commented on the decline of the family business in the United States (1962, 39-46), while Crozier (1965) has considered the question of the decline of occupational inheritance.

Firth has noted the high degree of discretion allowed among English kinship networks (1956: Firth et al., 1969) which, I suggest, in terms of Parsons' theory is a result of the loosening of economic ties with kin in modern times when viewed in historical perspective (see Chapter 7).

Parsons claims that his concept of the 'isolated' nuclear family in no way precludes the continuation of kinship ties, and that the challenge to his work in this area indicates complementarity rather than contradiction (Parsons, 1980, 225). We will explore the links between nuclear families and their kin in the context of the New Zealand findings.

Summary

As a general approach to problems associated with the relationship of family and economy, functionalism obscures

the overlap between the public and private spheres of social life by opposing them. This is seen most clearly in Parsons' treatment of women's employment and in the work of later research. Functionalism, generally, also encourages the conflation of biological, ideological and material dimensions in the social forms which we call 'the family' so that it is impossible to distinguish the factors underlying different expressions of the oppression of women and children within it, and indeed of men.

Parsons' highly abstract model of the nuclear family, discourages attempts to account for, or even recognise the power differentials within it. As we have noted, there are assumptions about the 'naturalness' of the family division of labour, with women's expressive abilities opposed to men's instrumental ones, forming one axis of differentiation. The dysfunction for individuals, either within the family or elsewhere, is hardly considered.

Despite these deficiencies, some aspects of Parsons' work, or the work of others who have modified his approach, look more promising. This is particularly so where the focus is on change in the formal economic system where this relates to kinship, links between households and variability in conjugal roles. Some functionalist studies of social change involving the interrelationship between family, kinship and the formal economy are also useful in constructing an analytical framework.

Functionalist Theories of Social Change

In general, functionalists have been more interested in the contemporary family than in its historical forms, though some notable work has been done on the effects of industrialisation on the family and vice versa. In this section, as in the previous one, other non-Marxist writers' work is included.

While Parsons' own work lacks empirical grounding, Goode's data (1963a, b) comes from many societies, mainly non-Western, which have passed through, or were at that time experiencing industrialisation. Goode's thesis is that there has been a general trend in societies undergoing industrialisation towards acceptance of the conjugal nuclear family both as an ideal and an empirical reality.

Industrialisation and Change in New Zealand

We must now consider how the work of functionalists and other non-Marxists discussed in this Chapter may be best used in relation to the study of the household and women's work in early twentieth century New Zealand. Let us start with the problem of identifying which aspects of industrialisation, as it was experienced in New Zealand, might have affected the instrumental activities of household members. We may note, however, that the theoretical work to be discussed was based on the industrialisation process

in Britain, North America and, in the case of Goode, a range of non-Western societies as well.

In order to generate useful propositions it is necessary to isolate exactly which elements of the general process of industrialisation affect family life (Beechey, 1978, 196). While in his earlier work Goode failed to make these explicit (Harris, 1983, 68-70), a more recent paper (1980) spells out the important factors in some detail. These include proletarianisation, the contractual nature of relationships between employers and employees, and the greater possibilities for living as an individual rather than as a member of a family group. Summing up this later paper Goode writes

Industrialisation affects the family in three structural ways. First, at various points in the structure of the conjugal family or of the larger extended kinship network, industrialization reduces the authority of those who have traditional statuses, such as parent or husband. Second, it offers the less powerful, such as the young and women, alternative sources of the rewards that they used to be able to get only in families: for example, sexual pleasures, social security, personal services, etc. Third, industrialization has not created additional supports for family, while it undermines the authority of older institutional supports for the family, such as the church, schools and the state.

In general, the technical and economic market needs of industrialization emphasize four new factors: first, skills rather than family connections; second, the privacy and rights of the individual rather than those of the family group; third, geographical mobility, which becomes more important than family

stability; and fourth, an alertness to self interest, which supersedes familial loyalty (Goode, 1980, x-xi).

In his critique of Goode's work, Harris (1983, 68-70) singles out type of industry and its association with achievement and other 'modern' values, concentration of capital and mode of industrialisation. He puts forward the proposition that the fit between work skills, job demands (for geographical mobility for example), and values will depend on the degree of industrialisation reached. Thus, at an early stage of industrialisation, one might expect to find family forms and values consistent with earlier period. Much would also depend on the economic and social location of the families studied and especially on the precise ways in which they were articulated with the economy, as wage-earners or otherwise.

Taken together with Harris's observations on the precise way in which industrialisation, proceeding at uneven pace, created the conditions for change in pre-existing family forms, we now have the beginnings of a propositional inventory. The sociologist may therefore expect to find a wider range of family forms in a transitional period both in relation to their contact with new forms of earning a living and in relation to different occupational categories.

Functionalist Treatment of Women's Work

Goode's work is notable for its stress on Western notions of individualism in creating or facilitating change in family structures. Associated with this is his claim that the conjugal family, with its emphasis on the marital bond, with the freedom to choose a mate on the basis of romantic love and a number of associated features is a remarkably attractive option to those whose lives are dominated by kinship, and for whom alternatives exist as a result of industrialisation. Examined from a feminist perspective this interpretation raises questions about women's and girls' subordination as wives and daughters and about the alternatives to marriage and motherhood offered by industrialisation.

Although considerably less rigid in his use of functionalist assumptions and categories, Goode's 'soft' functionalist approach (Morgan, 1975, Chapter 1) reveals the ideological tone of Parson's assertions about the roles of family members especially his notions about the employment of women in contemporary society. Goode considers the 'statistically unique' position of women today, the result of their improved status in society and the more liberal attitudes which allow them to leave the home to engage in paid employment, that is, as a relaxation of 'traditional' values (Scott & Tilly, 1980, 126).

Scott & Tilly point out however, that peasant and proletarian women have always worked and that traditional values favoured their contribution to the household in whatever ways were possible (1980). On the basis of comparative study of employment statistics from a number of European societies, they claim that during the course of industrialisation, married women withdrew from the work force, partly as a result of improvement in economic conditions (Scott & Tilly, 1980). According to Scott & Tilly (1980) what Goode understood as 'traditional' values of women, is in fact, a contemporary form of domestic ideology.

As I intend to demonstrate by using New Zealand material, this originated in middle class Victorian values relating to women's 'proper' place. The question of the ways in which change affected the values of women and girls in different levels of society will be raised through an examination of their work in the household and elsewhere, as well as the social relations of domestic labour and community networks.

There are two issues to be considered here. First of all, there is the questionable validity of the so-called principle of "stratified diffusion" used by Stone (1979, 26), Banks (1954) and Young and Willmott (1973) in which values espoused first in the middle class then diffused both upwards and downwards through the ranks of artisans and into

the lower reaches of the working class. Such a view denies any possibility of alternative value systems in working class or rural communities (Moore, 1974: Joyce, 1980). Gittens has challenged the 'principle' in connection with the spread in birth control among working class women (1982). Secondly, there is the question of the nature and changes in values held by women rather than by men. This will be discussed in a later chapter when alternative interpretations can be evaluated in terms of the data.

Smelser's *Social Change and the Industrial Revolution* (1959) is a good example of work in the Parsonian tradition, relevant to the general area of change in family structure as a result of industrialisation although the book has recently attracted damaging criticism (Anderson, 1971, 1980a: Harris, 1983). However, the book is of some importance since it was the first attempt to draw attention to the persistence of traditional familial values, especially patriarchal ones (Smelser did not use this term), as they conflicted with new patterns of work organisation in the formal economy. Later research suggests that Smelser misinterpreted the nature of change in families adaptation to changing circumstances as well as mis-timing the period when change created disturbances (see Joyce, 1980, 53-56).

Kinship and Industrialisation

Parsons' theory of the continuing trend towards the structural isolation of the nuclear family suggests that any study of family and economy must concern itself with links between households related by kinship, especially in past time (Chaytor, 1980: Hareven, 1978).

Morgan describes Anderson's analysis as "the most sophisticated attempt at a sociological explanation of the importance of kinship in an industrialising society" (1975, 79) covering both rural and urban forms of kinship and reciprocity. Anderson's documentary research on family structure in Preston during the 1840s and 1850s is particularly useful since he has demonstrated that kin relationships provided the basic social mechanism for adaptation to the new forms of earning a living created by industrialisation and urbanisation. In this way, family ties may have become stronger as a result of the hardships caused by social change (Anderson, 1971: Roberts, 1984).

Hareven (1982) noted the importance of kinship during an industrialising period in the United States. Using both interviews with past employees and records, she described and analysed much the same sort of relationships among her French Canadians in Amoskeag (1900-30) as Anderson had done in Preston for an earlier period (see also McLaughlin, 1971). The presence of kin was a major buffer mitigating

the chronic hardship suffered by many working class households at this time (Bradbury, 1982: Humphries, 1982: Young & Willmott, 1962: Rapp, 1982).

We do not yet have enough data to demonstrate what mechanisms for survival were used where families had no kin on whom they could draw for assistance, for instance, as a result of long-distance migration as we are likely to find in a recently settled colonial society. Under what sorts of conditions were households likely to turn to neighbours for help? Do neighbours sometimes provide a substitute for kin? (Anderson, 1984, 181: Park, 1982). These issues will be discussed in the chapters on kinship and community.

Origins of the Modern Family

While functionalists of the Parsonian kind would seek to explain changes in the family in terms of adaptations to other social systems, Goode would do so in terms of the value to individuals in maximising their needs (Harris, 1983, 66). For instance, he views the emergence of modern forms of the family in the working or lower classes, those least able to withstand the impact of industrialisation, those who have nothing to offer their children by way of property or inheritance (Goode, 1963a, b). The adult children are then free to seek what fortune they can elsewhere in the form of employment.

Some of the historical work on family and kinship in past time addresses this question. Anderson (1971) attributes a high degree of calculation on the part of wage earning young people in industrialising Preston. Their wages, so necessary to the household, could be used as a lever to extract better treatment at home. Alternatively, they could afford the money to live elsewhere, away from parents who made claims on their money or domestic services. Roberts (1984b) using her oral history material for a later period for Preston challenges Anderson's interpretation, noting the very strong familial and kinship ties in the early twentieth century and even today. She does concede that the early period of industrialisation may have been different. For instance, the desire for young people to be independent from their parents may have been a function of very strict parental control in the earlier period, especially under threats to patriarchal authority as a result of economic change.

Leaving home or migration in search of better-paid work may have been the only viable alternative for some young people. Empirical research is necessary if we are to be able to know what kinds of people in what kinds of circumstances, accepted or rejected available alternatives. It is notable that research in contemporary New Zealand on Pacific Island migrants to Auckland reveals the same sort of tensions between elders and young adults described by

Anderson in nineteenth century Preston (Pitt & Macpherson, 1974).

Parsons would appear to locate the origins of the modern family in the middle class, as exemplified in his model with its distinguishing characteristics of leadership and function in relation to the conjugal pair and their children, its structural isolation and successful fit with the industrial system.

There are problems with both Parsons' and Goode's accounts as we have noted. Most specifically, Parsons is not concerned with the empirical investigation of change or the variability in family types. In common with Parsons, Goode's work is value-laden, resulting in a misleading and partial representation of reality. A clearer model is required if change in family relationships is to be more adequately distinguished.

Harris (1983) is careful to specify that the structure of the family and the nature of any changes in domestic and other social activities must be viewed in relation to the links between the family and the community on the one hand, and the larger social formation of which it is also a part. Accordingly, the most important distinguishing features of the modern family in addition to its nuclear structure, the common residence of a husband, wife and their children, are its relative segregation from

kin, from the social life of the locality and from the major forms of economic life.

It is now appropriate to consider how best to conceptualise this 'larger social formation'.

The Theoretical Primacy of Capitalism or Industrialisation

Goode's work combined with Harris's explication of the specific elements in industrialisation affecting the family can direct us to some of the features which must be taken into consideration if a sociological account of change in family form during an industrialising period is to be effective. However, as Harris says, functionalism

has failed to provide any way of analysing the variety of family types empirically found in industrial society and understanding their incidence and variation in terms of a theory of the social form of the societies in which they occur (1983, 70).

In constructing types of family, we might specify the dimensions in terms of the degree of childcentredness, and the degree to which segregation of the family from kin, the social life of the community and the formal economy, as suggested by Harris (see above). We might also categorise families on the basis of differences in their division of

labour within the household and on the social relationships involved in getting a living.

The thrust of Harris's argument is that functionalism is inadequate because it is committed to mapping the interrelationships between elements in society, in terms of the contributions that part makes to the whole. The presumed 'fit' of the nuclear family with the demands of industrial society, cannot direct us towards effective analysis of interrelationships within it, nor can it help us explain changes in structure during periods of transition. Indeed, 'industrial society' is not a theoretical type, but a term denoting an empirical class of societies (Harris, 1983, x) and as such, cannot be used to generate propositions.

In contrast to functionalism which, he considers, provides a clear theory of the modern family, but an inadequate one about the nature of industrial society, Harris suggests that Marxism does the opposite (1983, 179). Although Marxists have traditionally taken for granted the relation between the family and the economy, especially where women are concerned, historical materialism has the potential to produce satisfactory explanations.

Materialism must take its full title seriously and accept that, because all production takes place under determinate historical, social and cultural conditions, specific forms cannot be explained by reference alone

to the mode of production of the social formation of which they are part. Their explanation always requires reference to the conditions which are historically determined and incidental to the mode of production itself (Harris, 1983, xi).

Harris's book *The Family in Industrial Society* is an exploratory work, based on a critical review of the relevant functionalist and other literature. It is particularly influential in this thesis, having the same general concerns and appearing around the same time as a number of other publications which are related to the more specific concerns of this thesis, that is, the situation of women and their work as members of households.

Like some of the feminists whose writings we are about to consider in some depth, Harris urges empirical investigation of the processes whereby industrialisation interacted with existing family forms, transforming them along with the rest of society. In particular he observes that we do not know enough about the variety of preindustrial forms of the sexual division of labour, especially within the household. He writes

understanding of transformation requires examination of the changes in marital relationships, whose understanding depends in part on the changing activities of men and women outside the family and the resultant transformation of gender concepts and definitions general throughout society (1983, 198)

As we have noted above, this involves investigating the social context, the nature of local communities, the ways in which domestic groups were articulated with other groups in society. We need this information if we are to be able to effectively explain changes in the internal organisation of the family.

We also need to examine the changing place of domestic groups in relation to the mode of production. While much of Harris's literature review is concerned with the transition to capitalism, this thesis focuses on the changes wrought by change in the means of production associated with industrialisation and in the associated social relations of work, particularly within the household.

Some Implications for Analysis and Interpretation

The review and critique of the work of functionalist and other scholars included in this Chapter indicate directions for analysis of New Zealand families at three levels.

At the societal level, the implications of changes in economic life as a result of increasing penetration of capitalism, especially through the industrialisation process, can be identified in terms of proletarianisation. We could expect to find variety at the local level in terms of the availability of employment and other forms of earning

a living and also some variation in the nature of social relations at work. We could also expect variability in levels of skill and demands for new skills, depending on the type of industry. A newly formed industrial community might attract labour from elsewhere, leading to the formation of a new community with some of the social characteristics of those in other industrialising societies. The interview material presented in Chapter 5 and subsequently will demonstrate some of this variety and explore the implications for family life.

The attraction of new industry and job opportunities raises questions about geographical mobility and also sets the scene for exploring the quality of relationships between households related by kinship (Chapter 7). It also suggests interesting questions about other kinds of social ties of a primary or second nature, ties with neighbours who might exchange goods and services with others (Chapter 8).

We could expect variations in communities long settled with those consisting largely of recent migrants. This offers the analyst opportunities for exploring the factors which are associated with the degree of cohesion and social differentiation and therefore, the ways in which individual families were articulated with others in work and social life more generally.

As suggested earlier, the degree to which families' social networks could be regarded as close- or loose-knit,

may be of importance in predicting the degree of segregation in household economic organisation and in the leisure patterns of married couples. This question will be followed up, firstly in Chapter 6 which deals with the household division of labour, and later when dealing with variability in community life in Chapter 8.

As we have noted, the industrialisation process is considered to have had important implications for changes in relationships between parents and children. There were also important changes in the social relations of husbands and wives. These changes will also be examined (Chapter 9).

In the summary of Parsons' work and that of his intellectual descendents, it was noted that their general approach is inadequate because of its cursory treatment of gender differences. Their uncritical association of the family with harmony and loving relationships is also inadequate to explain the patterns of dominance and submission clearly observable in family life, both past and present.

We must now turn to approaches which offer a more effective analysis, those which question assumptions about consensus, stability and harmony in family life and which also focus on hierarchies created by age and gender.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The universality, and indeed, the very concept of kinship has been questioned by Schneider in a recent critique (1984).

² A number of reviews and studies deal with Parsons' 'exceptions'. Although Frankenberg (1966) is not particularly concerned with kinship, the early chapters of *Communities in Britain* give something of the flavour of life in a wide range of rural and small locations together with a relevant bibliography of community studies. For the upper class, there are the studies by Crozier (1965) and Lupton & Wilson (1970). Both of these studies associate kinship and affinity with property. A large number of studies dealing with kinship in urban communities and housing estates in Britain are mentioned by Frankenberg (1966). Park's (1982) study of Pakuranga covers a middle class suburb in contemporary Auckland.

CHAPTER 3:

MARXISM AND FEMINISM

Feminist theories of the oppression of women are generally based on economic hierarchies rooted in the mode of production, and/or gender hierarchies which are perpetuated in the family and reproduction. Some of these will be reviewed in the first part of the Chapter and their merits and demerits evaluated in terms of their usefulness in analysing change in household organisation in New Zealand in the early decades of the twentieth century, a period of quite rapid economic and social change.

Throughout Chapters 3 and 4 it will be argued that fruitful avenues for exploring the links between the so-called public and private spheres, production and reproduction, can be made through viewing the interaction of capitalism and patriarchy as a single historical process (Lown, 1983). When the household is taken as the primary unit of analysis it is possible to distinguish conceptually between the material and ideological bases of familial behaviour, and to theorise the links between them. It is also possible to distinguish changes in economic and kinship relationships over time.

Much of the work with which we will be concerned in the earlier sections in this Chapter stem from Marxism and/or feminism. Most of the writers fall under the labels of Marxist-feminist, radical feminist or socialist-feminist. While these approaches are analytically separable, it is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish them since there is no basic agreement as to who should wear which label, especially when modifications to earlier views bring approaches closer together. All of these writers share a belief in women's oppression and seek theoretical insight to identify its specific forms in a wide range of historical and social contexts. Together they believe oppression to be the result of human agency and seek to eliminate it through social and political action (Jagger, 1983, 123).

Both Marxist- and socialist-feminists are committed to basic Marxist concepts and therefore see human nature created through the dialectical interrelationships among human biology, society and the physical environment. These interrelationships are mediated by praxis, that is, human labour. Human nature is a product of society, and reflects the specific historical conditions of production and reproduction at any particular period. While orthodox Marxist approaches regard gender as unproblematic, socialist feminists emphasise that humans are also gendered beings. They therefore focus on the different kinds of labour of men and women which form the basis of their life experience,

seeking to understand the sexual division of labour¹ and the social relationships involved in work. Their method is that of historical materialism.

Along with a theoretical commitment to the primacy of the concrete, historical materialism implies that consciousness, however expressed (e.g. as intellectual production, attitudes and beliefs), originates in social relationships in the material world. This does not mean that the material determines the ideational, but rather that social structures embodying particular kinds of social relationships places constraints or limits on consciousness and experience (Young, 1980, 185). Both women's and men's lives are circumscribed by their class position and their gender. Socialist feminist analysis demands a political economy grounded in an examination of their material condition in order to expose the ways in which both participate in and oppose their own subordination (Hartsock, 1983, 304).

Feminist historical materialism also demands that transhistorical explanations be eschewed (Young, 1980, 186). Any claims regarding the cross-cultural universality of women's situation must be regarded with grave suspicion (see the critical review of radical feminism below in this regard).

At a later stage we will return to socialist feminism since some of their insights are particularly useful to the

present project. At the moment, however, it is necessary to sketch out some of the earlier work to provide a solid background for analysis and interpretation of the New Zealand data. Let us start with some of the ways in which production and reproduction have been treated in Marxist and feminist analysis.

Production and Reproduction

Many feminists have been influenced by Engels' work, *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*. His definition of 'materialism' is contained in the following evaluation of production and reproduction in social life.

This ... is of a two-fold character: on the one side, the production of the means of existence, of food, clothing and shelter and the tools necessary for that production; on the other side, the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species. (Engels, 1972, 71)

It is only quite recently that modern Marxist scholars have become interested in the relationship between capitalism and the family viewed as the sphere of human reproduction in which workers are maintained and the next generation produced. It is the value created by housework which has claimed their attention.

The Debate on Housework

One of the earliest contributors to what has come to be known as the domestic labour debate (Benston 1969), concludes that housework, a precapitalist form of labour, produces only use value for the woman's household. Seccombe (1974) considers that housewives create goods through their work as producers and consumers in the family but in relation to capitalism cannot be termed 'productive'. Both consider domestic labour, however useful to the persons involved, forms no part of the capitalist system. Dalla Costa and James (1975) argue that housework creates labour power which can be viewed as a surplus value creating commodity. They also assert that housewives should be paid for their socially necessary work. As Humphries (1982, 198) has pointed out, labour power is the only 'commodity' that has the capacity to create more value than it possesses itself. Who then appropriates this value?

Other writers feel that housework increases surplus value and therefore, the profit to employers. For instance, Harrison (1974) considers that housework enables capitalists to pay wages at a level below that of the value of labour power and so increases the margin of surplus value. The housewife therefore contributes to capital through her domestic labour. Gardiner (1976) and Fox (1980) take a somewhat different view. They consider that domestic

labour depresses the value of labour power by reducing the amount that the household must spend on commodities. As a result the capitalist may pay workers less and thereby increase their profit. However, the value of labour power must be sufficiently high to cover the cost of a family's reproduction (Molyneux, 1979).

The domestic labour debate now appears to have reached a stalemate. While all participants see domestic labour as functional to capital in some way through the reproduction of labour power, there is no consensus about the ways it does so. Its protagonists have been criticised on the grounds of their insistence on demonstrating the functionality of housework for 'the system'. They have therefore fallen into the same teleological trap which has beset others who have tried to explain the family in terms of its functions.

In addition, the domestic labour debate may be criticised on the basis of its rank economism, its high level of abstraction, insensitivity to the range and flexibility of women's work not only in the home, but also in the labour force.

Both traditional Marxists (and functionalists who include 'liberal' feminists) have clearly distinguished the spheres of production and reproduction in their conceptual equipment. For both, it is waged work which provides the essential link between the two. Most feminists now

consider that they have thereby perpetuated and reinforced the ideological divisions between 'the public' and 'the private', divisions which are implicit in contemporary notions equating work with the paid employment of men (see Chapter 4). Such dualisms and others like them have their origins in the Victorian middle class cult of domesticity which will be discussed later.

What the domestic labour debate shows quite clearly is that home and work are not separate spheres economically. They form part of the same system although the ways in which they are interrelated are still unclear (Morgan, 1985, 90).

Reproduction

In orthodox Marxist theory, the family is usually considered to be part of the superstructure of society. In this view, the family, like other institutions, serves to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie through the transmission and reinforcement of ideology.

As has been pointed out before, the great, classic writers on social theory were concerned with major social change in society. It appears that the nineteenth^{century} social theorists shared an assumption that women belonged to the private sphere, and were marginal to their interests. Marxist categories are not gendered, so it is not possible to use them without modification in any analysis designed to

identify or explain differences between men and women in either production or reproduction. Marx himself did not consider domestic labour as productive (Oakley, 1982, 167: Hamilton, 1978, 15-17). Furthermore, he was quite clearly antifeminist and appears to have shared many of the characteristics attributed to the bourgeois *paterfamilias* of his own time (Collins, 1985, 117).

Engels, however, recognised the inferior position of middle class women in nineteenth century England. He considered this to be a result of the importance of private property, and the need to control their sexuality. Lacking property, proletarian women were not similarly oppressed. As wage labour destroyed small-holding peasants, patriarchal relations were undermined as women and children were incorporated into social production (Hartmann, 1979, 3: Beechey, 1977, 1978).

Feminist writers have not necessarily shared Engels' view that women would eventually take an equal place in society with men as an outcome of the proletarian revolution. In the light of evidence from societies where revolution has taken place changes have been made, but these are superficial. Most change has occurred through women's increased participation in the labour force, but their domestic labour is still exploited suggesting the persistence of oppression (Imray & Middleton, 1982, 15).

As the domestic labour debate has shown, housework may be seen as producing workers, thereby replacing labour, the economic equivalent to the replacement of machinery or other necessary forces of production (Jagger, 1983, 156). Their concern has been centred on the economic links between housework and capitalism, most specifically on the implications for the theory of surplus value.

Socialist feminists have taken the heretical step of modifying Marxist theory for their own purposes. They insist that the labour involved in sexuality and procreation is part of the economic foundation of society, "partly determining 'the economy' and partially determined by it" (Jagger, 1983, 136).

Furthermore, social and individual needs for bearing and rearing children, as well as for sexual satisfaction requires human labour in the form of nurturance. Men and women are both capable of providing nurturance but the sexual division of labour ensures that it is women, not men, who are involved in child rearing.

While the sexual division of labour varies greatly from society to society, and class to class within the same society, control by men over women's bodies and women's work results in male-constructed definitions about the proper form and content of women's productive and procreative capacities. Thus it is only among the upper middle class in capitalist society does it make sense to look on women as

emotional/irrational creatures, incapable of heavy manual labour (Jagger, 1983, 130). Class, as well as gender, expresses the material and social relations upon which the woman's household rests.

Socialist feminists consider that Marxism provides a convenient framework for the analysis of change through the use of the historical material method. However, they agree that in unmodified form its use precludes effective identification and analysis of historically specific forms of oppression which are the result of the dominance of women by men. Marxists must therefore provide other explanations of how dominance is determined by the mode of production. Radical and socialist-feminists are sceptical about the ability of Marxists to do so. They therefore seek resolution in extending Marxist categories to allow the analysis of the sexual division of labour in productive and reproductive capacities taking into consideration the social relations of production which differentiate women from men in any specific situation.

It is the insights gained from radical feminism which have stimulated the growth of a new movement in feminist theory. Let us now examine the special contribution of radical feminism before returning to its synthesis with Marxism, socialist feminism.

The Contribution of Radical Feminism

The distinguishing characteristic of radical feminist theory is in the attribution of theoretical primacy to patriarchy when attempting to explain the oppression of women (see below). In direct contrast to Marxist feminists, radical feminists reject the notion that it is capitalists who most benefit from housework. Radical feminists argue that it is men, in individual cases, the woman's husband who is the beneficiary. Not only is he able to expropriate her services, but also any income created by household members for his own consumption and time for his own leisure.

Radical feminists vary in the ways in which they conceptualise and treat both patriarchy and materialism. Mitchell, writing of the labour of women, locates their paid employment in the sphere of production, and treats reproduction, sexuality and child-rearing as ideological phenomena, that is her conceptualisation of patriarchy has no material base (Mitchell, 1966). Her later work expands on this approach (1973). Reiger (1985) has applied her theoretical framework to the condition of Australian women for the period 1880-1940.

Firestone, on the other hand, considers the fundamental historical dialectic to be that of sex (1971). In this view, the material base of patriarchy is women's reproductive work. Although her work attempts to bridge

Marxism and feminism, it is nevertheless considered "the most complete statement of the radical feminist position" (Hartmann, 1979, 9) because of her insistence on the primacy of patriarchy on which all other forms of oppression rest.

A writer whose work is more directly relevant to this thesis is Delphy. Delphy is a feminist sociologist who has departed from orthodox Marxism. She has also departed from the empirical concerns of other radical feminists in her interest in the rural, peasant household of France (1984, Chapter 3-5) and also in her work on consumption within the home (1979). Her research work demonstrates the divisive effects of patriarchy not only on women, but also on junior members of the household, including men.

According to Delphy, the material base of women's oppression is the domestic mode of production. Delphy views marriage as 'the institution by which gratuitous work is extorted from a particular category of the population, women-wives' (1976, 77). The marriage contract is a form of labour contract which ensures that domestic work has no value (see also Hamilton, 1981, original 1909). Throughout history, marriage has been a necessity for the vast majority of women. Within marriage, women's labour-power is appropriated by husbands, thus constituting the common oppression of all women by men.

The value of Delphy's work for this thesis lies in her stress on the significance of the social relations of

work within the household and its division of labour. In regard to the concept of the head of household she writes

The power of the husband and the power of the father are not opposed; they are both the power of the head of the household and that power accounts for the appropriation of the labour of the children as well as of the wife, and that of unmarried female or male relatives and other dependents" (1984, 168).

Problems with Delphy's approach fall into two areas. According to Middleton (1983) she takes a 'dogmatic' stance in relation to the character of the marriage contract and exhibits a 'gross insensitivity' to the substance of historical change.

In common with other radical feminists, she supports the view of the independent, overriding importance of patriarchy in all cultures and all times. However, as Rosaldo (1980, 394) has pointed out, men do not dominate women universally. It is rather that they do so through a variety of social structures so that women are denied the social privilege, authority and esteem enjoyed by a majority of men. There is considerable variation in the situation of women in different social classes, as well as by ethnicity and other attributes. Radical feminist theory cannot account for differences such as these, nor for the enormous variety found in Third World societies (Freire, 1972; Rogers, 1980).

A critique of Delphy's work from a Marxist viewpoint has been made by Barrett (1980, 14), who argues that the concept of patriarchy invokes dangerous generalities regarding male domination and is therefore unacceptable within a Marxist feminist framework. A critique of Delphy's work also appears in Barrett & McIntosh (1979) and a spirited rejoinder is provided in Delphy (1984, 154-181).

We must question the universal nature of the marriage contract posited by Delphy. Numerous writers have commented on the variable nature of marriage within and between cultures. Many have noted the indispensability of the wife's contribution in peasant and proletarian households (Scott & Tilly, 1980). Contemporary observers like Eilert Sundt in Norway (1980) and Frederick Le Play in France and Germany (Scott & Tilly, 1980) make the point that the value of a thrifty and hardworking wife in both country and town was immense and often made the difference between survival and ruin. Handbooks for immigrants to New Zealand in the nineteenth century all emphasised the economic importance of wives.

Furthermore, the personal columns of newspapers of the time make quite clear that both men and women expected to bring to their marriage a contribution in the form of money, chattels and skills which would make their future economically secure. Comparisons of the personal columns of

New Zealand newspapers in the early 1900s with those of the 1980s are instructive (Phillips, 1983).

These conceptions of womanhood and marriage, together with their empirical manifestation must be contrasted with the image and reality of middle class Victorian ladies (Branca, 1974). They also vary substantially from those associated with women in contemporary New Zealand and elsewhere. The marriage contract and the sharing of resources must be viewed within their socio-historical context.

In connection with the broad course of social change, Middleton argues that the means for the transition to capitalism was effected not solely by the accumulation of capital by wealthy urban-based merchants, as suggested by the mainstream of writers in the field, but also through a process in which the heads of some peasant households acquired surpluses through appropriation and later expropriation/exploitation of the labour of all members of the household, family or servants, male or female (Middleton, 1983). This suggests that the rise of capitalism depended on the expropriation of labour power of subordinate household members by the head of household.

The empirical evidence for women's continued oppression in the household can be seen in the disparity of hours worked by women and men. The evidence comes from the work of a range of researchers, only some of whom use a

feminist framework. It has been shown by Walker & Woods (1976) that when employment is combined with domestic duties that women who are employed spend 71 hours a week working, compared with the 55 hours similarly spent by their husbands.

Despite improvements in domestic technology, the number of hours spent by housewives in the United States in the 1970s is slightly more than that spent by their counterparts in the 1920s and 1930s (Hartmann, 1981). Other studies are concerned with the unequal allocation of resources and the ways in which they are consumed. These studies demonstrate the favoured situation of the male breadwinners in relation to contemporary housework (Hartmann, 1981: Pahl, 1980: Land, 1980: Oakley, 1974: Miller & Garrison, 1982).

An interesting area of study is that of the development of domestic technology. Despite dramatic improvements in public utilities, consumer goods designed to lighten the housewife's load, and the trend to smaller families, the time spent on housework has not declined (Barton, 1985: Strasser, 1980, 1982: Vanek, 1980: Davidoff, 1976).

As we will see in the next section, the type of household organisation studied by Middleton was a very different one to that of the contemporary household which has been the object of intense study in regard to the hours

of work of men and women. Hartmann (1981) considers that this disparity is clear evidence of the continuing presence of patriarchy in modern capitalist society. The question which must be raised here is very nature of patriarchy. We cannot assume that the same form of male dominance existing in early modern times was the same as that of today.

Summary

The debate on housework has raised many questions relating to the adequacy of Marxist theory. The narrow conception of the productive base of society limits an effective analysis of the sexual division of labour since, by definition, this is located in the public sphere in modern society. As we have seen, too, Marxist theory is sex-blind. Men and women are involved in both production and reproduction but we cannot explain why it is that it is women who perform domestic labour and why it is that women are oppressed by men, not only in the household, but also elsewhere, and not the reverse (Braverman, 1974: Hartmann, 1981: Harris, 1983, 194).

One of the more valuable lessons learned from the protagonists in the domestic labour debate is that in focussing on women, rather than wives/mothers, Marxist-feminists have concentrated on economic, rather than 'natural' or biological interpretations of women's

subordination. This is consistent with analysing the family not merely as a childrearing group, but also as a household (Harris, 1983, 198). As I have argued earlier, by clearly distinguishing economic from other aspects of family life, we come closer to avoiding the problems created through ideology embedded in sociological theory (Strathern, 1981: Rapp, 1982).

In Delphy's work, firstly in her emphasis on the family, analysed in terms of a domestic mode of production, and secondly in her application of this to the French peasant family we can perceive the importance of patriarchy not only with regard to women, but also other subordinate members of the household. If, however, we are to be able to specify the theoretical links between modes of production, both within specific historical formations and between them, we must draw on the methods of historical materialism in order to specify in what ways the social relations of production and reproduction are peculiar to that time.

This section serves the purpose of introducing the broad strands of feminist theory rather than attempting to draw attention to concepts for specific use in the analysis and interpretation of data. In the next section, it will be possible to start selecting specific strategies for organising the research material utilising the most promising strands of socialist feminist theory.

Capitalism and Patriarchy

In this section, a critical analysis will be made of the contributions of socialist-feminists and others of the nature of the link between capitalism and patriarchy. A distinction will be drawn between those who have sought to theorise the two as separate systems, linked in various ways and those most recent contributions who locate the source of women's subordinate position in terms of a single historical process through which male dominance is reinforced and recreated in new forms specific in time and social location.

The feminist literature is fraught with conceptual confusion especially in regard to the term 'patriarchy'. Many of the early and psychoanalytic feminists view patriarchy as an autonomous ideological system through which the child acquired gendered identity. Radical and revolutionary feminists see patriarchy as a system of male domination in which men as a class have power and control over women as a class. Such a view is quite unacceptable in its universalistic assumptions.

Many anthropologists reserve the terms 'patriarchy' and 'matriarchy' for categorising whole societies (Bamberger, 1974). Even among socialist feminists three distinct conceptions can be identified (1) as a generalised structure of hierarchical gendered relationships, (2) as male control over women's labour power and (3) as male

control over women's reproductive capacities (Burris, 1982, 53).

As we have seen in previous sections, socialist feminists insist on the material basis of women's oppression though they do not necessarily succeed in specifying the material basis of patriarchy (Burris, 1982, 54). For them, capitalist-patriarchy is a specific form in which the capitalist mode of production is structured by the patriarchal sexual division of labour. Capitalism and patriarchy are mutually reinforcing in this view (Mann, 1983, 278-79: see also below).

Other writers have suggested that the use of the term is inappropriate to modern society and should be reserved for situations in which fathers and husbands maintain relations of domination over children and wives and older men over younger men (Edholm, Harris & Young, 1977).

Some theorists have suggested terms which embrace whole systems of domination associated with procreation and sexuality. For instance, Rubin (1975) uses the concept of 'sex-gender system' and Cockburn (1981) has proposed 'andrarchy'. Rubin believes that the sex-gender system has its own relations of production, distribution and exchange. Ferguson & Folbre (1981) use the term 'sex-affective production' to denote the socially conditioned activities associated with 'sexuality' and children. The ages at which women become mothers, the numbers of children they have, the

organisation of child-rearing, and the ways in which nurturance and sexuality are expressed can be seen as the outcome of economic and social factors operating in a particular social milieu.

The problem with these proposals to replace the term 'patriarchy', with an approach such as that which Rubin, Cockburn or Ferguson & Folbre suggest, is that the search for the source of domination is located outside the social relationships of men and women (Lown, 1983, 28). The division of production and reproduction into separate spheres is dangerous too, since it perpetuates the familiar associations with the public and the private. Both these criticisms apply to dual systems approaches. Resolution may be found in a single system approach though this has simply been proposed rather than developed (see below).

Dual Systems Approaches

Two names are most closely associated with efforts to develop the links between capitalism and patriarchy, Hartmann and Eisenstein.² Hartmann views capitalism and patriarchy as two separate and semi-autonomous entities. Eisenstein would see the two as mutually reinforcing (1979, 5-55).

Hartmann defines patriarchy as

a set of social relations between men, which have a material base, and which, though hierarchical, establish or create interdependence and solidarity among men that enable them to dominate women. Though patriarchy is hierarchical and men of different classes, races, or ethnic groups have different places in the patriarchy, they also are united in their shared relationship of dominance over their women; they are dependent on each other to maintain that domination (1979, 11, *italics added*).

Patriarchy's material base is men's control of women's labour in the household and in the market place (1981, 372). Men maintain this control through excluding women from access to competition for crucial economic resources, and by restricting their independence and sexual freedom through monogamous marriage. They have a vested interest in the continuation of sexual and domestic services which they also claim as their right, although they may not benefit equally. The services performed by women for men within the home extend into the labour force where women are likely to do the sort of tasks which are shunned by men.

For Hartmann, the family is the locus of gender, class and political struggle (1981). Family relationships are not primarily based on affective ties, rather, the family is a unit in which production and redistribution take place, the prime location for the study of the material aspects of gender relations.

It is interesting to note that some Marxists are moving towards reconceptualising the Marxist concept of

production. For instance, Frankenberg (1976) critically reviewing British community studies in the light of recent feminist work sees women and children as a reserve army, not only for the economic system to which they are indirectly linked, but also for the family (1976, 29-30). Close (1985) considers that families are still attached to the economy, remaining 'units of production' despite changes in the means of production as a result of industrialisation. His view is that the Marxist concept of production should be extended to the private sphere. This involves the notion of 'people production' (see section on production and reproduction above).

Murgatroyd takes up this challenge, seeking to distinguish the production of people and things in both systems (1985, 57). In trying to preserve the integrity of Marxist theory, she assigns priority to the productive and social relations of capital. Without this, the 'tight internal logic' of Marxist theory dissolves. In doing so, however, she appears to fall into the same trap as she accuses Hartmann of doing, for the activities and relationships involved cannot be neatly categorised in one sphere or the other.

One of the problem with dual systems theory is that market and family relations, the production of things or people, and divisions of class and gender do not necessarily coincide. Jagger considers that the use of dual models of

production and reproduction analytically conceal as much as they reveal. She suggests that it is the social relations involved in the division of labour which should form the basis of our interest (1983, 158). In her view those who offer a single stranded approach using the best insights of Marxism and radical feminism show greatest promise. Her suggestions are paralleled by those of Burris (1982, 66-72) who seeks resolution of problems in feminist theory in similar terms. These theoretical formulations, are, however, at an early stage of development.

There are also problems with conceptualising the mutual dependence of capitalism and patriarchy, or indeed any relations postulated in their interconnection (Burris, 1982). Dualistic models such as Hartmann's tend to give analytical pre-eminence either to the economic hierarchies inherent in the mode of production (Marxist) or to hierarchies of gender lying in the sphere of reproduction or procreation (radical feminists), approaches which tend to determinism and even reductionism (Lown, 1983, 29). They are therefore both politically unacceptable to socialist-feminists who desire change, and run counter to Marxist assumptions of human creativity.

Single System Theories

Socialist feminism is a relatively new approach, embodying both what is called the dual systems approach and a single system approach. However, a plea has been made that the dual systems of capitalism and patriarchy be replaced by a single theory powerful enough to analyse vastly different social structures. Discontent with 'dual vision' (Kelly, 1979) has come from a number of American writers, notably Young (1980) and Interrante and Lasser (1979). Their contributions are discussed by Jagger (1983, 146-163).

Young's major concept is the sexual division of labour (1981, 52). She argues that "a feminist historical materialism must explore the hypothesis that class domination arises from and/or is intimately tied to patriarchal domination". Her work is consistent with Ehrenreich & English's (1979) interpretation of the transition to capitalism through the focus provided by examination of 'experts' advice to women (see below). With them, she would see a distinct change in the nature of male domination consistent with the new mode and means of production and the social relations of work. Details of their theoretical contribution in which the specific mechanisms through which 'masculinism' became the characteristic mode of male dominance in capitalist society will be discussed below.

Lown recognises political relations as a pivotal organising principle (1983, 36). She argues that the concept of a dual system is not necessary and is non-productive for theory. For her, familial, reproductive, age and gender hierarchies meet in the household together with economic ones. Her empirical work shows the differential effects of industrialisation on men and women. In brief, she found that women, through their household and other labour cushioned the effects of industrialisation for proletarian men, enabling them to benefit from the fruits of higher levels of production. Women's interests, however, were sacrificed in the process.

Gittens (1985) is also concerned with the development of patriarchy in the transition to capitalism and the industrialisation process. She too rejects the artificial distinctions between economy and family, production and reproduction, maintained by Hartmann, Eisenstein and other proponents of a dual system. Her treatment of kinship and family in terms of hierarchies of age and gender are similar to Lown's. She too questions the economic and ideological dimensions of 'the family' conflated in the work of others and draws attention to the importance of the household (Gittens 1985, 70ff).

The work of Marxist and feminist scholars reviewed in the earlier parts of this Chapter is remarkable for its silence on the question of the place of kinship and children

in any historical formation (Rushton, 1979: Qvortrup, 1985). The emphasis on the relationship of capitalism and patriarchy, then, would appear to ignore important issues which have bearing on the different experience of men and women.

A single system approach in which gender and age is of central concern (Harris, 1983, 157-9), can be used to analyse the real world of household and family relationships between generations and between households, including children. Put somewhat differently, it allows us to examine changes in structures of domination, illuminating the process whereby a system of patriarchal domination associated with the head of household (as a production unit) was gradually replaced by other hierarchies of gender and generation based on a single breadwinner. This will be attempted using the New Zealand material. Ehrenreich and English's (1979) conceptualisation of change in the relationships between men and women as a result of the transition to capitalism will be used as a basis for analysis.

Ehrenreich & English (1979) use the term 'patriarchy' to categorise a specific pre-capitalist social order organised around household production in which life was not marked off into different spheres of experience of work/home, public/private or sacred/secular. Family relationships were primarily working ones. There was no external formal economy in the sense we know it today, but

rather local markets. If economic disaster struck, it was likely to be a result of vagaries of climate rather than distant markets. In the Old Order, authority was vested in males, especially elder males who made the decisions which controlled the family's work, purchases, and marriages.

The patriarchal order was not confined to the household, or a group of related households, but extended into society where the priest or minister, the 'town fathers', and the local nobility reinforced their patriarchal power at each level corresponding to their particular responsibility. Coercion was not necessarily needed since patriarchal authority was thoroughly legitimated and accepted.

A specific characteristic of the patriarchal order was the importance of women as workers. While undoubtedly subordinate to men, they were involved in a wide range of productive capacities, unimaginable today (see section on women's work in Chapter 4). They were also important for their skills as healers.

It was the coming of the Market economy, the creation of a vast and complex network of pecuniary exchanges and interdependencies, which started to shatter patriarchal relations, gradually breaking down the parochialism of household production. Only in the nineteenth century was the enormity of the change beginning to be grasped as

proletarianisation increased rapidly, building on enclosure of common land and protoindustrialisation. These cataclysmic changes meant that life would now be experienced as two separate spheres: a 'public' sphere of endeavour governed by the Market, and a 'private' sphere of intimate relationships (Ehrenreich & English, 1979, 5-10).

Only in the home could men expect to find love and nurturance, be valued for themselves rather than their marketable qualities. Women, children and home life, then took on dimensions inimical to the household as a locus of production. Women were no longer viewed in terms of their old functions, at least, not in terms of the ideology of the New Order. For those men who successfully claimed the public world of industry and commerce, home became 'a haven from a heartless world'. Their wives and children became economic dependents requiring protection from the dangers of the 'public' sphere.

Not all men were successful in the 'public' sphere. They, together with their wives and children continued to eke out a living as they could. It was among the emerging middle class that the ideologies of the new 'masculinism', deriving their coherence from the new economic order were adopted. According to Ehrenreich and English (1979, 16-20), these ideologies had their origins in scientific rationalism at a time when the revolutionaries of the economic order, the rising bourgeoisie, were developing

systems of thought consistent with the materialism and individualism of the Market order (see also Zaretsky 1976: Hamilton, 1978).

It was a world view which proceeded from the Market, from the realm of economic, or 'public' life. It was by its nature external to women, capable of seeing them only as 'others' or aliens ... Biologically and psychologically, she seems to contradict the basic principles of the Market ... Economic man is an individual, a monad, connected to others only through a network of impersonal economic relationships; woman is embedded in the family, permitted no individual identity apart from her biological relationship to others (Ehrenreich and English, 1979, 18-9).

Patriarchal ideology had viewed women as being organically linked to the whole hierarchy of society, but as morally inferior to men. In the New Order, this was reversed. The ideologically-defined woman was a perpetual alien in society, the 'public' realm. In her own domain, she was the ministering angel, the guardian of the hearth, the moral superior of man. Among the working class, such a vision could not be sustained.

Their domestic work involved hard manual labour, and when required to do so they earned money how they could. In fact, the life style of the leisured lady, delicate, fragile, elegant and childlike, required the unceasing hard labour of armies of young and unmarried women, a fact which the bourgeoisie seem to have accepted without question

(Kitteringham, 1975). A number of books and collections of interdisciplinary feminist papers deal with the emergence of bourgeois ideology (Burnam, 1979: Hartmann & Banner, 1974: Mitchell & Oakley, 1976: Hamilton, 1978, 50-75: Holcombe, 1973: Degler, 1980: Ryan, 1981).

Reviewing Ehrenreich and English's book, Interrante and Lasser suggest that the distinction might

help overcome the dichotomous analysis of the family and the economy ... It suggests a method for analyzing, in a unified and interconnected way, both the political economy of sex and the sexual economy of work. [Reading the book] the transition from patriarchal to masculinist society involves ... the very creation of work as "work" - that is, the transformation of role-defined useful work into value-producing wage labour ... [M]asculinism would highlight the complex importance of gender in distinguishing public and private spheres of activity and in identifying individuals and groups in relation to those spheres ... It could be seen as an aspect of social organisation which reproduced class divisions - by regulating the kinds of kin and non-kin contacts which supported household operation ... (Interrante & Lasser, 1979, 34).

Ehrenreich and English's (1979) conceptualisation of male dominance is particularly useful in the present context since it provides the tools for examining changes in the situation of women in New Zealand. The terms, patriarchy and masculinism, will be used in the sense in which they have been defined above for the purposes of analysis. It should be noted that these are ideal types. Applied to real

families, one could expect considerable overlap. As we shall see, however, the economic and social conditions affecting New Zealand households and families almost certainly perpetuated residual forms of patriarchy under particular conditions well into the twentieth century (Zaretsky, 1976, 38). This has important implications for feminist theory and practice and for sociological theory.

The period for which data are available covers a time of modernisation, rather than the long transition to capitalism. Nevertheless, because of the particular conditions of New Zealand's industrialisation process, such as its low level of structural complexity, the importance of the family farm, relative absence of employment for women and relatively high wages for men, that New Zealand presents an interesting case study for viewing changes in 'the political economy of sex' and 'the sexual economy of work'. This of course, will be viewed through the prism of the household which better enables us to distinguish these changes and should lead to a better understanding of the relationships between 'the public' and 'the private' as suggested by Harris (see Introduction, 3).

The recreation of the concept of work is, of course, a central question in this thesis, especially in regard to balance in responsibilities of men, women and children. Later on, we will consider the implications of one example of masculinism in the concept of the 'family wage', the

attainment of which made possible the control of family resources by the breadwinner, paving the way for husbands' spending of disposable income on leisure (Barrett & McIntosh, 1980). At the same time, it made the wife/mother economically dependent. The implications of this will be the major focus of Chapter 9.

Let us now consider some of the implications such an approach might have for the study of the household, in particular at changing patterns of male domination associated with the changing nature of production. First of all we will return briefly, to dual systems in the form of Hartmann's useful insights and then to an examination of mechanisms by which dominance might have been achieved and reinforced.

Patriarchy, Paternalism and the Household Division of Labour

In an influential paper, Hartmann has observed that social historians and others who have sought to throw light on the organisation of preindustrial family units have obscured the asymmetry of power relationships within the family. In putting forward her argument, Hartmann cites such diverse writers as Laslett, Zaretsky, Anderson, Shorter, Engels, Goode and Hareven, strange bedfellows who share little other than the view of the family as

a social entity that is a source of dynamic change, an actor, an agent, on a par with such other "social forces" as economic change, modernization, or individualism (Hartmann, 1981, 368).

She argues that these implicitly rosy views of family life in past time is a result of the emphasis by historians, anthropologists and sociologists on the mutual dependence of family members.

Mutual dependence by no means precludes the possibility of coercion. Women and men are no less mutually dependent in the household than are workers and capitalists or slaves and slaveowners. In environments that are fundamentally coercive (such as patriarchy and capitalism) concepts of choice and adaptation are inevitably flawed - as is the belief that workers and capitalists or men and women have unified interests. This is not to say that such unity can never exist. (Hartmann, 1981, 376, *italics in original*).

Working in opposition to Hartmann's dualism, Lown has developed a concept of patriarchy in such a way as to embrace asymmetry in both economic and familial processes. Her argument is founded "on the notion of unequal power relations of gender and age forming a central axis of historical and social change ... not just a facet of one particular historical formation" (Lown, 1983, 29, 30). She argues that patriarchal authority, based in tradition and legitimated in the on-going social interaction of the household is at one and the same time part of the material

relations of society and therefore subject to historical change.

Lown herself admits that the term 'patriarchy' is a conceptual minefield and appears to have confused her terms. For her, 'patriarchy' is a hierarchical system whereby adult men occupy superordinate positions of power over women, children and younger men. 'Paternalism', which is usually conflated with patriarchy is the form of social interaction which occurs in such hierarchical systems whereby the power of those in superordinate positions (i.e. senior men) is legitimated (Lown, 1983, 35). Put another way, Lown says paternalism is the outward manifestation of patriarchy in everyday social interaction.

In my view, Lown appears to have confused the term 'paternalism' which is an alternative label used frequently to denote traditional authority, with 'patriarchy' a sub-type of traditional authority (Weber, 1968, 346-51). In Chapter 9 where forms of control are the main topic of discussion, the concept of deference (Bell & Newby, 1976) will be used to denote the outward manifestations of patriarchy and masculinism.

Laslett has written about what he calls the decline of patriarchy, presumably following Weber's definition. As we shall see, this is quite consistent with Ehrenreich and English's account. It also leads us to the point of being

able to create theoretical linkages of major importance to the analysis.

First of all, his account of the division of labour within the sixteenth century household, the pre-industrial production unit stresses

The man at the head of the group, the entrepreneur, the employer, or the manager, was then known as the master or head of the family. He was father to some of its members and in place of father to the rest. There was no sharp distinction between his domestic and his economic functions. His wife was both his partner and his subordinate, a partner because she ran the family, took charge of the food and managed the women-servants, a subordinate because she was woman and wife, mother and in place of mother to the rest (Laslett, 1971, 2).

Here was an embryonic form of wage labour coexisting with a domestic group engaged together in productive enterprise (Harris, 1983, 102-111). Here, also, is the indispensable mistress of the household, for all her importance, subordinate to her husband but along with the rest of the household, creating surplus value and the possibilities of capital accumulation (Middleton, 1983).

Harris is more specific than Laslett about the process of change in terms of sociological discourse both in regard to employees and household members.

Laslett's thesis is that it is the patriarchal family/household that was destroyed by

industrialisation. Laslett's implicit distinction between (in sociological terms) individuation and autonomy makes it possible for us to envisage a society in which individuation, resultant on the extension of the division of labour prepared the way for the emergence of industrialism but, at the same time, had not conferred upon the individual that autonomy which is associated with competitive free-market capitalism in its pure form. It also makes it possible to understand the existence of present-day dependency relations within family forms, in political life in rural areas and within traditional industries (usually termed 'paternalism' see Newby, et al., 1978) not as the modification of an ancient collectivism, but as a survival of a much more recent form of social organisation, which immediately preceded the industrial era. (Harris, 1983, 106, *italics added*)

Laslett is no feminist of course, nor is he a Marxist. Indeed, the 'glaring omission' from his account of historical change is the concept of mode of production according to Harris (1983, 106). Nevertheless, there is in this passage the link between patriarchalism/paternalism [sic] suggested by Lown, and a way to help clarify the relationship between the nature of power in the household and broad economic and social change.

Lown does not refer to Laslett's work, but her approach and that of Gittens' is broadly consistent with his depiction of the household division of labour by age and gender (Gittens, 1985) and with the conceptual implications of the lack of autonomy of 'subsumed' persons.

The concept of head of household has shown remarkable persistence. It can be seen as an administrative and organisational 'first order' concept, overlapping with the

kinship terms of father/husband. Legitimacy for the power invested in heads of households was originally vested in the heads of households as production units (or the great houses of the nobility), and their legitimacy was reinforced through the church as well as in the close-knit communities of past time. Heads of households, then provided the essential link between the State and the people. Their power, however, depended upon having a household in the first place.

We cannot assume that all adult men enjoyed power and prestige in their own households, especially those who laboured for low wages and whose own livelihood depended on wives and children. The power of the head of household would depend a great deal on his relation to the prevailing mode of production, as well as to access to resources in the household or elsewhere (Delphy, 1984, 168: Middleton, 1983).

In Chapter 1, I argued that the classic writers of sociology, intent on capturing the dramatic changes in social and economic life in the nineteenth century, overestimated their regional effects. They also possibly underestimated the persistence of traditional values in rural areas and other places where proletarianisation was less obvious. In some places, the face-to-face nature of community life, minimal contact with changing ideas, and particularly the continuing salience of older forms of work

embued with social meaning, rather than the economic contract of employer and employee, would serve to create conditions favourable to the retention of patriarchal forms of male domination.

Other kinds of families than Laslett's production unit existed in pre-industrial England, families of agricultural workers, proto-industrial and small holding families (see Harris, 1983, 91-115 for a useful discussion). Hard evidence about their household division of labour and internal relationships is very sparse indeed. It seems most likely that there was a rough measure of equality between men and women who shared responsibility for earning a livelihood (Hamilton, 1978: Segalen, 1983: Bourne, 1984), so that patriarchal authority was most strongly associated with the ownership of property in the means of production. In terms of legitimation, it was enjoyed by heads of households as such, under whom all other household members were subsumed.

In industrialising society, traditional authority was manifested in the paternalist relationships between employers and employees as well. The successful management of the new relationships of work, involving a high degree of control, were of critical importance in mitigating conflict associated with the cataclysmic changes associated with the industrial revolution. Paternalism thus helped diffuse tension and discouraged proletarian rebellion in the mid

19th century (Lown 1983: Joyce, 1980, 90-133).³ As I intend to show deferential relationships were also important in the household as a masculinist strategy associated with the growing economic dependence of wives and children. As in employer-employee relations, dependence was mediated by deference, a concept which will be discussed in detail after the New Zealand data has been presented (see Chapter 6).

Marriage has always been an economic necessity for the vast majority of women, the means through which they became 'goodwives' or 'mistress' of a household (George, 1973). Regardless of their productive and organisational activities, women's identification was derived from familial dependence as mothers, daughters, wives or servants. During the long transition to capitalism, they were increasingly excluded from attaining work identity which they had previously achieved through their labour in a wide range of trades. They were also increasingly less likely to gain public recognition of their achievements in the world outside the home, except as wives.

In this section, the links between capitalism and patriarchy have been explored. The shortcomings of dualistic approaches have been pointed out and the desirability of a theory in which age and sex form the axes of differentiation within the household is suggested. This approach, in which the mode of production and the system of male domination are

viewed as a single system, rather than in terms of the interaction between them, is poorly developed as yet. Nevertheless it would appear to show promise when assessed in terms of the research of historians and others who have focussed on the importance of traditional authority and the mechanisms through which it was employed to dissipate conflict and maintain legitimation through periods of transition.

FOOTNOTES

¹ While recognising the problems associated with the use of the term 'sexual division of labour', particularly when commitment has been made to distinguishing carefully between sex and gender, I will follow Alison Jagger (1983, 163) and Nancy Hartsock (1983, 289) in their use of the more familiar term. The 'gender-based division of labour' is clumsy and it is also inaccurate since the division cannot be reduced to purely social dimensions. It is women and not men who bear children. It is men who impregnate women and women who lactate (see also Fox, 1967, 31 for these basic anthropological 'principles' of kinship and marriage).

² See also Eisenstein (1979a, b), Kuhn & Wolpe (1978), Barrett & McIntosh (1979) and Sargent (1981) for a variety of positions.

³ A different interpretation of the 'liberalisation' process is given by Foster (1974).

CHAPTER 4:

HOUSEHOLD AND WORK

This Chapter is concerned with interdisciplinary study of the household and the work of its members as it might relate to New Zealand. The literature on each of these topics is vast and only matters of particular relevance to this thesis will be considered. In this final part of the literature review we take into consideration the concepts derived from recent developments within socialist feminism. We will then be ready to undertake an analysis of the New Zealand data.

There are a number of reasons for focussing on households rather than families when exploring the changes in the instrumental aspects of family life in New Zealand. First of all, an examination of liberal approaches in Chapter 2 revealed something of the extent to which the scholarly literature is suffused with middle class, ethnocentric and male biased assumptions about the nature of family life in contemporary society and in the past. These assumptions have also affected the content of what has been studied as feminist historians have shown (Rowbotham, 1974).

Those whose lives have been hidden from history, have not only included women, but the vast majority of people who

have belonged to the underbelly of history (Medick & Sabeau, 1984). It is only fairly recently that overseas social historians, demographers and economic historians have turned to the scholarly study of the 'trivia' of everyday life in past time, especially where this is concerned with the gaining of the means of subsistence.

Radical approaches dealing with familial relations are not without assumptions, although feminists certainly have a vested interest in divesting themselves of them. Feminists have rarely considered the work of children in past time, nor, in general, are they concerned with the work of men except as employers or employees (Novitz, 1983).

An analysis focussing primarily on the labour of all household members provides a firmer basis for theory building than one limited to women's work alone. As I intend to show, it is important to avoid conflating family and ideology. Without this conceptual distinction, it is all too easy to allow one's own normative notions to impose on a social context in which both material life and sets of ideas were very substantially different from those of today.

Such an approach is consistent with a materialist position and makes possible discovery of the means whereby definitions of work have changed, with all the implications that has for the position of women in modern society.

Family versus Household

In recent years there have been suggestions from a number of scholars on both sides of the Atlantic that conceptual clarification of the term 'the family' must take account of the ideology which surrounds it (Barrett, 1980: Thorne & Yalom, 1982: Segal, 1983: Bernardes, 1985a, b, 1986: Gittens, 1985). This rather impressive array can be summed up in a representative statement of the general argument.

The Family is not a concrete "thing" that fulfillls concrete "needs" but an ideological construct with moral implications ... [Awareness of this] can lead to a more refined analysis of historical change in the American or Western family than has devolved upon us from our functionalist ancestors (Collier et al., 1982, 37).

After a discussion of the contributions of historians to knowledge about the household and its division of labour in past time, Barrett (1980, 204) also concludes that if we are to analyse the contemporary family effectively it is essential to understand the disjunction between the economic organisation of households and the ideology of the family.

Rapp's writings (1979, 1980) provide useful insight into the normative and ideological. At one level of meaning 'family' to Americans of all classes means the broader and narrower ties which constitute their kin by blood and marriage (Schneider, 1968). At another level, husbands,

wives and children are a set of relatives who should live together (see also Bernardes, 1985a, b). It is as a result of the norms governing marriage and parenting that people get recruited into households in which they

enter into productive, reproductive and consumption relations ...and experience the absence or presence, the sharing or withholding of basic poolable resources ... "Family" (as a normative concept in our culture) reflects those material relations; it also distorts them ... Our notions of the family absorb the conflicts, contradictions, and tensions actually generated by those material, class-structured relations that households hold to resources in advanced capitalism (Rapp, 1982, 170).

In this view, 'families' is a term denoting one set of relations between those living in a household.

In the course of analysing and interpreting the New Zealand data, it is the relationships of members of households in the course of their daily work that we will consider primarily. There are many aspects to this. In reviewing the literature, the following will have to be taken into account in terms of differences between households associated with class, sex and age.

(1) Households may acquire members as a result of the norms of extended kinship (Firth, 1969). The sort of situation I have in mind is the coresidence of a widowed parent of the husband or wife, an orphaned child of their adult siblings or the spouse of an adult child where the norms of neolocal,

independent housing cannot be met. Whole households may fuse on the basis of common kinship and common material needs as in the case of widowed sisters who combine their resources. We may therefore expect to be concerned with multi-generational households, or those extended as a result of the addition of parents' siblings or collateral kin of some kind.

(2) Women not only reproduce labour force, but care for the old and the sick which may involve them with other households (Rosser & Harris, 1983, 220-3). Humphries (1982, 201) states that "family ties vitalized by ideology and emotions, bind together laboring and non-laboring individuals and secure for the latter a share in the produce of the former, not only in primitive communism, but also in more developed modes of production". She claims that this material base of kinship sheltered proletarian people from capitalist oppression. We would expect that households would differ in the extent to which these kinds of services are exchanged as a result of differences in needs and ability to provide the services.

(3) Family households although based on the norms regulating marriage, parenthood and kinship, may also include non-kin such as lodgers (Davidoff, 1979) and servants of various kinds (Laslett, 1971). The nature of the relationship of non-kin with other household members is a topic with which we will be concerned later.

There are the dynamic aspects of household to be considered. For example, in the organisation of production, reproduction and consumption associated with the needs of the members who enter the household and leave the household during the life cycle. We must ask how strategies concerned with the household economy were decided upon.

Included in these strategies, there is the very important question of the household division of labour, both by sex and age and how this operated to form the basis for the different experiences of women and men, girls and boys as household members (Chapter 5) and as gendered beings - wives and husbands, daughters and sons (Chapter 6).

Household Composition, Present and Past

The importance of historical perspectives on the household is partly demographic and partly economic. Much of what we know is, on the one hand, a result of the work of Laslett and the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, and responses to their work. On the other hand, it is due to sociologists and others who have been concerned with the organisation of the household economy in past time. A useful review of the work of both groups are contained in Anderson's, *Approaches to the Study of the Western Family 1500-1914*¹. While the work of those who have been concerned with the strategies and tactics employed by

households in their struggle for survival will form part of later discussion, we should note here, if only briefly, the contribution of Laslett and other demographic historians.

The definition of household has caused many problems to researchers concerned with the household in past time (Wall, et al., 1983, 1-64; Smith, 1984, 1-86). However, Laslett himself still considers it justifiable to regard the household as a coresidential group. This matter is discussed in a recent essay concerned with the family and household as work group and kin group in Europe (Laslett, 1983, 513-563). This definition will be retained in the present work.

Laslett's framework for the analysis of households in past time proposes three main types

- (a) simple households consisting of a couple with their children (he uses the terms, husband, wife and children).
- (b) extended households which include a single kin member such as a widowed parent (generational) or sibling (collateral) of the adults.
- (c) multiple households, consisting of two or more couples linked by consanguinity (Laslett, 1972, 28-30).

The most notable of Laslett's findings is the persistence of the nuclear family as the modal type, as far back into history as the thirteenth century (1972). Although his work has received much criticism, we can never again take seriously romanticised pictures of extended

families as the normal domestic group (Anderson, 1980a, 22-38).

Although the average size of household was 4.75 persons and the modal unit was a nuclear family, the picture is much more complicated than at first appears. More people lived in large households than small. The reason for this is that many households contained servants and workers, retainers of all kinds, depending on the wealth and status of the head of household and the business conducted within it. Non kin, serving these large households were recruited from other families (Laslett, 1972).

In the case of households unable to support older children and young adults, these large households provided work and sustenance where no other forms of labour were open to the young people. Some might remain in this kind of service all their lives, others might marry. Service in a large household might be temporary. Apprentices would have remained with their masters until they became journeymen and for the fortunate, masters of their trade. The term 'life cycle servants' refers to this type of temporary service (Laslett, 1971, 1972).

In modern times, household is often confused with family, since the two are so often seen to overlap. An examination of Census data on households makes it quite clear that this is not the case². Flandrin presents an interesting discussion of changes in the terms 'family' and

'household' based on early dictionaries (see also Mitterauer & Sieder, 1982, 5-13).

If one consults the older English and French dictionaries, one finds that the concept of the family was divided between the notions of co-residence and kinship, which one finds amalgamated in the definition that has become most current today. In former times, the word 'family' more often referred to a set of kinsfolk who did not live together, while it also designated an assemblage of co-residents who were not necessarily linked by ties of blood or marriage (Flandrin, 1976, 4)

In this usage, servants and other domestics were also part of 'the family'. Thus, Samuel Pepys writes at the beginning of his Diary, "I lived in Axe Yard, having my wife, and servant Jane, and no more in family than us three" (quoted in Flandrin, 1976, 5). This is an apt example of the sort of dangers assailing modern researchers of past time.

The independence of adults from kin is a notable feature of English kinship, today as in the past (Firth et al. 1969: Macfarlane, 1978: Laslett, 1979). A widowed parent was likely to live with adult children only where economic or other circumstances made their independence impossible (Laslett, 1977, 1979, 97-114). Adult children, that is, married children, remained with their parents only in special circumstances. This might happen in cases where other accommodation could not be obtained, or where the

customary rules of inheritance demanded it, a situation uncommon in most areas.

Studies of the household in past time have been criticised for their insensitivity to life cycle change (Berkner 1972, 1973, 1975). The utility of this sort of approach is also of limited use in the present study because of the abstracted empiricism of many historical demographers (Anderson, 1980). Because of the nature of the data available to demographers and historians, the links between households involving exchanges of family members are also obscured (Chaytor, 1980).

Some of the problems involved in reconstructing the household and family in past time are associated with the scarcity of evidence. Records for elite families have survived in the form of household documents as well as diaries and letters of family members making possible such studies as Trumbach's (1978) detailed account of the domestication of aristocratic families in eighteenth century England, Macfarlane's editing of the diary of Ralph Josselin (1970) and Pollock's (1983) work on children. These works stand in marked contrast to accounts of the development of the Western family in which evidence about working class and peasant families is replaced by romantic speculation (see E. P. Thompson's review of Shorter (1977)).

There is plenty of evidence to be gathered through the use of parish records and other documents and this can

provide useful information about the size and composition of households for the mass of the population as we have seen above. However, this kind of information can be very misleading (Chaytor, 1980, 27). By employing the method of family reconstitution a clearer idea about the demographic facts of the life cycle can also be gained. Rather more difficult is grasping the fact that the boundaries between households were broken down by the continual redistribution of people between households. This has been done by Chaytor (1980), for four families in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a small sample indeed, but one which puts some flesh on the bare statistics of historical demographers.

In the useful critique of historical demography which precedes the presentation of her own findings, Chaytor (1980) also comments on the general fragility of domestic relations as a result of geographical mobility and mortality. She points out that the changing household structure altered the context in which productive and reproductive relations were lived, commenting that we have assumed much about the actual social relationships experienced in households in past time.

In particular she notes the general unsubstantiated claim that industrialisation had the effect of removing the father and other earners from the household during the working day. His presence in the preindustrial period is simply assumed. It is also taken for granted that his

presence was of enormous influence on children. But, says Chaytor, we cannot assume that the father did not spend his time doing all sorts of chores which took him away from the household. Was there no sexual division of labour? Can we really assume that the father's presence meant that he would have been involved in childminding or in domestic chores? (1980, 29-30)

Although we know very little about the sexual division of labour in England in earlier centuries, Chaytor asserts that it was unaffected by the household's size and composition (an assertion challenged by Pahl, see below in this Chapter and also in association with the New Zealand findings in Chapters 5 and 6).

We do not know about childrearing patterns used by the vast majority of the population although Aries (1962) Trumbach (1978) and Pollock (1983) and others have studied childrearing in past time. Their samples have included only the aristocracy and other sections of the population leaving diaries and other personal documents. Their findings suggest that relationships between parents and children were considerably warmer and closer than the black picture of childhood painted by such writers as Shorter (1977) whose sources, particularly for non-literate strata, were fragmentary (see above).

Chaytor also observes that "much of demographic history has been written as though the experience and the

interests of the sexes and the generations were identical" and suggests that such assumptions have to be questioned (1980, 30). This has already been discussed in association with Hartmann's and Delphy's theoretical work on family households, both of whom would also consider that the ideological content of family relations and unequal distribution of power within households and society as a whole, are neglected, especially in so far as women and children are concerned.

Economic Context and Household Strategies

It is important to distinguish between economic analysis, the observation and description of economic activity and the economy (Finley, 1974, 26). By economic analysis I mean the kind of intellectual pursuits directed towards explaining economic life generally, that is, "the analytic or scientific aspects of economic thought" (Schumpeter, quoted in Finley, 1974, 26). An example of this is the domestic labour debate (Chapter 3).

My fieldwork was concerned primarily with gathering interview material about family life in the first couple of decades of this century. In the course of conducting the early interviews, it soon became apparent that the production, reproduction and consumption patterns described by many of my respondents were essentially different to

those experienced by contemporary families in New Zealand, and that an explanation for the changes needed to be made using sociological analysis. For instance, misunderstandings first arose about the use of money among farming families. My farming informants did not use money as children, nor did their parents on a day to day basis, since most of what they consumed was produced on the farm itself at a level of productivity consistent with their own needs.

When writing about economic strategies at the level of the household, I am preserving the original Greek concept *oikonomike* (or *oikonomia*), that is 'the art of household management' (Finley, 1974, 40) which includes a wide range of activities encompassing the organisation and operational effectiveness of productive and reproductive activities as well as consumption within the household (see also Netting, 1984). As we shall see, later, however, these activities may well be governed by notions of hierarchy affecting all household members in different ways as well as the involvement of members in work away from home.

Work groups and kin groups do not usually coincide in modern society (see Laslett, 1983, 550). In fact, the vast majority of households send their members elsewhere to work in what I am calling (after Pahl, 1984) the formal economy in which labour power is exchanged for wages which are then

used to buy most of the goods and many of the services required for subsistence and other purposes.

Local conditions set limits on the sorts of opportunities available to household members in the way of earning a living, whether on the land or in urban based industry or services (Anderson, 1980, 65-66). As Pahl has pointed out, "the way in which all work is done is substantially determined by the opportunities available in a relatively restricted milieu which, in the case of formal employment, is generally assumed to be a local labour market" (Pahl, 1984, 143).

For the young adult sons and daughters of small farmers in New Zealand, wage earning might be a necessity. In the absence of a local labour market, or suitable households for live-in service, we might find them migrating to cities. For the more prosperous, adult children might stay close to parents, especially where inheritance of the farm, or marriage to a local person was possible. We might also expect variations in strategies according to the values espoused by parents, such as keeping young women within the domestic domain. Indeed, there is evidence that in New Zealand, as in Britain, waged work was despised and some parents wished to avoid having their children go 'out' to work (Pahl, 1984, 42-3).

We would therefore expect to find a range of strategies used by households including quite wide variation

in the sexual division of labour based on demographic imbalances as well as conditions of scarcity. In farming areas, for instance, the problem of balancing the production of food with the number of mouths to be fed would be one problem faced by many. One likely method of solving the problem would have been the sending of 'surplus' children to other households suffering a shortage of labour, perhaps as a result of life-cycle imbalance of labour resources.

As far as access to wage earning and other formal employment is concerned, in a 'young' society like New Zealand, we might also expect to find less specialisation within a single career pattern than elsewhere. Where skills are in short supply, such as in a newly established rural community, a farmer may be required to act as carpenter and casual labourer, depending on the requirements of the local community and personal talents. In towns and cities, too, we would expect to find a range of occupational statuses, and a relatively high proportion of self-employed persons and small employers (Fairburn, 1979: Toynbee, 1979).

Other strategies could be expected in the case of New Zealand at this time in its history. Both international and internal migration, exemplify activities of households and wider kin groups aligning themselves with labour markets in order to maximise their earning abilities.

By definition, proletarian households are those which exist through sending their members elsewhere to earn wages.

This does not mean, however, that the wages were seen to be the property of the person who earned them or that others cannot occupy themselves in a productive way. Historians of work have commented on the practice of a common, or family fund into which all earnings were put (Laslett, 1983, 544; Scott & Tilly, 1980). The phenomenon of the common fund has been observed among labouring families in different parts of Europe and England as early as the sixteenth century and as late as the twentieth according to oral historians. This fund was typically administered by women (Roberts, 1984).

Productive work may take place within the household in the provision of goods and services for others, for domestic use or exchange. This might include the transformation of raw materials into goods, cash or services needed for reproduction, e.g. a range of forms of domestic provisioning and the growing of vegetables for household consumption, market or non market exchange. In preindustrial times, most labourers had garden plots, a pig and quite often a cow (Laslett, 1983, 544). Again, these by-employments create forms of wealth to be shared among members of the household, or differentially allocated.

Resources can be found in the immediate environment. The presence of firewood, game, fish, fruit and other natural products, there for the taking, may present opportunities for extra contributions to a household's

economy whether these may be obtained by poaching or within the limits of the law. Common land and heath, sea, shore and marshland have always been crucial to the English poor, and their gradual disappearance through enclosure and other outcomes of social and economic change had disastrous effects on the living standards and wellbeing of the English rural dweller (Samuel, 1975: Pahl, 1984: Bourne, 1984: Pinchbeck, 1981, 22).

Pahl argues that as wage labour in Britain has grown over a period of two hundred years, so other customary work and the utilisation of common and other sources of raw materials has declined - except for the domestic work of women. We may hazard the proposition that industrialisation created the conditions for an overall decline in the range of strategies used by families, making them increasingly dependent on commodity production and on wage labour.

On the basis of Goode's theory of change in family structure, we could also expect wage labour to result in new forms of independence for young people, and with rising wages, a release from the necessities of earning a little here, a little there, through a number of means. We would also expect to find variations in the degree to which that independence was granted, depending on the relations of authority with the household. Informed by a feminist framework we could expect that men, rather than women, and boys rather than girls would avail themselves, or be granted

the fruits of disposable income and time. We would also expect to find that girls' household activities would continue, while those of boys would decline.

Before discussing the sexual division of labour, we should consider what we mean by work and the type of social relations likely to be involved in all forms of work involving households.

Work

Work is defined for the purposes of this thesis in terms of the tasks necessary to maintain a household. It includes meeting the basic needs of food, shelter and emotional support in line with both the economic context within which the household is located and the cultural prescriptions appropriate to the time and place. We are therefore concerned with both objective and subjective levels, including the significance of work to the individual as a source of self-esteem and of status. Work is central not only to the maintenance of social life in general, but also to the individual's concept of self.

The domain of work is more than material transformation of resources and of the social relations involved in economic transactions. Work is linked to notions of identity and personhood and to relations of differential control and privileges (Tiffany, 1984, 8).

Work also involves status in the sense of observable patterns of differential privileges and rights, including ideologically based evaluations of worth. The concept of status entails specific assumptions about gender (Tiffany, 1984, 1-11; Strathern, 1981, 203; Tolson, 1977). Concepts of work, like those of family, are imbued with meanings in everyday social life and are culturally specific.

There is a widespread assumption today, general in Western society, that work is paid employment. Even within academic sociology, courses and texts on the sociology of work are generally centred around the concept of the labour process, that is on forms of work done for wages and thus regulated by tripartite negotiations between employers, employees and the State. It is the theoretical obsession with 'the public' which has created a blinkered approach to work.

However, there are signs that the tide is turning and increasing recognition that 'work' must be conceived of in broader terms than previously. The impetus has come from a range of disciplines and approaches including feminism where the scholarly study of housework has been quite prolific. Pahl (1980, 1984), along with a number of other sociologists, anthropologists (Tiffany, 1984; Wallman, 1979), geographers (Long, 1984) and radical economists (Gershuny, 1979) have recently been investigating forms of work other than employment. Their interest in the topic has

largely coincided with the deepening economic recession in Western societies since the early 1970s which has raised many questions about the nature of work and leisure, as well as assumptions about employment. It has also come about through study of marginal urban workers in Third World cities (Pahl, 1984, 114) and through peasant households in different parts of the world (Long, 1984).

These writers are concerned with work which involves exchanges with friends, neighbours and members of their extended families, both paid and unpaid, legal and illegal, on the basis of direct or generalised reciprocity.

Historians have also been involved in empirical investigation of work in past time (Pahl, 1984, Chapters 1-3). As we have noted, the productive and reproductive base in pre-industrial society was the household unit. The labour of all family members was involved whether the household was one which contained servants or not. There was no conception of the 'right to work'. Indeed, work was a lifelong obligation for the vast majority. Childhood, adolescence and retirement are all modern 'inventions', periods of life in which the individual is not expected to 'work' (Aries, 1962: Rabb, 1971).

Work is social activity involving relations with others which may be hierarchical or not. Pahl's approach to household divisions of labour is based on three forms of work: domestic self-provisioning, informal/communal and

formal, each characterised by specific sets of social relations involved. The sources of labour are the members of the household itself as individuals or as a group. (Relationships of employer and employees have been discussed in earlier sections dealing with the mode of production and implied in discussions of paternalist relations in industrialising England.)

Domestic self-provisioning involves relationships with husbands, wives, sons and daughters and covers such activities as vegetable gardening, food preserving, the making of clothes, feeding animals and people, repairing household goods, maintaining the exterior fabric of the house itself, gathering fuel as well as the range of chores normally associated with housework (Pahl, 1984, 137).

New Zealand sociologist, Novitz (1983), notes a tendency in feminist work to ignore the labour of men in the household. They also tend to focus on the production of goods and services on a daily basis, that is, on immediate as opposed to long term consumption. For many households, even in contemporary New Zealand, the domestic skills involved in stretching income through growing fruit and vegetables, home decorating and the making and mending of garments at home is of quite crucial importance. As we shall see in Chapter 5, there have been substantial changes in the nature of thrift (Bourne, 1984).

Similarly the efforts of husband and wife on do-it-yourself projects also conserves money, or creates disposable income, whether we are thinking about vegetable gardening, or painting the house exterior (the vast majority of New Zealand homes are constructed of timber and require considerable maintenance), concreting paths or any of the hundred-and-one jobs which New Zealanders undertake in their 'spare time'. New Zealanders joke on Monday mornings that they have come to 'work' for a rest.³

Domestic self-provisioning involves social relationships of differentiation and hierarchy based on sex and age, those involving mothers-fathers, parents-children. In discussing domestic self-provisioning, we will therefore be concerned to identify how these relationships affected the nature of the work performed and other aspects of the work situation such as control and autonomy, responsibility and freedom to make decisions.

Differences in the degree of domestic self-provisioning is also hypothesised on the basis of differential access to income and opportunities to make economies through household labour as opposed to the purchase of consumer goods. Since the social relationships involved in domestic self-provisioning are subject to change we will also^{be} concerned with differences between households in relation to their means of subsistence.

Work which is done for, or by, friends and neighbours is based on norms of reciprocity. As with domestic self-provisioning, the object is not to make a profit, but to be understood in cultural terms as something which should be repaid in kind or cash, in the short term or the long term, directly or indirectly. It also assumes that the relationship is a continuing one, so that we could expect to find more work of this nature in stable close-knit communities than in others (Anderson, 1971, 86-98). Work in the communal/informal economy is one concrete expression of social bonding. The relationships here are similar to those involved in domestic self-provisioning in that they are of a primary nature, lacking the legal-rational ties of employer/employee characteristic of work in the formal economy. They may involve interaction with kin or non-kin.

The analysis of non-wage labour ... inevitably raises questions of the social value and expectations of such work or co-operation. Clearly, many of the tasks and relationships involved cannot be assigned a monetary value. They can only be understood in terms of the benefits perceived and derived by the participants themselves. Many non-wage relationships are in fact based on sentiments of kinship, on neighbourhood or community ties, or imply commitment to some local system of social status. It therefore becomes important to make explicit the social and cultural frameworks within which these relationships operate and to identify the broader structural conditions under which they arise. (Long, 1984, 16-17)

Informal/communal labour may also include the work involved in caring for dependents who are neither present, nor future workers, for example widowed parents. It is a type of labour which in modern society is associated with women. In recent past time, the mutual aiding of kin and neighbours, especially in working class and rural communities is of this type (Young & Willmott, 1957: Moge, 1956: Townsend, 1957: Klein, 1965: Frankenberg, 1966). This kind of labour will be discussed in Chapters 7 and 8.

The Social Relations of Work

In criticising the efforts of socialist feminists, Jagger has pointed out that although they have identified a range of types of labour traditionally ignored, and also expressed considerable insight about the nature of non-market forms of exploitation, feminists' theoretical work has identified the content of women's work, rather than its relations. One of the important departures from earlier versions of feminist theory is that a single systems approach should centre on the social relationships of men and women since women are not oppressed by what they do so much as by the social relations in which their labour is defined and controlled (Engels, in Jagger, 1983, 158). Pahl also deals with the social relations of work outside formal employment in some detail (1984, 123-128).

Pahl (1984, 123-126) provides a modern example of a woman ironing a blouse at home in order to drive home his point. I will paraphrase his argument to make the points and differentiate clearly between different types of social relations. In my examples, the woman or girl is gathering eggs from a hen run which is situated in the family garden. She may be involved in the formal economy

(1) an outworker involved in wage labour, producing at home for an employer who will collect her product and sell it himself to make a profit

(2) the owner of a market stall gathering her eggs for sale on Saturday morning, engaged in petty commodity production

Most probably she will receive cash for her efforts, though in the case of (2) she could be involved in barter for a neighbouring stall may have some butter to exchange.

On the other hand, this girl or woman may be working within the area of domestic self-provisioning

(3) she could be gathering an egg for a meal which she will cook and consume alone, that is individual reproduction.

(4) if she is gathering eggs for a family meal, she is engaged in social reproduction

There would be no remuneration for the latter two tasks. While all workers (and future workers) require to be fed, clothed and sheltered, the work involved may be done either by the worker or by others. Social reproduction typically done by married women in modern society, and taking the form of domestic labour and childrearing, is seen by feminists as determined by relations of male domination in capitalism (Pahl, 1984, 124).

A woman gathering eggs for her husband's breakfast is not necessarily constrained by patriarchal social relations.

(5) the woman could be involved in *shared wage labour* if they labour together to produce eggs for wages

(6) or she could be engaged in *shared reproductive labour* since this task is equally shared with her husband

(7) or *undominated subsistence work* in which case tasks are equally divided among household members, none of whom is a wage worker or self-employed worker

Other forms of labour are involved when informal/communal work is concerned.

(8) she may be gathering eggs for harvest home

The social relations involved here may involve community norms requiring support for the Church (and other

essentially social, rather than interest groups). She may or may not subscribe with enthusiasm to pressures to supply eggs for such a purpose when she needs them for her family, but on reflection regards the work as involving indirect reciprocity. On the other hand, she may reflect that she gets 'put on' as a working class woman, who is expected to help clean the Church when her middle class neighbour organises the labour and arranges the flowers. The social relations involved here are those of both class and patriarchy operating in the public sphere. It is women, who characteristically do these forms of work. Middle class men serve a management function, reflecting their superior position.

(9) the woman may be gathering the eggs for a friend who is ill. It is wintertime and fresh eggs cannot be obtained. (Remember that we are writing about the first decades of the century when goods were not necessarily obtainable out of season.)

Here she is involved in *social solidarity work*. This should be distinguished from *voluntary work* which may be done anonymously and is not based on constraints of social interaction. Social solidarity work is both a function and an expression of social cohesion, an essential feature of any group or community who must preserve a high degree of harmony in order to survive. Pahl does not say so, but voluntary work may be viewed alternatively as a function of

altruism or as a form of paternalism, typically practised by the middle class and involving invidious forms of patronage and deference.

Women's and Children's Work

In his recent book on *Divisions of Labour*, Pahl puts women's work to the forefront of attention observing that "The systematic neglect of women's work is inexcusable, given the overwhelming historical evidence" (1984, 139). Like other writers, however, Pahl does not deal systematically with the work of children which occasions little comment in either the feminist or the sociological literature.

The work of women and children within the household itself is often described and commented upon by oral historians whether in Britain, Europe, North America or elsewhere (Thompson, 1977, 1983: Vigne, 1981: Roberts, 1984: Jamieson, 1983: Samuel, 1981). Personal documents such as memoirs, diaries and autobiographies often provide useful information for the nineteenth and earlier centuries (Burnett, 1982: Pollock, 1983: Facey, 1981, for Western Australia). Other evidence of children's work and precarious earnings in past time has been documented by historians (Davey, 1985, McCalman, 1984 in Australia: Parr, 1982: Bradbury, 1979, 1982 in Canada: Armitage, 1979 for the frontier United States). Few writers deal

systematically with children's work. It seems that they are even less visible than women, indicative of their even lower status in society (Qvertrop, 1985).

The essence of women's work in past and present time is summed up in the titles of two works published in 1982 on different sides of the Atlantic, Strasser's *Never Done* and Davidson's *A Woman's Work is Never Done*. That they should have appeared simultaneously and apparently independently is evidence of the increasing importance placed on the subject.

There are several other general works concerned with women's work in English history, such as Clark (1982), Pinchbeck (1981). These works demonstrate the flexibility and adaptability of labouring and proletarian women's productive and procreative labour.

Clark (1982) writing about seventeenth century England commented on the complementarity of men's and women's activities. At that time women were widely involved in productive work of all kinds, including crafts. They worked in the fields, they kept dairies, poultry, brewed and spun in addition to household chores. Under the system of domestic industry which preceded the industrial revolution, any profits of domestic industry belonged to the family and not to individual members of it. Although authority was vested in the father as head of the household, his obligation was to provide for daughters through their

marriage portion, while his wife would succeed on his death as head of the family.

The empirical study of such remote periods, and the change in women's work as a result of their employment in factories has less relevance to New Zealand than other areas of the literature on women's work. Girls and women were employed in textile factories and sweatshops of Dunedin in the nineteenth century (Olssen 1980), but they represented a very small proportion of the female population of New Zealand (see Chapter 1). Nevertheless, for the sake of completeness, the work of Pinchbeck (1981) should be mentioned as the classic statement on women's work in English factories.

It is interesting to note that in earlier times, older, more highly skilled women were far less unlikely to do housework than today. In the first place, their freedom to do other things was important to maximisation of resources. Domestic work was therefore most likely to be done by young women.

The elaboration and celebration of domesticity in the form of housework is the subject of Davidoff's (1976) paper. She describes in some detail how the tasks associated with domestic labour have changed since the sixteenth century. There was little to clean or cook in the houses of the poor in the past. There was little in the way of clothes washing, because there were few clothes. Even weekly

changes of clothing were a later nineteenth^{century} luxury, replacing seasonal orgies of washing. The 'art of household management' for the poor, consisted in getting the means of subsistence by whatever methods were possible and this involved women and their children in casual earning, in cottage industry, gathering and whatever else was available to them. Kitteringham (1975) describes the wide range of activities in a number of English counties in the nineteenth century for countrywomen and girls.

Town life and urbanisation presented a different set of problems and opportunities for the household. Alexander (1982) and Hall (1982) give a graphic account of the working lives of women in cities. Alexander is concerned with the teeming mass and disorder of London life between 1820 and Hall with petit bourgeois families. Branca (1974) has shown that the idea of the leisured Victorian middle class housewife is largely a myth. Most of them did their own housework, perhaps helped by a young maidservant who had to be trained. Higher up the social scale, upper class women in Britain did employ enough live-in servants to absolve them from work, allowing them to indulge in conspicuous consumption and to act as the gatekeepers to polite society (Davidoff, 1973).

The domestic arts in early New Zealand have been covered quite extensively by a number of writers (Sargison, 1984). Drummond and Drummond (1967), drawing on

documentary sources is the most useful. Drummond (1960) is a selection of writings from diaries and autobiographies including that of Sara Higgins who describes in detail her pioneering life and times in early Nelson.

Lady Barker's account of her life in New Zealand (1870) is more general, but does include references to trying to make a genteel home under difficult conditions. Millen (1984) provides some perspective on working class women's work in nineteenth century New Zealand, while Simpson (1940) reviews women's activities more generally from the time of earliest settlement until 1945. A recent book (Ebbett, 1981) describing women's lives in New Zealand in the 1930s, is of greater relevance since it corroborates the material gathered through interviewing, even although facilities had improved in the intervening period with the introduction of gas and electricity in many places. A report on the study of older women in Wellington uses oral history methods (Society for Research on Women in New Zealand, 1982) and provides some validation for my own interviews (see also Appendix 1 for other oral histories locally available to me). Hunt (1979, 1981) has produced two books of oral histories dealing with specific rural areas in the South Island of New Zealand.

Other useful information on women's and children's household or farm work in frontier societies is available for Australia (Carter, 1981; Grimshaw, 1985; McCalman, 1984;

Barton, 1985) and for the United States (Armitage, 1979: Degler, 1980: Matthaei, 1982: Vanek, 1980).

Implications for Analysis and Interpretation

We are now in a position to bring together strands of feminist theory and other concepts drawn from the review of studies of household organisation and work in past time.

I will be attempting an historical material analysis of the social relations of production with particular reference to the relative positions of men, women and children in terms of both class and gender. In doing so, male dominance is not to be seen as a subjective relation but rather a reflection of the material base of society and the household.

Patriarchal authority in the sense of the subsumption of all household members to the head of household could be expected in association with preindustrial household organisation. A different set of political relationships could be expected in households dependent on a breadwinner, himself dependent on an employer for wages. These sets of relations will be termed 'patriarchal' and 'masculinist' respectively (see Chapter 3).

There is no *a priori* commitment to demonstrating that capitalism requires a particular family or household form. It is rather that we are interested in the ways in which the

process of change might have affected pre-existing forms (Harris, 1983, 181). Given the period, and the recent settlement of New Zealand, the origins of many of the early settlers and the underdevelopment of the economic infrastructure, we would expect to find considerable variety of family/household forms including those associated with pre-industrial (though not pre-capitalist) conditions.

The most appropriate 'theories' are new and untested. Indeed, they suggest broad directions to be explored rather than a well-defined system of propositions and interrelated concepts to be tested. Nevertheless it is important to try to develop these insights on the basis of the findings from fieldwork.

As we have seen, there have been suggestions that production and reproduction should be viewed in interaction. Men and women are involved in both. Biology as such may be held responsible for the physiological facts of impregnation, pregnancy, childbirth and lactation - but we have no concern with these, but rather cultural interpretations associated with them.

The Means of Subsistence

By 'means of subsistence', I mean the provision of food, clothing, shelter in order to sustain life in culturally acceptable ways. The reproduction of life is intimately

tied to the needs for production through consumption. The reproduction of human beings to a large degree determines how much has to be produced in order for them to survive. However, the nature of what is required to satisfy needs are socially determined. The number of children a couple produce is not to be explained in terms of biological determination, but by the interaction of their material circumstances and socio-cultural milieu (Caldwell, 1976: Cameron, 1984).

As indicated above, the means of subsistence can be met through the production of goods and services in the formal economy, through domestic self-provisioning and through informal/communal labour of all or selected members of the household. This, and the division of labour through which subsistence needs are met are partly determined by access to resources and historically specific notions about the acceptability of possible strategies.

Daily Maintenance of Workers and Future Workers

This includes various cleaning, tidying, washing, cooking, mending and other domestic maintenance tasks which ensure the physical comfort and health of household members. This group of tasks will be referred to subsequently as housework or domestic work.

Intergenerational Reproduction

Here I am concerned chiefly with demographic behaviour and with childrearing practices. Nurturance and sexuality will be dealt with only briefly since they lie outside the scope of this thesis. Adult sexuality cannot be dealt with except tangentially since such matters were very rarely discussed in the homes in which my respondents were brought up. This in itself says a great deal about ideas of modesty, morality and the deliberate withholding of knowledge by parents and other people.

Social/Cultural Reproduction

At another level, the production and maintenance of ideologies associated with class and gender will be discussed. Social and cultural reproduction is not confined to childhood, but is an on-going process. Nor are they confined to the household but also takes place where ever people meet to work or play in everyday interaction, at Sunday School, at Church, during the Sunday walk or the Works picnic or during tea with grandmother.

Let us now turn to the New Zealand data. After an introductory section dealing with the broad characteristics of the sample families, Chapter 5 will describe in detail the context and content of household work in different locations. The focus is on domestic self-provisioning, on production and reproduction and most particularly on the means by which subsistence was achieved. This will be followed by an examination of divisions of labour by age and sex in Chapter 6. The question of hierarchy, control and deference patterns of family members will also be raised, to be dealt with in detail in Chapter 9. Relationships of the families with kin will be examined, in Chapter 7, especially in regard to economic links and social change in control over family members intergenerationally. This will be followed by an examination of the class and gendered relationships of community life.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Anderson (1980a) provides a useful critical overview, including a review of Laslett's work (see also footnote 5 below). Another more recent one, with more discussion but less comprehensive than Anderson's is contained in Harris (1983, Chapters 4-10). See also Mitterauer and Sieder (1982) for an extensive review of the European literature on the period 1500 to 1950. Medick and Sabeau (1984) are the editors of a collection of papers by historians and anthropologists. Their introduction and essay on interest and emotion, seeks to close the gap between social historians and anthropologists. Elder (1978) and Demos & Boocock (1978) give more space to American scholars. Hareven (1976) offers a literature review of particular interest to feminists.

² See Close (1985, 15-17) for contemporary society. Berkner (1972: 1973: 1975, 738) has commented on this matter in comparing his own findings^{with} Laslett's work. Census statistics indicate a marked decline in households containing nuclear families over the last couple of decades, in modern Western societies. In brief, the greatest increase has been for households headed by single parents and their children. A marked increase in the number of the aged living alone has also been noted, and the tendency for young adults to live independently from their parents. A discussion of this matter can be found in Close (1985, 15) who is concerned with Britain. Swain (1978) has done the same for New Zealand. More recent statistics for New Zealand show a continuing decline in the proportion of households containing both parents and children of any age.

³ Do-it-yourself has become a major industry in New Zealand, but it has been always so in New Zealand because of the cost of wages relative to materials and formal hours of work. This is also true of much of domestic work in a country where canned goods and ready-made clothing have always been expensive because of the low population base. The cost and availability of domestic servants has also meant that the vast majority of housewives both today and in the past have done their own housework.

The author, having been brought up in Scotland, arrived in Australia as a young married immigrant in 1960 without the necessary domestic skills of bottling and dressmaking and had to learn them. In the ten years which followed, constant residential mobility in both Australia and New Zealand offered opportunities for unsystematic observation in personal networks in a number of urban and non-urban

milieux. It was uncommon for women not to have a 'full tin', i.e. freshly homebaked cakes and biscuits, good stocks of preserves, and uncommon to buy simply constructed women's and children's clothes. Part of being a 'good wife and mother' was demonstrated competence in this area, and in having a ready supply of home-baked biscuits and cakes.

Part of the explanation lies in the relative cheapness of factory made goods in Britain. In New Zealand, tinned fruit is expensive - more expensive than the identical product in British supermarkets. Although the differences in prices of British and New Zealand produced clothes for women and children has been reduced in recent years because of importation of mass produced clothing from Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan, I understand through personal enquiries, that New Zealand women still tend to make as much as they can themselves.

P A R T I I I :

HER WORK, HIS WORK AND THEIRS

INTRODUCTION TO PART III

In each of the Chapters to follow, interview material relating to work in the household and the community will be presented.

Before we can start, some information on the location of the sample families and the origins of their parents is required. This will be followed by a discussion of some of the problems associated with the operationalisation of class and status in New Zealand. Finally, a short section on family size and household composition will complete the setting of the scene.

The Sample

Altogether, usable interview material was collected for eighty three families, usually from a single survivor. Although most of the interviewees were living in Wellington or its environs at the time of the actual interview(s), their families of birth were originally located all over New Zealand. However, the vast majority came from the lower half of the North Island, including one farming area. Most working class and many middle class urban dwellers had lived in Wellington all their lives, or had moved there as small children. The process of selection for the study is fully

explained in Appendix 1 and a map is provided in Appendix 4. The representativeness of the sample is also discussed briefly below in connection with the occupational distribution of breadwinners.

Appendix 2 is a listing of every family including their most important characteristics. Pseudonyms are used throughout the listing and the manuscript, to protect identity. Where it was felt that someone might be identified, other details have been slightly changed in such a way as to maintain anonymity without prejudicing the integrity of the analysis.

Location of Families

A couple of farming families lived close to a town while others lived in remote areas where roads were rudimentary and travel difficult especially in bad weather because of slips and the trials of driving horsedrawn vehicles on muddy roads. Some families lived in tiny settlements or on the edges of towns or in what I am calling 'scattered suburbs'. New Zealand's towns were expanding at this period, and many people were moving to outlying areas where there were rather few houses and a great deal of space between them. Most were poorly served by public transport, if at all. All three types of locations offered special kinds of opportunities for women and children's work.

Working class families were mainly located in an 'industrial' area in which there was a freezing works, railway workshops and a woollen mill, large by New Zealand standards, as well as a number of small factories. One of the farming families also lived in this borough until their pastures were overtaken by new housing.

It may seem odd to the reader that an industrial area should include a farm and odder still, that a working class area should contain large tracts of land as yet unoccupied by buildings. Nevertheless, cows, horses and other stock grazed here, while the river which ran through the area provided recreation and food for the inhabitants as did the surrounding bush and beach. For those who lived in inner suburbs, there was less in the way of open space. Photographs are provided in Appendix 5. Whether they lived in town or country, almost all of the families had their own gardens.

Origins of the People

It was noted in Chapter 1 that over a fifth of the New Zealand population in 1911 (22.69%) had been born elsewhere. Twenty six of the fathers of my respondents, and twenty two of the mothers were immigrants, most of them from Britain and a smattering from Australia (5) or Europe (3). In all, this represents twenty-nine per cent of the parents. Since

the average date of birth of the respondents was 1905, we may assume that their parents' average date of birth would have been around 1875 or earlier. Relative to the population as a whole, we would expect a higher proportion of them to have been born overseas, than the total population of 1911. The proportion of parents born overseas is probably representative of the parents' age group of the time.

Assessing the representativeness of the class and occupational distribution of the families is a more hazardous undertaking than the origins of the respondents themselves or their parents.

Class

It is notoriously difficult to operationalise class, given the multitude of competing views in neo-Marxist theory (Parkin, 1979). While it is important to distinguish between the objective location of workers in relation to the ownership and control of the means of production. In an empirical study, it is also necessary to make distinctions which do not compromise the findings.

The strategy which I am adopting here is based on the findings of my M.A. thesis which had as its topic class and social mobility in nineteenth century New Zealand. One of the major tasks was to construct a model for class and

occupational analysis, one which could be used by future researchers interested in social change in New Zealand society. The findings of my previous research have been influential in selecting strategies in regard to the treatment of class and status which follows (Toynbee, 1979: other accounts of stratification in New Zealand are contained in Pearson & Thorns, 1983: Pearson, 1980: Bedggood, 1980).

I argued that European models of class were an uncomfortable fit when used with nineteenth century New Zealand material, particularly because of the relatively high degree of social mobility (Toynbee, 1979). Nevertheless, there was clear evidence of the gradual emergence of three distinct classes, an upper, middle and working class, characteristic of what Giddens calls the advanced societies (1973).

It is the nature of their emergence which is particularly interesting. There were three distinct upper class groupings, although there was a considerable degree of overlap between them. The upper class, consisted of a propertied and professional elite, a commercial elite and a landowning class, the three together correspond with Marxist notions of a bourgeoisie. There were also three middle class groupings comprising a "new", educated middle class of clerks and other white-collar workers, proprietors of small businesses and owners of farms.

Small proprietors and farm owners were likely to be family owned and run enterprises. Particular success, thrift and good luck in the nineteenth century could propel these members of the petit bourgeoisie into the upper class since the social barriers to upward mobility in New Zealand were less rigid than in England. It was money which was important rather than 'good' family, the 'right' school, accent or membership of an elite network. Some arrived in the 1840s and 1850s with nothing in the way of capital, worked for wages, saved and bought cheap land. A few were successful enough for them or their descendents to become very prosperous, the pillars of their local society or New Zealand generally.

It was only around the turn of the century that there were enough occupational openings for clerks and other white collar workers that this group started to emerge as a result of bureaucratisation. Their class position is problematic in that they do not create surplus value, nor do they own or control the means of production (Gray, 1977, 134). Nevertheless in their values, demeanour and life style, they can be shown to belong to the middle, rather than the working class (Crossick, 1977).

Petty proprietors too, are distinguished from both bourgeois and proletariat in that their work generally involves the sale of the owner's own labour and that of his family to others (Gray, 1977, 134). While their lifestyle

varied somewhat from that of white collar workers (as we shall soon see), they shared with them the 'closed local dimension' in their cultural life which Crossick (1977) associates with white collar employees.

Crossick and Gray are concerned with class and status divisions in Britain in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Nevertheless it seems that their observations would benefit from the work of Scase and Goffee (1982, 181-193) who distinguish between a stable, established middle class who not only own their means of production, but retain their professional and business standing into the next generation and those who have 'made it' themselves through higher education and commercial success, but who lack the capital and social contacts to weather the vagaries of the economic climate.

This extra dimension helps clarify the situation allowing two typologies, one of class to be used when writing at a more abstract level, and another for dealing with empirical reality. At an abstract level, I will use the term 'bourgeoisie' to refer to those who owned and controlled their own means of production and/or whose very substantial capital interests and high educational qualifications allowed them a high degree of control over their lives and the lives of others. I will also use the terms petit bourgeoisie/proprietors/business class to

distinguish their situation from all who sold their labour, the proletariat.

The terms which I will use most of the time have been used by many others as labels denoting status groups (though the writers do not usually acknowledge that this is the case). The terms selected for general use do indeed coincide with status groups and since this will form a major part of analysis towards the end of the thesis they will come in useful. 'Upper middle class' will be reserved when distinguishing those enjoying a specific life style at the top of the social ladder, while 'middle class' will be used as a generic term covering proprietors', small businessmen's families and those of white collar workers, the lower middle class.

Scase and Goffee's typology (1982) suggests the foundation of such a life style - fear of falling into the working class. Empirical support for this can be seen in the self-imposed isolated lifestyles, the privacy, the anxious striving for respectability in manners and appearance described by Crossick (1977). This syndrome fits well with Sennett's status deprived, late nineteenth century Chicago closed nuclear families (Harris, 1983, 165-171).

The term 'working class' includes all those not discussed above. Mogey's (1956) useful terms 'status assenting' and 'status dissenting' can also be used to mark off those 'belonged' to the working class and who did not

actively seek to remove themselves from their neighbours, from those whose class position was proletarian, but who wished to distance themselves from it.

Occupation

In terms of a comparison of the occupational distribution of males over the age of fifteen in the New Zealand Census in 1911, the sample underrepresents manual workers, and overrepresents both lower and upper middle class grossly. About half the New Zealand work force at this time were manual workers, compared with thirty four per cent of my sample. Proprietors were a reasonable match since they consisted of almost twenty per cent of the labour force and seventeen per cent of the sample. The lower middle class accounted for only seven per cent of the work force while the upper class, perhaps six per cent (these estimates are based on what Census material is available). In the sample, the corresponding figures were nineteen, and thirteen per cent respectively. There are good reasons why this should be so.

The Census includes all workers, those who have just started work as well as those who never marry. Given the late age at marriage (see Chapter 1) and the likely age group of my respondents' parents (many males of this age group would not have been able to marry in a highly

competitive marriage market, at least in rural areas) so it is not surprising that they are unrepresentative.

They are also unrepresentative because of differential life chances. Poor people do not live as long as those who are able to promote their health through good food and proper care. They are therefore less likely to have appeared in the sample.

The main reason for unrepresentativeness, is that the sample was deliberately designed to capture differences between groups, to make sure that enough information was available for widely varying kinds of families. Only when enough interviews had been conducted with people in similar situations as children did I stop looking for others in that category. 'Enough' means saturation, that is, new interviews yielded little which had not already been known as a result of earlier ones with people from similar backgrounds. A full account is given in Appendix 1.

Family Size and Household Composition

One of the crucial differences between families was their size. In terms of location, rural families (nineteen in all) were large with an average of 5.7 children. Those living in scattered suburbs (again, nineteen) had an average of 4.5 children. Small town (six families) and urban (thirty) families averaged five children each. The

remaining families, not included in the demographic analysis, were those broken by death or divorce.

The statistics for completed family size of women marrying towards the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth suggested that my sample families were, in fact, somewhat larger than average (see Chapter 1). Given the toll in mortality over the seventy to eighty years which elapsed since the respondents were born, the chances of my 'capturing' survivors from large families was greater than for small families.

As regards differences in family size by class, the most fertile were those of proprietors (seventeen in all), especially farmers. Proprietors' average family size was 6.4 children. Working class families had an average of 5.4 children (a total of thirty one families), followed by the lower middle class (sixteen) at 4.2 children. The ten upper middle class families had an average of 3.0 children. Full details of family size are available in Appendix 3.

Most families were nuclear. A few had coresident kin or servants living with them for several years (see Chapters 5 and 7 especially).

A few words about housing in New Zealand in the early twentieth century helps set the scene for the descriptive material on the household economy. The average number of persons per inhabited dwelling in New Zealand in 1911 was 4.66 persons. The sample families' households were

therefore larger than average during the childrearing stages of the life cycle.

As far as I know, all respondents lived in dwellings set in their own plots of land. Most were single storied and most would have been built of wood with corrugated iron roofs (few houses in New Zealand are constructed of other materials). In the borough in which most of my working class inhabitants were found the modal size of home had five to six rooms in 1911. It is known that some did not use the parlour, usually situated at the front of the house, except on special occasions. Kitchen quarters were situated at the back in general, with a corridor leading straight through the house from front door (sometimes on a covered veranda) to back door.

CHAPTER 5

HER WORK, HIS WORK AND THEIRS

This Chapter presents the descriptive material from New Zealand illustrating two of the major themes of this thesis, the household economy and the work of its members. Information on the location of sample families, the origins of their parents and other details have been provided in the introductory section.

The focus of attention will be on the productive and reproductive activities of members of households. These will be described in some detail using a rural-urban framework. There is a great deal of descriptive material and summaries will be provided at the end of major sections. Analysis and comment will be confined to the later sections.

A useful typology has been constructed by Tilly and Scott (1978) on the basis of the empirical study of women's work in nineteenth century Europe. Their 'family economy', 'wage economy' and 'consumer economy' had their counterparts in New Zealand. The terms will be defined in the relevant sections of the Chapter and will also be used when analysing differences in the working patterns of men, women and children as household members.

Terms such as 'family economy' are empirical types and do not provide us with any basis for explanation of differences or the course of social change. In the later analysis we will concentrate on trying to account for differences in household organisation. The question of the sexual division of labour will be left until Chapter 6 by which time we will be in a position to focus on the social construction of gender, age and class differences.

Farming Households

Farming households in New Zealand are here considered to be those in a rural environment, whose main income was derived from the land itself, the animals on the land and the goods processed with the intention of providing income, e.g. cream and butter. There were sixteen farming families in my sample.

The family economy as defined by Tilly & Scott (1978) was a pre-industrial form whose characteristics will be described more fully at the end of this Chapter. In terms of household work organisation, these farming families showed some close similarities with this type. In both cases, there was a high level of self-sufficiency made possible by the use of family-owned land on which all members of the household laboured. Women's time was spent primarily on productive labour in their own homes, allowing

them to carry out reproductive work as well. Unmarried women typically worked for their parents or in other households.

There were another five families whose income was based primarily on wages but who were able to supplement their income through the work of women and children on family-owned smallholdings. Since the work of the women and children so closely resembled that of farmers, their work will be illustrated in tandem with the farmers. In terms of Tilly & Scott's (1978) categorisation, however, they operated on the basis of the 'family wage economy' (see discussion towards the end of this Chapter).

Women's Work on Farms and Small-Holdings

In describing the work done by women on farms and small-holdings I will concentrate on those aspects which distinguish farming women and girls from their rural and urban counterparts in order to avoid repetition. Apart from the role of children in assisting their mothers, there are four main areas which distinguished their work from that of women in other kinds of families, (1) the large size of family, (2) the extra work required as a result of geographical isolation and minimal domestic technology, (3) the production of bread, butter, cream and other goods for household use or exchange and (4) work on the farm itself.

One of the important aspects of women's work was care of children. The number of children and the stages of the life style greatly influenced the amount of work to be done, and the possibilities for delegation of work. Farming families were larger than average, with a mean of 6.7 children. Taken in conjunction with life cycle stage, the size of family and the sex of the children had far reaching implications, for while a large family necessitated a great deal of work, children were also able to assist substantially in the house, dairy, and farm often accepting delegated responsibility for housework, cooking, childrearing and other chores.

Providing for their large families made daily life very hard, taking its toll of women's health.

Mum's hobby was having babies. She seemed to be always pregnant ... If she wasn't having a baby one year, she was losing it. She had to go down to the well in the daytime to draw water and she'd have a miscarriage. Where there is two years in between us, she miscarried in between ... it followed with having all the heavy work to do. They were having all these miscarriages in between, so goodness knows how many children she would have had if she had carried them all! (Oswald: 5 boys, 5 girls: farmer)

Mrs Oswald's mother's first action in the morning was to put on her corsets. "She never went without her corset. She said her back was too weak." This affliction was apparently a result of child bearing and the constant carrying of water

necessary for household tasks. Domestic technology on many of the farms was primitive even for the period, and it was common for water to be obtained from a rainwater tank or pumped from a well and then carried into the house. Speaking of her mother's work, Mrs Oswald commented that she didn't know how her mother ever coped with the poor facilities available to her, revealing at the same time how tired she must have been.

No washing machine! ... [only] ... a coal range. She had a little spirit stove which used methylated spirits and a tiny wee saucepan in which she heated the baby's bottle at night. 'Cause she never fed any of her children. She had to heat all the milk for their bottles.

WOULDN'T THAT BE UNUSUAL FOR THOSE DAYS?

I don't know. But she never fed one of us. Well, I suppose she had too much work to do when she had four or five of us ... she must have been very tired. I know she always used to scrub the kitchen floor every night after we all went to bed, nearly every night. Well, with ten pairs of feet travelling over it, out in the country ... (Oswald: 5 boys, 5 girls: farmer)

The substance of this extract was echoed by many people I interviewed, particularly those from large families whose homes had little in the way of such refinements as tapped cold water.

Since most of the farms were isolated in terms of geographical distance from shops farming women and girls were involved in a greater range of tasks than other women.

Virtually all the farming mothers made bread and other essential items used in the household. The mother in the extract below made bread, using her own yeast.

WHAT ABOUT SOAP?

She used to make soap and she used to make jam, she used to preserve fruit, and she used to make all our clothes and all that sort of thing, you know.

WOULD YOU HELP AS A FAMILY WITH PRESERVING?

Yes, everybody helped in the kitchen. Vegetables and that sort of thing.

YOU'D NEED THAT TO KEEP YOU GOING ALL WINTER?

Oh, yes. There were always a big crowd of us. I suppose we ate a lot. We used to have a huge garden.

OH, TELL ME ABOUT THE GARDEN

Vegetable garden [awed tones] Massive big garden with everything in it ... we had fruit trees, cherry trees and all that sort of thing. (Gilbert: 3 boys, 3 girls: farmer)

This mother of six children spent a great deal of time tending the garden and also worked on the farm, made cream and butter both for sale and for the family's own use. She was a little unusual only that she worked both in the garden and farm in addition to her household and dairying responsibilities. The family also kept a range of livestock producing eggs in addition to plenty^{of} meat.¹ As a result of their combined labour, it seems that the household achieved quite a high degree of self-sufficiency as my respondent pointed out. In common with many other rural farming households, cash was required only for the bulk purchase of

flour, sugar, salt, rice, tea and other goods which could not be produced on the farm itself.

Mothers, generally, were obliged to work hard to keep their households running smoothly and raise children even in the few homes in which domestic servants were kept. Sometimes, too, the mothers made butter for sale or barter.

DID YOUR MOTHER MAKE ANY CREAM OR BUTTER?

Yes, yes. We all could separate - do you know what a separator is? ... when the cream was ready we would churn it. Then we used to make butter. Yes, mother would take what we didn't require and sell it. They sold all the provisions they could. They needed the money ... Dad used to do some marketing on Saturday ... the shops were open ... and they would take eggs and skins and fowls, provisions to town to sell and then we really had to do the housework while they were away ... (Ritchie: 5 boys, 2 girls: farmer)

Another farming woman whose husband was a wage worker produced butter in quantity for a city store. This also involved walking several miles over the hills to the nearest railway station and putting the butter on the train for transport to Wellington.

She was a very hard working little woman. She used to milk, separate the milk and make the butter. Wardells in Wellington used to have a standing order for her butter. Home made butter. There was no transport in those days. It was a long walk to the Miranda station to take it into Wellington. (Watson: 1 girl: smallholder/labourer)

Sometimes the mother also added to the family budget through the growing and sale of garden produce. I asked another person about his mother who also added to the family purse.

DID SHE HAVE ANY HOBBIES THAT YOU CAN REMEMBER?
Gardenin' [emphatic] ... Supplied the money!

FLOWERS AND VEGETABLES?
And shrubs. Mmmmmmm... (MacArthur: 6 boys, 7 girls:
smallholder/labourer)

Almost all the farming women kept large stores of preserved fruit and vegetables and baked regularly in addition to normal farmhouse cooking and other forms of domestic self-provisioning.

Farm Work of Women and Girls

About a third of the women were known to have been involved in farm work, either at some stage in the life cycle when children were too young to be of substantial assistance on the farm, or during harvesting or shearing or lambing or because their help was essential to the economic effectiveness of the enterprise. It is highly likely that others would have worked on the farm before the respondent's birth.

She helped father at harvesting time. She was never home [then]. I'd come home from school and the dishes weren't done from breakfast. She worked very hard.

SO SHE WAS A FARMER HERSELF? She was indeed.

DID SHE REGARD HERSELF AS A FARMER?

She was very capable outside too ... I don't know how she regarded it. Perhaps she felt a bit tired at times, wished she didn't have to go out. She was splendid with father. (Ritchie: 5 boys, 2 girls: farmer)

The size of the family, the life cycle stage and its age-sex compositions were of critical importance in creating and changing strategies for achieving economic survival on farms and children were always an essential labour resource working along with adults. First of all let us consider the contribution of girls to the farm and household generally.

WHAT WERE THE SORT OF JOBS THAT YOU DID AROUND THE HOUSE AS A CHILD?

Well, I wasn't very interested in inside work ... I didn't work much inside. My sister did 'cause she was the next one in the family and she was only about eighteen months ... [or so] younger than me. She was interested in cooking and I liked being outside and I did all sorts of things like sledge work, horse and sledge. Oh, I could shear a sheep, and I worked outside with my father all the time. We milked cows and all that sort of thing.

... WHAT AGE WOULD YOU BE WHEN YOU STARTED MILKING THE COWS?

Oh, pretty young I suppose ... I suppose I might have been about thirteen or fourteen. We could always milk a cow, but I mean we were ... sort of into cows ... We used to milk about eight cows each, about four or five of us. We would separate by hand, turn the old separator you know. (Gilbert: 3 boys, 3 girls: farmer)

Like Mrs Gilbert some other girls preferred farm work to domestic work. In Mrs Gilbert's case, it was possible for her preferences to be taken into account because there was another daughter of suitable age to help in the house.

DID YOUR SISTER ... HELP YOUR MOTHER IN THE HOUSE A LOT?

Yes, she used to cook. Oh, she used to do a lot of things ... I used to do the cooking quite often but that was about the only thing I did inside. I used to cook in the weekend 'cause you know with a big family I was ... there were two big brothers and they ate like horses and [laughs]. I was interested in cooking and ... I used to do a lot of cooking. Mum didn't do a lot of that. She used to garden and that sort of thing. We had a huge garden.

DID SHE WORK ON THE FARM ALL HER LIFE THAT YOU REMEMBER?

All the time that I can remember she did.

SO SHE WOULD MILK TOO?

Yes. (Gilbert: 3 boys, 3 girls: farmer)

After the milking was done they would first separate and then take the milk and cream seven miles to the end of the road for collection.

... I used to do that a lot. We had a dog cart or trap, they used to call them, with a horse [I used to drive it] ... down to the end of the road

...WHO WOULD HANDLE THE MILK CANS? YOURSELF?

Yes [laughs]. You had to, oh, you couldn't be useless at our place. You had to be ... everybody had to be Oh, I think I must have been about fourteen or fifteen, you know, at that stage. (Gilbert: 3 boys, 3 girls: farmer)

It was not unusual for girls and women to do heavy manual work. In general, they worked from an early age in both house and farm work, starting with the lighter tasks and taking over from an older sibling as they grew older. For instance, a nine year old might be rising with the rest of the family at four or five in the morning and going to the cowshed where she might start off with tasks like washing the cows udders or tying up their tails. This was also the case with little boys.

According to Mrs Gilbert, the children were all competent at their tasks and enjoyed their work.

WHEN YOU SAY THAT NOBODY COULD BE USELESS AT YOUR PLACE, WHAT DID YOU MEAN?

Well, I mean everybody had to be able to do things ... We didn't reckon we were going to get Dad or someone to help us, you know. They didn't expect us to. I don't know, we just did it.

DO YOU THINK IT WAS BECAUSE ... IT HAD TO BE DONE?
Yes, it had to be done.

BECAUSE THE MONEY HAD TO BE EARNED?

Yes, you know. No one thought ... we were always hard ...[up]. Everybody was hard up in those days. There never seemed to be a lot of money ... (Gilbert: 3 boys, 3 girls: farmer)

Clearly these children were expected to be independent, self-reliant and useful. Their contribution was essential to all aspects of domestic self-provisioning and to the productivity of the farm itself. However, others did not

enjoy it and admitted to resentment at what seemed to them to be exploitation, even under prevailing social expectations. The control over children's labour and sources of resentment will be analysed later when forms of control and discipline are discussed (Chapter 9).

The data presented above lead to the conclusion that wives and daughters played an extremely important and active part in the farming household economy and the extracts show that they expected to do so. This suggests the presence of ideas about women's work consistent with those outlined for England and Europe in preindustrial settings by Scott & Tilly and many others (see Chapter 4). These 'really useful' women and girls provided domestic services for all household members preparing food, making and mending clothes, as well as the multifarious domestic self-provisioning tasks necessary to survival. Several women were also involved in the production of cream and butter, eggs or garden produce for sale. Girls commonly laboured on the farm itself, as did some of the mothers.

Farming girls' household tasks took the form of helping their mothers with the usual jobs of cleaning, cooking and sewing plus food preserving, dairy work and the making of butter. Almost all the girls did so. Exceptions will be examined later.

During the course of the working day daughters learned from their mothers the crafts that were and are still common to most women in Western societies, doing so by steps, taking on a wider range of duties and greater responsibilities as they grew in age, strength and experience. They were not specifically trained, but rather learned by doing the work in the company of others.

Men's Work on Farms

Farmers worked long hours in general, sometimes seven days a week, according to season and weather conditions. Many respondents considered their fathers were 'dedicated' to their land and animals leaving them little time for anything else. In the words of some their fathers' work, like their mother's was 'never done'. In slack times, there was always the maintenance of farm buildings, renewal of fencing and the large number of tasks to be done to keep the land, animals and buildings in good order. There were also such tasks as keeping the vegetable garden on which the family relied and general maintenance around the house itself.

Although farmers were constrained by the weather and the bank, they also had a considerable amount of freedom in organising their work and in deploying members of the household in the work of the farm. Much also depended on

the inclinations of the farmer, on the number of able sons and able daughters, his ability to hire help when required, and the seasonal requirements of the type of farm.

Mrs Gandy's father owned two blocks of land but according to his daughter was a bit work-shy in later years. The extract demonstrates some of the above and also reinforces the point that life cycle stage was an important determinant of the amount of work to be done and changing potential for work organisation.

DID [YOUR FATHER] WORK LONG HOURS ON THE FARM?

No, he didn't really. I think he worked hard when he was a young man but he didn't work ... well, farmers - they don't bust themselves. Now you notice they make their own rules. If you own what you have got, you know and ... it's not like working for somebody else. Oh, of course, work had to be done like shearing time and that sort of thing. He would be flat out. But otherwise if it was a wet day like this, well, he probably wouldn't go out. (Gilbert: 3 boys, 3 girls: farmer)

One of the important aspects of work on farms (and in other households in both town and country) was the keeping of a vegetable garden and an orchard. Because of the distance from shops, and also for reasons of thrift, the keeping of a good garden sufficient to maintain the family throughout the year was a very important aspect of domestic self-provisioning. Many people mentioned the garden spontaneously, commenting on the general

plentifulness of good, fresh though plainly cooked food. It was generally the fathers who appear to have been responsible for keeping the vegetable garden and orchard, a substantial contribution to the family's wellbeing. In this they were aided by other members of the family including their wives.

As we have seen, some farmers had to work less hard than others. Those who had employees and grown children could delegate work. I asked Mrs Gilbert if her father had helped round the house itself.

Well, he didn't have to because there were so many of us. We all did ... sometimes he would dig a bit of garden but Mum used to do most of the garden because she was garden minded, vegetable planting, weeding and ...

SHE REALLY LIKED THAT?

Yes, and it was quite ... it was something for her to get outside, you know ... He wasn't that well, I don't think. He used to have quite a bit of back trouble, I think. He was sort of quite a bit older than us but we used to think that ... he was putting a bit of it on ... but I think now that he wasn't [laughs].
(Gilbert: 3 boys, 3 girls).

Mrs Gilbert's father was not unusual. It was uncommon for men to be involved in housework of any kind. Wives and daughters on farms were responsible for all social reproduction.

Boys' Work on Farms and Small-Holdings

Although very few boys on farms or small-holdings did housework of any kind, all contributed substantially to the household economy through their labour.

WHEN YOU WERE YOUNG WHAT SORT OF WORK DID YOU DO AT HOME?

Milking cows. Twenty cows in the morning. Got up at half past three in the morning.

DID YOU WORK WITH YOUR BROTHERS?

I'm the eldest one. Used to take the milk to the factory, get on the horse and go to school.

HOW FAR?

Two and a half mile. Sometimes we all went on the same horse, sometimes I biked. (Rivers: 3 boys: smallholder/labourer)

These are the words of one of the sons of a small-holding household. In such cases, the children were unable to spend time in play because of their chores or take part in organised sports for their schools.

On every farm in which there was a son, he worked with his father though there were variations in how much was expected of the boys. Generally, the eldest boy or boys were heavily involved, often with the expectation that they would inherit the farm on their father's death or retirement. Younger boys, too, were expected to help substantially.

DID YOUR BROTHERS AND SISTERS HAVE THEIR PARTICULAR JOBS TO DO?

Of course. My brothers were all helping Dad on the farm, felling the trees. They had to clear the acres for grazing purposes, and my older sister mainly helped in the house. Helped with the little ones naturally. [The brothers] ... also milked the cows. They had to be done morning and night. They were a great help to their father then ... before the machines came. (Darroch: 5 boys, 5 girls: farmer)

Another farming boys' experience reveals the amount of work required of children as well as tension between demands of labour and schooling.

DID YOU DO ANY SORT OF WORK AROUND THE HOUSE?

Well, I had to get up in the morning and get my pony in and then milk two or three cows before breakfast and then ride to school which was three miles ...

AND THAT WAS FROM WHAT AGE?

Well, I never started school on account of that until I was about six and a half. That was usual in those days if you had far to ride to school and you had to do some work. Not many started [school] before they were six.

O.K., YOU MILKED COWS, WERE THERE OTHER COWS ON THE PLACE?

Oh, yes, I only did my share. There was usually a man that milked, about three or four too, but I wasn't the only one in the family did it. As the others came of age, they did it, the boys.

AND YOU WOULD DO THIS IN THE EVENINGS AS WELL?

Yes.

WHAT KIND OF FARM WAS IT?

Sheep and cattle. It wasn't really a dairying farm, it was only to make a few shillings extra to keep us, well, chiefly so that we could be sent away to be educated. (Weston: 3 boys, 2 girls: farmer)

This farm differed from any of the examples previously used since labourers were regularly employed. The man who milked the cows with Mr Weston was a cowman-gardener, a specialised occupation in a larger farming enterprise. The extract also reveals that education was valued in this family and the means to provide it had to be earned somehow. Extra work had to be done by other household members to meet the expenses involved in sending the children to boarding schools.

When Mr. Weston's formal education was complete, he stayed on the farm for a period, working for his father without remuneration. It emerges from the interview, however, that he was doing his duty by other members of the family. Having helped him to get to boarding school, it was now his turn to help send them.

YOU WORKED FOR YOUR FATHER FOR NOTHING?

Yes.

THAT WAS A COMMON THING, WAS IT?

Would be, yes. For two years. I wasn't the only boy doing that.

YES. THIS WAS ALMOST AN APPRENTICESHIP IN FACT?

Yes. Oh, well, they had been good to me. I remember when he spoke to me about it he said, "Now you're the oldest of five. I sent you to secondary school for three years and I feel it is my duty to send your brothers and sisters and therefore I won't be able to pay you for two or three years. That didn't hurt me. Really it was an education for me to get away from home probably and have a go. (Weston, 3 boys, 2 girls: farmer).

This quotation illustrates well the degree of family loyalty commonly expressed by children from farming and other households in which a high degree of involvement was necessary to survival and wellbeing. There were, however, variations in the degree to which this form of collectivism was expressed.

Farms with Employees

The basic problem to be faced by any household is in achieving a comfortable balance between production, reproduction and consumption so that members' means of subsistence are assured. This problem was of great importance to ordinary family farmers who could not afford to hire adult wage labour.

Some Life Cycle Strategies

For family farmers one of the most difficult stages of the life cycle was probably the period when there were young children to care for and no labour available to assist on the farm. According to a few respondents, their mothers had assisted considerably on the farm before their domestic and child-rearing duties had become too arduous for them to be able to labour on the farm itself.

One of the most notable findings of the research was the practice of using 'surplus' young adults from other

households as farm labourers or house servants. This can be interpreted as a strategy for household survival whereby the imbalances between labour and other resources occur, especially large families living on infertile land, or land insufficient to support the numbers of persons to be fed. In such cases, the problem was solved by sending their children to other households where they would, as Mr Weston put it, *earn a little and learn a little*. Their places in their own families would be taken by younger brothers and sisters while, they - as workers - would fill the gaps in another household at a stage in the life cycle which demanded able-bodied workers from outside the family, for example, when the children were too young, or there was not enough labour for them to make best use of their land. The custom of sending children to other households, Laslett's 'life cycle servants' had a long history in England (see Chapter 4).

The interview material for New Zealand provides information from the point of view of both donors and recipients of these young workers, for a few respondents were themselves obliged to leave home to take up work in another household, and some of them remember other young people coming to live in their own homes/farms to help their mothers, fathers and siblings for small wages. Their money was sent home to their mothers. As can be seen in the following case material, this period of service illustrates

how links between households can be forged or reinforced through needs for assistance.

In the first case, the daughter of a struggling household is featured. She was badly exploited by her employers. In the second case, the daughter was able to go to a household where she was treated as one of the family. Indeed, they were family friends.

When Mrs Oswald was fifteen her mother was asked by the keeper of the local general store if her daughter wanted a job because she was looking for help in the house at another store which they had just bought in an isolated area. They also had a pig farm and butchery. Mrs Oswald took the job and her sisters had to take over at home.

I worked from six o'clock in the morning because I had to get up and cook the butcher's breakfast so he could get on with his job. Then I had to help the children get dressed and some of them had to be got ready to go to school. Breakfast was porridge and toast. I had to get up and light the coal range every morning. She would get up more or less when the children were ready to go to school. I had to get their lunches and everything. I was only, what?, fifteen ... It was almost child labour.

The trouble was you never got a night off. She was very strict and you worked till eight or nine at night. If I went out in the afternoon, she would say, "Take the children for a walk". I was always cluttered up with children. If they went to visit her people for the day, I always had to go too. Look after the children while they went visiting their parents. I had to keep an eye on all the children. (Oswald: 5 boys, 5 girls: farmer)

From her wages of ten shillings a week, she would give her mother a few shillings every time she went home on her monthly visits. Her brothers were doing the same.

... the three eldest boys were working. That made a big difference. They were all working on farms away from home, too. So that was four of us out of the road. They lived in, got fed and a few shillings a week. (Oswald: 5 boys, 5 girls: farmer)

The poverty of this family forced their children into exploitative situations, and eventually into selling the farm. Since her employment took her far away from her parents, there was no opportunity for them to intervene in her affairs or indeed to know how she was treated. Nor was Mrs Oswald prepared to lose her job because she knew her parents needed the little money she was able to spare.

Mrs Lee's situation was somewhat different since she worked for friends of the family. Her father did not want his daughter to have 'a job'. However, she had several trips away from home helping other families.

I was always the one, like if anyone was in trouble, like we had a friend who lost her husband, and ... oh, they had this big, bad 'flu in New Zealand after the first war, and one very special friend of my father's, well, he died and, of course she was left with a family. I went to stay with her for a few weeks. She had a lot of business to attend to. I was only about seventeen ... I had more or less to look after the children. (Lee: 4 boys, 2 girls: farmer)

Later she did get a job in town at the instigation of her stepmother whose sister's daughter had died. Here she did housework and helped in the bakery which was part of the household unit. Although she got her keep and a pound a week in pay, she was "just one of the family".

On the whole, these young men and women appear to have been treated as family members in that they worked on the farm or in the house, either under the direction of the husband or wife. In two cases mentioned by interviewees, these were relatives, brought in as governesses to help cope with the problem of educating their charges, prior to being sent to boarding school.

It was not only the young women who were treated as one of the family. One farmer had a young man living in his household, the son of a friend, whose duties included baby-sitting the children when the parents went to social functions.

The practice was not confined entirely to farming households. A couple of upper middle class daughters kept house for brothers who had become farmers, while there were a few other daughters who were 'lent' to other households to help out, though not necessarily for wages.

The family economy, then, operated not only within households, but also between them, according to practices known to have been customary in England in earlier centuries. Sending children to known families, meant that

the parents could be sure they would be kept under control, according to their own approved standards. The practice must also have served to create or reinforce social networks well beyond the area of origin of the young people. Nevertheless there were differences in that some households exploited their life cycle servants. The question of assymetry will occupy our attention at several points, particularly in Chapter 9.

Other Labour Strategies

Not all farmers operated family farms. There were a couple of quite distinctive cases in which the father alone worked on the farm together with his paid adult employees. These were large farms with several employees run as a capitalist enterprise on the basis of labour power exchanged for cash (and kind). In these cases, women and children were not involved in farm work at all. In terms of their household organisation they more resembled those of upper middle class urban ones and will be treated as such for the purpose of analysis.

On these particular farms, social distance was preserved between family members, household staff and employees. The paid men were provided with so much meat, wood, butter and eggs in addition to wages. There were also shearers who were usually employed as a gang for a

particular period with their own cook. They were accommodated well away from the homestead.

By way of contrast, not all sheep farmers hired shearing gangs. Neighbours and relatives might be called in at such times to work on a reciprocal basis. Shearing was likely to involve small units in providing meals for the workers, a chore to be shared by the mother and her daughters. Communal labour among farmers and others is described in Chapter 7.

Occasionally an adult servant might be kept. One household had a domestic servant whose whole life was spent serving members of an extended family network. She was cared for till her death by that family as if she had been one of them. For instance, this woman would not claim her statutory right to a pension and the family accepted her wish to retain her pride and dignity, making sure that she was comfortable and not socially isolated until her death. Her relationships with the family more resembled those of a family retainer than an employee. Social distance was not preserved in this household which was run on the lines of a family farm, Tilly & Scott's 'family economy' (1978).

Summary of Work of Farming Households

In these sections on work on farms and in farm households, I have focussed on the importance of women's and children's productive work and self-provisioning generally, as an essential part of maintaining the necessary degree of self-sufficiency. Although these farming units were part of a capitalist economic system, dependent at least partially on bank loans for their survival, on a day to day basis they operated in such a way that parents and children were dependent on each other. To be sure, children attended school from around six years to about thirteen or fourteen at a very minimum (depending on the statutory leaving age applicable to respondents) but their time away from school was controlled by their parents and used primarily for work around the farm.

Girls' work involved learning to do housework just as their brothers did, through watching parents as they worked. They were not trained as such. The evidence suggests that the degree to which children were useful depended much on their age and that for many years the rearing of small children, farm housecraft, as well as helping on the farm itself must have severely taxed women with many children and no help. Later, the elder daughter(s) would take over much of her mother's labour and

responsibilities leaving her mother free for the more skilled work.

There was a critical need for children to assist on low-technology, labour-intensive farms, especially in the cowshed. Little wonder that children's services were needed early and families large. The low level of technological development and the continuing need for women's and children's farm labour is demonstrated in a survey of dairy farmers in New Zealand in the 1930s which showed that

the wife is in many cases as much a business partner as she is a homemaker; the children often are employees of the father as well as his family (Doig, 1946, 3).

The household economy of farmers required the commitment not only of the husband/father to production for the market and for the household's own use, but also his wife and his daughters and sons, a commitment of the total household group to the wellbeing of the group rather than the individual. There were, however, variations on these general points which will be considered later. In the meantime we should note that the divisions between home and work, private and public, production and consumption cannot have been very meaningful within the family farming context where at least a precarious balance of the unity of capital and labour prevailed.

Non-Farming Households

The 'great divide' between this section and the previous one is marked by the majority of non-farming households' dependence on cash and therefore, their ability to sell the labour of their members. The divide coincides with Tilly & Scott's (1978) 'family economy' illustrated through the New Zealand material given in the previous sections of this Chapter, and the 'wage' and 'consumer economies' both of which required that households send out at least one person to earn money.

Among families depending on cash and therefore wages, Tilly & Scott (1978) distinguish two main types. In the 'family wage economy', the persons sent off to earn might include children and women. Work for all might be casual, possibly insecure and certainly poorly paid. One example of this which we have already seen was the sending out of young adults to other households (where they were paid). Another was the smallholding families in which all members worked on the land, but the main income derived from the wage labour of the father.

In the next couple of sections we will see other examples of work behaviour characteristic of the wage economy in which children earned wages or were involved in gathering and extractive activities (e.g. firewood, fishing) which resulted in household savings. We will also see that

when they could be spared for work other than domestic self-provisioning and childrearing activities, some women were involved in petty commodity work at home, in their gardens, on the roadside and bush, and in the formal economy, helping make ends meet.

Tilly and Scott's final type, the 'family consumer economy' refers to household economic organisation based on the earnings of a single male breadwinner. These terms, together with their empirical referents will be used for further analysis at the end of the Chapter.

The work activities described by my urban respondents were similar to those found in other books and articles based on oral histories and autobiographies (see Chapter 4, 155-6 especially). I have not attempted to cite these in the text since to do so would be unduly repetitious and stylistically pedantic.

As far as rural families are concerned, I was unable to find any material at all to support my findings, except a few New Zealand oral histories featuring the activities of farming families, made available to me through the infant New Zealand Oral History Archives. The paper by Armitage (1979) and the book by Carter (1981) based on oral testimony of proletarian frontier women in the Western United States and Western Australia respectively, document very different situations to that of my informants living for the most part on barely established farms.

Women's Domestic Work

At the time of which I write, the period from around the turn of the century until the mid 1920s, the working conditions of most New Zealand women were rather primitive even in urban areas and where domestic help was employed though there was considerable variation by social class and by location in rural areas, scattered suburbs and urban situations.

One of my urban informants recently published a book in which she compared her mother's sister's home with her own. While her own father was a businessman whose fortunes rose and fell, the family's financial situation was fairly comfortable during the whole of her childhood. On the other hand, her mother's sister who had married a carpenter lived in straitened circumstances in the outskirts of a town. She described the house which was in a state of disrepair.

There were none of the refinements of our own home - no gas lights (only oil lamps and candles), no carpets, no chain to pull; in fact, no taps! The only water supply came from a pump with an iron handle that you had to push down to make the water gush out - and sometimes it didn't. There was an old tin bath in an outside shed, and water was always being heated in a huge iron pot on the coal range ... no wonder swimming in the river was encouraged all year round! (King, 1982, 60)

Lack of these basic facilities was commonly commented upon by the people interviewed and meant not only backbreaking work for the housewife but also took time and must have had considerable influence on the necessity of training children to do other chores.

The vast majority of women did their own washing though a few employed a washerwoman from time to time. A good description of this task was given in my informant's book.

By noon on Monday each week, as regular as clockwork, Mother would have stoked the copper with wood until all the clothes were well and truly boiled, as well as having rubbed soap into the patches where any dirt showed. Then, with a piece of broom-handle as a copper-stick, she would have lifted all the heavy, steaming, hot things over from the copper into one of the wooden tubs beside it, and there rinsed everything thoroughly, passing them between the rubber rollers of a hand-wringer several times from one tub of clean water to another. The last rinse would have bag-blue added, and then Mother would be satisfied to give the clothes a final wring and peg them on the lines.

Some things - damask table cloths and serviettes, embroidered tray-cloths and dressing-table mats, crocheted doilies and sideboard runners, and my own gingham dresses - would be given extra treatment in a basin of starch (made with cornflour) ... and my mother even gave the handkerchiefs this same treatment, after watering down the last of the starch, to make them nice and crisp and new-looking. They were lovely to iron ...

Already hot and tired after all her activity with the clothes, Mother would then use the hot soapy water still in the copper for scrubbing the floors of the wash-house and kitchen, the back porch, and the doorsteps - none of which I ever saw dirty - but I did see them wet on Monday at lunch-time.

But that was not the end of the wash-day chores. Last of all there was the job of baling the rest of the water out of the copper, using a tin dipper; then mopping up the remaining moisture until the copper was dry enough for the heat still in it to make sure no verdigris would form before the next Monday came around. (King, 1982, 99, 100)

Despite the relatively affluent position of this family, her washing day was a day-long, arduous task, something shared with the large majority of the mothers of the interviewees.

The long extract from my respondent's book reveals much about the nature of one aspect of housework and also something of its meaning to the housewife. Mrs King's family enjoyed a high standard of living relative to other families in the sample and were able to display their success, their gentility, in homely luxuries. Her mother was not totally confident of her skills in the laundry, however.

The stiff white collars that Father wore when he went into the city came hard and shiny, in a square cardboard box, from the Chinese Laundry where they were sent every week by the half-dozen. (Father never went to church, or there would have been seven). (King, 1982, 100)

Father's public appearances appear to have been considered very important, necessitating special arrangements.

Despite their relative prosperity, there was no paid help in the home. The mother had been offered domestic help

and refused it, preferring to do the work herself. She did have a hand-wringer.

Generally, urban and suburban mothers were totally involved in the rearing of their children, with cleaning, cooking and baking. Like farming women, some also preserved fruit. However, it was only the more affluent who could afford to buy fruit for bottling. The making of clothes, sometimes by unpicking old garments, the mending, darning, knitting, sewing and crochet were remembered by so many of their children.

She had a helluva time sitting up all night, making trousers and that from old raincoats. All that sort of thing (MacArthur: 6 boys, 7 girls: labourer and smallholder)

Women's Non-Domestic Work

Like the farming mothers with labouring husbands, some of the rural women, their children, and other co-residents were able to make quite substantial contributions in cases of economic need.

Mr Spooner's family lived on the outskirts of a country town. The main breadwinner was a telegraph linesman, a stepfather, feared by all the family for his violent temper. He did no gardening or home maintenance leaving this work to a co-resident mother's father who did

it for him while he, himself, drank alone in the local public house. Mr Spooner's mother was a good gardener, a terrifically strong woman who through her by-employment helped keep the family going.

We had in one part of the section about 150 gooseberry trees. She used to sell and pick something close to one ton of gooseberries every year. From the orchard she used to sell the apples and she used to sell out of the garden and things like that. She was a very busy woman, you never saw her sitting down reading or anything like that, or even knitting. She was always doing something. She never stopped working which shortened her life considerably.
(Spooner: 3 boys, 5 girls: telephone linesman)

This semi-rural family was also kept alive by the earnings of my respondent, the eldest son, who had paper and milk runs from the age of thirteen. Both boys and girls helped their mother and grandfather in the garden and in the house very substantially.

In another case, the rural-dwelling wife of a stock and station company employee worked not only to eke out the budget by way of her self-provisioning activities, but was also able to exploit the environment in which she lived, with the help of her children. Mrs Messenger's mother kept a cow and made her own butter. She also got her children to pick great quantities of wild mushrooms. In season, they would also collect walnuts which she would spread out on sacks and the children would then turn them over every day

until they were dry and then shell them in preparation for their sale in the city. In springtime, all the children at the school would be asked to pick daffodils and violets which were also sent to the city for sale. In addition, she took in seasonal workers as lodgers, men like Mrs Watson's father whose migratory work is described in the next section (Davidoff, 1979).

It was unusual for married women to be employed in New Zealand at this period (see below). There were a few cases among the families interviewed in both middle and working class. There were three midwives, a washerwoman, a laundry hand, one woman who assembled clothes lines in a hut in the family's back yard, one skilled factory operative, one who jointly ran a catering establishment with her husband, and one who tried to establish herself in a teashop.

Girls' Work in Non-Farming Households

The factors which seem to have been most important in determining whether girls should do housework or not, was the amount of housework necessary (in turn affected by facilities and number of children), the place of a child in the family (and the number of others available to do the work) and the values and attitudes of the mothers towards their daughters' contribution.

The girls in working class households were generally heavily involved in domestic chores, learning from an early age to wash dishes, stepping up to harder work and greater responsibilities as they grew. As with girls in farming families, the burden was greatest among the elder daughters of large families common among working class families. It was also true for only daughters.

The next set of extracts illustrate the work activities of girls. The material, like that referring to their mothers, resembles the housework and child care activities of farming girls, except that the latter might also work in dairy and farm. The first two cases are those of girls whose parents had migrated to New Zealand. Their experiences resemble those of girls born in New Zealand of New Zealand parents.

The first couple had only one child, an uncommonly small family in those days.² The mother was one of the few who remained in full time employment after marriage. She had found skilled employment in a local factory almost immediately they disembarked and had then 'spoken for' her husband. During the school holidays, the daughter was able to see her mother at work and spend time there too, a situation which would be unthinkable in a factory today but which was probably consistent with the relative informality of some enterprises in those times in both Britain and New Zealand. Her daughter was asked

WHAT SORTS OF JOBS DID YOU HAVE TO DO AROUND THE HOUSE?
I had cleaning to do. I always had to clean the fire stove, the old range out, and when my mother was working and my Dad - of course we were working to get the house - then I had all the housework to do. I did everything. In the mornings, I used to make the beds, wash dishes. And then when I came home I had to do all the shopping after school, bring it up the hill - there was no buses in those days. We had horse and trap. And I used to take it home. I used to clean all the kitchen out and get the tea ready for when my parents came home.

THIS WAS THE TIME WHEN YOU WERE ABOUT NINE OR TEN?
Yes. Oh, yes, I had all that to do. Mum says she doesn't know what she would have done without me. I always had a cuppa tea ready for them when they come in. And I used to do all the shopping after school. Go down and get the bread and the meat. (Gaunt: 1 daughter: both parents skilled factory operatives)

Another woman had migrated from Scotland with her parents when she was fourteen. This respondent spent rather a short time in New Zealand as a child to fit the criteria for inclusion in the sample, nevertheless her experience, was not unlike that of other elder daughters in respect of the control over her time by her mother. Her father was a tradesman who had originally come to work on a contract but who had decided that New Zealand was a better place to bring up the family and had sent for them to come out.

WHAT SORTS OF JOBS DID YOU DO AROUND THE HOUSE WHEN YOU WERE A CHILD?
Minding children. It was my job. I never had to do any work around the house.

SO YOU WERE A SORT OF NANNY ... WERE YOU THE ELDEST?
Yes, I was the eldest.

WOULD YOUR SISTERS HELP IN THE HOUSE?

No, they were little - if you mean when I was fourteen. I don't know if you remember [Interviewer was born and brought up in Scotland] but we used to have a shawl, a big shawl, like that [shows shawl]. We used to carry the baby around in that. Well, it was always like that when I was young. I used to hate it! To carry the children. And then we had a pram and we put them in the pram. I used to go out when others were jumping, playing with skipping ropes and all that, and I had my turn, ach!

WAS THAT USUAL FOR OLDER CHILDREN?

Yes, they always had to mind them! Always had to!

WHAT ABOUT YOUR BROTHERS? DID THEY DO ANYTHING ROUND THE HOUSE?

No! I don't know about your place, but Scots boys never did anything

CAN YOU REMEMBER YOUR MOTHER DOING THINGS ROUND THE HOUSE THEY DON'T DO TODAY?

Yes, she did everything. She was working all day. I was glad when I went to work so that I didn't have to mind the youngsters! [laughter all round] (Yarrow: 3 boys, 2 girls: engineer)

This woman may have escaped childrearing chores after she started work, but her Saturday afternoons were spent baking for the family, again helping her mother as most young working women did.

Both of these examples show how the only or eldest daughter fared in relation to her duties. In terms of the claims on their time and labour by parents, they differ only in that one appeared to have taken her duties in her stride while the other deeply resented them.

Among the middle class families, daughters seem to have done much less housework unless they were only or elder daughters in households without paid domestic help. Some middle class children came from small families in which there was an energetic and efficient mother who did not want to have a young daughter upsetting her routine. Sometimes the mother was already aided by an equally assiduous helper in an elder daughter, sometimes there was another adult such as a resident grandmother.

A few households had servants. In such families a couple of mothers insisted that their children, both boys and girls, learn to do housework themselves. In these cases, they did only a little, jobs requiring little skill or responsibility, and boys and girls tended to do much the same. One girl was taught how to manage a house and to cook, on the presumption that one day she would have to manage her own servants. In fact, she took her mother's place as mistress of the household when her mother died. She was fifteen at the time.

The next case illustrates the sort of work expected of girls from many middle class homes. The father was a clerk and they lived in a scattered suburb. This was a small family with only two girls, close in age, whose contribution seems to have been roughly equal.

WHAT ABOUT CHILDHOOD CHORES? WHAT WAS EXPECTED OF YOU?

I don't think it was expected. We just did it. I know we had to wash up. There were some battles royal over the washing up with my sister. We had to make our own beds. (Monmouth: 2 girls: cashier)

The chores done by the two girls in this household were similar and equally distributed. They were also lighter and less time consuming than those done by most working class girls. Similar patterns were observed among small families where there were boys, families in which there were no great divisions or differences in boys' and girls' work and in which few demands were made on them by parents in respect of labour.

Summary

Apart from the arduous daily round of housework and child rearing many of the city based mothers contributed to the household economy through their domestic skills in making and maintaining clothes as well as preserving food, that is, in domestic self-provisioning activities designed to save money. The urban mothers appear to have been very house-proud on the whole and there was considerable evidence of a concern with status not marked among the farming mothers. This subject will be pursued later.

Few mothers worked entirely alone. They were usually helped substantially by daughters. Some daughters resented

the control over their time, most apparently, did not. It emerged very clearly from the data that in working class families especially, girls did work hard, some of them having few memories of childhood play. A substantial economic contribution to the household was also expected from them after they were employed in addition to continuing to serve the household in other ways.

Some households created specialisation in their family division of labour so that one daughter would be earmarked for child-rearing while others gave their daughters a range of tasks consistent with their age. There were differences in respect of the amount of work expected of older and younger children as we found among farmers. There was also evidence of exclusion of children on the basis of their presumed incompetency. This appears to have been related to a high degree of domestic skill and self-reliance of the mother concerned and her monopolising of domestic territory.

Some of these themes will be elaborated in the next section where the activities of men and boys will be described. It should be pointed out that among the higher echelons of urban families, and among some working class families, the division of labour between boys and girls was less distinct and it is convenient to treat them together. One marked difference was the probability that boys and girls in small families would both be responsible for

individual reproduction, that is that they should make their own beds, and attend to other chores which involved only themselves, rather than being served by women or girls who assumed the total burden of social reproduction. As with the farmers, this was not so of adult men.

Men's Work - Employment

Men's work is usually identified with employment, and it is this area of work that we will consider first for the New Zealand sample. At the top end of the socio-economic scale there were families whose sole breadwinner was a top public servant, professional, or bureaucrat in the private sector. They and their families will be distinguished from other white collar workers by labelling them as upper-middle class.

Other middle class and working class fathers were involved in a wide range of occupations as owners or relatives employed in (family) businesses, as managers and shop assistants, as clerks and secretaries, tallow refiners, butchers, including two dairy factory managers (one man ran the enterprise totally by himself in each case), foremen, plumbers, carpenters, plasterers, drivers, compositors, engineers, and a couple of jacks of all trades, making their livelihoods where they could or would. There were also the

wage labourers whose wives and children's farming activities have been described earlier.

Some of the men were occupationally static in the sense that they remained in the same job and at the same level during most of the respondent's childhood, others moved to foreman level, others painfully acquired their own business and sometimes lost them. Some were self-employed, some employed someone else at least for a short time, perhaps an apprentice, perhaps a brother or friend who employed them at other times. Those who worked in offices or other non-manual occupations were either owners of small businesses or in a modest position of authority with an organisation.

A few men had to move in search of work, mostly seasonal workers who had to leave their homes in search of casual work to keep their families going until regular work became available again.

Providing for a family could also be hazardous because of job insecurity as a result of market fluctuations and/or lack of specific skills and because of the ever-present threat of accident, illness and sudden death. There was no accident compensation or other statutory benefits for families (beyond a tiny widow's pension for the 'morally fit') so that financial crisis was not uncommon

Other industrial conditions were harsh by today's standards. There were always others waiting for jobs which became vacant. Discipline appears to have been strict in all kinds of concerns and easily enforceable as a result of the power of employers. In some communities, however, the formality of the modern organisation was not yet complete for children were sometimes obliged to take their father's breakfast or dinner to work and so were able to observe them there.

Examples of earlier working practices were mentioned by a few respondents such as the son of a contract freezing worker. His own words provide some of the flavour of working class men's breadwinning activities in early twentieth century New Zealand.

NOW ... YOUR FATHER'S JOB AS A BONER ... WHAT SORT OF HOURS DID HE WORK THEN?

Well, from eight till five, but as they had the boning contract they were paid per hundred for sheep and cattle. He and Bob, they were partners in this contracting business to do the season and they engaged a lot of Aussie boners [whol used to come over for the Season ... My father would be working till nearly eleven o'clock at night and had to be up again at three o'clock in the morning and start again. (Gray: 4 boys: contract boner)

Contractors working in gangs for freezing works might be at work between 3 a.m. and 11 p.m. during the killing season (three respondents independently said their fathers' work

hours were so), while others worked long hours in other jobs or had two sources of income. The meat consumed in the Gray household came from the freezing works during season time and most of the vegetables from the garden

Although skilled freezing workers were much in demand during the season, they sometimes had to find other work for part of the year. One solved the problem by going to Taranaki each year bushfelling. As well as sending his wages home, he supplemented the family budget by sending back game by rail for the family's consumption. Other fathers made sure their families were provided for by taking on overtime or another, extra job, or 'moonlighting', exercising a great deal of initiative sometimes to earn a bit of extra money in the informal economy.

Some work was less predictable than contracting for the freezing works. According to Mr. McIntosh, his blacksmith/carpenter/joiner/cabinet-maker father's career was rather unpredictable in terms of bringing in the money as a result of swings in work. At times he had his own business.

Periodically, depending on the flush of work. Sometimes there'd be a terrible lot of work; other times there wouldn't be much work to do and then they'd go and one would help the other out ... Tom worked for Dad and Dad worked for Tom later. When he retired he used to sometimes have Dick's lot come and get him to make some caskets. (McIntosh: 2 boys, 4 girls: blacksmith)

This father generally worked normal hours for the period in New Zealand, that is 8 a.m. till about 5 p.m. as well as Saturday mornings.

Among those with the least bargaining power in the labour market were men like Mrs Watson's father. Her family was exceptionally geographically mobile as a result of her father's difficulty in finding suitable work, but they were able to eke out his wages by working their farmlets, keeping animals and selling their produce including butter.

My father never stayed ... he was doing - not contracting work - he moved from one job to another wherever work was available. It was not like it is today. He used to go away grass seeding, in the grass seeding season, probably for a week. And then he came home in the weekend. He would be round Akaroa ... Then he was working in a stone quarry. He worked very, very hard. (Watson: 1 girl: general labourer)

Then he got work with the railways which meant being transferred regularly. It also meant that they had to leave the small holdings on which the small family relied for food as well as the cash the mother was able to earn from making butter. The father, like others in his situation, also worked their land, doing the heavy work like bush felling and fencing. Arthritis, caused by working out of doors in bad weather virtually crippled him, and his career in the formal economy came to an end shortly after he began work as a labourer in a freezing works. He was never

able to walk again. The case study illustrates very well just how insecure families could be in those days.

There were another three or four situations like this, cases in which the fathers would like to have been full-time farmers, enjoying a life independent of an employer, but could not find enough capital to acquire and run an economic unit. This placed a considerable burden on other members of the family and recalls the exploitation of women and children observed in Australian soldier settlements (see Lake, 1985).³

Men's Work - Household

Many of the men intentionally saved money through their gardening activities. There was indeed a clear association between respectability, being a 'good father' and keeping a really productive garden among both working class and lower middle class families. While the women saved through their domestic skills, the great majority of the working class and middle class men in the sample were involved in producing vegetables, many of them achieving a high degree of self-sufficiency in garden produce at least in summer. This meant heavy digging, getting manure from the freezing works or seaweed from the beach as well as the maintenance of the garden.

Some took great pride in their gardens to the extent to getting special seeds from Australia and keeping careful records. While for some, gardening appears to have been identified primarily with keeping the family in food, for others it was a real source of interest as well. There was a dimension of gratification derived from success as a gardener, almost certainly part of identification with the role of breadwinner in much the same way as production of preserves and clothing by women of the household was necessary for the family's well-being as well as a source of interest and pride for them.

As far as home maintenance was concerned, ability and inclination varied widely from doing virtually nothing to being highly involved.

He would always be doing something in his workshop. Else he was in his study. He should have been an architect. He had a lot of drawings ... [He did] anything that wanted doing. We found a lot of these certificates, ... where he'd sent to Philadelphia for exams. They were all sorts. I know he had carpentry, electric wiring. And I think, but I couldn't be sure, that Dad used to do all the things around. He put on the water, the artesian water outside. (Jeffrey: 2 boys, 3 girls: foreman)

Few men were quite as handy as Mrs Jeffrey's father, who also made good toys for his children, but many were remembered painting and doing repairs around the place, sometimes in the company of their sons. A couple also

helped out their 'mates', using their work skills and receiving help in return.

As far as providing vegetables and home maintenance was concerned, some were more highly motivated than others. Those who could afford it, hired tradesmen to do the work, and vegetables were bought or grown by a gardener in the family's garden. At the other end of the socio-economic scale, some families rented their homes, may not have had a garden and lacked the motivation or power to maintain or extend the house.

Some lower middle-class fathers were helpful round the house, either with domestic chores or with children.

He'd look after us. I remember some days, my mother might have stayed in bed. He'd be up with a big pinny on. He'd be out in the kitchen with all us youngsters getting breakfast. Used to take a turn like that. (Cramer: 4 boys, 6 girls, clerk)

My father ... was a very domesticated man. He loved to get into the kitchen. He would say, "Out you go", and he would - like a lot of Continental men - enjoy making the Sunday dinner. (Paulich: 2 boys, 1 girl, physical training instructor)

This man was also one of the several fathers who made the household's soap though the making of soap was not common.

A task regularly performed by some men was lighting and stoking the copper in preparation for washing and some also helped their wives with the washing.

The washing and ironing took two days of the week. Father helped with the washing because mother was only a little person [... she also had a bad heart] ... he'd stoke the copper. Then they'd soak the clothes, then he'd boil them up. I remember he had a great big stick with which he would lever out the sheets into the tub, then rinse them and mother would turn the handle and collect the sheets. They always did this on a Monday night when he came home. He always did the washing. He always made cups of tea, early in the morning before she got up. On Sundays, he always used to make the breakfast ... made beautiful thin bread and butter. He must have kept his knives very sharp. (Monmouth: 2 girls, cashier)

Not only was her father anxious to shield his wife and his daughters from heavy work, he also made himself responsible for cleaning the shoes, a job on which he prided himself. Such substantial help on so regular a basis was rare and the domestic help proffered by husbands in this group was more likely to be of a general nature and spasmodic. He would wash the dishes when she asked him.

Boys' Work in Rural Areas and Towns

The nature of work in which boys were involved was partly a function of the opportunities available, the age/sex structure of the household and its class position. In general, most boys in rural areas and scattered suburbs contributed in a number of ways, usually in outdoor tasks, sometimes earning money but more often in collecting and preparing firewood and other jobs.

One boy living in a very small town had his first paid job at an early age. His tiny wage supplemented his father's wages as freezing works labourer. It seems unlikely that the reasons for his working were due to his delicate health!

DID YOU EVER HAVE PAID WORK BEFORE YOUR FIRST REAL JOB?
Oh, yes [emphatic]. When I was eight years old I was punching cows! Four and sixpence a week.

SO THIS WASN'T AT YOUR PARENTS PLACE, THIS WAS WORKING ...?

No, this farm ... What happened was that I wasn't very strong and the headmistress of Matarewa school, it was her mother that had the farm, her mother used to run it. And they said, give him a job on the farm - four hours - might build him up. That's how I got the job. I kept on farming right up till I got married ...

WHAT TIME WOULD YOU GET UP IN THE MORNING?

The time my Dad got up, six or half past six. Had breakfast and milked the cows. Never had far to go ... down the paddock, over the fence. There was our own cow. That was different. It was a job of mine.
(Morris: 6 boys, 2 girls: labourer/smallholder)

Some of the boys who lived in scattered suburbs did a lot of outside work. Living in an area where they were able to gather firewood, it was likely that this was a regular chore, one expected of them in the neighbourhood, and one not done by girls. Such boys, along with working class boys, also sought paid casual work in the neighbourhood. Unlike working class boys whose earnings in cash or kind were destined for the family coffers, middle

class boys were allowed to keep the money for themselves. They earned pocket money to dispose of as they thought fit. The acquisition of a push bike was a goal for which they needed money.

During the school week

those of us who had push bikes were lucky. They could get home quicker. Those that didn't, we used to run home and it was up [the] hill to get the firewood ... get as much wood as you could and have as much fun as you could with the other boys who were up there. Come home, chop the wood into six inch lengths so it would go into the fire, fill the wood box. The first thing Dad used to do when he came home at six o'clock was go round the back before he came in the back door, [and] he'd lift the lid of the wood box to see whether it was full or not. If it wasn't, then woe betide you! (Brierley: 2 boys: engineer)

Mr. Brierley's father was prepared to use the belt on him "only round the legs" for defaulting on his obligations towards the domestic economy. Mr Brierley also delivered newspapers after he had chopped the wood and on Saturday mornings, he worked at the local store bagging flour, sugar, rice and other items. He was one of the lucky ones because there was always a queue of boys in his suburb wanting such work which would allow them to scrape together enough money to buy a bike, or parts of one to build up with other parts scrounged from around the neighbourhood.

Gathering wood was heavy work, and combined with the elements of scientific curiosity, adventure and fun which accompanied their work, fairly hazardous as well.

I remember when we got to college my brother learned from his science master how to make gunpowder. We used to split our logs with gunpowder, much to - most probably - our own danger of which we were not conscious. We used to bore a hole with an auger, put this gunpowder in and a fuse, then go and hide behind the brow of the hill. It was fantastic how much easier it was to split the log. (Rowland: 2 boys: engineer)

This, together with the previous example from the same geographical location, is a very good illustration of the merging of work and play which may well have been more characteristic of pre-industrial work patterns. It is also worth noting that no girl appears to have got up to such fun and pranks as many of male respondents spoke of with such nostalgia. There was a theme which appeared and reappeared to the effect that "boys will be boys", one articulated by both male and female respondents, most explicit among working-class informants. We will explore this matter further in a later chapter.

Living in the same scattered suburb as the last two respondents was a fisherman father and his sons. It was the father who did most of the fishing, but the boys helped both with selling fish and maintenance work.

WHAT SORTS OF JOBS DID YOU HAVE TO DO ROUND THE HOUSE WHEN YOU WERE A CHILD?

Before we went [back] to school in those early days we used to go out with a dragnet our father made us - the four boys - and catch fish and go round the Bays with barrows and sell them cheap.

... the big catches my father used always to send to Wellington ... He used to give us only a few to sell for kitty money for the family. 'Cos in those days it was hard, you know. A big family and we used to go round selling them before school. And other families was the same ... Just a few bob, the family working together to buy things, that's all.

.... WHAT ABOUT HOLIDAYS? DID YOU EVER GO AWAY FOR HOLIDAYS?

Not when we were kids. We used to be out in the dinghies. Fishing or something like that.

WHAT ABOUT ROUND THE HOUSE AND THAT, DID YOU HAVE ANY OTHER JOBS?

We used to go over the hills and chop [down] wood. All manuka' up there in the early days in the ranges. Used to get plenty of coal very cheap in those days. Lots of families used to do that in those early days, you know.

WHAT ABOUT GARDENING AND STUFF LIKE THAT?

Well, we had a little patch around the back, you know. Grew a few vegetables and things like that.

DID YOUR BROTHERS AND SISTERS HAVE THE SAME SORT OF JOBS?

Ah, we all used to work in together.

DID YOUR SISTERS GO FISHING AS WELL?

No, no. [Very definite] They'd be helping mother...

WHAT ABOUT THE NETS? WHO USED TO MAKE THEM?

My father. And I used to fill the needles. And Joe and Frank. They're all gone now. He used to make them at home. Used to go over with balls of twine and he used to make his own needles because he was a seaman. Because you know in those days, you knew all about these things. And he was very good at making sails and this kind of thing. He was a terrific man on that. (Babinovich: 5 boys, 3 girls: fisherman)

Apart from the Babinovich family, there was no case in my sample which demonstrated these patterns in a non-farming setting. Mr Babinovich was quite clear about his usefulness to the household economy. He did all sorts of jobs as a child and left school to earn money for the family to keep them going in the early years of the Depression. Like many of the respondents, he gave all his wages to his mother and she returned to him a little spending money. It should be noted, however, that his money was not his own. It belonged to the household.

The case of the Babinoviches is interesting and illustrates the sharp division of labour observed in many households among adults and, more often than not, children as well. The Babinoviches, despite their gender based division of labour "all worked in together", a 'real family' in days when families was families. That they were of Southern European origin rather than British is of no particular significance, for the same concern for the welfare of the whole group was observed in many families, particularly among farmers and among working class interviewees. Further examples will be given in discussing the relationship between power and interdependence and in writing about parent-child relations (see Chapter 9).

Children's Work

What he felt to be the essential distinctions between boys' and girls' work was made by Mr Burton, echoing the observations of many non farming respondents.

The girls had to learn sewing, crochet and knitting; how to make a hat. The boys chopped the wood, got the coal in, and went searching for wood too, especially if you lived near the river bank. The boys did the harder work and the girls did the more genteel work. (Mr Burton: 3 boys, 3 girls: watchmaker)

This was quite a common pattern among those predominantly working-class families in which boys and girls both contributed labour to the household except that girls also assisted their mothers substantially with housework and childrearing as shown in the cases of Mrs Gaunt and Mrs Yarrow illustrated earlier in this Chapter. In many urban households, boys' chores were confined to outside work alone, sometimes also to gardening and earning money which contributed to the common purse.

Let us now look closely at a couple of working class households, one of them with two children - a boy and a girl, and the other with eleven children. We are now dealing with the work of both boys and girls since in some households their work was so tightly intertwined and that is impossible and theoretically undesirable to separate them.

Two points should be noted. In small families, the chances were that the children did less housework and had lighter tasks generally. Furthermore, girls and boys were somewhat more likely to do the same tasks. In such families, these duties were performed by the mother alone. In larger working class families, however, there was usually a distinct division of labour, with men and boys' tasks confined to wage earning, gardening and other tasks done outside the house itself.

The first example is one in which the father was 'absent' in both physical and psychological terms. The father worked at night as a compositor for a newspaper, was prominent in his trade union, spent his leisure time away from home and seems to have been more of a privileged boarder in terms of relationships with his wife and children. The mother never left the house for twenty years partly because of the size of the family (seven boys and four girls), the presence of a coresident mother's father and her husband's working hours.

As the family grew older they all had jobs. My [oldest] sister had to take turns with the dinner table at night. We had our dinner in the dining room. One night she would set the table and I would set out the tea cups and saucers for the older ones having tea after their dinner. And the next night we reversed our jobs. Our eldest sister ... she washed the dinner dishes at night. Our brothers had to take turns to dry dishes - they took night about. As there were seven

boys, they only had one night a week [laughter] ... still they did them.

WHAT ABOUT CHOPPING WOOD? DID YOU HAVE TO DO THAT?
No, the boys ... (Pratt: 7 boys, 4 girls:
compositor)

Both boys and girls cooperated in the household, sometimes overlapping in their tasks. Nevertheless, girls clearly did more than boys and had shown bursts of resentment of their situation as children. One example of this was that the older girls would make all the beds. The boys never did. This was a house in which 'own' beds were not made, but rather all the beds were made by women or girls.

Another source of resentment was the heating of water in the copper to fill a tin bath for an older brother returning home from work on a Saturday lunch-time and anxious to be off hunting in the afternoon. This was a house which cherished its breadwinners, servicing their needs and allowing them the freedom they considered the prerogative of their sex. The specially privileged situation of boys as actual or potential breadwinners was also clearly evident as it was in many other homes.

The girls had a set routine on a Saturday morning. Starting with the kitchen dresser

All the china had to come off that, although they were used every day, scrubbed from top to bottom. And it had brass door handles and brass latches which we had

to polish. And we had to black the stove on Saturday mornings.

YOU DID THIS EVERY WEEK?

Yes, it had to be. And we had a square white kauri^s table and this dresser my grandfather had made for his own wife and that had to be scrubbed. In the scullery we had a porcelain sink with a kauri drainboard and the brass taps - they all had to be done. When I was older I used to do all the brass. And the letterbox on the door. The light switches had brass which we were supposed to clean. (Pratt: 7 boys, 4 girls: compositor)

The family was relatively prosperous, at least until their father lost his job and could not find work in Wellington. He seems to have been regarded by his daughters as totally incompetent in household matters or any matter relating to children since when called upon in emergency failed miserably in his obligations. He did no gardening. As we have noted, boys did do the dishes and some outside work. They also helped to prepare school lunches.⁶ However, they were allowed considerably more freedom than the girls, a fact noted and deeply resented.

In Mrs Salmond's childhood home, the children had similar jobs. The father was a skilled tradesman, a boilermaker, and the mother a full-time housewife. Nevertheless, the children had to keep their own bedrooms and help with the dishes, taking turns at washing and drying. Both chopped the wood, and brought it in together with the coal for the fires. Her father who was a keen sportsman kept two pig dogs and ferrets. It was her job to

look after the ferrets. Mr. Salmond kept a good garden which contributed to the family food needs, but in common with most husbands he was not disposed to offering his services inside the house.

Among the upper middle class families, children - if they were required to contribute their labour to the household at all - did so on a more equitable basis than large, working class families. In a typical case, the Sorrell boys and their sister made their own beds, washed dishes, cleaned knives and set the table despite the fact that there was always a live-in maid.

A man who did no housework as such when he was a child offered some generalisations about other households.

CAN YOU REMEMBER THE SORTS OF JOBS YOU DID AROUND THE HOUSE AS A CHILD?
I had very few around the house. My father died when I was young. I don't know whether you call gathering and getting the wood ...? I think it was quite common that girls should do the house chores and boys should do the outdoor chores. That sort of thing. Consequently the boys didn't do any inside jobs. (Malcolm: 1 boy, 1 girl: public servant)

Mr Malcolm's over-generalisation in common with many of the observations and quotations used in this Chapter must await proper analysis in the discussion which will follow shortly. We are not finished with household labour, however, for the

situations of single parents and households with co-resident kin have not been introduced yet (see Chapter 7).

Summary of Men's and Boys's Work in Non-Farming Households

Among non-farming households the male breadwinners often contributed to the household not only their wages but also produced vegetables for household use. Many men also operated a range of other activities in the area of home maintenance. However, some men's (and boy's) activities were confined totally to breadwinning.

Whereas most mothers had someone to help them with their principal activities of domestic chores and child-rearing, the fathers quite often worked - and took their leisure - independently of other family members. In the workplace, they were quite separate from their families of marriage, although some middle class men worked for their fathers in family businesses. At home, they may well have laboured in their gardens alone while their sons did their share of gathering and/or chopping wood, cleaning boots, knives and odd household chores. A few men shared their gardening activities with sons.

The urban environment offered few opportunities for boys to contribute to the household economy when seen in terms of the prevailing norms associated with work and

gender. This was not the case with girls, especially those from working class homes and large families.

Some of the issues addressed in socialist feminist theories have been hinted at in relation to different degrees of participation in social production among women and girls, and in the nature and content of their work in different geographical and social locations. Some of these differences can be explained in terms of economic necessity, a struggle for material survival. Others demonstrate the influence of ideology. These issues will be specifically attended to in Chapter 6.

In the meantime, we will proceed directly to a discussion of some of the issues arising from the descriptive material presented up to this point.

Discussion

In the first part of this Chapter, we noted briefly that the three basic types of household economy observed during the course of industrialisation in nineteenth century Europe had their counterparts in New Zealand. These were the family economy, wage economy and consumer economy (Tilly & Scott, 1978). In this section, further comparisons will be drawn using the typology in order to analyse the course of economic and social change in New Zealand. It will be shown how the range of strategies relating to production and reproduction declined as a result of proletarianisation and the conditions of urban life. In analysing this process, the growing need for cash and consequent greater dependence on employment in the formal economy will be emphasised.

Comparing New Zealand with Britain, it is clear that the process was different. In the first place, far fewer jobs were available for women in New Zealand, and in the second place, other material conditions and traditional values favoured their encapsulation in the household.

It is not, of course, possible with the available data to compare different periods of time. It is possible to compare different kinds of families and to suggest the theoretical linkages between their organisational forms in such a way that the dynamics of change can be approximated. The remainder of the thesis is concerned with locating other

important sources of change in the household economic organisation and resulting transformations in political and ideological aspects of family life, kinship and community.

Household Labour Organisation

The family economy as defined by Tilly & Scott (1978) was a pre-industrial form, largely a subsistence economy. It consisted of a unit of low productivity in which all members worked at tasks differentiated by age and sex. Fertility was high, but held in check by high mortality and late marriage, the European marriage pattern (Hajnal, 1974). Children were potential heirs. Women's time was spent primarily on productive labour in their own homes, allowing them to carry out reproductive work as well. Approximations to 'the family economy' may still be observed in remote areas of contemporary Europe (Anderson, 1980a, 75: Frankenberg, 1966, early chapters).

In Scott and Tilly's account of change in women's work, the 'family economy', was gradually replaced as a result of industrialisation by the 'family wage economy'. Women continued combining their productive and reproductive tasks, perhaps working on land or commons available to the family. However the household needed wages to survive and household members who could most easily be spared earned money elsewhere (see Bourne's account of this process

below). For single women, domestic service in another household was the most prominent occupation, except in textile areas, where their skills were in demand. Married women were employed only when the family particularly needed money, their needs determining what she did. They might take on work in their own homes in the form of petty commodity production or wage labour, with help from their children. Those who were employed withdrew when possible, especially when children became able to earn. These households were also associated with high fertility and high mortality.

According to Tilly & Scott (1978), the increased scale of industrial organisation and higher productivity towards the end of the nineteenth century raised the standard of living above subsistence making the 'family consumer economy' a possibility for working class people. This type refers to households in which there was a sole male breadwinner with economically dependent wife and children.

The remainder of this discussion will compare Tilly & Scott's account with the situation of New Zealand household economic organisation in the first decades of the twentieth century. We will start with what appears to be one of the major differences between New Zealand and Britain, the dearth of formal employment opportunities for women. This will be followed with a discussion of the importance of

traditional values carrying over from early Victorian Britain. Finally, we will consider demographic change.

Women's Employment in Britain and New Zealand

One of the major differences in comparing women's work in Britain and New Zealand around the turn of the century, is the lack of employment opportunities. The Census for 1881 shows that about 20% of all males, but only 8% of all females under the age of twenty were actively engaged in the labour force. This suggests that a high proportion of young adult women remained at home in the service of their parents. Of those over the age of twenty, virtually all males recorded an occupation compared with only 16% of females almost 9% of whom were engaged in domestic service.

The period between 1881 and 1911 shows a rise in labour force participation of young people, and those in the older age group. In the Census for 1911, 22% of males and 11% of females under twenty were employed. In the same year, almost all males over twenty, but only 24% of females were actively engaged in the labour force (almost 10% of the employed women were in domestic service). Included in this 24% would be widows and other women whose husbands were absent. Considering the fact that 38% of all New Zealand women over twenty years old were either single or widowed,

we may safely assumed that the labour force participation of married women was very low indeed. Tables which have been compiled from the New Zealand Census for 1881 and 1911 may be found in Appendix 3.

The statistics given above allow us to compare the labour participation of males and females in New Zealand over the period 1881-1911. However, the category of 'under twenty years of age' includes all children. It is not possible to use the 1881 Census in order to compare sex, age and marital categories with those of 1911. However, analysis of the 1911 figures is most enlightening.

Focussing on the age group fifteen to sixty-four years inclusive, it is possible to determine a labour force participation rate for all women at 27.9%. For ages 15-24 inclusive, the labour participation rate was around 46%. Given the fact that only 15% of women in this age group were wives, the statistic seems very low. If the fine detail of the Census categories is examined, however, there is a large category of women who were returned as having been engaged in unpaid domestic duties. This amounted to 40% of the 15-19 age group and 52% of those aged 20-24. For the age group 15-19, the vast majority were single, while in the age group 20-24, about half the women engaged in unpaid domestic work were single and half married.

Gittens notes the 'very low' level of labour force activity of married women in Britain during the period

1900-39 (1982, 70). For instance, in 1911, 9.6% of married women were employed (this statistic do not include widows who had a substantially higher labour force participation). The corresponding figure for single women was 69% (Gittens, 1982, 70).

Unfortunately, it is impossible to make direct comparisons between the two societies since labour participation rates were not disaggregated by marital status in New Zealand until the 1920s. It seems likely, however, that New Zealand's female participation rate for the first couple of decades of the twentieth century was unlikely to be higher than than the figure of 3.5 per cent recorded for married women in 1926 and practically unchanged in 1936.

In terms of the sample mothers, only two of my respondents' mothers were in regular paid full-time employment and few had been actively engaged in the labour force before their marriages except as domestic servants. However, they did work even though the officials who compiled the Census may not have considered their labour as work. Many had remained on their parents' farms or helped their mothers bring up younger children, involved in commodity production and in the daily maintenance of the family's own labour power. We will learn more about the conditions of single women's lives in New Zealand in Chapter 6. It is quite clear, however, that in 1911, well over half of New Zealand women under twenty five were not

'actively involved' in the labour force. Furthermore, paid domestic service was the fate of a high proportion of the remainder.

Survey statistics for a somewhat limited sample indicate that of New Zealand women marrying for the first time between 1927 and 1937, four fifths were not employed before their marriage (Vosburg, 1978, 46a). This is roughly consistent with my female respondents' own formal labour participation. Among those who had been brought up on farms, most continued in some form of domestic service, paid or unpaid. At the top end of the upper social scale, young women remained 'at home'.

Scott & Tilly (1980, 129) consider that on the basis of their admittedly impressionistic and scattered data that as European industrialisation progressed, fewer married women worked. They supported this generalisation by a comparison of British with French data. In Britain, the most industrialised country of the time, there was a considerably lower proportion of married women working than in France where they were employed in smaller-scale agricultural and manufacturing concerns.

The New Zealand Census statistics are inconsistent with Scott & Tilly's generalisation. New Zealand's modernisation process eventually created jobs for women where few opportunities had existed before in the formal economy. There are two matters of importance here. First

of all, it seems that there was a serious lack of demand for female labour, apart from domestic service. Secondly, it appears that adult women and girls could be usefully 'employed' by their own families. Lacking other role models, lacking access to employment, lacking any bargaining power, especially in country areas, New Zealand women were rather firmly ensconced in home and family. The presence in New Zealand of the many family farms owned and run by their heads of household, can be interpreted in terms of older forms of household organisation in which wives and children were also engaged in production and in terms of traditional values associated with family labour. While these values were not necessarily inconsistent with paid employment, large families meant that young women were needed to stay at home and help their mothers and when required to work on the farm, work which was unrecognised, unpaid and unchosen.

Values - Collectivism and Individualism

Tilly and Scott (1978: Scott & Tilly, 1980) place great importance on collective values. They argue that the traditional values of European peasant and proletarian women involved the importance of belonging to a collectivity, the family production unit. These same values were consistent with women's paid employment so that there would have been no clash of values associated with employment among such

women when opportunities for earning wages presented themselves. As they correctly point out, peasant and proletarian women have always been involved in productive work combining this with reproductive labour. It was only in the later nineteenth century in Europe that working class women's values started to change, gradually accepting the essentially middle class view that 'a woman's place is in the home'. Scott and Tilly claim

a continuity of traditional values and behavior in changing circumstances. Old values coexist with and are used by people to adapt to extensive structural changes. This assumes that people perceive and act on the changes they experience in terms of ideas and attitudes they already hold. These ideas eventually change ... Behavior is less the product of new ideas than of the effects of old ideas operating in new or changing contexts (Scott & Tilly, 1980, 131).

According to Scott and Tilly (1980), the collective values associated with women's work did eventually change, becoming replaced with more individualistic ones as a result of industrialisation in Europe.

There is considerable evidence in my interview material which suggests the presence of old values operating in new places. This will be demonstrated as we proceed to examine different aspects of household and family throughout the thesis. A good example is the yeoman values of farmers, part of the cultural heritage which my informants

grandparents, fathers and mothers brought to New Zealand. Yeoman values meant family farming, perhaps with the addition of young farm servants at critical stages of the life cycle.

Another reflection of 'old values' lies in the divisions of labour which we observed in association with many working class households operating a family wage economy in which all earnings were put into a common fund. We cannot assume, however, that the collective values with which Scott and Tilly were concerned, were those governing the behaviour of New Zealanders (see below, also Jamieson, 1983).

Although their account is very useful from the point of view of providing valuable empirical material and a clear account of changes in women's work in the nineteenth century, it applies to an earlier period than that with which we are directly concerned and it is confined to European peasant and proletarian women's work.

There are also three theoretical problems with their approach. First of all, they locate the source of change in industrialisation *per se*. The importance of capitalism as the prime motor of change in economic organisation has been established in Chapter 2 (Harris 1983, 198). Secondly, they assume a high level of familial harmony, implying that all members of the household shared equally in the fruits of their collective labour (Hartmann, 1981). This matter will

be discussed in Chapters 8 and 9. Thirdly, they assume a type of collectivism which is probably inappropriate to New Zealand or Britain.

According to Macfarlane (1978), English history needs to be reinterpreted in the light of evidence which indicates that English society was qualitatively different from European society as far back as the thirteenth century. He considers that Marx and Weber's general theories were incorrect "in almost every detail" and in choosing England as the focus of their research, they chose a "singular and peculiar example" (1978, 195). Using Weberian criteria as a benchmark, Macfarlane concludes that England was as 'capitalist' in 1250 as it was in 1500 or 1750. In particular, there was no evidence of the collective values usually associated ^{with} peasant societies, but rather those Macfarlane labels 'English individualism'.

Macfarlane (1978) defines individualism in two ways. Firstly, England acted quite differently, separately, from the rest of Europe, taking her own 'individualistic' path. The second meaning in which he uses individualism is that

It is the view that society is constituted of autonomous, equal, units, namely separate individuals, and that such individuals are more important, ultimately, than any large constituent group. It is reflected in the concept of individual private property, in the political and legal liberty of the individual, in the idea of the individual's direct communication with God. (Macfarlane, 1978, 5).

Macfarlane concentrates on the economic aspects of individualism, especially in relation to the family, property and social transition.

There appears to be a strong link between English individualism and the notion of head of household discussed in Chapter 3 and 4. Harris argues that among peasant and small holders, it was family membership which determined access to the means of production associated with land (1983, 121). In peasant societies, rights to land were held collectively (Shanin, 1971) whereas in England (and of course, New Zealand), individual ownership prevailed. Ownership and control of productive private property was the source of power of the head of household and other 'subsumed' members of the household were dependent on him for their livelihood. In Chapter 3, we also noted that households of this kind were associated with patriarchal power (Laslett, 1971) and that patriarchal power embodied in the head of household was reinforced in local government and throughout society generally. What I am suggesting here is that Macfarlane's individualism may well be applicable to male heads of households but not necessarily to 'subsumed' members. We must wait for further evidence about the rights of individuals before this question can be answered (see below and Chapter 9). Let us now look those at New Zealand households most resembling production units. Here we can see something of the continuity of 'old values' in new or

changing contexts' which Scott and Tilly consider so important.

Yeoman Values and the Household Economy

As we have already seen, family farmers in New Zealand controlled their own labour resources, that is, their 'really useful women' and children. They could do so because they owned their own means of production and because the use of family labour was customary and expected by those concerned. Women and children expected to contribute to the economic wellbeing of the unit as required. Their contribution varied with the life cycle. At some stages, wives would work on the farm, perhaps in the days before children were old enough to keep the unit going. Later, the children would take over, leaving the mother free for her productive and reproductive work in the dairy, the garden and within the house itself. In large families with poor land, it might be necessary to send the older near adult children to other households to bring in a bit of extra cash.

Seen in terms of collectivism/individualism, wives and children in these farming households appear to have been in a similar situation to those in the preindustrial English household described by Laslett in which the interests of subordinates was 'subsumed' in relation to those of the

household head and already discussed in Chapter 3, preparing the way for the level of personal autonomy associated with competitive free-market capitalism.

The labour intensive nature of farm work itself in those days was such that children could be usefully employed in a wide range of chores and their contribution varied to suit varying needs such as a drop in market prices (Rushton, 1979, 43). Women and children were a 'reserve army' in the sense that their extent of their labour could be varied.

As we have seen, farming households produced most of their own means of subsistence supplemented by such cash commodities as flour, sugar, tea, cloth and so on bought in bulk. The need for these commodities, however, made them ultimately dependent on cash. There was also the need to pay the mortgage. This was by no means a subsistence economy in the sense used by Scott and Tilly (1980).

However, no one went hungry on farms. Most of the interviewees whose childhoods were spent on farms commented spontaneously on the amount and quality of the food they enjoyed and on the productivity of the gardens and orchards on which they depended for vegetables and fruit. Farming households largely produced what they consumed. No one on farms complained of imbalanced allocation in daily consumption patterns (Delphy, 1979). Furthermore, they appear to have eaten only what was available in season, products from the garden and farm or similar products which

had been preserved for later use. Cash was rarely in use on a daily basis.

Among the farming families, especially large ones, there was a strong impression of a battle against nature for a livelihood. There was also an impression of pride in winning the battle and in the ability to enjoy good, plentiful food, produced by oneself and other members of the family, a working team.

Like the contemporary English farming families described by Newby (1981), they faced the problem of surviving in conditions of economic marginality, displaying the yeomanly virtues of 'sturdy independence and solitary self-help', much prized and celebrated as a source of strength in the English national character adapted into a colonial context. Independence from employers appears to have been strong in both Australia and New Zealand, and discussions round the theme of independence often occur in the context of discussions of nineteenth century images of a sturdy English yeomanry, transplanted to the Antipodes (Lake, 1985: Grimshaw, 1985).

Harrison also noted the strong values of hard work, and the deeply internalised sense of thrift and self-reliance, values which appear to have been important in New Zealand as well, and not only among farmers.*

It may well be that nineteenth century immigration to New Zealand was a family strategy for obtaining a better life, the 'better life' being defined in terms of independence and, possibly, control over their own family labour. If independence meant autonomy from the watchful eye of supervisor or employer, it also meant dependence on children. Families ran farms and to a lesser degree were run for families (Harrison, 1975, 21).

As I have argued elsewhere, (Toynbee, 1979) male immigrants to New Zealand between 1840-1880 very often had some connection with farming or came from some other background which predisposed them to self-employment. Many of the men in my sample had fathers who were self-employed even if the sons who eventually emigrated, were themselves small town or city dwellers, and employees at the time of leaving Britain. Although the evidence we have on migrants' motives is fragmentary, it seems clear that family farming or the family business was valued for the special opportunities it offered as a relief from vulnerability to economic swings and unjust employers, experienced during a time of rapid proletarianisation in Britain.

The working lives of New Zealand farmers during the 1930s is well covered in Somerset's *Littledene* (1974), a community study of a small town in Canterbury. Although the period is later than that under investigation, the general

ethos of the rural community captured by Somerset accurately reflects the tenor of the interview material and the slow pace of change in rural areas. Of immediate interest are his remarks on work.

The people of Littledene believe in work. This is a heritage from pioneering days when the most urgent need of the community was labour, and the most admired virtue was a willingness to work ... The long working day has now become a habit, and the habit a virtue ... When the farmer is asked how long he works, his reply is invariably 'From daylight to dark'. This is the usual formula - a rationalization that is not strictly true ... There are so many circumstances in farming over which man has no control - the weather and the markets, the bankers and the mortgagees - that he has never learned to plan ahead, to work to schedule and to drop the day's work when it is over. (Somerset, 1974, 29, 34)

This quotation is useful for it captures so well what many farming respondents said. The question of time use (Nelson, 1980) and attitudes to work also recalls the nature of married women's work in that they too have so little control over the factors which shape their working day, although they may have considerable freedom from direct supervision.

Women's Values and the Wage Economy

Households' dependence on cash, and therefore on employment in the formal economy made all household members vulnerable

to economic swings and to loss of income through strikes, accident, illness and death. Their insecurity in the face of increasing proletarianisation was exacerbated by the fact that most urban families had far fewer opportunities for income-generating activity than non-urban families because of economic, social and legal restraints on the employment of married women and children and also lack of access to land or bush or beach, i.e. a decreasing ability to exploit the physical environment when compared with farmers or those living in rural areas. Money-saving activities such as domestic self-provisioning should be seen in this light, as an effort to gain greater control over resources in order to meet survival needs. This will be followed up in the next section which deals with 'old' and 'new' forms of thrift.

In terms of the New Zealand data we noted that there were five cases in which the land owned by wage-labouring fathers was worked by mothers and children and by the fathers in their 'spare' time. This was one strategy for coping with low wages, underemployment, a situation in which "a rural wife or daughter could free a husband to engage, perhaps full-time, in some entirely separate sphere of production" (Middleton, 1983, 21) as in pre-industrial England.

Other practices associated with proletarianisation and low wages were observed in New Zealand including petty commodity production, selling mushrooms, walnuts, flowers, taking in the odd bit of mending, keeping lodgers, finding casual work for older children to bring in a bit of extra income, firewood and so on. Some women were obliged to find employment when their husbands were ill or died. These were categorised as belonging to the 'family wage economy'.

The New Zealand counterpart of the 'really useful' woman was the working class 'ruby without price', controller of the household and powerful indeed in her own domestic sphere. Lacking opportunities for wage labour for herself or her school aged children, she was much concerned with applying her skills to make ends meet through organising extra income and particularly through the use of her own domestic self-provisioning skills to save money. The mother's control over childrens' earnings when work could be found for them has been noted by many other writers (e.g. Roberts, 1984: Burnett, 1982: Jamieson, 1983).

Direct evidence relating to the values of mothers is lacking and can only be inferred through their behaviour, a somewhat hazardous venture. It is my considered opinion that both the 'really useful' woman and the 'ruby without price' held values which ensured that they put the interests of others first, that they expected to work long hours in the service of husbands and children and would use whatever

means available to them to enhance the household's wellbeing. The general unavailability of wage earning work did not stop them finding other means of making ends meet. In this they can be seen as the British colonial embodiment of Scott and Tilly's peasant and proletarian women.

Women's Values and the Consumer Economy

In relation to Britain, real wages were high in New Zealand (Galt, 1985). During the period 1900-20, the average level wealth increased about one hundred per cent while income rose three-fold. Furthermore, government policies made possible a redistribution of assets. In the period 1890-1895, the top one per cent of the population owned 55-60% of all assets. In the period 1935-39, this had fallen to 25-30% (Galt, 1985, 1-2). Other evidence of redistribution is in the reduced incomes for top earners and a decline in margins for skill (Galt, 1985, 2). Indeed, the ability of families to survive on the basis of a single wage was probably much greater in both New Zealand and Australia (Tait, undated) than in Britain or the United States.

Seen in terms of Scott and Tilly's typology, the wage economy was probably far less significant than in either Britain or Europe. It would then be possible for a

considerably higher proportion of proletarian families to attain an acceptable standard of living on 'the family wage'. For those with small families this would be much easier.

The term 'family wage' should not be confused with the wage economy. The 'family wage' is a term used to denote an ideal of sufficient income from the breadwinner's occupation alone to keep wife and dependent children at a decent standard of living (Barrett & McIntosh, 1982). As we noted in Chapter 1, the 'family wage' was institutionalised in law in the late 1930s in New Zealand.

There were many households in the New Zealand sample whose domestic organisation matched that of Tilly & Scott's 'family consumer economy', usually middle or upper middle class but also working class families with small numbers of children.

In terms of analysis, we should be careful to recognise that the presence of the family consumer economy may not reflect a change in values favouring domesticity for wives and a protected childhood for sons and daughters. It may be associated with different kinds of values altogether, or it may be associated with a lag in values.

Among my sample there were well established middle class households. They, or their parents, would have brought with them to New Zealand ideas about the proper behaviour of a Victorian lady. New Zealand conditions

would have forced a change in behaviour, given the general difficulties in getting servants. The class and gender appropriateness of their situation may have rankled with them, but their New Zealand born daughters' concrete experience would have forced a greater correspondence between values and reality.

For members of the working class who became relatively prosperous, the situation would have been different. Having achieved an economic situation which relieved both women and children of many their previous economic functions, they too would have been open to change in values though the change may not have been immediate. Later, we will consider the question of the kinds of social context and knowledge bases constraining their choices (Chapter 8 and 9). This will give us a firmer basis for evaluating the nature of values.

Decline in Productive Functions of Households

The reasons for decline in the productive functions within the household in New Zealand, as in other Western societies, is a combined result of the advance of capitalism, needs varying with life cycle stage, and value preferences associated with ideologies of class and gender. In this section we will consider the relationship between different types of thrift.

Most writers who have investigated the nature of the changes in the family/household during the transition to capitalism have concentrated on the separation of 'the family' and 'work'. This is often conceptualised, especially by functionalists concerned with social change, as the change from the family as a unit of production to one of consumption.

One dimension of change at the level of the household which is barely considered in the scholarly literature is the difference between the material bases for operating different kinds of savings, the 'old thrift' and 'new thrift'. Shifts in thrift are also related to the changing nature of the work of household members.

Bourne's (1984) perceptive study of *Change in the Village* originally published in 1912, describes the forced alteration in the villagers' household economy as a result of the loss of common land in Farnham, Surrey and their responses to the change.⁷ The villagers in Bourne's book lived on a heath, close to a large town. By 1912, the town was already encroaching on what had once been common land, once the sole source of independent livelihood of most of its inhabitants. Bourne's 'crofters' or 'peasants' [sic] had by this time become navvies, labourers, drivers, many of them existing through casual farm or other employment. It was several decades before the Enclosure Act of 1861 were obvious because customary rights to graze donkeys and cattle

were honoured and because improvements to the heath provided paid work for the villagers (Bourne, 1984, 75-77). During this time, the old ways of earning a living continued. Heath was used for building material including thatching, firing could still be obtained from waste places, fern could be obtained to litter the ubiquitous pig styes. In addition, the people kept their gardens for vegetables and flowers, they kept cows, made bread, cured their own bacon.

As the years went by and the Enclosure Act was enforced, it became impossible for the villagers to carry on their using their time-honoured methods for earning a living, lacking access to their means of production. In short, without access to, or use of the common they were obliged to earn money and to obtain what they once produced in a spirit of self-reliance, in a shop. Subsistence was sufficiency and they dreamed of no other life or of bettering themselves (see also Samuel 1975, 227-236: Kitteringham, 1975: Thompson, 1973).

The points I want to make are that these people used what was in their immediate surroundings, taking advantage of what their own environment had to offer. The qualities of self-reliance and self-sufficiency were obvious in the farming households I investigated, and also noticeable in rural areas in New Zealand, among waged smallholders and to some degree among people living close to bush. These New Zealand households demonstrated traditional ways of making

ends meet, customary ways of life in the Old World, brought to the New and adapted to local conditions. This type of work typically involved women and children (Kitteringham, 1975: Samuel, 1975).

Another important point is that immigrants to New Zealand would brought with them ideas about thrift. Before the Enclosure Act took its full effect in Farnham, cottagers did earn money through the sale of their surplus butter, milk or pig-meat. The spending of cash savings from the proceeds was intermittant rather than regular, needed only for the occasional purchase. But savings took the form not only of money but also of goods.

Under the old style, a man's chief savings were in the shape of commodities ready for use, or growing into use. They were, too, a genuine capital, inasmuch as they supported him while he replaced and increased them. The flitches of bacon, the little stores of flour and home-made wine, the stack of firing, the small rick of fern or grass, were his savings-bank ... (Bourne, 1984, 81)

Without the value-added products of the heath waiting in the form of these flitches of bacon and other products of domestic self-provisioning, the household was unable to insure itself against reverses of fortune occasioned by economic depression in the formal economy (Bourne, 1984, 81). Although paying into a benefit society to safeguard against illness or death, these funds could not be realised

for trade reversals alone. To derive benefit, the labourer must be ill or dead. A similar situation would have existed in early twentieth century New Zealand in the use of Lodges.

In New Zealand too, dependence on wage labour or the full and regular payment of farm mortgages must have created permanent insecurity for many families. There is plenty of evidence that those on low and/or irregular wages could not make enough in the way of savings to take advantage of buying in bulk in order to maximise advantage. Nor could they make other kinds of savings. Cheap boots are uncomfortable, create deformities and require to be replaced quickly. To make jam or preserve fruit, the housewife has to buy sugar and fruit in season, and also requires the capital equipment to do so. My respondents made frequent reference to the re-use of kerosene tins as buckets, with their uncomfortable and cutting handles made of number eight fencing wire and the flour-bag linings of boys' home-made pants.

Ebbett (1981, 1-3) makes this point well in her discussion of thrift among New Zealand housewives in the Depression. She also comments on the use of home made jam jars made from beer bottles. The plentiful supply of beer bottles will be commented on later when patterns of household consumption will be examined. It may be that women whose interests were subordinated to those of

husbands, were obliged to hang on to the tenets of the 'old thrift' much longer than their husbands.

Many of the migrants to New Zealand in the nineteenth and early twentieth century would have internalised the 'old thrift' as children in rural areas or in the outskirts of British towns. Others would have experienced the painful necessities of trying to survive under the new conditions of urban living as a result of the increasing necessity for dependence on wage earning.

One important reason for coming to New Zealand may well have been a realisation that the new country could provide opportunities for security and the more satisfying life style described by Bourne in terms of modest self-sufficiency and freedom from employers, rather than as for satisfying ambitions for social mobility.

For households whose high earnings allowed them to cope with the new thrift, there were marked differences consumption patterns, for example, in the probability that eggs, vegetables and clothes would be bought on a routine basis, and that savings would be made through buying provisions in bulk, possibly for preserving. For those with the highest incomes, the work of both men and women was drastically cut through the hiring of labour, either domestic servants of some kind or through the use of a gardener or tradesmen employed for the tasks which were done by the breadwinner in other households. Among their

numbers would be members of a new occupationally and socially mobile middle class, earning their living as bureaucrats and professionals.

Demographic Variability

In presenting the material on farming households, we noted that it was not always easy to achieve balance between production, reproduction and consumption needs, so that young adults had to be sent to other households, where they would earn a little and learn a little. Virtually all large families faced problems of this nature, especially those living in towns where there were few opportunities for stretching income beyond the parent's domestic self-provisioning.

In most Western societies, urbanisation has been an important catalyst to demographic transition since the short term economic value of children was sharply reduced relative to rural areas. In fact, children obliged to remain at school have to be fed and clothed and may be seen as an economic burden for parents relying solely on wages. Coupled with rising material expectations, a trend to lower fertility could be expected. The trends to lower fertility have been outlined for the New Zealand population in Chapter 1, 25-28). In this section, we are more concerned with the interview data.

Some care is needed in interpreting the results. The respondents may not have known about siblings who died before they were born, and no still births were recorded because of the respondents vagueness, she was always having babies, and when she didn't have one that year, it was because she lost it. Completed family size may therefore be underestimated. Another difficulty was that some parents died, remarried or there was a hint that the parent's sexual life was inactive because another baby would kill the mother, I don't know how they did it ... she wasn't strong, you know.

Some arbitrary decisions therefore had to be made about how the statistics could best be presented. Only those families whose parents (or step-parents) lived in the household till the respondent was in the early teens were used for demographic analysis. Some categories were small when disaggregated by location and class or status group (see Introduction to Part III, 170-5). Nevertheless there were some interesting findings which should be followed up by other researchers. Detailed tables can be found in Appendix 3.

Demographic variability was associated with residential location, social class and with household organisation. The largest families were those of farmers and one other family operating an urban family economy, with an average of seven children. These families had a

considerably higher average number of sons than daughters (4.4 sons, and 2.7 daughters). Although families depending for their living on a kin-based urban business had far smaller families than the farmers (4.3 children), they too had a higher average number of sons than daughters (2.8 and 1.5 respectively). It seems likely that there was a definite policy on the part of parents owning their own means of production, to keep on having children until the desired number of sons was achieved. Since children on farms could assist considerably in earning their keep, it is hardly surprising that their families were so large.

Working class families were also rather large at an average of over five children each. Here there was no difference between the number of girls and boys. Nor were there significant^a differences between those working class families operating a wage economy or consumer economy.

Lower and upper middle class families operating a consumer economy (and not including those involved in family businesses) were smaller than average at 3.9 and 3.5 children respectively. This includes the two farming families in which neither women nor children were involved in the work of the farm at all. There were no significant differences between the average number of boys and girls in these families.

The results indicate that a demographic transition was indeed taking place in New Zealand and had important

implications for change in family relationships, over and above those associated with the household economy. A discussion of these will be deferred till Chapter 9 in which an evaluation of changes in family life around this period will be made. As we shall see in the second part of this Chapter, however, size of family and its distribution by sex were important indicators helping account for variability in the household division of labour by age and sex.

Ownership of the means of production in which farm labour was customarily done by children was an important predictor of completed fertility, one aspect of the exploitation of women's bodies and of the material basis of procreative behaviour. The production of boy children at a level consistent with family farming on the one hand, and family businesses on the other, is also highly suggestive of the material basis of patriarchy.

Summary

I have isolated some of the ways in which different kinds of family households would have been affected by the modernisation process using Scott & Tilly's typology as a benchmark. New Zealand enjoyed a high standard of living relative to other Western societies in the period 1900-1925. Nevertheless, some distinctly preindustrial forms of

household economy were still in operation, involving much work by wives and children as members of the family farming unit. The farms on which some of my informants grew up were highly labour intensive. In fact, before the very widespread use of milking machines and other farm machinery, children's labour would have been very important, particularly in view of the need for self-sufficiency.

Some of the farming families found real difficulties in balancing their productive and reproductive activities with their consumption needs, especially those with very large families. These farmers sent their children to other households. Some were obliged to sell their farms, sons of farmers without spare capital, and others unable to find secure employment in the formal economy, would have had to find additional ways of earning income.

The modernisation of New Zealand in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was very different from that which had taken place in nineteenth century Britain. There were very few large factories and the scale of manufacturing industry generally small since many goods were imported from Britain. Although the mechanisation and rationalisation of farming was established in some areas, and although urbanisation and bureaucratisation were beginning to forge ahead by the turn of the century, there were fewer new jobs in the formal economy for women than men, until well after the turn of the century. If women

were in demand, it was as wives and daughters, as unpaid but also as (poorly) paid domestic servants. In general, their situation was eminently exploitable.

Means of balancing the budget had to be found in households trying to exist on low wages. As I have shown, those in rural areas, those with good gardens and access to bush where firewood could be obtained, and above all through domestic skills, people made do and mended. The key was flexibility. Other families, chiefly those with two or three children, managed to live off a single wage provided by the father sometimes quite well.

The range of strategies for earning a living found in New Zealand, and descriptions of domestic work were not dissimilar to those described by a range of other writers who have used personal documents and oral histories as their main data sources. However, it should be noted that a very high proportion of New Zealanders had gardens for growing vegetable and fruit. Many also had relatively free access to the natural produce of river, beach and bush.

It is likely that whole concept of the 'really useful' woman brought from areas of Britain largely untouched by industrialisation would have been perpetuated in the colonial situation along with other values associated with the 'honest yeoman' or artisan. I suggest that farming, rural and many working class women in New Zealand were 'domesticated' in a material sense, long before

domestic ideology might have started to be imposed on them. I further suggest that favourable economic conditions, and fertility control, made it possible for a relatively high proportion of urban families to manage on a single wage earlier than in Britain or Europe, thus establishing an earlier and closer approximation to a 'family wage' situation than in other societies. The corollary to this is a higher level of economic dependence of women on men.

FOOTNOTES

¹ It is likely that most farming households would have eaten meat three times a day at this period. The quality and quantity of food, especially meat, is frequently mentioned in the diaries and letters of nineteenth century migrants of all classes (Drummond, 1960: Barker, 1870 Arnold, 1981) and in handbooks written for prospective emigrants.

² Other migrant families from England usually had very small families relative to the New Zealand ones of their class. This supports Vosburgh's claim based on her survey data that immigrants had smaller families on average than New Zealanders (1978, 90).

³ A recent programme shown on New Zealand television featured World War II soldier settlements in New Zealand. The harsh working conditions and isolation mentioned by Lake (1985) were apparent in these New Zealand farm settlements especially in the early period during which the land was being broken in. Today, the survivors have prosperous farms, but many abandoned their land in the early years. During the programme, the economic contribution of both wives and children was acknowledged.

⁴ Manuka is a type of native timber widely used for firewood by those living close to bush.

⁵ Kauri is a good quality native timber which once formed the basis of a thriving industry in Northland, even before systematic settlement began. It was exported for use as

ship's masts even before systematic settlement. It was also used for building and for making furniture in earlier times. It is now rare and very costly and only a few stands now remain.

⁶ It is customary for children to take packed lunches to school in New Zealand today. It seems also to have been common in the past.

⁷ Bourne was educated as a teacher but returned to his native village to take charge of the family wheelwright shop on the death of his father. Here, he worked with his employees, after having had to learn the trade (Sturt, 1973). His description of economic and social change reveals great insight and an almost total absence of middle class assumptions about the lives of working people including women and children. It is also consistent with personal documents such as the working-class autobiographies and diaries which have survived, revealing detail about the struggle for achieving the means of subsistence (Burnett, 1982: Facey, 1981: Carter, 1981).

Bourne, unlike most professional scholars, describes and analyses a transition period from the point of view of his neighbours who, barely grasped what was happening to them. Much of what he writes about the process can be directly translated into the words of my respondents and to their reflections on social change.

⁸ My New Zealand cases, however, differed from the contemporary English ones in the far greater degree of involvement of wives and children. In direct contrast to the situation in New Zealand in the early decades of this century, the contemporary English research found that 95% of the daughters and 86% sons had no involvement in the farm as children (Newby, 1981, 50). My interview data in no way allows for direct comparison because of the qualitative nature of the data. However, it is quite clear that the amount of work done by the New Zealand children was considerable.

⁹ I am not using 'significance' in a statistical sense here. The numbers are far too small for the use of what would otherwise be the appropriate statistical test, the t-test.

CHAPTER 6:

PATRIARCHY, MASCULINISM

AND

THE HOUSEHOLD DIVISION OF LABOUR

This Chapter is specifically concerned with identifying differences in household divisions of labour and in the origins and outcomes of changes in ideology associated with gender. In the previous Chapter, we have seen that there was a wide range of strategies for making a living. These strategies were partly determined by such material conditions as availability of land and access to local labour markets. However, it is clear that ideas about the 'proper' roles of men, women and children were also in operation and that these were important influences in determining behaviour.'

In Chapter 3, two types of male dominance were identified, patriarchy and masculinism, both rooted in the material base of society. These forms of male dominance are of crucial importance in analysing the division of labour, whether we are concerned with the sexual division of labour in society or in the household itself (Edgell, 1980). Patriarchy has been particularly identified with the head of productive household units and ownership of private property

in the means of production. Masculinism, on the other hand first made its appearance with the coming of the Market, and with the rising bourgeoisie and is now the form of male dominance characteristic of capitalist society.

Patriarchy and masculinism are associated with quite different ideas about the proper work roles of women and children. The 'goodwife' of the patriarchal household was essential to its productive enterprise as were her children. Among the new bourgeoisie, she might be 'mistress' of the household, directing the efforts of servants but she should not be involved in any way in the 'public sphere', that is in the network of economic relationships constituting the formal economy, the preserve of men. Masculinism carries with it the ideology of a single male breadwinner as head of household, domesticity and economic dependence for adult females.

The emergence of masculinism, as the form of male domination gradually replacing patriarchy, was associated with the doubts and anxieties which were part of the rise of industrial capitalism, of rapid and all-encompassing economic and social change. It appeared first among the emerging English bourgeoisie, and among prosperous farmers whose wives, sons and daughters relinquished their chores to paid farm labour and domestic servants, adopting a similar lifestyle to the urban bourgeoisie and protected from the harsh realities of capitalism through their banishment from

the contaminating contact of the Market (George, 1973: Arnold, 1981, 25-6).

Masculinism was also associated with a particular idealised vision of woman, a distinct type of 'feminine' person, emotional, gentle and self-sacrificing. It was this ideal which Goode confused with the 'traditional' [sic] woman whose place was in the home (Scott & Tilly, 1980, 125-32). Masculinism was also associated with ideas about the moral superiority of women, the guardians of the hearth (Dalziel, 1977). At the same time as it created change in women's lives, it also created the conditions for the emergence of modern concepts of protected childhood.

Let us now consider in what ways changing concepts of family roles may have fitted the New Zealand scene in the early twentieth century. This will involve a deeper investigation of the work of women and children and the ideas associated with their work. It will also require attention to class and status (see Introduction to Part III) since socialist feminist theory demands recognition of the different material circumstances and experience of bourgeois and proletarian women.

The Chapter will conclude with a theoretical discussion of power, control and dependency. This will provide a convenient linkage between domestic relationships and those to be described in Chapters 7 and 8 when the

articulation of the family and the community will be the focus of attention.

Patriarchy, Masculinism and Gender

In Chapter 5, the work of adult women and their children on farms was described. On most farms in my sample, their work was of crucial importance to the survival of the household as a unit. The most important characteristics of the division of labour in farming households were the involvement of women and children in farm work, and the non-involvement of men and boys in housework, childrearing and the dairy. However, not all farms were like this.

There were four farming households in which neither mothers nor daughters did farm work. In the two wealthier ones, cowman-gardeners relieved the parents of the tasks associated with dairying and keeping the vegetable garden. In one case, the mother seems to have been somewhat marginally involved in either housework or farm work.² For much of my respondent's childhood, there were servants who attended to most of the domestic affairs of the household, but as they left for other jobs, my respondent's mother was obliged to learn how to do housework. In both families the daughters' early education was catered for through a governess, in both cases a young woman from a household related by kinship. In later years they went to

exclusive girls' boarding schools. Neither of these families had sons.

In the other two farming families in which girls were not involved in farm work, there was good evidence that better things were expected for the daughters than their mothers had experienced, perhaps that they would become the wives of businessmen, professionals or farmers prosperous enough to ensure there would be none of the drudgery on the farm which they knew many wives of farmers experienced. One was advised by her mother not to learn to milk; both were taught music and other lady-like arts. Mrs Lee's father specifically

wanted us to learn things, wanted us to be ladies ... we did a lot of fancy work and music ... we learned painting and woodcarving and things like that. (Lee: 4 boys, 2 girls: farmer)

In fact, both Mrs Lee and a respondent in a similar situation had to work after they were married. Mrs Lee married a man who had been severely injured during World War I and was obliged to learn to milk cows and to do so for many years, morning and night. The other was forced to take paid work during the Depression.

In another couple of cases there was much evidence of chivalry to women which seemed quite inconsistent with the amount of work they actually did around the farm. We didn't

do heavy work. Father was adamant about that. The respondent then went on to explain his attitude by saying that he was the youngest child of a cherished wife whose health had been jeopardised by hard work and child-bearing.

Maybe he was brought up that way ... Grandfather was ... he was a gentleman. His wife had eight children ... she wasn't to have any more ... and she was the one that was looked after. My father was the youngest of the children and he used to see the mother sort of being looked after. I think maybe the background was different, but he expected us to go and milk the cow and these sorts of things. But we didn't do the heavy jobs. (MacIvor: 1 boy, 2 girls: farmer)

All the girls discussed in this section were sent to secondary school, either boarding, or staying with relatives in town. However, compared with those who did not take any part on the farm, those who did so had parents who encouraged them academically and both achieved matriculation standard although their brothers had left school earlier to work on the farm. In neither case were the girls able to go to University since by the late 1920s the families had to dispense with employees in order to make ends meet.

YOU WERE TALKING EARLIER ABOUT THE DEPRESSION, YOU HAD TO WORK HARD ON THE FARM?

We all did. If you didn't do anything else, you grew your vegetables, looked after the fowls, you milked the cows, you went out and helped with the mustering. Whatever ... (MacIvor: 1 boy, 2 girls: farmer)

Although they did not get wages as such, their father gave them money for clothes and allowed them some measure of independence. For instance, after her marriage, Mrs MacIvor's father gave her some money to keep in the bank for herself. There was no suggestion in either of these two families that farming work was not suitable for women although the work they did was lighter than that of their brothers.

In a few farming families, husbands and sons helped at the time of preserving fruit and vegetables which might spoil or in the dairy where the work was particularly heavy.

WHO WOULD DO THE SEPARATING AND CHURNING?

Well, we did do some of the churning because the last part of it before it becomes proper butter becomes quite heavy work for a lady.

YOU HAVE GOT TO SQUEEZE OUT THE WATER?

Yes. That's really after it becomes butter. What we used to do was take the lid off the churn and pour some straight cold water in and then turn it and that used to sort of wring all the salts and the water out of the butter as well. (Weston: 3 boys, 2 girls: farmer)

It seems that around the first few decades of the century, that ideological elements of masculinism were evident among the more affluent and better educated farming families. A serious education was valued and a limited measure of independence was given to the girls in the form of spending money in recognition for their labour. In both

the cases cited above, the girls came from old established farming families who had originally been struggling pioneers. They both had mothers whose independence as 'really useful' women had been of major importance in the family economy.

Their families were also members of close-knit social networks of kin with whom they were in regular touch which might have helped make them more resistant to alien ideologies unsuited to the exigencies of family farming in an economy dependent upon world markets. There were elements of masculinism in this situation in the father's desire to protect them from heavy manual work, a sort of chivalry which came up several times among middle class urban families as well (Chapter 5). Masculinism was clearly associated with situations in which at least one of the parents had travelled and were themselves relatively well educated. This created tension between the needs of the enterprise, essentially a family affair, and the new ideologies about women's place.

The reader will recall that urban middle class men occasionally helped their wives with the mangling or other aspects of clothes washing because the work was too heavy for them (see Chapter 5). Again, here is evidence of masculinism, the association of delicacy with women, and strength with men.

Other themes concerning the relationship of work and status can be developed in connection with the careers of urban upper middle class young women. Virtually all of them stayed at school until they were seventeen or eighteen, and then remained 'at home', perhaps helping servantless mothers, accompanying them to tea and tennis parties where suitable company was provided, and attending the odd invited private Ball.

We cannot assume that tertiary education was viewed in terms of career. Two of the women went to University. Indeed, it is more likely that for most young women, University education was seen as a respectable option to remaining at home which at one and the same time, would provide a good (but not too) liberal education and enhance marriage chances.

One of my women respondents graduated as Master of Arts and tried to get a job as a clerk in an insurance company. Her father was furious that she even thought of such a thing and refused to allow her to take the job which was offered her. In fact, the man who had offered her the job informed her father that she had applied for it! The other got 'a couple of units' and drifted off to Europe for an overseas trip for the year before her impending marriage. Both daughters of farmers and upper middle class urban women commented on the narrowness of their lives as young women. The effectiveness of their father's power in making sure

that their networks were confined to socially acceptable persons can be seen in the terrified reactions of two of my upper middle class respondents to meeting 'the public' in their first jobs. Already middle-aged, they were manpowered during World War II.

Very few of the interviews reveal evidence of daughters from farming or upper middle class households being employed in a strictly defined employer/employee relationship, apart from those whose services were required during World War II. I found only a few cases in which a sister or female respondent had a 'real' job though there may well have been others. One woman told me that a friend who belonged to her upper middle class social circle was totally ostracised when she took a job. Daughters of farmers stayed at home and busied themselves in domestic labour for their own kin or for other households, usually already known to the household. A couple of middle class daughters did the same sort of thing.

One, after having spent three years taking the place of her dead mother in the kitchen, was allowed to go nursing by her arty-farty, authoritarian father when he remarried. Whatever the motives of the father in allowing her to have such a career, he surely did not concern himself greatly that she would achieve a great deal of economic independence on the basis of salary. Nor could he have worried too much at how her spare time would be spent away from the family,

taking into account the gruelling work, long shifts and missionary zeal with which the virtue of the probationers and even registered nurses was guarded in the Nurses Homes.

To summarise, although most farming households in my sample required the work of women and children, there were signs that notions of what was fit work for them were changing. This was best illustrated among the farm families at the top of the rural social ladder. Indeed, it is possible that the wives and daughters of the very rich pastoralists of the South Island were never involved in work on their runs or in the domestic labour of the household, except perhaps in the early days of settlement, and as managers of the household. None of my respondents had been brought up on a large sheep station, although the mother of one had spent her orphaned young adulthood on one. She did do housework although the run was one of the biggest in New Zealand.

It should be noted that the women and girls who worked on farms did so in the company of their husbands, fathers and brothers. The urban bourgeoisie required that their young women did not 'work' and that their movements were confined to home, family, and a carefully chosen social circle. The question of control of women's networks will be raised again in Chapters 8 and 9.

Patriarchy, Masculinism and Housework

One theme which ran the whole gamut of the interview material was that females were responsible for domestic labour and for childcare. Almost all the mothers did so, although some had paid domestic help. Most young women and girls did housework and/or attended to their younger brothers and sisters, allowing their mothers to get on with other tasks. In such households, mothers managed the household, delegating responsibility (see below).

Few of the fathers did any kind of 'women's work', though boys in some kinds of households attended to jobs such as dishwashing and made their own beds. In some households where there were no girls (or none of appropriate age), boys were obliged to take their place. Furthermore, some boys in small families shared small household tasks equally with their sisters. Let us review these situations in some detail.

To some respondents (both male and female), the very idea that men might be expected to be involved in housework was greeted with amusement or horror. Upper-middle class informants were so vociferous in their denial of their father's involvement in housework, that the question was finally abandoned in the interests of retaining rapport.

Oh, no! ... [conversation observing that Scottish men don't do housework] ... it just wasn't done. They had people to do the work. They had maids. They didn't have to do things for themselves. (Sorrell: 2 boys, 1 girl)

Much the same reaction was observed in asking the question about any paid employment their mothers might have had. In such homes it appears that the gender-based division of labour was complete, at least among adults where there was clear recognition of separate spheres for men and women.

Most other respondents regarded questions about men's and boys' housework with a fair degree of equanimity or cynicism. Negative replies grouped into two main categories, those who flatly said that neither father nor sons did housework, or that there was no need for them to do so because there were plenty of girls, revealing gender-based assumptions about the household division of labour.

One of the more interesting points to emerge from analysis of the data on work was the way in which some working class boys were allowed to roam free, to play and to enjoy life while their sisters' time was highly controlled by their mothers. It should be noted that some of these boys had paid casual jobs. This pattern for children's work paralleled that of their parents', households in which the husband was the main or sole breadwinner (and sometimes did little else in the way of work, e.g. gardening) while

the women and girls, the elder ones especially, somehow made ends meet. In these working class households, it was predominantly mothers who were the most powerful members of the household whether or not they themselves earned money. They appear to have handled the money and undoubtedly controlled the children.

The 'ruby without price' also had her counterparts in oral histories of Lancashire women (Roberts, 1984) and other accounts of working class life (Roberts, 1971) during the long period of English industrialisation in which the 'family wage' was not yet a reality, if indeed it ever was (Land, 1980). Male 'dominance' in such households appears to have taken the form that breadwinners should be cherished. Women and girls in these households appeared unquestioning of the expression that "boys will be boys", regardless of age. Having earned the money, the men had the right to the rewards in terms of leisure of their own choosing. In Chapter 9, we will consider some of the means by which working class patriarchal rights in the form of male privilege were subverted or negotiated among proletarian families.

Seen in the light of the decline of the wage economy and the emergence of masculinism among middle class and some working class families, a striking change appears to have taken place. Masculinism seems to have been associated with a measure of restriction on the life-styles of husbands and

sons. This took the form of much gardening, home maintenance and other chores which demonstrated a much greater degree of personal responsibility for the family's financial welfare than the group described above.

It is of note that the only farming boys who did any housework took turns with their sisters in washing the dishes and were also responsible for making their own beds, belonged to a small group of educated families who had strong ideas about restricting women's and girls' farming work to the lighter tasks. Help with heavy jobs and the same individual responsibility for bedmaking and so on were also found in a couple of urban middle class families, but it was not uncommon among the small families of some working class and middle class families where girls' duties were roughly similar to those of boys.

In short, masculinism appears to have been associated with the acceptance of 'extra' work around the house and garden for men and boys, in addition to breadwinning activities. As we shall see later, it was also associated with other measures of home and family centredness. Among women and girls, masculinism was associated not only with physical domesticity in the sense of being confined to the house and kitchen because of the amount of work to be done, but also with a high degree of self-reliance and a withdrawal from the social life of the community. This will be dealt with in a later Chapter.

Servants

The question of domestic servants is such an important one that it deserves a section in itself. In New Zealand, the regular employment of a servant was no mark of middle class status as it was in Britain in the Victorian and Edwardian eras (Branca, 1974). There is much evidence that the shortage of domestic servants in New Zealand has been the despair of many a newly-arrived middle class housewife, forced to learn to do the menial work she once considered beneath her.

Lack of servants is of crucial importance to the understanding of the historical situation of married women in New Zealand. Without servants, it was not possible for the life of the leisured Lady to be sustained. The lives of most of the upper middle class mothers had much in common with other women, in that they too, had to attend to the needs and wants of husbands and children.

Gorham (1982, 6) points to some of the ambiguities in the position of women who were expected to have womanly strength in their domestic calling, but to remain permanently childlike in terms of maturity. 'Women's work' was hard work, demanding organisational and interpersonal skills as well as specific domestic ones which required training and experience. The demands were contradictory to the qualities associated with bourgeois notions of genteel femininity.

Branca (1974) has shown that the leisured Victorian 'lady' always was something of a myth. The vast majority of English middle class women had to be content with what their husband's salary could stand. For most, this was likely to be a single domestic servant, which made it difficult for the woman to avoid menial work herself. It may even be that the New Zealand woman was at something of an advantage because the chances were that she would have had ample domestic training in her childhood home if she had been born in New Zealand. However, four or five of the upper middle class respondents commented that their mothers had been brought up in homes where there were servants and had barely been able to cope when they had to learn to keep house and to cook for the first time.

The shortage of domestic servants in New Zealand almost certainly had the effect of keeping middle class women tied to the kitchen and home during the childrearing years at least. For those middle class women who lost their servants to other more lucrative and congenial forms of employment, the questionable propriety of doing their own household labour had to give way to the necessity of their personal involvement in all aspects of social (and cultural) reproduction. The effect of 'the servant problem' would have served to level out differences in the concrete experience of New Zealand women at a much earlier stage than in England.

We should now confront some of the subjective aspects of housework affecting women in different social locations. Changes in the ways in which women viewed housework should be seen in terms of the outcomes for their definition of self.

Some Subjective Aspects of Housework

Sometimes what is not said is more important than what is. Not one of my farming respondents, and none of those who had mothers who worked on small-holdings or sold the produce of their gardens had much to say about housework as such. However, many of my other respondents, particularly women, spoke at some length on their mother's domestic activities as housewives rather than mothers. Their descriptions of these activities leave an indelible impression of the high degree of housepride among urban, domesticated women, totally dependent on their husband's wage packet. Values of spotless cleanliness and impeccable order within the house itself seem to have featured prominently among this group which included most working and middle class housewives.

Urban housewives were deeply concerned with appearances. Most were scrupulous about their washday activities sparing no effort in providing their families with what we would consider today to be luxuries, e.g.

starched table linen when the family kitchen had bare boards or linoleum, hand embroidered pillow cases with lace³ in households where day to day living was financially precarious. The long extract featuring Mrs King's mother in Chapter 5 was chosen for its representativeness though not all of the mothers had such a selection of household goods to keep in perfect condition.

Concern for public affirmation of their housewifely abilities is suggested by the fact that the urban housewives' work was 'on show' to neighbours. Competition to get the whitest-of-white sheets on the line, the rows of billowing snowy petticoats, to be the first to hang them out on a Monday morning appears to have been a spur to housewifely pride. Competition was also apparent in sending children to school 'well turned out'. Although farming women's work was far less likely to be visible to neighbours, they went to a great deal of trouble in their preparations for public events, like picnics, when the whole family was 'on show' in the community. Agricultural shows also provided institutionalised venues for displays of domestic and horticultural virtuosity in which both men and women vied for the annual prize for the lightest sponge or the heaviest cabbage (see Chapter 8).

Housework in its many aspects appears to have been an important basis for their evaluation by others, and therefore a source of self-esteem for most urban housewives.

What I am suggesting here is that women, especially those in neighbourhoods where 'everyone knew everyone else', earned status and prestige for themselves and their families as a result of their work. This topic will be raised later, where I will argue that increasing privatisation, as a result of geographical mobility, suburbanisation and other factors, resulted in a situation in which women gradually lost this basis for evaluation by other women. Gradually, their status depended almost solely on their husbands.

Class and Gender

So far, the focus in this Chapter has been on the emergence of masculinism in families at the higher end of the social scale. As socialist feminist theory suggests, it was the wives and daughters of farmers at the higher end of the social scale and upper middle class women who were most likely to be highly domesticated and protected from any form of social production.

Prosperous farming families and upper middle class urban ones showed evidence of both patriarchy and masculinism. Indeed, there were more authoritarian fathers among these families who at one and the same time also held strong views about the place of Ladies, than among other kinds of families. They were the New Zealand equivalent of the English Victorian *paterfamilias*, distant and somewhat

awesome, engendering respect and fear rather than the love of their children. In other words, it was the mothers who were likely to show the effects of masculinism as a result of changing ideologies about the proper role of mothers.

By contrast, the work activities of farming women and girls described at length in Chapter 5, closely resembled those of peasant women labouring in preindustrial settings, illustrating the presence in New Zealand of the 'really useful' woman described by Sundt, Le Play and other European observers (Scott & Tilly, 1980). She was also the sort of woman so much in demand as the 'colonial helpmeet'.

Their work patterns were also somewhat similar to those described by Lake (1985) in a paper dealing with the settlement of rural families in Australia between 1870 and 1930. Lake (1985, 173) describes the household and farm as a 'locus of struggle' in which an aspiring Australian yeomanry battled with the contradictions involved in setting up a farm without sufficient capital or labour in an already capitalist society. As in New Zealand, there was a strong desire to create an antipodean yeomanry, without the rural class structure based on the three-tiered hierarchy of owner-tenant-labour as in England. In Australia, women and children in poor farming families slaved. Lake writes of settlers put on the land as a result of settlement legislation, including soldier settlement

Because penniless men were put into an occupation which demanded capital, they were forced to exploit their wives and children's labour in farm production in a society which had institutionalised separate spheres for men and women and dependency and schooling for children. Where settlers did possess some capital, women's farm labour could be replaced by hired hands ... and machines. (Lake, 1985, 182)

For the successful, there were rewards in both material and social terms, but for those without substantial capital and the ability to repay a heavy mortgage and other debts, life was harsh and conditions exploitative. It seems likely that this was the case in New Zealand for those who pioneered the land on the basis of insufficient capital. A few respondents told me how they, or their neighbours were forced off the land as a result of the death of their father, or their brothers in World War I, or as a result of being unable to weather the Depression. They also commented that before the full-scale mechanisation of farming (which appears to have varied widely - machines had to be paid for), women and children's labour was quite essential. They can be seen as a household 'reserve army' (see Frankenberg, 1976).

Drawing on Dalziel's work on the colonial helpmeet in New Zealand (1977), Lake observed the ideological contradictions between the cult of domesticity which had firmly entrenched itself into Australian urban life, and the actual working conditions of the women (and children) in

soldier settlements. She notes that farming in Australia, even by the 1870s was highly capitalised and commercialised. The yeoman image already anachronistic in economic terms, also assumed "a family production unit in which individual interests would be subsumed by the family interest"[sic]. But by this time too, the essentially 'separate' interests and rights of women were being recognised in Australia. In her discussion, Lake argues that the term 'helpmeet' was used to serve

the hegemonic purpose of attempting to reconcile the contradictions of rural women's position. The helpmate was the model for women required in the interests of agricultural production to perform 'unsexing' work on the farm and it was frequently invoked by the administrators of land-settlement schemes. (Lake, 1985, 183)

She adds that by the 1900s, the separate spheres had been more clearly demarcated into two rather narrow roles so familiar in contemporary society, the housewife-dependent and the husband as breadwinner. The case histories, drawn from documentary evidence, leave one in no doubt that rural (and working class) women in Australia grasped their new roles enthusiastically, given their previous conditions.

The central features of the helpmeet, the farmer's wife are set out by Ryan (1979) as "a sturdy, orderly and industrious" woman, a mode of femininity well adapted to the

Chapter 6

rigours of frontier survival in the United States. As in Australia, this image of women was to disappear with the onset of industrialisation in America during the period 1820-1860 (see also Chapter 9). What of New Zealand?

A clear example of socially constructed definitions of what constituted work 'proper' for women is seen in Mrs Gilbert's statement that "You couldn't be useless round our place" when I commented on her carrying of heavy metal milk cans at the age of fourteen. It is highly unlikely that any of the urban middle class fathers carried anything as heavy as a milk can in their daily work because, as we have seen above, they had 'people' to do heavy and menial work for them. Indeed, it was quite proper for upper middle class people to be 'useless'.

It appears that because of the lateness of settlement in New Zealand, that the colonial helpmeet, the 'really useful' woman, was still an important image of rural femininity. The majority of the mothers of my farming respondents did not labour on the farm itself, at least during the years of my respondents' childhoods, leaving this sort of work to their children and husbands. But, the extra work they had to do as a result of their isolation and the low level of domestic technology did not free them for any sort of genteel domesticity. Their relationships with their children appear to have been largely of an instrumental nature, concerned with getting the chores done,

rather than expressing affection and concern with their personal fulfilment and growth.

Nor can it be said that smallholding or working class women with large families and heavy duties involved in running a household on a small budget approximated the material conditions of middle class housewives in England and the United States. Although largely confined to the home, they do not appear to have practised the "'cult of true womanhood': piety, purity, submissiveness", the litany of feminine virtues listed by Ryan (1979) and others who have written about changes in concepts of womanhood as a result of the transition to capitalism. Many working class women were regarded by their children as all powerful. Indeed, they managed the household, delegating work and controlling the family purse. They, like the farming women, leaned heavily on their daughters.

Based on my own findings, there was little evidence of direct male domination of these 'rubies without price'. If patriarchy existed in the working class, it took the form of general 'absenteeism' among fathers from the domestic domain. It was the husband/father's role to provide for the family, but having brought in the money they were free to do as they wished. As breadwinners, they were cherished. As wage earning employees, their employment life was as much their own, as the time they had left when their obligations to family had been discharged. This is

not to say that they lacked power. Their responsibility was wage earning. Their wives' responsibility was the home and family.

Among other working class families, and the middle class generally, it was husbands who were 'the boss'. These kinds of families were characterised by the encapsulation of women in the household, attending to their housework and childrearing activities and by the preoccupation of men with earning a living. These were families which were most likely to declare loyalty to that masculinist precept 'a woman's place is in the home', a precept which the bourgeois took for granted. The point I am making here is that many of these families were, I suspect, none too distant from the working class themselves having achieved some of the trappings of middle class status as a result of occupational mobility in an expanding economy. This is a matter which must be left till much later in the thesis when the probable course of social change in family relationships will be discussed (see Chapter 9).

The Household Division of Labour by Age

There were some interesting findings relating to age, most of which have already been described but not analysed in terms of patriarchy and masculinism. The heavy duties of

older children, especially daughters, appear to be associated with patriarchalism.

Implications of the birth order appear to be much neglected by sociologists, possibly because the families they study have been much smaller in recent times. In the past, however, place in family was very important from the point of view of an individual child's responsibilities in the division of labour and in relation to inheritance in the case of sons (Chapter 7).

The labour of older children was of crucial importance, making possible the running of a farm or a household with many children. It appears that because of large family size and the length of the child rearing cycle, it was also possible for the role of elder sons and daughters to be assumed by younger siblings as their seniors left home. The concept of 'elder daughter/sister' should be interpreted here as a role, unless chronological seniority is indicated in the context.

The miseries and heavy responsibilities of eldest daughters came up again and again in both country and town. Sometimes it was the respondent who was the former eldest daughter, or a younger sibling who acquired the role when her sister left home. Sometimes informants would be describing the lives of their elder sister or their mother as a young woman. Mrs Oswald, reflecting on her life experience sighed

I've had to cook and wash and help look after babies ever since I can remember. (Oswald: 5 boys, 5 girls: farmer)

In providing for the needs of younger children and assisting their parents through delegated responsibility, elder daughters were grossly exploited in today's terms. They appear to have been taken quite for granted, both by their parents and their siblings as children, their duties taking precedence over any personal wishes they, themselves, may have dared to cherish. A couple of examples will help the reader appreciate what is meant because the case of elder daughters illustrates very well the degree of control exercised by parents, an apparently internalised inability to rebel, as well to a considerable degree of resistance by elder daughters to having 'a family' of their own in later life.

Elder daughters tended to be more obvious in very large families than in other ones, possibly because some of the informants regarded them as substitute mothers. In two cases, the elder daughters of farmers accompanied younger siblings to town to keep house for them (and perhaps chaperone them, I suggest), while they either attended Teachers' College or were employed. In one case, a house - but no money - was provided by the parents. It was expected that the younger children would pay their sister their wages. However, this was not enough and she found it very

hard indeed to manage, used as she was to farm life where food had to be grown, not bought. It should be emphasised that she received no payment whatsoever.

In several cases, elder daughters did not marry at all, or did so only when long past childbearing age. Although no question was asked regularly about elder daughters, they were mentioned spontaneously again and again, often with comments about the harsh life they led and lack of surprise that they did not marry. Their treatment accords with that of other writers of their own or earlier periods (Burnett, 1982) and with the oral testimony used by contemporary social historians and others (Thompson, 1977).

It was not only girls and young women who were exploited. Elder, and sometimes younger, sons were expected to take over the farm or businesses. They too, suffered from the taken-for-granted attitude of parents who clearly saw their right to control their children's destiny. The plight of elder children was associated with patriarchy.

On a more positive note, it should be pointed out, that younger children's wishes appear to have been taken into account, or that some provision was made for their future. However, some younger children found themselves involved in supporting elderly parents at a time when they wished to marry. In such cases, the engagement was prolonged over several years. Two or three people specifically said that the introduction of statutory aged

benefits in the late 1930s had allowed them to marry, since they provided their parents with sufficient income to live. The support of the aged, however, lies outside the scope of this thesis.

The point to be made here is that although patriarchy and ownership of a business or farm are associated, once the productivity and profits of the unit are assured in the future, there is no need to keep a high degree of control over younger children. Young men may be allowed to take up alternative careers. Indeed, changes in New Zealand's occupational structure at this time suggest that patriarchal fathers had competition from a whole number of sources for the services of their sons (Goode, 1963, 1980). It may be that because alternatives were available too, that fathers had to tread all the more carefully, initiating change in the quality of relationships between men and their adult sons.

Propriety and Pragmatism

There were some unusual cases in which boys did a considerable amount of housework and baby-minding, but little in the way of outside chores. This was usually because there was no girl available to do the domestic chores since the firstborn children were boys. In the following case, the father was a dairy factory manager, the

sole employee. In winter he was obliged to get labouring work with a farmer a few miles away. The family was fortunate in having coal supplied by the Company, which meant that Mr Masters didn't have to chop a great deal of wood as a boy. The house was rent free. They did not keep a garden for the farmers supplied them with enough vegetables in exchange for his father's soldering of their milk cans as a favour. But the facilities were primitive and his mother had to wash clothes outside, a miserable and time consuming job especially in the freezing plains of Canterbury winters.

On Saturday mornings Mr Masters and his brother washed the kitchen floor, his mother having chalked a line down the middle. They also cleaned the knives. There was always a baby in the house from Mr Master's viewpoint (not to mention his mother's). The boys were expected to mind the current baby, taking it for walks. Actually, sometimes they would take the pram down the road and park it and go off to play, making quite an adventurous life for the babies, one of whom narrowly missed a watery demise when the pram slipped down a bank at the river.

The case is unusual, reflecting the socio-economic context, the family's demographic ideosyncracies and the amount of work which had to be done. There were in fact other cases like this in that where the family had no child of appropriate sex, another would take over the tasks. In

this way, in some households which had no boys, a girl or the mother would chop the wood, while in families without girls, a boy would help his mother in the house as well as taking care of the usual boys' chores. Absence of a child of appropriate sex was, however, no guarantee that the job would get done by a child and the extra burden might well be shouldered by the adult of the 'right' sex.

Mrs Ritchie's mother helped on the farm all day when she thought it necessary, leaving the breakfast dishes and housework undone.

AND DID HE HELP HER IN THE HOUSE?

Oh, yes. He'd come home late and have his tea. And little things to be done, he would help. Certainly he would. There was always plenty to do. (Ritchie: 5 boys, 2 girls: farmer)

However, an imbalance as a result of not having children of appropriate age or sex, or a situation of family crisis such as the death of a mother, created a situation in which it appeared quite permissible and desirable for the gender-based division of labour to be varied (Lummis, 1982, 47). For example, Mr Bright's father regularly made his own cut lunch to be eaten far from the homestead. Mr Murrow's father was helpful in domestic matters when a visiting preacher was lodged in their household, making extra work. In neither case was there a daughter old enough to help the

mother. In brief, whatever the prevailing norms in regard to the division of labour, these may have been waived in individual cases where 'appropriate' personnel were not available and/or where individuals choose to organise their labour according to their own circumstances.

Summary

In this Chapter we have investigated differences in the division of labour by gender and age, taking into account the class situation of the family households. Special attention has been given to accounting for differences in the household division of labour resulting from the operation of patriarchy and/or masculinism. Among the most prosperous farmers, there were indications of a shift in ideology relating to the nature of women's work and a clearer division between 'his work and hers'. We also noted an emergence of protection for children from heavy work. We observed that among farming families there were signs that some parents were allowing their children greater control over their lives and planning for education over and above that required by law.

Masculinism was associated with dependency of the family on wage earning, usually by a sole male breadwinner. The families demonstrating this most clearly were usually middle class, had smaller numbers of children, and had a

clear division of labour in that women's work was confined to domestic and childrearing duties and men to providing the money primarily. Among these families, there was also a tendency for parents to relieve children of duties which were demanded by other parents. Instead of requiring the heavy involvement of girls in housework and childminding, these mothers tended to monopolise this type of work themselves, delegating only small tasks to both boys and girls. The distinction seems to have been in a move from the social reproductive tasks by girls to individual reproduction and routine tasks. These themes will reappear in later Chapters.

The nature and priorities surrounding household work have changed, but the proprieties about who does what, appear to have become much more clearly defined with the advance of capitalism. It is now that a married woman's work is 'never done'. The married woman, once mistress of her poor or wealthy household, may have delegated work in the past to children, servants or both. In patriarchal households, housework and childrearing duties were carried out by women and their daughters. In masculinist households, social reproduction became the speciality and responsibility of women. In fact, moving up the social ladder, girls were less and less involved in housework, and certainly in social reproduction.

Let us now turn to a theoretical discussion of the power relationships in families integrating the concepts of socialist feminism with those of more general sociological theory. This is necessary if we are to be able to explain rather than simply describe the process through which patriarchy was replaced by masculinism.

Power Relations and the Family

The classic definition of power is Weber's, according to whom power is equated with "the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his will despite resistance regardless of the basis on which this probability rests". Weber's definition of power is a general one. Anything which gives a person or group a degree of control over valued resources may be seen as a source of power (Mann, 1983, 300). We are most specifically concerned with the forms of power attributed to men as a result of their relationship to the prevailing mode of production and which allow them to benefit from the labour of their own wives and children, but we are also concerned with the power of mothers over children.

It was argued in Chapter 3, that the long transition from feudalism to capitalism was accompanied by a transformation in power relations in families. In the earlier social order, patriarchal domination associated with

the head of the household production unit was the dominant form. Here, all other household members were subservient to him. Although the 'goodwife' was subordinate to her husband, she was manager of domestic affairs and had the right to command the services of younger women and girls at least.

Access to making a living was through heads of households as fathers, as husbands, or as 'employers' since almost all work was undertaken in or through household production units.

Some men enjoyed more power within their families than others as a result of their different relation to the means of production. In patriarchal society, those who were not heads of production units, those who earned a precarious living by intermittent wage earning, or who scratched out an existence through a variety of means were unlikely to have been able to constrain the activities of their wives and children to the extent that heads of households did. Nor did they enjoy the privileges of heads of households as leaders of local communities, able to extend their power beyond the household. Nor, lacking access to ownership or control of the means of production, were they likely to be able to control the activities of their adult children who had to depend on the heads of households which were also production units for 'employment'.

As a result of proletarianisation and other changes in the social organisation and relations of work, the power of male heads of households lay in their control over economically dependent wives and children. A contemporary expression of this masculinist relationship associated with capitalism is succinctly stated in the following quotation.

"The authority of the husband to direct certain family decisions is ... much more than simply adherence to a traditional belief in male authority but a product of the institutionalized subordination of family to the economic life, and the latter subordination is more than merely a matter of tradition: it rests on the fact that the irreducible basis of their life as we know it is economic. Without the removal of this economic base it is difficult to see how a breadwinner can fail to carry authority in the family" (Turner, 1970, 263, quoted in Edgell, 1980: 29)

The process during which households became dependent on the formal economy was described in the discussion section of Chapter 5. We must now consider the nature of dependency and its relationship to power.

Power and Dependency

Dependence should be understood here firstly as a general term denoting reliance of a person or group of persons on others. To the degree that families require cash for spending on goods and services in the formal economy, they are also dependent on it. We may also speak of the

dependence or interdependence of family members on each other for provision of the necessities of life and for emotional support, personal gratification and comfort.

Power is a relational term. To have power, means to have control over the satisfaction of the needs and desires of others. Dependency relationships which involve the reliance of a subordinate person on a more powerful one not only suggest the potential use of asymmetrical power, but also the potential for exploitation. Resources may be given generously or withheld.

Dependency relations are not necessarily characterised by oppression and exploitation (Tulloch, 1984, 21). They may be mediated by traditional obligations, law or local custom embodied in the term 'moral community' (see Chapter 9). Subordination and exploitation are demonstrated when superiors both emphasise their superordinate position and use their position to control the other's life chances to their own advantage in both material and emotional ways. Subordination may be accepted as legitimate or not.

Relationships of power involved in day to day work within the household are far less specific, more flexible and at the same time, potentially more damaging and more exploitative than others. The operation of power within the family is also more insidious and usually far less obvious than in other types of social relationships.

One of the most interesting aspects of power, either in the form of patriarchy or masculinism, is its institutionalised nature.

In any society, the pattern of people's lives and their living conditions take the forms which they do, not so much because somebody somewhere makes a series of decisions to that effect; but in large part because certain social mechanisms, principles, assumptions ... are taken for granted ... The favoured group enjoys effective power, even when its members take no active steps to exercise power. They do not need to do so - for much of the time at least - simply because things work their way in any case (Westergaard and Resler, 1975, 142-43, quoted in Stacey, 1981, 9).

The taken-for-grantedness of the patriarchal order was of course to be questioned as a result of changes in the mode and means of production. If we are to understand the changing relationships of power associated with the advent of masculinism, we need the conceptual apparatus with which to analyse the ways in which the tensions created between differentiation and identification are mediated.

Power, Control and Deference

Male-dominated and ahistorical approaches to sociology have tended to neglect the importance of forms of traditional authority still existing in contemporary society (Newby, 1975, see also Chapter 3, 119-126). However, the concept of paternalism, an alternative label for traditional

authority, has enjoyed something of a revival in recent years, not only as a result of its importance in explaining the means by which proletarian conflict was contained in nineteenth century England, but also in its links with the associated concepts of deference and dependence in contemporary marriage. It may also be used to explain relationships between parents and children (Bell & Newby, 1976).

Deference, as it is defined by Newby is "neither a type of behaviour nor a set of attitudes, but a 'form' (in the Simmelian sense) of social interaction. Specifically, deference is the form of social interaction which occurs in situations involving the exercise of traditional authority (1975, 146). In somewhat similar terms, Shils defines deference as the dynamic, interrelational aspect of status (quoted in Newby 1975).

Deference, which is based on power, 'is the means through which traditional authority is maintained by traditionally defined elites across all their roles, e.g. employers, heads of households, contemporary husbands. It serves the purpose of legitimating social hierarchy. The value of its successful application in the present context of patriarchy and masculinism, is that it transforms potentially unstable coercive relationships into a stable ones.

Bell and Newby (1976) seek to explicate the concept of deference within the context of attempting to explain the persistent subordination of women to men within the family which they see as the central arena for ensuring the stability of the *status quo*. They emphasise the normative and relational means by which paternalism is acted out and reinforced within the family and in the community where kin, neighbours, friends and others have their part to play.

The stability which a deferential relationship promotes, requires more than simple interaction, or even interdependence, but a positive, affective identification (Bell & Newby, 1976, 157). Involvement in such a relationship is not merely calculative but has a positive, 'organic' quality. This very tension between differentiation and identification is what may cause the relationship to founder. Over-identification and over-differentiation may both result in the denial of legitimation by the subordinate. It is the task of the superordinate to manage these tensions, "to control, contain and dissipate the tensions" in Bell & Newby's own words (1976, 157).

If women are to continue be kept in a subordinate position which they themselves accept and endorse, a high degree of ideological hegemony is necessary. Consistent models appropriate to the gender and class of parties to the relationship are learned during childhood and reinforced throughout life providing access to alternative ideologies

are blocked off or rendered irrelevant as a result of deeply held values. An important aspect inhibiting change in the successful management of the deferential relationship is ensuring that subordinates do not come into contact with ideas that conflict with the interests of the superordinate. It is here that kinship, neighbourhood and social networks become very important. Where the free movement of women is barred, the nature of the deferential relationship with husband, or of children with parents is unlikely to change.

However, in a period of rapid social change, he may choose to 'swing the norms'. It is in this manner that the apparent liberalisation of men's behaviour towards women (and children) take place, but the power relationships underlying their behaviour do not.

Paternalism and Deference in Society

Lown (1983) argues that paternalism was used in the nineteenth century to secure and maintain social stability in the period of rapid industrialisation and urbanisation, insinuating itself into the workplace as well as the home (see also Joyce, 1980). This new paternalism was strongly associated with the new domestic ideology which stressed the primary identification of women with the home and children, and of men with earning a living. Industrial paternalism still remains in small business firms where it is still

possible for employers to take a genuine personal interest in their employees' welfare. The deferential relationship conceals the underlying conflict of interests, dissipates tension engendering loyalty and identification on both sides.

A constant theme of middle class nineteenth century literature were twin themes linking the village and home life, two romantic ideals opposed to the grim reality of the business world. Within both, subordinates knew their place because of their limited access to alternative conceptions (Davidoff et al., 1976, 143). In these two organic communities, resident gentry and head of household respectively could make decisions for their subordinates without consulting them. In both, deference could be easily maintained. The flight of the Victorian middle class to the suburbs was also a response, an escape from the city, from commerce and from the risk of tainting the home with its dirt.

Emerging new forms of traditional authority were associated with political and legal measures to ensure women's marginal status and the denial of their rights to own property or as citizens (Lown, 1983, 34: Koopman-Boyden & Scott, 1984). Among the working class, the demand for a 'family wage' can be seen partly as a desire to earn a decent living wage, and as a way to control the activity of women and children through dependence on a single

breadwinner. The living wage would create the material base for the emergence of domesticity.

Implications

The answer to the question of why it is women who are subordinate to men and why it is men who control access to the means of earning a living rather than women, lies in men's successful control over women's bodies and their labour throughout the transition from feudalism to capitalism. In terms of the data on early twentieth century New Zealand, some of the mechanisms by which this was achieved can be examined. It is only when the holistic picture is grasped that the narrowness of women's lives can be comprehended. This can only be done through an investigation of their activities in the community as well as in their own homes, a task which is about to be attempted.

In the Chapters to follow, we will see further evidence of the socially constricted and largely monosexual networks of women and girls which made continuing hegemony possible. Among farmers, labour within the household economy, and communal sociability meant that it was unlikely that husbands and fathers at this period would have to contend with penetration of ideas which might seriously

threaten their power. Most urban women were confined to their households, their kin and their Churches.

Theoretically, the same argument applies to children growing up in residentially stable areas where everyone knew everyone else and where siblings, peers, kin, church, school and neighbourhood presented essentially consistent values and norms, where everyone was doing the same thing.

Where the place of women is considered to be in the home, and such an ideology is both promoted and reinforced by heavy domestic duties, the deferential relationship is easier to maintain and there is less likelihood of conflict. That does not mean to say there was no conflict. It is a topic of considerable interest to which we will return in Chapter 9 when we consider change in the relationships of husbands and wives, parents and children. At that point, the mechanisms of the deferential relationship will be considered in more detail as the threads are pulled together.

FOOTNOTES

¹ A methodological note is in order here. The interview transcripts of male respondents demonstrate that they did not necessarily know much about what women and girls actually did. This was particularly noticeable among working class men who as boys, and potential breadwinners, spent rather little time in the house itself. This was a pattern characteristic of highly segregated households. Similarly, some female respondents were rather vague about the activities of their brothers in such households. Whereas the boys were not to be found when work needed to be done, there was little opportunity for play for some of these girls working under their mother's stern supervision. Lack of knowledge about the work of the opposite sex indicates very clearly the separate experience of each as well as the presence of gendered definitions of physical space (Ardener, 1981).

² The other case was quite different. Although the farm was a very prosperous one and many employees were engaged, the mother had been a domestic servant as a young girl and was a highly competent household manager. Her daughters did housework although they had a governess and later went to an exclusive boarding school.

³ Household linen was probably brought to the marriage by the wife, having spent much of her youth preparing her 'glory box'. The 'hope chest' also seems to have been a matter of importance to my female respondents many of whom spoke about endless sewing and embroidery from the time they were children.

⁴ Scanzoni (1978) and Blau (1964) have attempted to use exchange theory to analyse the changing power politics of American marriage. More specifically they have attempted to explain apparent shifts in power in terms of resources such as the contribution made by wife's earnings from employment. However, exchange theory is itself, based on a misunderstanding of Simmel's notion of exchange which is interaction. Bell & Newby dismiss their approach which they consider to be based on norms, not power. "Deference derives from power ... and is not a prerequisite of power ... by itself it cannot account for any change in the structure of power" (1976, 156).

P A R T I V :

HOUSEHOLD, FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

CHAPTER 7

KINSHIP AND HOUSEHOLD ECONOMY

Morgan (1975, 60-1, 84-5) has pointed out that the study of kinship has become divorced from the major issues in the sociology of the family. A broad-based socialist feminist framework can help bring it back in. This Chapter, like Chapter 5 deals with the household economy and the means through which subsistence was achieved through productive and reproductive activities. However, this time we will be dealing with collective strategies involving more than one household in which members were related by blood or marriage.

Two major groups of kin based activities can be distinguished in the New Zealand data. First of all there were those associated with a family farm or business involving primarily men's work. While Marx may have considered relationships like these something of an anachronism in capitalist society, they were probably common in New Zealand at the time. They are particularly important because they demonstrate the link between property ownership in the means of production and patriarchal control (Greven, 1970).

Secondly there were situations in which kin cooperated to solve specific problems. This sometimes involved the fusion of two households and always involved women. I will argue that with the acceleration of modernisation in New Zealand, men became increasingly divorced from economic relationships with kin, leaving kinship as part of the private sphere, the domain of women.

Some General Observations about Kinship

Reviews of the sociological literature on kinship demonstrate quite clearly that ties between members of households related by blood, marriage and adoption are important to both the middle and working class in modern Western societies.¹ However, there is considerable variation by class on what kind of services are exchanged or given, and the frequency and nature of sociable relations between kin (Allen, 1979, Morgan, 1975, 60-86). These differences are at least partly due to variability in resources which set constraints on behaviour. There is also variation as a result of geographical distance, common economic interests through occupation or property ownership, range of kin available and the persons willing and able to take initiative in maintaining kin contacts (Firth & Djamour, 1956, 21). The data suggest that these variables were also important in early twentieth century New Zealand.

Kinship Contact

For the purposes of analysis, we need to know what contact the sample families had with kin. Whereas a review of modern studies of kinship in Western industrialised societies give the impression that middle class are somewhat more residentially mobile than working class samples, the reverse was the case among my early twentieth century New Zealand sample. One outstanding difference between middle and working class families was in the amount of kin contact. There were three middle class families who had no kin at all in New Zealand. Ten had relatives living at such a distance that they saw little of them. The rest (thirty-seven) were regularly in touch with kin at least once a week and sometimes daily including several instances in which households were only a few minutes walk.

The closeness of kin ties generally among the New Zealand middle class families is all the more remarkable because the numbers include farmers who may have had many kin living locally. However, they were unable to see much of them as a result of the demands of the farm, poor roads and large numbers of children, they have been categorised in the intermediate group.

The great majority of the working class families in my sample either had no kin in New Zealand (five), or their kin lived too far away to be categorised as effective². In

fact only ten of the thirty-four working class families (including wage-earning farmers) had relatives living close enough to allow even weekly visiting.

Nor was contact necessarily made. Those working class families who had kin living quite close did not see very much of them because they could not afford the transport costs and the effort involved. This was a common complaint among those with large families. In three other cases there was very little or no contact between families living nearby because of conflict and in another, the only kin in regular contact was actually a co-resident mother's father.

It is not surprising then, that there is little evidence of the sociability or the generally close and important ties with kin observed in other studies of working class communities, or the sort of social relations with kin experienced by the middle class in the sample. Most of the working class New Zealand families studied had moved from their birthplace early in the parents' married lives in search of employment.

However, what working class families lacked by way of kin ties, they seemed to make up for through neighbourhood networks. These were of considerable importance in managing their everyday lives and in providing sociability for women (see Chapter 8).

Most of the urban working class respondents had lived as children in a new industrial area which attracted labour

from elsewhere. It may be that the geographical area from which my sample was drawn is unrepresentative of New Zealand as a whole in the first quarter of the twentieth century (see Appendix 1). Other working class families whose fathers were able to find secure employment in their birthplaces would have been far more likely to remain there. In general, however, the vast majority of parents of my working class respondents had moved far from their birthplaces, usually after marriage and before they had large families.

In the discussion which follows presentation of the descriptive and illustrative material, it will be possible to start identifying links which help clarify the issues raised in terms of the structural isolation of families from kin, and more generally, the variability in the ways in which families were articulated with their communities of residence.

Economic Activity Among Kin-Related Households

It is now time to investigate different kinds of social frameworks for economic behaviour defined by kinship among men in the communal and formal economy. We will deal firstly with the situation of farmers who helped each other and secondly, with men involved in family businesses.

It was in situations where the greatest interdependence existed among household members that the highest degree of reciprocity was also observed between households on a regular basis (Frankenberg, 1966). Farmers who made full use of the services of their wives and children, also sought the reciprocal help of kinsmen where they were available. It was in this context, too, that men appear to have been most closely connected with their kin, including related wives and children in leisure activities (see Chapter 8).

In the urban situation, there were six families involved together in family businesses in which adult sons worked for their fathers. Some of these adult sons were the third generation of the family to have been so involved. Unlike the farming situation where women and children were very much part of the productive system, they were totally excluded in the urban.

As we shall see, blood relationship existing between workers on farms or family businesses did not necessarily imply a high degree of mutual affection. The social relations of production created friction between fathers and sons, between sons and in other familial interrelationships. There was also a high degree of control by fathers over their adult children, a price to pay for future gain (Homans, 1951, 244-8).

Farmers

Some farmers had very close and active networks involving them both in economic cooperation and regular sociable activities with kin. Where it was possible, farmers interacted regularly and often with kin. Where it was needed, they also cooperated in farming activities.

The relationship between kinship and economic life was most clearly shown in the common pattern of the parents of the respondents settling in areas close to their relatives, especially father's kin. Patrilocal residence appears to have been common and there is other evidence of patrilateral bias.

Mr Bright's long established extended family was especially notable for collective activity and innovative talents. Several households lived within a few miles of each other with frequent interaction between them including sociable family gatherings, Church and community activities. Mr Bright said that all four of his father's brothers helped each other. The extended family was a *company affair*. In those days, he told me, working in teams was the making of farms, but problems existed in communicating information quickly. Their solution to this was to import telephones from the United States in 1906, to enable them organise themselves much more effectively.

There were other such cases of economic cooperation such as Mrs MacIvor's family in which three brothers owned adjoining land inherited through their father. Each specialised in particular aspects of farming life, but work and equipment was often shared, including the shearing shed which was conveniently situated close to all their properties.

Cooperation like this was often not possible because of problems of distance and difficulty in communicating rapidly, or unnecessary because paid employees were permanently kept or could be hired on a casual basis. It should be pointed out too, that economic cooperation varied during the life cycle. Help might be required when children were young, but not later. Furthermore, kin might move away to other areas illustrating the fluid and changing nature of kinship relations. Mrs Gilbert's four father's brothers had begun their farming careers along the same rather isolated road. They later moved to another part of New Zealand, leaving their brother and his family without local kin.

As we have seen in Chapter 4, elder sons, and sometimes younger ones, were expected to take over when their father died or retired, thus maintaining a base for kinship networks in the local community. It should be noted that the fathers themselves had not necessarily inherited their farms. It is known that some bought a farm after a

period of wage labouring,³ but given the fact that some of them had been immigrants and pioneers, this is not surprising. They were unlikely to have kin in the neighbourhood.

Although I did not ask routinely about inheritance, three respondents offered information on this subject. There was expectation that sons, or at least one son, would inherit the farm.

Mr Murrow's father had come to New Zealand from the Hebrides with his brothers as young men. In middle-age, they lived and worked close together in a small, farming community. Because of close residence their wives, too, were able to be in regular touch with each other during their working days. Although he had helped with all the hard work of milking, helping mustering and shearing sheep on the mixed farm owned by his father, "any job that was going", Mr Murrow felt rather left out of things.

My eldest brother - you know the Scottish habit of making the eldest the head of the tribe? My father saw that he did everything and knew all. And I was often bypassed. I got the feeling of being second in the family. (Murrow: 5 boys, 1 girl: farmer)

The example clearly shows an expectation on the part of some farmers that the eldest son would inherit, and an obligation on the part of the father to train him accordingly.

Mr Weston was an eldest son destined to take over the family farm, although he was sent to boarding school to complete his education.

WAS THERE AN EXPECTATION ON THE PART OF YOUR FATHER THAT YOU WOULD TAKE OVER THE FAMILY FARM?

Yes, there must have been, because it eventually came that they agreed, the whole family, that I should run it for them all. When my people passed away, we took it over and we called it Weston Brothers [sic] and that included us three boys and my two sisters. I ran it for several years and it has been wound up about six or seven years ago. (Weston: 3 boys, 2 girls: farmer)

The 'several years' was in fact the whole period of his working life. At the time of interview he still farmed in semi-retirement.

Mr Bright was very specific on the matter of occupational inheritance. He had, as a boy, nourished secret dreams of becoming a baker⁴ but had left school at the minimum leaving age to continue working full-time on his father's farm although he was a younger son. His father had bought farm land, a whole valley, for all his four sons having raised a large mortgage in 1918 so that they would all have their farms and their independence. In his first interview, he specifically said that his father didn't want his boys to go out to work and used the same words in a second interview, preceding this by saying his father didn't want 'the boys' to be employed. Mr Bright never

broached the possibility of an alternative career with his father. To do so, would have been unthinkable in view of the mingling of fear, awe and respect he nursed for his father.

Another point to be made is the lack of resistance made by Mr Bright to his patriarchal father. My respondent drew my attention to the quite extreme degree of punishment meted out to himself for what seemed quite trivial offences. One of these was an injury sustained by the young boy playing rugby. He was punished and never allowed to play again because the injury interfered with his farm work.

Mr Bright's father had himself been born and raised in New Zealand. One point to be made here is that long residence (and therefore departure of ancestors from Britain in an earlier stage of economic and social development) may have been influential in the aspirations parents had for their children. Those who came in the earlier years of settlement, with little education themselves may well have held strong traditional values of English individualism (Macfarlane, 1978), and a quite vehement desire to resist the disgrace of proletarianisation. Later arrivals, those valuing education and able to support their children through a long period of dependency, may very well have viewed their children's chances quite differently, considering alternatives for their future.

Kin and Family Businesses

There were continuities between the farmers and urban middle class families, especially among those whose lives were tied up with family businesses. Strong structural links between males were observed. These were often of a hierarchical nature demonstrating the clear dominance of fathers over their adult sons.

Mr Rowland's family owned a small family engineering business in which several of his father's brothers were involved. Since there was a well established family business some of the men of Mr Rowland's kin network saw a great deal of each other during the course of their working day. Relationships were not necessarily cordial, especially where the question of payment came up.

YOU SAID THE WORKING CONDITIONS IN THE WORKS WERE BAD?
Yes, father was poorly paid. Grandfather never paid any of his sons more than five pounds a week. He reckoned that was enough for them. (Rowland: 2 boys: engineer)

The amount of payment is an indication of the nature of the blood relationship. Just as farmers' sons and daughters might not receive any regular payment when working for their fathers, men like Mr Rowland's father would pay their sons poorly but employees at ordinary rates, or even liberally.

In fact, Mr Rowland said that father was the first employer in New Zealand to pay apprentices.

When his grandfather died, he left shares in the business to the family but the sons got more than the daughters.

DID THE GIRLS GET ANYTHING IN HIS LIFETIME?

Oh, yes. They all took advantage of grandfather. He was always forking out. Some of the men too. I had one uncle who had built a house for himself and he built it on his section and part on the bloke next doors'. Then grandfather had to buy the one next door! He was quite soft-hearted in many ways but he was hard on his sons.

And these sons that he paid five pounds a week! Uncle Jack was a chief engineer on ships in England and being paid five hundred pounds a year. Yet his father sends for him to come back at five pounds a week! (Rowland: 2 boys: engineer)

In families like Mr Rowland's a great deal of conflict was caused by the grandfather who was both manipulating and manipulated. He appears to have been successful in engineering the favours of his economically hard-pressed daughters and daughters-in-law by paying bills for clothes, and juggling with the emotions of his sons by changing his will "every six months" towards the end of his life. Tensions ever-present in the family were the reason his mother gave for insisting that Mr Rowland and his brother be employed elsewhere.

Mr Rowland observed that the five adult sons of a farming family his family had personally known in his youth had not received payment. father and mother bought

as incongruent and unwelcome changing norms threatening their power, norms more likely to be abroad as a result of contacts of their children with others (e.g. at school).

It may be that the economic links between adult sons and their fathers in family businesses may have caused considerably more conflict in cities than among farmers because of the helplessness of adult sons trying to provide for families and needing the cash to do so. There were several cases in which one or all brothers clashed with their fathers about going into the family business or leaving it. There were also conflicts between brothers in family owned and operated businesses.

On New Zealand farms at this period, the degree of self-sufficiency was probably high enough (and expectations low enough) to provide for a growing family of marriage in spite of parental manoeuvring. The nature of the work, difficulties in transport or in getting away from the farm may also have served to reduce overt intergenerational conflict. There is also the possibility of alternatives available to sons because of changes in the occupational structure as a result of modernisation (Anderson, 1971: Goode, 1963).

The data presented so far suggests that traditional authority vested in the elders of households linked by both kinship and economic enterprise was limited to males. In fact, two women reported having powerful, interfering

paternal grandmothers who imposed their standards and their wills on their unfortunate descendents. It seems likely that they both held power as widows who managed their husbands' estates. The obligatory Sunday visits to them were remembered as having been unpleasant and rather fearful occasions. Such visits were also mentioned by middle class townspeople who had 'expectations' and were by virtue of this, in no bargaining position in terms of freedom to manage their own affairs independently.

By contrast, one of the women who had a matriarch as paternal grandmother, commented on the warmth and attraction for all the extended family of her maternal grandmother who was the hub of their lives. Indeed, where grandmothers were remembered with love, the impression gained was that this was associated with the absence of ownership or control of private property. In fact, it seems that some grandmothers may have been compensated for their efforts in bringing up a large family, through their position as social 'stars', pivotal kin, attracting younger generations and by doing so, reinforcing links between them all (Firth et al. 1969, 129). There is a clear link here with interests and emotions.

Goody (1976) has pointed out that the possibility of inheritance in the form of future gain, is likely to affect the emotional tone of intergenerational contacts as well as family structures, migration, marriage age and so on.

A study by Greven (1970) is specifically concerned with paternal authority and control in four generations of Massachusetts families around the period 1650 to 1750. Greven shows clearly that there was a high degree of patriarchalism among his landed families not only affecting the sons who inherited land, but also their brothers who became tradesmen. For instance, fathers were able to control their marriage partner and the age at which the sons married. He notes that patriarchalism is still to be found in modern England and Canada, citing Williams' studies of Gosforth and Ashworthy (1956, 1963). Williams' most significant finding was "the length of time which the transference of control takes is broadly a reflection of the degree of patriarchalism within the family: the more authoritarian the father, the longer the son has to wait to become master" (Williams, 1963, 91, quotation cited in Greven, 74).

There are implications here of two kinds of adult status, the first based on marriage, the second on attainment of full adult status as head of household. Other English community studies show unmarried men (and women) lack full adult status in farming families and remain subordinate to their fathers as adults (see, for example, Frankenberg, 1966, 43). The second stage implies an economic independence consequent upon the assumption of control over the family's resources in the means of

production. I suggest that the concept of patriarchal control underlies this now somewhat archaic process.

Goody (1976) has pointed out that the possibility of inheritance, of future gains, is likely to affect the emotional tone of intergenerational contacts as well as family structures, migration, marriage age and so on. The data gathered on inheritance was sketchy since it was felt that the 'children's' knowledge was likely to be incomplete. Nevertheless, there was an impression that where there was a family business in which the respondent's father earned a living, the quality of visiting with grandparents was cool and distant, compared with that of mother's parents with whom the young family enjoyed cordial and happy relationships. Perhaps this goes some way to explaining the high degree of selectivity in relations with kin enjoyed in contemporary society (Firth, 1969) where there are certainly more alternatives open to the sons and daughters of propertied and patriarchal elders (Goode, 1980).

Kinship, Aid and Life Cycle Crisis

Apart from farmers and some urban families involved in their own family businesses, social ties with both kin and neighbours was more a feature of women's lives than men's.

The "fragility and impermanence of most domestic arrangements" was noted by Chaytor in her study of kinship and household in preindustrial society (1980, 29) and by Bradbury for the industrialisation period in Canada (1982). Even at the time of my informants' childhoods, it was not uncommon for a male breadwinner to die, leaving the family without means of support apart from a meagre widows' pension. In such cases, it was likely that help would be asked of, or offered by kin.⁵

Let us first of all consider the reorganisation of the household economy among the seven families whose breadwinner died or deserted when the children were still young. All but two of them took employment.

Two of the mothers had jobs as cleaners, there was one bookbinder, one typist-clerk and a postmistress cum local storekeeper. Although classed on exactly the same basis as men, their market position was not the same as for men in terms of life chances and styles since these women were far less comfortable financially than they would have been had they earned equal pay with men in the same job.

The case described below is a very good example of cooperation between households which fused as a result of the death of a male breadwinner. Here all adult members contributed in an effort to keep alive in times of difficulty. As in the second case, there is good evidence of the sort of interdependence observed among farmers, but in rather different contexts, a village and a city.

Mrs Duckworth's parents were married in Scotland and her father, an engine driver by trade emigrated, later sending for his wife. Since his qualifications were not acceptable to the New Zealand authorities he was obliged to take labouring work. When Mrs Duckworth was only a couple of months old, her father was killed as a result of an explosion in the tunnel which he was excavating. Unable to live on the meagre Government pension, the young mother returned to Scotland. She then re-emigrated with her three sisters. Two of the older sisters found work in the North, one as a school teacher and the other as a shorthand typist, while the rest of the family settled near Wellington. The mother found a job as forewoman dressmaker in a local emporium serving a settlement based on farming and a freezing works.

When her grandparents joined them a couple of years later, the extended family minus the older sisters, moved as a group to a village in Taranaki where the mother had found a job as postmistress and general store keeper. The

parents had to be kept. Grandmother was nearly blind, and grandfather - like the father - was unable to use his qualifications in New Zealand.

In a rural community, however, it was possible for the family to survive through the mother's job, through the tending of a large garden principally by the grandfather, and keeping fowls, a cow and other animals. As a dressmaker, Mrs Duckworth's mother was able to make all the clothes, including coats. She also took orders from the farmers wives, earning extra money this way. In order to do this she had to be away from home for short periods so that the clothes could be fitted and made at the farmers house, a personal service which was common at that time. Her mother's life was hard.

Sometimes Mum was up at five or six o'clock in the morning to get the mail away to the train about half past seven ... She didn't take the mail but we had a chap and he had his horse and gig and he used to take the mail to the station, pick it up and bring it back. That was done every morning. And then, as soon as she got the mail out, she had to go and milk the cows. There was always butter to churn ... (Duckworth: 1 girl: sole charge postmistress, dressmaker)

At harvest time, both the grandfather and young aunt were able to get work on local farms. My informant did not know whether or not they received payment. The Duckworths employed a wide range of skills between them, demonstrating

a flexibility which was not unusual in straightened circumstances. This is the best example of both international and internal migration as a strategy specifically designed to help the other members of the extended family requiring maximum cooperation to survive. In keeping with their situation in a rural community where they were well known by everyone, income obtained through the mother's work in the formal economy was supplemented through labour of other household members in the communal and informal ones. In addition, a high degree of domestic self-provisioning was possible, adding to household wealth.

Another example was that of Mrs Brewster whose father was killed in World War I. Two of her aunts, neither of whom had children, had also lost their husbands around the same time. Together, the three sisters shared breadwinning, housework and eventually set up in business together. In the earliest days, the aunts had adjacent rented houses in the city and kept boarders to support themselves. They also boarded their niece while her mother was employed.

When Mrs Brewster grew old enough to find employment, she was recommended by one of her aunts who found work for her in the same office in which she herself worked. The aunt also trained her to use a book-keeping machine. In comparison with the Duckworth family, this urban one employed far fewer strategies. However, their money-making

activities through the taking-in of lodgers and her mother's judicious buying and selling of houses (the family home), helped them live fairly well.

Two working class women only just survived on their earnings from cleaning homes and offices and from odd bits of mending and darning for other households. One had a brother living with her, a War pensioner, who eventually died of his injuries. The other had been obliged to send her children to an orphanage for a number of years when she was first widowed but was later able to retrieve them.

Upper middle class women were more fortunate in economic terms. For instance, Mrs Chambers' baby brother was taken over by his paternal grandparents when his father died young, while her mother got a job and raised the two girls on her own. This involved her daughters in considerably more housework and cooking than they had been accustomed to previously. On leaving school, my informant took a job in her grandfather's office where she remained until marriage.

The two other bereaved upper middle class women remained dependent on senior male kin. Another had a private income and was able to support herself and her two children in their own home. Her male relatives lived close by, and saw to it that the son had a University education and was introduced to the 'right' people. The other returned to her father's house to act as housekeeper

and housemaid. Her mother independently kept a paid companion who was not engaged in domestic labour.

The death of a male breadwinner was likely to result in rapid downward mobility for widow and children unless substantial help was available. Among the few families able to support widows, class position was maintained at least for the children in the sense of the provision of a good education (two of my respondents in these circumstances went to University) or a 'suitable' job. The widows remained dependent on male relatives, one of them assuming a decidedly menial position in her father's household. There was evidence that this woman resisted attempts to remarry and her situation at home may be interpreted as a sort of punishment for failing to conform with paternal expectations.

What is very clear is that both farming and urban upper middle class families resisted or forbade any attempts on the part of either mothers or daughters to take employment which might involve them in the public sphere. It was not only husbands⁶ who did this, but other kin. In doing so, they themselves, as 'natural guardians' were obliged to provide economic support.

Long-Term Coresidence with Kin

Apart from the above cases, co-residence was not very common among the middle class families during the period of the respondents' childhoods. Only two farmers had co-resident kin, both of them young women who were 'governesses' to their nieces. There were two cases in which there was a widowed mother's mother actually living in the house for a long period, and another two in which mother's sister moved in to help in a time of crisis.

Among the working class there were three cases of grandparents living with the family for extended periods, three for a shorter time and four cases where a young relative, usually a cousin, boarded with the family.

It seems then, that at least on the evidence that we have about the sample families, that extended family households were not common in New Zealand at this period. Indeed, given the very large family size in the generation of my respondents' parents, we would expect a low level of co-residence of grandparents since they would have had several households from which to choose (indeed, one poverty-stricken, peripatetic grandmother and her daughter in fact shifted from household to household, as her adult children lost their patience with her). What evidence there is suggests that grandparents might take up residence in cases where they could not support themselves adequately (see Laslett, 1979).

Research more clearly focussed on relationships between households linked by kinship in New Zealand may well support this finding. Independence of the aged was valued in English preindustrial society. What evidence there is suggests that it was only when it was not possible for them to retain a separate household that aging were obliged to move into the household of one of their adult children (Laslett, 1979). It is not without significance that several of my working class respondents lived with parents immediately after their marriage (see also Strathern, 1981, 118-20).

Intergenerational Aid without Coresidence

There was not much evidence of intergenerational aid without coresidence. However, the case of the Rowlands whose kinship relationships involving a family business, appeared above illustrates the degree of family loyalty noted among many families, whether or not it was actually possible for them to keep in touch with each other. Mr Rowland's mother's mother living in the next street received substantial care from her daughter. This case was unusual because the grandmother had become disabled as a young woman and required assistance into advanced old age. The daughter was then obliged to leave her employment as an apprentice dressmaker and keep her many brothers and

sisters, and her mother who was paralysed and unable to speak. During the thirty years in which Mr Rowland's mother cared for her mother, she married.

...After they had been here [in New Zealand] a few years, my mother - who was then about fifteen was learning dressmaking. My grandmother had a stroke. She was left completely paralysed, unable to speak and an invalid. My mother had to leave her dressmaking at sixteen, bring up her half-brothers, of which there was a family of five and the youngest of which was a baby of five months. She had to do all the housework, all the cooking, make all the clothes for the family, bring up the baby and look after her invalid mother - at sixteen! It was just expected of her.

I THINK MAY BE IT WAS EXPECTED IN THOSE DAYS ... THAT IF YOU HAD A RELATIVE WHO WAS SICK IT WAS THE FAMILY WHO LOOKED AFTER THEM ...

Yes, that's right ... For as long as I can remember she looked after her mother even though she wasn't living with her. We lived in Aubyn Street and her mother lived in Creswick Terrace which is not very far away. Well, even after she was married ... and she didn't marry until late in life because of this responsibility for her family. I always got the impression she had turned down somebody she really liked because of it ... I can remember, even though they had a sort of housekeeper-maid, she was still up and down all the time to her mother. Making clothes for her mother. She taught her mother to knit by the Shetland Island way, where they had a pocket in their stays and they hook a needle in there ... she could use one arm. She used to make baby clothes, Granny. I think she made baby clothes for nearly every baby in Wellington. But she was paralysed for over fifty years. She lived to be over eighty. (Rowland: 2 boys: engineer)

This is a good example of what it meant to be an elder daughter around the turn of the century.

There were no neighbours coming in to help. Mr Rowland specifically said in response to a question on neighbourhood relationships, "I don't remember much of that. You were terribly self-reliant. They were in those days, that generation." Self-reliant, middle class women certainly were, but where help was needed female extended family members could apparently be called upon for substantial aid and over long periods, women's work.

None of the middle class respondents mentioned day-to-day mutual aid between kin with the exception of widows and the few ever involved in the care of dependent aged relatives. Among the working-class, however, this was quite important to the rare families who had kin living close to them. In two cases adult siblings (sisters) were important sources of help either on a day-to-day basis or when needed. In another nine of the thirty-one cases, intergenerational aid was given, often in connection with confinement. One woman had her mother-in-law deliver her child. There was a doctor in the area but he doesn't appear to have been called in (Chamberlain & Richardson, 1983).

Working-Class Families

As a result of residential mobility, there were rather few cases of working class families whose day-to-day instrumental activities involved cooperation with kin. The case I have chosen to illustrate kinship behaviour among the stable working class is in many ways similar to that of the Rowlands, showing strong interdependence, mutual aid and continuity through generations. In the working class example, however, the father was a German migrant, originally a seaman, a bit of a jack-of-all trades, often away from home on 'business', interned during the First World War, highly sociable, with many friends, and the very antithesis of the Scottish patriarch of the Rowland 'clan'. Very little was known about his origins, except that he had been one of ten children.

My respondent, a Mrs Paulich, was the grandchild of a skilled craftsman, a "cultured, educated Irishman" who served as a scribe for illiterate members of the Irish community in his spare time. At his death, his wife (the respondent's mother's mother) came to live with them. As with the Rowlands, the daughter was the eldest of five children. Her stay with the family attracted visits from two mother's sisters who had both married Scandinavians and lived in Foxton, some fifty miles from Wellington. They had

moved there on marriage because their husbands worked there. The sisters were nevertheless very close.

My mother being the eldest, they always seemed to turn to her for aid when they needed it. For a loan, money - she would always give it, always. But she was first in the family and when her father died she took over. She was more like the head of the family than the mother was.

DO YOU THINK THAT WAS COMMON? THAT THE ELDEST CHILD WOULD TAKE OVER WHEN THE FATHER DIED?

... my mother just seemed to take over. But then she married my father when she was just eighteen and he was twenty-seven. Then, of course, the war came and my grandmother, she had to look after us. (Paulich: 2 boys, 1 girl: physical training instructor)

The father's German nationality and his internment meant the family lost its main means of economic support and attracted a good deal of ill-feeling towards the family despite their previous high status in the community. However, the mother found a job with friends who had a small hotel and was able to bring home food in addition to her pay. This is another good example of the way in which the family economy can be observed spilling over into other units, where interdependence between generations of adults replaces a previously non-economic relationship. It also illustrates the means by which jobs were found and something of the general insecurity of workers whose skills were not in demand. The case is also an outstanding example of a

dominant working class mother whose abilities and skills held her immediate and extended family together.

Unlike the Rowlands, only small numbers of kin were involved. These relationships were warm and close. This working class family was also tightly knit into the neighbourhood, though the neighbourhood changed on several occasions in keeping with family crisis such as the father's internment. Like many other working-class men, Mrs Paulich's father had moved far as a young man seeking work, employed as a seaman, later a physical culture expert and in his declining years, as a wharf labourer. It should be noted that the extended family was scattered because of the necessity of finding work wherever it was available. Total curtailment of relationship with father's kin were also characteristic of many of the working class people in the sample whose family of origin and kinfolk were left behind in other countries or in distant parts of New Zealand.

The importance of kin among those separated by long distance was partially solved through the fairly common practice of sending one or two children at a time to visit relatives living in other places, especially to farming families. The hosts might be grandparents, or parents' brothers and sisters. It might be adult siblings who had moved to the country on marriage, or who had stayed behind when the rest of the family moved to Wellington. Unlike the middle class, parents were rarely involved in trips of

this nature. For most of the children, it was their only holiday as children. They were fortunate indeed in this respect since many middle class children never had a holiday before reaching adulthood.

The parents of interviewees who had no contacts with kin as a result of migration may well have missed them, either in terms of economic or emotional support, but there is no evidence of this apart from scattered comments about the exchange of letters by sisters and the sending of children for holidays. It is doubtful that such matters would have been discussed with children in any case.

Discussion and Conclusions

As Morgan (1975, 60-1) has pointed out, sociological studies of kinship do not usually address themselves to the link between kinship and economy or to intergenerational conflict. This is partly because most research has been concerned with kinship in urban areas in modern society and the random sampling methods used by most such studies are not likely to yield substantial numbers of adult sons employed by their fathers. Furthermore, contemporary studies use individuals as their units of analysis, which commits researchers to the study of attributes rather than relationships (Morgan 1975, 70-75).

The use of an historical perspective and a more qualitative, anthropological approach suggests the importance of the strength of economic ties in effecting control over adult children's behaviour (Pitt & Macpherson, 1974). Such an approach also reveals some of the ways in which middle class property owners and proprietors exercised their power in order to maintain their class position into the next generation. As Medick and Sabeen have pointed out, families select strategies for advancing the reputation of the house and its members (1984, 15). Households and families related by kinship also seek to protect vulnerable members of the group.

Many of the findings in this Chapter can be explained in terms of the economic structure of New Zealand at this period where the rise of managerial capitalism was slow to take hold compared with the Britain and the United States. We have already discussed the small scale of New Zealand society at this time, the importance of the family farm, the high proportion of persons who were self-employed in farms and family businesses, and the lack of occupational specialisation (Chapter 1: see also Bell, 1962, 39-46). This is exactly the kind of economic structure which would favour a lack of geographical mobility among families owning their own property in the means of production. For many adult sons, a secure economic future and their class

position could be assured by remaining in the same place, ready to take over when their fathers died or retired.

In the first section of this Chapter we saw that farming households were likely to engage in work-related activities with kin providing they lived close enough, and where the help was actually needed. Where this involved intergenerational relationships there was evidence that ownership of private property was associated with patrilocal residence. It was also associated with a high degree of control over the lives of adult sons and their dependents on the part of senior males. The same phenomenon was observed in urban family businesses where the structural importance of father-son links was also strong. Senior males could choose to use their patriarchal power benignly or not.

It has also been pointed out that widows (presumably in control over their husband's estates) may have had this kind of power, using it to make sure their grandchildren maintained the extended family's honour in the community, through correct behaviour. This is an interesting example of the ways in which the meanings attached to gender and age can be negotiated to suit the economic circumstances. Generation may well have taken preference over gender in situations like this.

Deference to patriarchs was quite evident in many cases. It took the form of unquestioned obedience to their wishes. It was clearly evident in the very high degree of

control, in the question of payment and the subsumption of young and adult men as well as others to the will of the eldest male who owned the means of production whether or not they were coresident. These elder males made plain their power while their subordinates generally acquiesced in their own oppression. Their power did not stop at the social boundaries defined by their own particular definitions of kin influence, but extended into the community where they were involved as elders of the Church and sometimes in local government as well. Evidence of this will be presented in Chapter 8.

For upper middle class women who lost their 'natural protectors' in the shape of their husbands, patriarchs may well have taken over the reins of guardianship. As we have seen, one of them was resubsumed in her father's household, virtually a servant. I suspect that others took advantage of the somewhat limited opportunities in employment open to women so as to remain free of such a degrading relationship, despite the gross economic problems they faced relative to their previous position as middle class wives.

Not all middle class families owned their own businesses of course. Nevertheless, few could be described as spiralists', depending on career promotion through geographical mobility as they moved up their firm's hierarchy. The absence of spiralism in New Zealand in the

first couple of decades of the century is understandable in the light of the stage of industrial development.

Most middle (and upper middle) class respondents had some kin living close to them (see also Chapter 8). Most of my middle class respondents themselves had considerable financial help from their parents. Apart from inheritance, there was the buying of a house, or a section on which to build a house, or some other considerable gift at the time of marriage. None of the working class respondents reported anything of the sort.

Seen in terms of the general process of industrialisation as proposed by Goode (1963, 1980) and Harris (1983), the New Zealand capitalist economy was insufficiently developed for widespread social change to have taken place for a large section of the middle class. As expected, and in general, family connections were still important in economic life, family loyalty came before self-interest and the rights of the individual (even among male heads of household) were subordinated to those of elders. Patriarchal control was still in operation, and it was associated with ownership in the means of production.

This does not mean to say that some change had not taken place. Not all male property-owners exercised patriarchal control, and not all adult sons (or their wives for that matter) were prepared to acquiesce in subordination to patriarchs. Other occupational opportunities were

available for men in the expanding economy, occupations which did not necessarily require high qualifications and which were open to men who had been to secondary school.

Women who had experienced the indignity of their own and their husband's position as the recipients of patriarchal authority may well have been influential in loosening the economic ties with kin. Although Mr Rowland's father was considered 'the boss' in his childhood home, his mother insisted that her boys work elsewhere as adults, specifically to remove them from the family rows and manipulations she perceived as the cause of much unhappiness. Power was not necessarily unilateral in many cases for masculinism brought with it an obligation on the part of husbands to listen to their wives, at least (see Chapter 10).

Residential mobility has been shown to be important in determining the nature of kinship ties among the working class in contemporary Britain (Allen, 1979: Goldthorpe & Lockwood, 1969). A comparison with the highly active and solidary relations associated with 'traditional' working class communities such as Bethnal Green (Young & Willmott, 1957: Townsend, 1963) with Goldthorpe and Lockwood's privatised affluent workers (1969) makes this clear.

My New Zealand working class sample were extraordinarily lacking in effective kin. Perhaps, this is a function of the sampling procedure, since so many of

working class respondents lived in a rapidly developing industrial suburbs, attracting workers from all over New Zealand and some from Britain. As we have seen, only a few of my working class families had ties with kin of an economic or affective nature. Nevertheless it should be pointed out that the minimal contacts between kin in working class families was replaced by neighbourhood reciprocities involving day to day mutual aid, emotional support, help with finding jobs and other functions otherwise associated with kinship. In no way could most of them be said to be 'privatised'.

On the basis of what evidence is available, it does not seem that workers were necessarily employed on the basis of special skills when they were first taken on in their manual labouring jobs. Indeed, the nature of most of my respondents' fathers' factory work suggested minimal job differentiation. Tradesmen, too, often seem to have tackled a wide range of work over and above their special skills.

In Chapter 2, I argued that the type of industry, and the level of industrialisation was important in determining the kind of values associated with family and economy (Harris, 1983). We would expect that the fit between work skills, job demands and values would depend on the degree of industrialisation reached (Harris, 1983, Goode, 1963, 1980). As we have seen, old values were indeed associated with those owning their own farms and small businesses. They

were also associated with men in minimally differentiated work, although kin were unlikely to be involved with them. Possibly the reason why so many of my working class respondents' families moved, was not so much that there was skilled work for suitably skilled workers, but that there were relatively secure jobs in that part of the country.

The New Zealand data on kinship indicate quite clearly that modernisation did have the effect of differentiating kinship and economic life among men who no longer shared occupational concerns and material interests as members of a kinship group. As we shall see later, there was evidence of the sharing of religious, political and recreational activity among those who owned their own means of production, another demonstration of the validity of Parsons' relative structural isolation thesis, especially in its less known detail (see Chapter 2).

However, women's economic and material activities as gendered beings, as wives, mothers and daughters continued to provide them with a common basis of work and life experience which has not been lost in the passage of time even although geographic mobility, as a result of their husband's career strategies, may result in their being torn from female kin.

My data suggest that during the period of investigation it was probably not uncommon for households related by kinship to join forces in the event of the death

of the male breadwinner making it possible for the widow(s) to continue to rear their children themselves in spite of the totally inadequate Widow's Pension. The alternative was an orphanage.

There was also evidence of the substantial aid given by women to dependent relatives, sometimes over a very considerable period of time. This involved a great deal of extra labour in some cases. Sometimes it also involved substantial financial sacrifice on the part of both men and single women obliged to keep aged or sick relatives unable to take paid work.

Morgan points out in his critique of contemporary approaches to the study of kinship,

Kinship ties are not seen as abstract lines on some genealogical chart but actual living relationships established and developed, elaborated over time and sustained through constant use. (Morgan, 1975, 79, *italics in original*)

The findings indicate quite clearly (as do those of modern studies) that it is use rather than the significance or ideological components of kinship, which ought to receive more of our attention. Examination of kinship behaviour seen in terms of the material aspects of life, indicate not so much any single system, but as number of broad

overlapping forms of kinship behaviour based on abilities for manoeuvring economic opportunities and constraints.

The concept of kinship 'in use', indicates clear differences between men and women in terms of both interest and emotion (Medick & Sabeau, 1984, 9-27). That kind of traditional authority which Laslett has called 'patriarchalism' appears to have existed in New Zealand among property-owning groups and had considerable effect on the quality of relationships between men and their sons. Another kind of bond can be seen in the strength of the structural links between middle class father-adult sons as a result of property ownership and future expectations.

It seems clear that urbanisation, geographic mobility, together with increasing proletarianisation and occupational differentiation in New Zealand had the effect of distancing men related by kinship, especially fathers and sons. Lacking a common occupational base, the salience of their relationship based in material life, also affected its emotional content.

The strength of mother-daughter ties among the stable working class in contemporary society has been observed by several writers (Adams, 1968: Young & Willmott, 1957). This seemed to hold in some of my middle class families too. Under conditions where occupational demands require residential mobility, any desire that adult women may have to remain in close contact with their mothers is likely to

be a secondary priority to earning a living. Let us consider the situation of my respondents today, compared with that of their mothers during the early decades of the twentieth century.

While there was little evidence of strong adult daughter contacts with their mothers during the childhood of my working class respondents, many of the women indicated that they themselves, their sisters and their own daughters had been able to retain close ties with their children. In fact, there were many times that interviews with women were interrupted with visits or telephone calls from daughters. Sometimes contact with the respondent was made through her daughter who was living a few minutes walk away from her mother. It was possible for close ties to be retained since work was available for daughters' husbands locally. Without this economic stability, there would have been no kinship in 'use' for my aging respondents. Nor would there have been any kinship in use without the commitment of their daughters to their mother's welfare. In this sense, women's economic dependency on men is a product of the dependency of others.⁶

The situation seems to have been different among my middle class female respondents who were less likely to have had daughters living close to them. This can probably be accounted for in terms of increased bureaucratisation and the consequent increase in spiralism. Husbands' careers and desires for promotion would have required residential

mobility, creating a physical break between mothers and adult daughters. The interesting question is the degree to which choice was available and what constituted 'choice' for either husbands and wives in this situation. To what degree is residential mobility taken-for-granted as part of a life-cycle strategy in contemporary times, by husbands, by wives or, for that matter, by the parents of both?

It may be said too, that residential mobility in contemporary times in New Zealand as elsewhere in Western industrial societies, does not have the same implications as it did in the past. Rising affluence, the car, the telephone, and statutory holidays have created conditions favouring 'quality' time with relatives, whereas economic conditions and the rise of the Welfare State has modified the need for some forms of aid which were once provided by kin.

At the same time, demographic conditions in the late twentieth century are placing considerable strain on public resources giving rise to insistent political demands to return care of elderly and other dependent relatives 'to the community', that is in effect, to middle-aged women (see e.g. Finch & Groves, 1980: Ungerson, 1985). This raises a bewildering variety of problems associated with social change. What is very clear, however, is that many of the economic functions of kinship which have been illustrated in this Chapter have declined, at the same time, changing the

meaning and sentiments involved in intergenerational relations. Firth writes about this aspect of kinship in terms of 'selectivity' while Goode writes about 'ascriptive friends'. One of the more positive features of contemporary life for men, women and children, is their relative ability to choose their friends some of whom may be kin.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Comprehensive reviews are contained in Allen (1981) and in Morgan (1979). Writers on the family in New Zealand generally assume that overseas empirical findings are generalisable to New Zealand. What limited survey data as is available (Gilson, 1969) would suggest that the assumption is a reasonable one.

² 'Effective' kin are all living members of a kin universe of a particular household with whom social contact is maintained during a specific time period either through face-to-face interaction, by telephone or correspondence. 'Intimate' or 'core' kin are those with whom intense contact is maintained. This is likely to consist only of parents, siblings and children of adult egos. 'Nominal kin' are those of whom the individual is simply aware (Firth & Djamour, 1956, 45).

³ In one case, a suitor for the hand of a farmer's daughter worked for her father for seven years during which time he acquired enough knowledge and money to run, stock and buy his own one. Proving his worth was a condition of his future wife's parents' approval since he had originally arrived in New Zealand totally unprepared for pioneering life and had appeared at the time as a gentlemanly adventurer. On marriage, the young couple bought a farm far away from her parents, established a family of eleven children and do not appear to have visited, or been visited by them.

⁴ Mr Bright's youthful aspirations are still apparent. He provided me with an afternoon tea which included breads,

biscuits and cakes in different varieties, all baked by himself although he lives alone.

⁵ There was also one case of a mother dying when her children were young. The farmer father did virtually all the housework and childrearing work until he was able to find a housekeeper a year later. They subsequently married.

⁶ One respondent, who was old enough to have been a mother for the youngest respondent, told me that she had found herself her first job in a department store as a young married woman. They were living in lodgings at the time and there was no housework, or indeed anything for her to do. When she told her husband, he was horrified and insisted that she change her mind. He said that his bank would not allow their employees' wives to be employed and that he would lose his job if she persisted. Whether or not this was true is beside the point. It was certainly effective, and she lost her only chance to contribute to any household fund.

⁷ Spiralism is associated with professional employment and the career opportunities open to bureaucrats. It is "the progressive ascent of specialists ... through a series of higher positions in one or more hierarchical structures with a concomitant residential mobility through a number of communities" (Watson, 1964, 147, quoted in Edgell, 1980, 1).

⁸ I am deeply indebted to Dr Patricia Tulloch for this insight and for personal correspondence on the subject of public and private dependency of women in contemporary society. See also her article on this topic in Broom, D. (ed.) *Unfinished Business*, 19-37 and also the comment by Cass who believes that "without historical evidence, we can only describe women's economic dependency at an abstract level of categorical theorising, but we cannot explain its causes, the particular form it take, its maintenance, or the meanings attached to it" (Cass, in Broom, 1984, 40).

CHAPTER 8

COMMUNITY, SOCIABILITY AND LEISURE

The purpose of this Chapter, like that of Chapter 7 is to link households and families with the communities of which they were a part. This will be done by describing and analysing the sociability and leisure patterns of the couples involved. In general, these reflected their work as 'husbands' and 'wives', appropriate to their class position, to socially constructed notions of behaviour for men and women based on patriarchal or masculinist ideology and to claims for status. This Chapter paves the way for an investigation of power relationships between husbands and wives, and parents and children in Chapter 9.

Definitions of Leisure

The problem of trying to distinguish work and leisure has been noted by many writers (Parker, 1983, 1-21). The most recent trend in this area is to conceptualise leisure as a set of activities through which social relations of domination and subordination are acted out (Jones, 1977). Veblen's classic work is useful in that his concept of leisure falls squarely in the realm of political economy.

Veblen made a clear distinction between non-productively used time and the ability, the resources or power to enjoy leisure which may also require money. For Veblen, both housework and domestic work are productive in the sense of being 'motivated and characterised by the welfare of the group', in his words, by serviceability or workmanship (Edgell, 1980, 74-5). 'Leisure' in the sense in which it is conceptualised here is activity

which occurs only in the absence of direct obligations - be they obligations of work, family, religion or society. Leisure in this view is free activity which the individual engages in for his [or her] own purposes, whatever these may be. This leisure implies some degree of choice - a choice which may well be affected indirectly by social determinants but is made basically by autonomous individuals free from the long arm of traditional authority (Marrus, 1974, 4).

In this sense, leisure has had a relatively short history for all but the nobility, the gentry and the emerging bourgeoisie of nineteenth century England.

The concept of leisure assumes not only material sufficiency but also a quality of social life in which there is a relative absence of pressure to be involved with other people in discharging the mutual obligations of extended kinship or community. Like Marrus, Bailey (1978) writing of England, also comments on the qualitative differences in use of 'free' time in comparing

pre-industrial and modern society. In pre-industrial society

the daily round was seasoned with a good deal of complementary sociability ... With little discrimination between generation or sex the people made their own amusement...popular leisure was public and gregarious, and both its great and small occasions was heavily bound by the prescriptive ties of communal custom reinforced by a powerful oral tradition (Bailey, 1978, 2)

Sociability is characteristic of a non-industrial work situation. It may take the form of 'leisure-in-work' in which agricultural labourers enjoy a break from the shearing or celebrate the harvest with their families (Parker, 1971, 20-32). It may take the form of the sharing of recipes and confidences over the back fence, or the heady gossip of the parish exchanged at afternoon tea in which the business of keeping one's daughters virtuous and one's sons hardworking might occupy the ladies present. Sociability is the means by which people create, maintain and reinforce their patterns of collective social life, their shared meanings. It may be associated with work, in the sense of the means of economic survival; it is most importantly associated with non work, with social relationships within the family, with ties of kinship and community. Life without sociability is life without community.

In previous Chapters, the importance of the material base of society in determining class and gender differentiated productive and reproductive activities has been emphasised. Sociability and leisure are associated with the same kinds of social relations within the household, between households and in the formal economy.

In considering the emergence of leisure, we must take into account the nature of social networks in which the families were involved. These created different kinds of obligations for family members in relation to other individuals and groups. Within the family itself, too (as opposed to the household), rights and obligations associated with being a father, mother or child created constraints on the use of time and on the spending of money.

We would expect to find that families most likely to employ patriarchal forms of control to differ in the use of time and money from other families. We would also expect that the separation of home and family from employment to be associated with masculinism. A breadwinner's employment creates clear separation between work time and his 'own' time. Employment is also the source of a wage, paid to an individual. We must therefore consider how different kinds of families relying on wages differed from those owning their own means of production in regard to the use of 'own' time and 'own' money, the rewards of paid wage labour.

Rural Sociability and Leisure

The essential qualities which distinguish the sociable activities of farming families from all others is the sharing of tasks directed towards commodity production, the sharing of leisure and the strength of their community ties. The farming communities described by my respondents, whether from the point of view of farming or other rural families, appeared to be highly cohesive.

Most of the parents came from old farming stock, the kind of origins most likely to be associated with patriarchal forms of control and values of thrift and hard work deriving from the English yeoman household. As we saw in Chapter 5, self-sufficiency was important to survival, achieved through interdependence in work. In Chapter 7, we noted that those who could do so, cooperated with kin in neighbouring farms. It was the farmers who had settled in areas in which they themselves had been raised that were the most interesting in this respect.

There were basically three types of farmers, including the type whose household economy and family relationships had more in common with upper middle class urban ones than any of the others. They will be excluded from the analysis altogether since to all intents and purposes their leisure patterns were similar to those of the urban upper middle class.

The other two, both family farmer types can be distinguished on the basis of their life styles and their status in the community. The first type struggled hard to make a living and were most likely residing in a fairly isolated area in which either they or their parents had pioneered. These families had larger families on average than other farmers. Apart from the community activities common to all farmers, they had little recreation. Life was work, although children were free to play when their chores were done.

The second type of whom there were four families, were more prosperous than the first. All had come from pioneering farming forebears who had settled in the district. In three cases, there were grandparents with whom visits were regularly exchanged and usually also a large extended family well settled and prospering in the district. These families had achieved a considerable measure of prosperity, and some were able to hire employees, at least for some of the time. Single employees lived as family and ate at the same table, that is, social distance was not observed. These families were also treated separately when discussing their kinship activities (Chapter 7). Let us now consider some of the sociability patterns experienced by farmers and rural dwellers general to my sample.

Community Life in Rural Area

Something of the quality of interaction with kin has already been discussed. For those whose farms were isolated, most of the families had relatives whom they were able to visit, perhaps for a holiday if there was some child old enough to take over the farm or have relatives to stay with them if there was room. Others managed a visit from time to time by horse and buggy when variations in the flow of work allowed.

There were also the visits of the Minister or the trips to Church that could be managed when there was no urgent work on the farm, or some people could be spared. There were the School and Sunday School picnics and the community dances to which everyone went, even babies.

Picnics with relatives, and community picnics, were remembered by all the rural dwellers. These, like the holidays involved a great deal of preparation and effort which had to be squeezed into the already busy domestic workload.

It was a big event to be going for a picnic. Yes, we used to have picnics. We would either go up to the domain or drive down to the bush or somewhere, but poor parents [sic] who seemed to have to cook for days to provide the food for it ... you know, it seemed to take about a week to prepare for anything in those days because there was so much preparation (Murdoch: 8 boys, 5 girls: farmer)

This informant then went on to describe the job of ironing the clothes for picnics, complaining that her brothers never did this, for outings or at any other time.

Many respondents showed photographs of picnics with relatives, friends and neighbours, everyone dressed in their 'Sunday best', with hampers of food and a variety of gigs and buggies and horses in evidence. Picnics were days in which the whole family's reputation was at stake so that their appearance must be beyond reproach. Furthermore, the domestic skills of women were also on display, occasion for comment and evaluation by others.

The following extract comes from an interview with a woman who spent her childhood in a close-knit rural community and who gave a lively account of the social life there.

WHAT SORT OF THINGS DID YOUR FAMILY DO TOGETHER? WHAT ABOUT CHURCH?...

Yes. I went to Sunday School which was just across the road from us 'cos there was no Presbyterian Church and we used to have a Band of Hope... There wasn't, "You're a Presbyterian, You're a Methodist, You're a Catholic", sort of thing. It was all in together. Then once a year there was what they called the Settlers' Ball and everybody went to that. It used to be funny, because there were no motor cars and you always knew when the Settlers' Ball was on, or anything big on in the hall, because the farmers would get up early to get the milk to the factory, go home and the carts would be all scrubbed. You could see your face in the milk carts. And they put sacks on them. And everybody was going to the Ball in all their finery in the milk cart [laughter]. It used to be quite an entertainment. And then after the Ball - everyone

supplied something - the farmers provided pigs and turkeys, ducks, geese, whatever there was - the next day the children at school were all given a party. We went over and there were sandwiches and cakes, jellies and whatever was left over.

BUT YOU WOULDN'T GO TO THE BALL?

No, we weren't allowed to go to the Ball.

WERE YOU EVER TAKEN TO DANCES?

... on the Saturday night, they had what was called the Scrap Dance [immediately after the Settlers' Ball]. All the kids went to that. All the children in the community went to that. Sometimes it was a fancy dress dance and you all got dressed up. And that was from seven till nine. We danced, and we did the Schottische and the Lancers and the Waltzes and all the dances that were danced in that day, we danced. We could all dance from the youngest to the oldest. Even the three year olds used to get up and dance.

THEY'D TAKE THE WHOLE FAMILY!

That's right. And when they took the babies, the babies would be bedded down in the supper room perhaps, then as the older children dropped out they were bedded down too, and they'd be home about midnight in time for milking the next morning. (Duckworth: 1 girl: sole charge postmistress and dressmaker)

Some families danced all night arriving home in time for the milking. Others had dances in the company of neighbours in their own homes. Despite isolation and bad roads and shortage of money there were for most, occasions when everyone enjoyed themselves.

Three things should be noted about this long quotation. First of all, the children in this community did not go to the Settlers' Ball. Most respondents from farms did go to all the dances and any other community social events. The second point is that entertainment meant work

for everyone, for all to enjoy. It also meant the pooling of food produced by participants, not the cost of one's tickets. Thirdly, these communities were notable for the absence of class or religious divisions.

Because of their smallness and because of the economic and social needs, it was essential not only to bury potential divisions, but also to utilise people's talents to the full. For instance, the father of one of my informants was the manager of dairy factory (actually a one-man operation illustrating the smallness of scale involved).

The dairy factory manager was an elder of the local church, worked on the school committee, acted as postman exchanging parcels for outlying farmers with sacks of swedes or potatoes for the family. He had a seasonal job as a farm labourer for one of his neighbours during the dry season, and worked as a sort of handyman, soldering milk cans free of charge when he could spare the time, good examples of work within the informal and communal economies which are only possible in the presence of well developed social networks where interpersonal trust is earned through face-to-face contact (Morris, 1985).

The family home seems to have been a centre for sociability like others close to the local church. Neighbours and friends, fellow churchgoers, would gather there after church to have tea and chat and would sometimes sing hymns together. Here, as elsewhere, everyone went to

the local dances and School and Sunday School picnics, including the babies. Even those who actively disapproved of dancing, would go to chat and meet kin and neighbours.

In some communities there was no physical meeting place. Before there was a church or community hall, families would open up their own homes to the whole neighbourhood to gather for worship or to have a social evening. The gifting of land and materials, and the building of halls for community use were commented on by some respondents. As they said, people made their own 'leisure' in those days and in doing so, created community.

There was a strong ethic of helpfulness to others. Farmers who had no kin living close to them would help each other at harvest time and lambing. When a woman was ill, neighbours would send cooked food to help out. Among my respondents there were cases of both fathers and mothers helping in cases of sickness where there was no doctor but where someone had special skills or knowledge needed in another family. It also seems to have been not uncommon for older women to be approached to help with special problems associated with young babies or for doctors to refer young women with ailing babies to such women. Their long experience as mothers of large families made them respected members of the community, filling a place now held by professionals.

The lifestyle of family farmers at the top end of the socioeconomic ladder was subtly different although they too participated in the community life described above.

Social life among these families was rich, especially in visiting with relatives. Like the other farmers, they also attended Church - sometimes as an extended family - and they also were able to spend holidays both with each other and elsewhere. They went to balls and they were sometimes members of Clubs if they lived close enough to town. They were also less isolated than other farmers, having settled in areas opened up by their near ancestors and stayed there.

Not surprisingly they were also heavily involved in organising community affairs. The men were likely to be involved in local politics as County Councillors, on the Hospital Board, the School Committee while some of the women organised fund raising and helped support the Church (and husband) in various ways. Voluntary work was not charity work in rural New Zealand. It involved giving one's labour not to 'the poor' but in building and reinforcing community.

There were several cases in which regular family visiting was carried on among related families, sometimes centred on a surviving matriarch or patriarch. Sunday appears to have been a day of family worship followed by a mid-day communal dinner.

WHAT ABOUT FAMILY GATHERINGS WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY? ... EXTENDED FAMILY?...

Grandfather ... they all [grandfather's brothers] had farms, but grandfather, he had a cottage in town ... It wasn't a very elaborate place at all. There was a shed where they could stable their horses and they'd come in particularly at Church time, and we'd all arrive there at the cottage with food. (MacIvor: 1 boy, 2 girls: farmer)

These burgess' families and others like them appear to have been very influential locally, involved in politics and the local church. In their kinship and community relationships they closely resembled the English burgesses first identified by Watson (1964: Bell, 1968: see also Frankenberg, 1966). The farmers also had much in common with urban families involved in family businesses as far as their visiting patterns were concerned and in their mutual interests in inheritance and common occupation.

Adult women worked hard not only in domestic self-provisioning, but they also assisted their husbands in acquiring status. The case presented immediately below is taken from an interview with a respondent who did not belong to this category of rural burgesses, but who came from an area where their extended kinship network was extensive. All the men were brothers who had migrated as adults. They were nevertheless quite prosperous by the early 1920s.

DO YOU REMEMBER YOUR MOTHER HAVING WHAT SHE WOULD HAVE REGARDED AS A HOBBY?

No, I don't ... she was a very keen knitter but apart from her work ... she was an excellent cook ... all the old men tell you [that] about their mothers ... But I can't say she had any particular hobbies that way.

WAS YOUR MOTHER INVOLVED IN THE CHURCH ORGANISATIONS?

Yes. She would back my father up in those things, you see.

DID THEY HAVE A WOMEN'S GUILD OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT?

No, I don't think so. I don't remember anything like that. Except that they had meetings, what they called Tea Meetings, an old Methodist institution and she always helped with those. It would be a question of cooking and providing ...

WAS THAT A FUND RAISING THING OR ...?

Oh, yes, it could be or an occasion when some special preacher came along.

I DON'T SUPPOSE THERE WOULD BE A PLUNKET OR ANYTHING?

There would be Bible Society Meetings. Various Maori missionary groups that collected funds for those things. Salvation Army used to come round [inaudible].

THEY STAYED WITH YOU TOO?

Yes. Such tales as they could tell.

HOW WAS THE LOCAL CHURCH ADMINISTERED?

My father was one of the trustees. Administered from this P ... place, I think.

SO HE WOULD BE QUITE A BIG MAN IN THE LOCAL CHURCH?

Oh, yes. He gave a half acre section, quite close to the farm, and he donated it so that the Church could build on that section. (Morrow: 5 boys, 1 girl: farmer)

This case illustrates very well how women's time was taken up in assisting their husbands in the community, and how men were economically involved in the establishment of settlements. It was apparently expected of both that they should serve in this way, standards imposed by the local

community, and not only in rural areas for this sort of behaviour was observed in towns among the middle class and socially aspiring lower middle class. Community service was a badge of respectability. What is more, it seems that there was an obligation to give of one's services, to be seen attending local social gatherings. Somerset comments on the obligatory nature of rural communal life in New Zealand of the 1930s (Somerset, 1974).

It was quite clear that women were expected to contribute to community life in quite specific ways which were extensions of their housewifely duties. For instance, Mr Murrow told me that his mother regularly lodged speakers for the Church. He specifically said that he did know how his mother put up with it. Other mothers ran youth clubs, sang in the choir, produced goods for bazaars, and other kinds of social solidarity work. Others again enhanced their own and their husbands' status in the community by giving and attending competitive tea parties designed to display feats of baking and hostessing skills. Questions about status will be raised later in this Chapter and in Chapter 9.

Urban Families

There was an almost bewildering variety of patterns involving sociability and leisure amongst urban families. It is helpful to categorise them according to sociability and leisure which was primarily

(1) home-based not associated with earning the means of subsistence, e.g. flower gardening beyond maintenance standards, fancy work, reading, card playing and board games, musical interests

(2) community based, involving primarily service activities. This might include the Lodge, Church-based organisational duties and choir practice, voluntary work for Church

(3) interest based, which took place outside the home and involving sports (as spectator, participant or organiser), interest organisations (political or professional), concerts, cinema, dancing and so on.

Going to Church was a regular Sunday event for virtually all the business and lower middle class families unless prevented from doing so by distance. The upper middle class were less likely to attend, but like the others, usually did so as family groups. Only one urban working class man attended Church regularly, though about one third of the women did. Virtually all children attended Sunday School (some working class children found multiple

attendance at Sunday School brought special advantages in the handing out of sticky buns or extra picnics).

I am categorising attendance at Church separately since public religious observance *per se* does not constitute service activity, nor is it interest based except in the widest sense. Religious observance is treated in this thesis in terms of social control and traditional authority. Religious doctrine is also a source of stability and change in hierarchical relations in society and in kinship (Gittens, 1985: Hamilton, 1978: Hall, 1979).

Any family may have participated as individuals in all three categories and in attendance at Church. Generally, home-based activities ran the whole gamut of urban families, sometimes as families (see below).

Urban Business and Upper Class

While a comparison of urban upper middle class and business families reveals similarities with those of farmers whose status position was similar, there were also differences. Among the upper middle class, parents enjoyed leisure with each other not shared with their children. There were differences between the urban upper middle class and business families too, in that the latter's non-work activities were likely to be focussed on kinship and Church much as the more prosperous farmers. Here too, were the

Sunday visits, and the involvement of women in enhancing their husbands', perhaps also their kin groups' status in the local community. Let us look at these two types of the non work activities of these families in more detail.

It is among the upper middle class, among the professionals and those men with top jobs in Government or in private bureaucracies that hobbies and individual interests were most obvious. The fathers of these families were better off financially than the others and used their money to create free time through the use of servants and their ability to buy the goods and services which others had to produce themselves.

In the urban situation some fathers were office-bearing members of sports clubs (including national office-bearers), a few actually played in some sport as opposed to watching or organising it. If they gardened at all, it was as a hobby interest. As with the upper bracket of farmers, many of these men read and some had very specific 'modern' interests in science and the arts. Their wives also tended to have some kind of hobby interest, even if she was only, for example, 'a great reader'. Several of them played the piano 'beautifully', a couple practised several hours a day (one till her servants departed) and one also had friends in to play for musical soirees.

The leisure patterns of small proprietors and businessmen's families merged imperceptibly with those of

the upper middle class but they were far more likely to spend a great deal of time gardening and in other aspects of domestic self-provisioning (see below). They were also likely to be heavily involved in sociability with kin where there was a family business and like all the middle class, with Church.

Despite the Rowland's family feuding (see Chapter 7) there was much visiting among their numerous relatives at weekends.

DID YOU SEE [YOUR RELATIVES] A LOT?

Oh, yes. In those days there was a lot of visiting. There wasn't the entertainment, like there was no television or anything. So you went visiting. In our home, when we had the cottages and whares' over there ... there wouldn't be a Sunday go past that we didn't have visitors. Every Sunday. It was the thing to do, you went out visiting and even on a Sunday afternoon, in Wellington you went for walks. And you invariably went for a walk where you visited a relative. (Rowland, 2 boys: engineer)

One of the most obvious differences between middle and working class families was in their Church attendance - or lack of it. On the whole middle class people attended Church regularly as family groups. Their younger children went to Sunday School and other activities organised by the Church, while the older ones went to Bible Class which also had substantial social programmes. Bible Class activities offered opportunities for meeting members of the opposite

sex in highly controlled, respectable settings (see also Burnett, 1982, 252).

Middle class mothers were quite likely to be involved in some way with Church in addition to religious devotions, for instance in organizing or working, making things to sell in forthcoming bazaars. Others served through singing in the choir. The following extract demonstrates something of the flavour of the Church bazaar and of the middle class woman's efforts in supporting it.

DID YOUR MOTHER HAVE ANY SPECIFIC HOBBIES AND INTERESTS OUTSIDE THE HOME?

Yes, she was a fantastic sweet maker. She ran the lolly stall in the Presbyterian Church ... for twenty one years. She made every lolly on that stall. She used to make up two 70lb bags of sugar into sweets and she made everything. Chocolate, liquorice all-sorts, peppermint walking sticks, those dropped almond toffees, coconut ice, every mortal thing. [She got her ingredients through a wholesaler] She had a marble slab for rolling the lollies out on and a proper copper lolly pot for making them in. We used to have to sit and wrap these darned things in paper for the fair, so they didn't stick together.

She was a wonderful sewer ... [she was a dressmaker by trade] ... and knitter. And she could make a piece of four by two timber sprout and grow.
(Rowland: 2 boys: engineer)

This woman was not the only one who gave greatly to the Church through her confectionery making and also entertainment for young people. Another ran separate clubs for boys and girls for about thirty years.

Others were less involved but might meet for a sewing bee in each others' homes with other Churchwomen, or have regular tea parties with other women they knew from Church. Quite common, too, especially among the upper middle class and aspiring lower middle class was the practice of formal afternoon teas with invited friends, invariably addressed as "Mrs". Children were not present. On return from school, they were allowed to greet the guests and were then sent elsewhere.

WHAT ABOUT VISITING?

Yes, she had visiting cards with "first Thursday" written on them. Friends were supposed to come on that day. Fancy waiting for someone and nobody came!

WHAT ABOUT CHILDREN? DID YOU GO WITH HER WHEN SHE WENT VISITING?

No, she went alone. And you had to put down two cards, two for the husband and one for the wife. (Sorrell: 2 boys, 1 girl: company executive)

As in rural communities, a high degree of control appears to have been maintained over women and children among the middle class. This was achieved in the case of the upper middle class through the joint leisure of parents (women did not go into public places alone), through social activities with other members of their own social 'set', through formal tea parties and by limiting the social contacts of children. The sheltered lives of young women whose parents could afford to keep them 'at home' provided

the clearest examples of this kind of control. Among other members of the middle class, social movement appears to have been confined to home, the shops and the Church. The question methods of control will be elaborated in Chapter 9.

Kinship was not only a basis for economic relationships of the proprietorial middle class who owned family businesses, but also formed the core of their social relationships, together with Church activities. Kinship was also an important social base for those members of the upper middle class whose kin lived close to them, making possible tighter control over the physical movement of women and children and over their knowledge base. In the case of the upper middle class, this might also include shared holidays as families.

In summary, although a few upper middle class women had musical and other individual interests, the vast majority of middle class women had no leisure in the sense in which it has been defined at the beginning of this Chapter. Any time left over from the daily round of housework and childrearing duties was likely to be spend extending it in the service of their immediate families, their kin and in the community, imprisoned in a seamless web of service to others and in the production of status.

Apart from the upper class men, there were few fathers who had specific hobbies or interests which could be considered under the heading of leisure. They were engaged

principally in providing for their families, and in enhancing their status in the communities which they headed much in the same way their farming counterparts. Compared with the upper middle class, middle class burgesses' had a distinctively local orientation both in their work and non work activities, pillars of local society. The implications of this will be spelled out after the activities of working and lower middle class couples have been described.

Working and Lower Middle Class

The contrast between the lives of all middle class and working class women is quite nicely demonstrated in relation to Church and relationships with other women. While it was not uncommon for working class women to attend Church and it may have been important to them, *her only comfort*, they were not at all likely to be involved as voluntary workers except in small communities. This may have been because of their much larger families, their lack of money, or their deliberate social exclusion.

Nor did working class women attend afternoon tea parties. Working class women - and those middle class women who lived in minimally differentiated small communities - were likely to enjoy a 'popping-in' arrangement with neighbours, an arrangement in which whole families were likely to join in on weekend evenings or special occasions

to sing and play together. Mr Burton's mother was somewhat self-reliant and kept herself to herself. Nevertheless, the neighbours were still important.

APART FROM MEMBERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD, WHOM DID YOU HAVE THE MOST CONTACT WITH?

Neighbours. You didn't live in your neighbour's pocket. Now this is something people don't realise ... you were always - I don't say you were distant - you were always ready to lend a hand, give a hand when in trouble, but not make it ostentatious at all. Whatever came your way, you couldn't close your eyes to it. You would help.

We did have a sing-song and music round the piano. People would come in, or we would go to them. But you didn't do this every day of the week. You kept a nice connection with them, but it was never overdone, and never made as a duty ... (Burton: 3 boys, 3 girls: watchmaker)

Most working class women were more outgoing than this, however, enjoying the sociability and reciprocities exchanged with other women in the neighbourhood. Like farmers, they participated in helping others who were ill or in need and again, the norms of reciprocity were voiced often.

DID YOU HAVE NEIGHBOURS POPPING INTO THE HOUSE?

Oh, blimey! The house was always full of neighbours! ... Mrs Cunningham would pop in, Mrs Lambert, she would come to see Mum for something. And Jim, they used to live down in Waione Street. My father emigrated him out in 1906. He helped to bring him out ... [chat about networks, people now dead]

SO IN THAT COMMUNITY THEN, EVERYONE WOULD HELP EACH OTHER OUT?

Oh, yes. If they thought Mum was sick or anything, next thing you know it wasn't a big area, you see, come in with bowls of soup, come in with fruit. They'd take some of the washing. (Salmond: 1 boy, 1 girl: boilermaker)

The help of neighbours could be counted upon, not only for material aid in sickness, but for exchanging advice on domestic matters (see also Chamberlain & Richardson, 1983). The closeknit quality of working class communities was illustrated in my informants comments on shopping. This was an occasion for sociability, for catching up with the gossip and generally, meeting other women.

These housewives probably had a measure of freedom in organising their time which their husbands lacked in their place of formal employment. While it may be true that 'a woman's work is never done' in that while there were young children, or illness in the house, where husband's shifts required a hot meal to be put on the table at unusual hours, some of her work could be spent sociably in the company of others. There was likely to be considerable variation with the life cycle. Those who were reputed never to leave the house had visitors 'popping in' for a chat and a cup of tea. Who did the visiting and who was visited depended much on the demands of life cycle stage.

In general, the vast majority of working class mothers were weighed down by their domestic

responsibilities. They had no leisure as such. Questions asked about mothers' leisure and political associations were often greeted with laughter. How could mothers find time for leisure? Did I mean knitting, sewing and so on? Of course mother had no political opinion, she voted the same as Dad, or they did not talk about these things. Naive questions provoke interesting answers.

Apart from working class women and those in the lower middle class with large families, the remainder of the mothers usually had some form of home-based activity usually fancy-work and/or reading. A couple of lower middle class women had community based interests related to Church. One played bridge regularly with her husband and a neighbouring couple. Lower middle class women in general led highly privatised lives in the sense that they were unlikely to be in close contact with neighbours, preferring to 'keep themselves to themselves'.

Differences among Men

The sociability and leisure patterns of men were far more complex than those of women. There were four groups of non work patterns observed among wage earning men. These corresponded roughly with their degree of homecentredness. There was one large group of working and lower middle class men whose interests were firmly fixed in the home and who

shared a pattern of gardening, odd-jobbing round their own homes and membership of a Lodge. Lodge membership in fact proved to be a good indicator of the respected and solid family man. In this group there was a high degree of privatisation although most of them lived in close-knit communities.

The second had home and family-centred interests, but also took part in the public life of their communities, for instance in spectator sports.³. Some of them also enjoyed the luxury of sociability with neighbours and 'mates' in the pub or Working Men's Club although drinking was occasional rather than regular. Respondents in this group were quick to assure me that their fathers never got drunk.

There was a group of men who did not spend much time at home and on the basis of their children's testimony seem to have been somewhat 'absent' fathers, both in psychological and physical terms. Some of them worked long hours in their jobs, most of them were involved in organizational pursuits based on community service of some kind. Most of them were long-standing, well-respected members of working class communities. These organisational pursuits included local politics and Church activities as well as such activities as service as Freemasons or being "great community men", according to their children. There were interesting similarities with this working class group

and upper class men who were ambitious both in their professional careers and in the local community.

There was fourth group of men whose activities was highly individualistic. Most of them appeared as shadowy figures in their children's eyes (Gittens, 1985, 30: Frankenberg, 1976, 35), described as solitary or convivial drinkers, rolling stones and ne'er do weels. They were men who were interested in nothing other than hunting or 'the bottle', who were remembered for their brutal behaviour on the one hand and as gay Lotharios on the other, the singer, the pianist and thrower of parties for friends and neighbours.

It was noted in Chapter 5 that many breadwinners were obliged to produce their own vegetables and were involved in others aspects of domestic self-provisioning, activity which conflicts with the distinction between home/work used by many writers. Home was not necessarily a haven for men returning from the day's heavy labour. The following (edited) extract gives a good, fairly typical picture of the non-work life of a working class family economically dependent upon a sole breadwinner. It will be used as a basis of comparison with other types of families.

WHAT ABOUT GARDENING?

Oh, yes. We always had a vegie garden. And we had chooks. Yes, we always had half a dozen fowls. Or more. And he always had one patch, next door to that.

And God help the fowls if they got out onto his garden!
[laughter]

...WHAT ABOUT SHOPPING WITH YOUR MOTHER?

Occasionally. It was a real outing. Going to town ... Sometimes ... we'd visit grandma and we'd see my father's sisters who lived in town. And we'd visit relatives [who lived within walking distance].

CAN YOU REMEMBER YOUR MOTHER HAVING ANY HOBBIES OF ANY SORT?

No. She wasn't a great reader. I don't think she had time for much. Dad used to play cribbage, that's where I first learned to play cribbage, I still play it. Many a time they'd have a game of crib together. We'd have a nice fire going in the old stove and father in his chair and mother in hers and they'd be playing crib. It was a happy home. (Wishart: 5 boys, 4 girls: butcher)

It was also a comfortable home, with a generally cooperative and conscientious father, concerned for the welfare of the family. But the happy home was riven with a major contradiction.

WHAT SORT OF JOBS DID YOUR DAD DO AROUND THE HOUSE?

Oh, we always had fires. [presumably he attended to the grates] In our house we had four bedrooms and a front room - Mum's pride and joy. We had a piano in there. We had a bit of carpet on the floor and we had a nice little suite and an open fire. A dining room next to that. It had an open fire and it also had a door off the big kitchen. So there was always plenty of wood needed.

WHAT ABOUT ORGANISATIONS OUTSIDE THE HOME? TEMPERANCE?

Yes, she was a white ribbon woman. The boys used to tease her because she was always frightened to take a drink ... My Dad worked very hard as a butcher, slaughterman ... if he knocked off at five o'clock, he used to go up to the Albert Hotel sometimes. I know now that he went up to have a beer, but Mum said Dad had gone up to see the time! She'd never let on to us

kids that he'd gone up to have a beer! [laughter] She loved a game of cards. Later on, she used to go out with friends and play euchre. But I don't remember her ever belonging to clubs.

WHAT ABOUT THE CHURCH?

Go occasionally. They used to give to the Church. She'd do her duty there. She used to work for bazaars, not that she was particularly good at doing things. She was a plain woman, you know. (Wishart: 5 boys, 4 girls: butcher)

This extract is revealing for a number of reasons since it illustrates some general patterns associated with keeping a family on a low wage. Both parents were involved here, the men through gardening and the women through sewing, knitting and mending. For some men gardening was their only outlet.

Although this family had no kin living close at hand, the mother visited her sisters in law occasionally, combining this with shopping in town. Like others in her economic position, this kind of visit was a treat for the family could not afford to pay the railway fare to town (eight miles away) on a regular basis. Nor, presumably could the time be spared very often. Many of the interviewees responded to questions about their mothers' visiting of kin in this way.

We should note that the family was able to set a room aside for special occasions. The use of rooms for specific purposes was not routinely asked about but a few people said that it was used for special visitors like the Minister who

called occasionally. Perhaps this practice can be regarded as reserving space for 'public' rather than family/private use.

There was strong emphasis put on musical entertainment in a high proportion of working class homes (and also among farmers). This seems to have been done on quite a regular basis and sometimes involved neighbours, or visiting with neighbours who had a piano, or someone who could play other (sometimes home-made) musical instruments. Many of the fathers whose sociability patterns involved the public house or Working Men's Club, also took part in this kind of home entertainment.

Fourthly, and most importantly, it should be noted that the father in the above extract could choose to retain part of his money for beer, while the mother was involved in the Temperance Movement. Within the home, she deferred to his desire for drink - ashamed to let her children know their father drank - and knowing that money spent on drink was money needed for the family. A few respondents actually commented on this matter specifically. The issue will be discussed in detail in Chapter 9.

Family-Based Leisure and Children's Play

Apart from adult activities associated with community life, there was also home- or family-based leisure in which everyone took part. This varied quite considerably and was partly related to the amount of time available for spending as a family, for example, the parents' work commitments. Some families had a great capacity for fun. Others by contrast appeared to take their 'leisure' very seriously, apparently regarding 'family time' as occasions for duty walks with father, sometimes including mother, a Sunday outing seen as the opportunity for a healthful walk in which children could be taught about the mysteries of the countryside. Others again, appeared somewhat fragmented in the sense that it was unusual for them to spend time as a family.

In general, farming families activities were fitted around the seasonal and daily round of work. In the evenings and on Sundays, they might read together or play some games. In about half the cases, parents did not take part. Many respondents said they had little in the way of toys, but added that the farm and surrounding countryside offered plenty in the way of children's amusements after they had been released from their chores. As with urban children, chores had to be done first.

As we have seen, farming families often attended community picnics. These too, were popular among the urban working class. In those days, firms and unions, as well as Sunday Schools, put on annual picnics. These were great occasions and many respondents captured the excitement of the annual trips of their father's firm and/or union which may have included a train or boat ride. The whole family went to these, sometimes the whole neighbourhood.

None of the middle class urban dwellers went to picnics of this nature, but most of those who lived close enough to the beach or the bush did have at least occasional private picnics. For the most affluent, the motor car became an important means for family leisure. The others walked or used horse and buggy.

Apart from upper middle class children, the majority of respondents do not remember having toys except those they made themselves. The children of the upper middle class demonstrate the emergence of leisure in New Zealand. While working class and farming children made their own fun, at the top end of the socioeconomic scale children had ponies, cameras, they had toys, they had music and dancing lessons and played tennis in the grounds of their homes.

Whereas most children's time, like that of their parents, was circumscribed by their regular chores, upper middle class children had plenty of time in which to benefit from modern concepts of childhood as a special time.

However, there were some interesting differences. Although working class children had (at least for most of the boys) a great deal of freedom about when and with whom they could play, at the top end of the social scale, children and young adult's recreation was highly controlled in the sense that their physical and social space was limited to home ground and that of carefully selected social peers. There are some interesting parallels here with the control of women's movements.

Urban women generally were far less likely to take an active part in family fun than their husbands. It is likely that they did not have either the time or the energy, and that they did not see romping with their children as part of their motherly image. Life appears to have been a very serious affair for them.

Fathers too, had their free time circumscribed by their wage earning and domestic self-provisioning activities. However, the vast majority of men had time to spend, time which could have been spent with children if community responsibilities and other diversions were not more pressing, or more attractive.

Men who were homecentred were not necessarily family- or childcentred. Some kept themselves to themselves even within the home. Some men who were 'absent' fathers in the sense that they spent most of their leisure time (and much of the family money) away from home, but 'horsed around'

with children in the parlour, garden or beach at other times.

There seems to be no clear explanation for their attitudes to spending time with children, and how that time should be spent. The reasons may be associated with personality rather than socially based. There was more than a suspicion, however, that in the period around the turn of the century and well into the first decades of the twentieth century that parenthood was viewed in terms of duties and responsibilities which kept both mothers' and fathers' noses to the grindstone. These were defined differently by class (Chapter 9) and concepts of the parental roles did not necessarily include either overt affection or the enjoyment of one's children as people. Given the material conditions of the time, and the gradual spread of new ideas about the respective roles of men, women and children it is not surprising that the interviews show such variety.

Community and Status

Patterns of sociability and leisure among the couples in the sample were closely related to their class position and to gender. They were also associated with what appear to have been quite deliberate strategies to take part in, or withdraw from the neighbourhood in which they lived,

adopting and maintaining a social network which they perceived appropriate to their material situation and their values.

There appeared to be three quite distinct levels of extra-domestic sociability and leisure patterns - one based on working class community, one associated with leadership in small towns and suburbs and another with more cosmopolitan and professional associational interests. These predictably also corresponded quite clearly with class and status groupings.

The work of writers who have been concerned with the emergence of leisure in Britain are of interest here. McLeod (1977, 68) suggests that the English late nineteenth century working class tended to have a system of proletarian parochialism which largely rejected identification with larger social entities. Such communities may be viewed as social microcosms with their own standards of evaluation based on local norms (see also Plowman, 1962 and Loudon, Chapter 9). Within their local communities, the working class enjoyed a measure of esteem in their non work life, denied them in respect of occupational status.

Roberts (1984) investigation of working class women's lives in Lancashire in the early twentieth century stresses the importance of local community morals. Here too, as in my New Zealand working class communities, sociability was important, the means by which information was exchanged and

social control effected. Robert considers Wirth's assessment of urbanisation in the United States to be a false one.

... the urban working-class village shared with rural communities of the past, a foundation built of mutual responsibilities and obligations ... the working class undertook to look after itself, relying when necessary on families and neighbourhoods for physical support and psychological sustenance (Roberts, 1984, 183)

Roberts' women's lives were importantly shaped by religious values in the sense of their duty to help neighbours. My interview material suggest that this sense of duty was apparent in New Zealand among both men and women, and as Roberts suggests, was based on a community reinterpretation of responsibility rather than attention to theological doctrine (see Moore, 1974, 226-9, for a discussion of communal and associational religious values).

Working class community life presents a sharp contrast with other life styles. McLeod (1977) suggests that while most members of the middle and upper classes, together with many smaller property owners were probably sincere in their religious convictions, religious association was also a reflection of the pattern of obligations that went with their position in society. He considers that shopkeepers and small employers conceived of this society in local terms, so that their obligations were

fulfilled by participation in local government or by acting as churchwardens.

In comparison, members of the elite groups tended to think in wider terms. They saw national politics and questions of government policy as being something of a personal concern, and they felt equally bound to take some interest in more abstract political, social and religious issues (McLeod, 1977 67-8). They also demonstrated adherence to different norms and were clearly more open to ideas relating to, for instance, the value of secondary education, than others.

McLeod's work is of particular relevance since his findings clearly correspond with the life-styles of my New Zealand families described above. He also draws attention to Thompson's (P,1977) work using oral histories, which provided the initial inspiration for the present thesis. Both Thompson and McLeod comment on the care with which some sections of the working class and the lower middle class generally, chose their associates. The sharpest single difference was the degree of intimacy in their relationships with neighbours (McLeod, 1977, 70). This shone out clearly in my own interviews on family and social life in early twentieth century New Zealand.

Some families lived in close knit neighbourhoods yet preserved social distance from neighbours. These were working class families whose fathers were largely

homecentred and whose mothers sought to avoid the traditional types of reciprocal obligations characteristic of working class and rural communities (Anderson, 1971: Roberts, 1984: Young & Willmott, 1957: Frankenberg, 1966). Unless they had kin, these women were very isolated in social terms, having deliberately sought to 'keep themselves to themselves'. In terms of neighbourhood aid, some of them would give, but not receive help (a nice example of closer adherence to religious doctrine than ancient and general forms of community morality). Perhaps some had been considered to be standoffish by neighbours and excluded from neighbourhood networks (see below).

Some lived in neighbourhoods where 'popping in' was 'not done'. Frequently, this involved middle and lower-middle class women who valued self-reliance. Mr Rowland specifically said in response to a question on neighbourhood relationships, *I don't remember much of that. You were terribly self-reliant. They were in those days, that generation.* In either case, they joined a trend to privatisation, homecentredness and relative social isolation characteristic of heterogeneous, stratified modern urban society (see Chapter 9).

Synge (1976) found that at the same period of history, Canadian, anglo-saxon, urban working class women's world was centred not on the neighbourhood, but on family of procreation and Church. If a woman had no relatives and did

not attend church, she was unlikely to leave the house except to go shopping. These relatively prosperous British migrants and native-born Canadians provide a direct contrast in terms of social isolation with women belonging to gregarious ethnic minorities in the United States (Hareven, 1982: McLaughlin, 1971) and most of the working class women in my sample (see also Roberts, 1984, Thompson, 197 for English examples).

Synge's findings therefore coincide well with mine in New Zealand except that the gregariousness was found in ordinary working class communities where women without kin had to rely on each other for support.

There was a clear status division shown not only in the degree to which women's networks were close and of high density, but also in those of their husbands. Men seem to have been far less involved with neighbours. Men had their own friends, their 'mates'. Some working class and middle class men interested themselves in community affairs rather than in sociability at the pub or club. Burgesses, or other men who aspired to making their influence felt in the area in which they lived, might spend several nights a week away from home, for example, on Church business. In their later years, these men would have been the respected elders of the small towns and suburbs in which their families lived. The chances are that their wives would also have been involved in supporting their efforts, helping them in

their bid for status and prestige especially as their children grew older.

There was little sign of community involvement among the upper middle class. They clearly belonged to their own status group which owed its coherence to the material conditions and values which marked the lifestyles and class-based social networks of these families. There was also evidence of much wider social networks based on kinship and on friendships with other people. Like the burgesses and lower middle class though, the upper middle class also sought to ensure their gentility through techniques resulting in social distance.

Why should status have been so important? For men in white collar occupations, their personal appearance and respectable life style would have been a condition of employment. In daily contact with their social superiors at work, they would have had to be careful in their appearance and bearing, as well as in their private life with their families. For those white collar workers whose occupational skills were minimal, for instance clerks or shop managers, dismissal would have meant rapid downward mobility and probable destitution. Lower-middle class families are particularly interesting since they show a clear link between deference based on class differences at work and its effects on family life (see Chapter 9).

A similar argument can be made for the upper middle class whose social networks would have provided them with special advantages allowing them to retain their privileged class position. These included networks through which their children could find socially acceptable marriage partners, contacts which would also provide information on a range of matters relating to continued economic and social success. Their patterns of sociability and leisure demonstrate quite clearly a distinctive life style, though in some respects, this shaded into that of the stratum below them.

To recapitulate, the sociability and leisure patterns observed show that the families operated in distinctive local or national levels of society. These activities provided some with a basis for status claims which would have served their present and future material interests. Towards the end of Chapter 9, the link between status and esteem will be explored, extending the discussion to working class neighbourhoods as well. The implications for change in women's status will be further explored in that context.

Social Networks, Status and Control

Some investigation of the way in which networks are created, reinforced or broken down is needed if we are to understand how these families were articulated with the community, and the implications of this for control and change in familial relationships. Bott writes of neighbourhood networks,

Localised networks are most likely to develop in areas where the inhabitants feel that they are socially similar to one another; such feelings of solidarity appear to be strongest in long-established working-class areas in which there is a dominant industry or a relatively small number of traditional occupations' (Bott, 1957, 103).

There is a great deal of evidence to indicate that this is the case.

Mutual needs and shared norms of reciprocity also seem to be important. In Robert's study of working class women in Lancashire around the early decades of this century, neighbourhoods displaying the most solidarity were also the poorest. The converse also seems to be the case except perhaps in very small farming communities (see also Frankenberg, 1966: Klein, 1965: Anderson, 1971: Synge, 1976).

Studies concerned with the development of new suburbs in contemporary urban life also demonstrate that in the first few years, when their needs for assistance are

greatest, when paths and gardens have to be laid and babies are young, young couples help each other. In later years, they are likely to develop associations outside the neighbourhood (see for example, Moge, 1956, 87).

Not all established neighbourhood have the necessary basis for establishing reciprocity. It appears that trust is a necessary component for the exchange of services and help (Anderson, 1971). Where kin are present, such exchanges can be expected. Strangers however, present an unknown quantity and newcomers to a neighbourhood may fear to approach them for help, or accept advances from neighbours (Young & Willmott, 1957).

Roberts (1984) considers problems relating to status appear to have developed in working class neighbourhoods when the feeling of being the same both socially and economically began to break down. Resentment and envy of relative material success, or any kind of behaviour likely to be regarded as 'toffee-nosed' creates social divisions. One of my respondents put the matter well.

SO THERE WASN'T MUCH IN THE WAY OF NEIGHBOURS HELPING OUT WHEN THE YOUNGER CHILDREN WERE BORN?

No. The midwives would go round on bikes. They used to live in the same area. The neighbours - we did the same thing ourselves - anybody who wanted help, well you want anything, we'll do it.

LIKE THERE WAS SICKNESS IN THE HOUSE, SOMETHING LIKE THAT?

Yeah, oh yes. Well, it was only a small community and you had hardly any way of getting out of it. Unless you got a toffee nose, and you say, "To hell with you, you're not a worker". (Morris: 4 boys, 4 girls: freezing worker)

It appears that the kind of changes suggested by Roberts (see above) did take place in the working class suburb in which most of my working class respondents were raised. Although the area had not been settled long, mutual need for some form of protection, together with the lack of kin would have served in the early days as a catalyst uniting the mothers of families. Common interests as workers, and 'mateship' among men would have helped cement their relationships (Phillips, 1980). I suggest that status divisions started to arise as a result of the increasing sophistication of industry and specialisation in the division of labour.

As we have seen, there were working class families who were notably privatised, who sought to keep themselves to themselves. These families tended to be slightly more prosperous, had somewhat smaller families and appear to have had aspirations for their children.

Working class families who lived in other communities, or who moved, might also find themselves in the situation of Young and Willmott's (1957) Greenleigh

residents, uncertain of the norms and fearing adverse criticism from neighbours in their new location.

There was some evidence that material affluence among farmers created status divisions. It meant that it became possible for some of them to hire workers when needed, or to have their own shearing shed instead of sharing with neighbours. In rural communities too, after the first decades of settlement, the Church was built and so was its Hall so that there was less need for economic contributions and labour needed for the basic material necessities for community life. It is unlikely, however, that the quality of rural interaction changed as drastically as in urban areas for fund-raising for community needs and social events still require the cooperation of local people. They cannot be bought with money in the same way as commodities and services are available in cities.

Group Formation and Social Control

After studying variability in the degree to which families were involved in social networks, Bott (1957, 60) offered her now famous and fertile hypothesis that "the degree of segregation in the role relationships of husband and wife varies directly with the connectedness of the family's network".⁴

Bott's hypothesis is of particular interest here, not because the present study was in any way designed as a test, but rather because her work and that of some of her critics, raises interesting questions about the nature of group formation (Harris, 1969: Morris, 1985, 329), particularly where the networks are defined in monosexual terms. There are also some interesting implications for the study of stratification as well as for variability in socially constructed notions of role performance here.

Some critics have pointed out that the extent to which network structure favours group formation may be more salient than the networks themselves as far as their influence on social behaviour is concerned. Harris writes

the more interconnected the network, the greater the chance its members will have of developing common norms, and the better will they be able to act together, because both these processes require effective communication of which a close-knit network is a structural pre-requisite (Harris, 1969, 170).

It follows that where the linkages are numerous then there is also a greater propensity for the sharing of ideas, meaning and common experience (Morris, 1985, 330).

The responses from the great majority of survivors of farming and working class families presents a picture of overwhelming 'belongingness' with men, women and children participating in community life, all members of the

community together. Other kinds of families had their local networks too, defined by their status-based group.

It is important to note, however, that although farming people went as families to Church, to picnics, dances and other events, actual interaction may well have been effectively mono-sexual and differentiated by generation. No specific questions were asked about this, but information provided by a few respondents specifically said that men drew together to discuss matters relating to farming work, while women chatted about their children and domestic affairs. Children ran off to play.

The division between the sexes in the social life of Littledene was commented upon by Somerset in reference to sexually segregated behaviour at country dances (1974) and has also been observed in virtually all English community studies (Frankenberg, 1976).

In towns and cities, analysis of the evidence demonstrates the very clear divisions between men and women's activities. Apart from the home itself, and in company with kin, adult activity was highly segregated on the basis of gender, strictly monosexual. This was also genderally true of school children and young adults before they started the serious business of courting.

It is interesting that the authors of British community studies do not usually comment at any length on such sexual divisions, taking for granted that the specific

and separate interests of men and women keep them apart. This is a topic which begs for further study, but which must be strictly limited to the implications for change in family relationships.

Taking Harris' proposition, we would expect to find that communication was more effective among women and among men but not necessarily between them. Where linkages were many and highly interconnected such as in farming and working class communities, norms would be well developed and known by all. For instance, we could hypothesise that changes in concepts of women's roles associated with masculinism would take more time to develop in rural communities and in urban neighbourhoods where women and men had their own separate networks and where evaluations of role performance were based on local standards (see Loudon, Chapter 1). We would also expect that the close knit social networks of men and women would discourage any tendency to deviation from 'proper' behaviour of children in relation to their parents.

Similarly, control could be expected to vary with the degree of network density, that is, among privatised families the necessary - but not sufficient - conditions for changes in ideas about work and leisure would be present. Much would depend upon the desire of the partners for change, their knowledge and on their negotiating abilities. Where the ability to communicate was poor, change would be

less likely. Where elders with patriarchal attitudes were present we could also expect a brake on change to be applied.

Virtually all rural and working class interviewees made remarks to the effect that in their neighbourhood, everyone knew everyone else. A few also said that everybody was doing the same thing in regard to women and children's work especially. There can be little doubt about the dense quality of these networks and the shared experience of my respondents and their parents, mother's especially.

In the previous section, I suggested that there were three levels of community/society at which my families operated in their extra-domestic affairs, the neighbourhood, the 'cream of local community' and the elite of society. I suggest that these also formed the communication channels along which information about community norms (farmers and rural), or local norms (lower middle class and burgesses) or new ideas, flowed in from other societies (upper middle class). It is exactly these communication channels which favoured or inhibited the flow of new ideas about the changing roles of husbands, wives and children, ideas which will be examined in some detail, along with the data in Chapter 9.

Close knit networks appear to be structural prerequisites for establishing community standards in

working class communities. Factors favouring intense group formation and therefore the possibility of both social control and evaluation of individuals, include

economic insecurity deriving from inability to cope with the 'new thrift' and subsequent dependence upon neighbours (who may be kin in some places but not my sample)

acceptance of the demands of gregarious community life through familiarity, long residence, values which do not include the desire for social or economic mobility.

marriage in a community in which both husband and wife had their prenuptial monosexual peer groups. The classic example of this is Dennis et al. study of Ashton (1957). In such communities, emotional intensity is not likely to feature because of the importance of pre-existing affective ties with kin and same-sexed companions

Group formation would have served to reinforce norms and encourage competition based on community standards of housewifely virtuosity and manly qualities. Deviation would be visible and sanctions immediate. Geographical mobility into such a neighbourhood, or a feeling of social superiority on the part of the competent or over-anxious

wives of ambitious men would create social isolation both in the working class and other families.

Except at a very general level, it is not possible to test these propositions with the available data which were designed on the basis of exploration of what was important in family life in early twentieth century New Zealand. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests a broad correspondence between the propositions and my findings.

Let us now consider how social change might have taken place in view of the theoretical material discussed in this Chapter.

Patriarchy, Masculinism and Leisure

In most New Zealand farmhouses in my sample, these 'goodwives' (George, 1973) and their children operated under a form of male domination becoming obsolete in towns and cities, patriarchy. Wives' sociability took the form of being present with the rest of the family in visiting with kin, religious observance and at community events. It is doubtful that these 'really useful' women were ever able to spend time with neighbours or had any hobbies whatever beyond the perennial knitting and sewing demanded of them as mothers of large families. The reader should note, however, that husbands too had little leisure.

In general, because of isolation, poor roads and above all, the struggle to earn the means of subsistence there was little time and little money for inequalities to show themselves between husbands and wives in the sense of unequal allocation of resources.

At the very top of the social scale, a couple of my Edwardian mothers enjoyed enough free time to approximate the upper class version of how such a Lady should be - cultured, educated, well-acquainted with all the social graces and an asset to any status and class-conscious gentleman belonging to the Best Circles (Davidoff, 1973). Few women were able to attain this leisured ideal in New Zealand because they lacked the domestic servants which made possible the translation of the ideal into reality. But it was clearly apparent from a couple of the interviews that the ideal was recognised and strived for.

The distinction between the gender-based leisure patterns of the upper middle class lay in a clear division between private and public. Whereas wives were confined to the home and very clearly delineated social space in the form of the homes of other women like themselves (or in the company of their husbands), the husbands were generally involved in public affairs involving cultural, educational, sporting and professional interests. Many of them spent a great deal of time away from home, sometimes as a result of

occupational demands, but also because of personal interests.

For those women less materially blessed but socially aspiring, domestic skills made possible the creation of enough time for genteel sociability in the form of formal tea parties, Church and perhaps making up a regular four at bridge with another couple. To a very limited extent this was also so of some lower middle class women. All these women were very much concerned with keeping up appearances, not only for themselves but their whole families. Part of their work was to prepare for these 'public' appearances where the families' respectability might be at risk. Reputation was important, and wives were the moral guardians of the hearth, impression-managers in chief (Goffman, 1959). As we shall see in Chapter 9, their influence extended into society in general.

Among the whole middle class, wives were often involved in activities which would have brought their husbands added prestige as pillars of small town or society in general, thus extending the whole family's reputation in the public sphere, but one which was extremely circumscribed in terms of any personal interests the woman might have herself.

As we have seen, working class women were very much confined to home and neighbourhood, but enjoyed considerable social contact with other women as a result of neighbourly

values of helpfulness and friendliness. Like the upper middle class men, many working class husbands took their leisure and sociability away from home. In Chapter 9, we will see that this was not necessarily acceptable to their wives, and was a source of annoyance and worry to some. The subject of male dominance among working class families will be dealt with then.

The word 'public', is theoretically a dangerous one in the present context. Later in the century, middle class women would become involved in voluntary associations, some of which would be extensions of their domestic lives others which they could attend jointly with their husbands. The world they inhabited outside the home was not a public one, in the sense in which it has been used throughout this thesis, i.e. in terms of the impersonal relationships created by the Market economy. Women's extra-domestic lives were experienced in a kind of social limbo created out of the changing interaction of class and gender where they would be protected from unwelcome social interaction with strangers on the one hand, and excluded from power in the real public world of the Marketplace on the other.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Burgesses are a middle class social group associated with local shopkeeping and small-scale businesses. They were first identified by Watson (1964). Their kinship patterns have been examined by Bell (1968). Together with spiralists, they make a convenient typology for the study of the effects of social mobility on other social behaviour. See Edgell (1980) for a recent use of the concept of spiralists and a short explication of both concepts (1980, 1-2).

² 'Whare' is a Maori term used by other New Zealanders to denote a holiday house. In the South Island, the corresponding term is 'bach'.

³ Among the twenty five working class men in this group sports and other personal interests included rugby (7), cricket (2), fishing (1), bowls (1), pig shooting (1), trotting (2), horse-racing (2).

⁴ There was little evidence of sharing of domestic duties among husbands and wives among my sample. Conjugal roles could not be considered joint in respect of work, except in the cases of wives who helped earn a living among some farmers and those who were able to contribute through wage earning or petty commodity production. Sharing of 'free' time, was likely to be time spent by the fireside in the company of children, in the form of family Church-going and for those involved in community affairs, or 'high society' appearances as a couple.

CHAPTER 9

SOME ASPECTS OF POWER AND CONTROL

FAMILY, COMMUNITY AND CHANGE

In general, the evidence from the interview material presented in previous Chapters suggests that the course of social change in New Zealand resulted in clearer gender role differentiation in work between women and men (which took the form of greater domesticity and less flexibility in women's work) and less likelihood that children would be involved in production or social reproduction. The material on leisure and community indicates an increasingly persistent move towards greater homecentredness in men, and a distinct withdrawal of families from community life, generally. It will be argued that these changes were associated with new forms of familial power and control, a gradual withering away of traditional authority in the form of patriarchy and its replacement by masculinism, the type of male dominance specifically associated with capitalist society.

Feminists are rarely concerned with children except as dependents. By definition, they are concerned with the oppression of adult women. In considering familial

relationships, that is both age and sex hierarchies, however, it is clear that patriarchy and masculinism were associated with historically specific kinds of relationships between parents and children.

One of the most interesting findings in the New Zealand material was the apparent absence of overt conflict between men and women, and parents and children given the high degree of control over their time and energy. This may seem surprising in terms of today's standards. However, it is in terms of the social relations of the past that the topic has to be considered.

The final section of Chapter 6 was concerned with power and control. It was argued that superordinates seek to main control and legitimacy by creating a balance between identification with their subordinates, and differentiation. Superordinates can afford to be liberal where they perceive their position to be unassailable, where their dominance is unchallenged. In situations where their power is threatened, or where their demands might be challenged, they must withdraw identification and rule by coercion or fear. They also maintain control by ensuring that subordinates do not have access to knowledge or ideas which threaten the prevailing balance of power. In more concrete terms this means limiting the social networks open to subordinates.

First of all we will deal with one specific instance of conflict between husbands and wives and then more

generally, between parents and children. In both cases we will draw on more general historical perspectives, seeking to place the New Zealand experience within the general framework of the emergence of the modern family, but highlighting the major themes which have run through this thesis. Chapter 10 which follows, deals with my conclusions in respect of the relationship between the household, 'the family' and 'work'.

Husbands and Wives

In this section, the focus is on conflict arising out of inequalities between husbands and wives in regard to the use of time and money spent on sociability and leisure. It is here that the clearest evidence of male dominance and control over women's lives lies. The nature of the evidence did not allow investigation of inequalities in work. Men rarely did any form of housework, but we cannot assume that segregated work, or segregated leisure is necessarily an indicator of inequality given the prevailing sexual division of labour in society (Edgell, 1980, 16). The emergence of this kind of conflict must be seen in historical perspective.

English proletarian wives of the nineteenth century, like those of earlier centuries did not expect to be 'kept'. They expected to work for a living, using a range of

strategies to reconcile their domestic activities with others. At the same time that households became increasingly dependent on wage labour for food and commodities which they would have otherwise produced themselves, women and children were being gradually edged out of the labour force.

In some areas of Britain, at least, it is known that working class women controlled the family purse, using the contributions of husbands and children to purchase what was necessary for survival. This was a necessity in poverty-stricken households since successful budgeting required both skill and a thorough knowledge of what resources were available as well as control over them (Roberts, 1984).¹

Having received their husbands' pay packet and given him his 'beer and baccy money' (which may have varied quite substantially from household to household), they were then responsible for stretching the domestic budget regardless of economic swings, periods of unemployment and sickness (Oren, 1974, 238). The pawnshop, credit management at local shops and the neighbourhood support network of other housewives which included the midwife and layer-out of the dead, all helped make this possible (Chamberlain & Richardson, 1983: Ross, 1983).

When money was short, it was wives and children, especially the former, who did without. Husbands got fed, clothed and had their pocket money regardless. Indeed, it

was a matter of pride to make sure that the breadwinner was satisfied; 'cherish the breadwinner', because without him all would starve. A common practice among workers with earnings above subsistence was for the husband to give a fixed allowance to his wife. This did not increase proportionally with an increase in earnings (Stearns, 1973, 38; Oren, 1974, 231). What evidence we have suggests that as the century progressed, women lost control of the family purse long before they were able to consider the possibilities of taking leisure or money for their personal use (Stearns, 1973, 116, see also 1980).

As the ideal of the 'family wage' became a reality for many families this had the effect of changing the balance of power in working class families and also created new psychological benefits for the husband as a result of his newly found domestic power, a new source of identity for the husband as sole provider.

Powerlessness and 'the Drink' in England

Struggles over 'the drink' are a good illustration, both at the micro- and macro levels over the changing balance of power in working class marriage. Discussing the life of the public house in industrialising England, Walvin remarks

To men, it was their own world, replete with friendship and enjoyment, but women tended to see it more through the eyes of the teetotaler, even when they themselves drank, as the cause and occasion of their family's misfortunes (Walvin, 1978, 40).

It is not hard to imagine the attraction of the public house and the euphoria produced by drink for men whose homes were overcrowded, noisy and uncomfortable and whose wives' economies interfered with their comfort (Bosanquet, quoted in Young & Willmott, 1957, 18). Grossly exploited by capitalism, some men in turn, similarly exploited their dependent wives and children who had no effective means of protecting themselves.

However, not all husbands drank excessively, nor did they necessarily grossly exploit their wives. Many working class women appear to have been powerful in the domestic sphere (Roberts, 1984). Roberts' Lancashire mothers were powerful in the home, 'not so much from legal rights as from moral force'. Commenting on the question of the relative power of husbands and wives in working class homes she quotes from Bosanquet writing as a contemporary observer in 1906,

Fathers are regarded by the children as plain inferior to mothers in authority, in knowledge of right and wrong, and above all of 'manners'. Talk of the subjection of women, I doubt if the bare idea of father being equal to mother in rank and authority ever entered the mind of any child under sixteen. Father is

generally regarded in the light of mother's eldest child and disobedience in him is far more heinous a crime, than in them (Roberts, 1984, 112).

Let us now look at New Zealand, using the interview data. We would not be surprised, given the predominantly English heritage of the settlers, to find a similar situation around the late nineteenth century.

Struggles over 'The Drink' in New Zealand

There is much evidence to suggest that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in New Zealand, there was a very considerable concern with questions of social order, with respectability and with economic security (Eldred-Grigg, 1984). This was illustrated in my data in attitudes to drink and claims to status in working class communities. These were related to changes in material conditions and the economic insecurity experienced by women, despite general increasing prosperity and rising wages.

Phillips (1980) considers that the heart of working class male culture in nineteenth century New Zealand was the pub. By the late nineteenth century, hostility to this male culture became acute, complaints of 'larrikinism' increased, while solid citizens feared any threat of social disorder or affronts to their respectability. There was a great gulf between the single man and the married in colonial New

Zealand. The respectable married man was one "whose family responsibilities made him a sober, hard-working, and honest man". An alternative to the pub was one of the many voluntary associations and clubs which served "as respectable alternatives to the pubs, as places where the family man could enjoy male companionship in a controlled environment" (Phillips, 1980, 230).

The substance of Phillips' claims were generally supported by the information provided in interviews. However, there was considerable variability among the working class in attitudes to the virtues of sobriety and to concepts of what constituted the 'good' husband or wife.

There appears to have been considerable and recognised interdependence between many working class husbands and wives. Although there was virtually complete segregation in conjugal roles (apart from women who were employed or earned money from their household productive activities), women were powerful in the domestic sphere as indicated by Roberts (see above).

The kind of opinions expressed by my working class respondents were similar to those of Roberts with powerful mothers and 'absent' fathers. This was not at all the case with other interviewees. Let us consider the question of power within the household briefly on the basis of my respondents' perceptions.

In the majority of New Zealand cases, it was the father who was seen to be 'the boss'. In upper middle class households, the answer was invariably *My Father!* This was usually the answer in middle class households too, but respondents often had to think carefully about this, made some qualification or concluded that their parents made decisions either jointly, or that they had separate spheres of responsibility and authority.

Sometimes, informants said that their fathers *thought* they were the boss, but made it clear that their mothers got their way through manipulating him. This would indicate a recognition of dominant norms, and a reality grounded in attempted subversion.

In many working class households, however, and in the cases of two struggling farmers with very large families, it was the mother who was unequivocally the head of household.

Roberts (1984, 1) specifically states that her working class women in early twentieth century Lancashire knew their worth and did not feel subordinate to men. If they were exploited, it was in terms of class, not gender. On the basis of working class experience in Britain it is likely that the experience of their counterparts in New Zealand was similar. Certainly, their children knew their worth, felt the strength of their domestically based power and commented on it (see below).

On the basis of a similar argument it is likely that in New Zealand, as well as Britain, many working class wives were in control of family finances.² Certainly in all working class and lower middle class households, children contributed their wages to their mothers, perhaps receiving a little pocket money in the first years after they started work, more as they attained adulthood. In this sense, at least, there was a common fund.

There was also plenty of evidence to suggest the cherishing of working class breadwinners in New Zealand. The best available evidence is that relating to sociability and leisure. Having worked hard all day, these men were considered to have earned their leisure. Let us now concentrate on one very specific area, the vexed question of 'the drink', and on two analytically separable groups of working class women.

Many wives appear to have accepted their husbands' rights to take their leisure and pleasure as they chose. These were the wives who seemed to be the most powerful in the home, the managers of the household, and the mothers of large families. These were women who were demanding of daughters, and allowed greatest freedom to their sons. It was their husbands who were the ones most likely to be absent from home.

By contrast, other wives resented their husband's spending on leisure.³ I suggest that conflict arose in

cases where women recognised that their interests and those of their children were being sacrificed.⁴ Children needed to be fed and lacking other methods for meeting consumption needs, the only way of getting more money was to wrest it somehow from husbands. A good example of this is Mrs Wishart's mother.

In Chapter 8 (pages 379-382), we saw that Mrs Wishart's mother heartily disapproved of her husband's rather mild drinking to the extent that she (a) tried to keep this knowledge from her children, (b) joined the Women's Christian Temperance Union to fight for a cause she felt she could not challenge openly in her own home. This woman, and others like her, were beginning to realise their interests, their own economic powerlessness relative to their husbands. This sort of individual realisation would have taken place for many women at the time with important implications for the formation of status groups and, ultimately, for the increasing privatisation of the nuclear family.

I will use Mogey's terms status assenting and status dissenting (Mogey, 1956) as labels for these women, for claims for status - as well as economic insecurity - appear to lie behind conflict with husbands.

Status Group Formation and Privatisation

The process of status group formation is of course of critical importance in explaining the process of privatisation of the nuclear family since it involves the fracturing of ties with important sources of social control within the local community, sources which would otherwise reinforce older values of reciprocity, helpfulness, belongingness. Of particular interest in this thesis, is severance from influences supporting concepts of the proper, community defined roles of 'good' husbands and wives.

Let us first of all consider how we can account for the phenomenon of status dissension. I suggest that proletarian husbands began to acquire greater power over the purse as income above subsistence started to increase and they started to give their wives an allowance for housekeeping, rather than operating the family fund (see Stearns above). As their hours of paid work also started to drop, men had more time and more money to spend, resulting in the emergence of leisure and extended opportunities for sociability, particularly for drinking.

At the same time, traditional patterns of household organisation associated with the family wage economy continued in some households. Women whose social networks brought them in contact only with other women in a similar situation and with the same traditional values as their own may not have known, or not even questioned their husbands'

spending habits. It was their job to continue manage as they had always done, through their skills and their women's 'trade union'. It was a matter of honour that they did manage and their success was rewarded through the esteem of other status assenting women.

Recognition of the injustices of their situation almost certainly arose in the context of the wives' comparison of their own situation, with other more prosperous and respectable families in situations where wages were rising, where special trade skills were in demand, where husbands became supervisors of some kind and where other families' standard of living was better as a result of having fewer children (potential status dissenting).

There were other socially isolated women, those whose husbands were known drunkards. It is not known whether they were outcast along with their husbands, or chose to avoid the opprobrium of other women, but four or five respondents commented on their father's heavy drinking and general unpopularity in the community.

There is plenty of reliable evidence (Galt, 1985), that this was a period of relative economic prosperity, so that many working class families were able to survive on a single wage. In a rapidly expanding industrial area, such as that which attracted my respondents' parents from all over New Zealand, the economic conditions for the emergence

of status groups and for invidious evaluation of individuals and families in relation to each other, were perfect.

I suggest that the kind of working class families most likely to become socially isolated from neighbourhood networks, those most likely to become status dissenters, were (1) those at risk for becoming labelled as 'toffee-nosed' because of their relative economic affluence, victims of envy, (2) those choosing to remain aloof from the neighbourhood when they moved in, or withdrawing when they felt that it was not in their longterm interest to be identified with the neighbourhood group.

In summary, it seems likely that some women specifically sought to distance themselves from neighbours as a result of their feelings of superiority, impatient at interruptions in their work routine, with gossip or with fear of not being accepted (whether the reason for this was a presumed fault of theirs, their husbands or their children). Drink, claims to status, and respectability were very clearly associated.

Public Issues and Private Troubles

At this time in New Zealand, there were new ideologies about familial roles abroad in society generally. Masculinist concepts of the husband as sole provider, domesticity for women, and a protected childhood for children appears to

have been established among middle class urban families in precept if not reality (see Chapters 6-8 and next section). In this section we will consider the degree to which bourgeois ideologies may have influenced working class women at this period.

Women's organisations in late nineteenth century New Zealand were generally concerned with the material interests of women and family life. They were of middle class in inspiration and feminist oriented, though few feminists today would approve of their family and home centred views, again, reflections of bourgeois masculinism. For instance, Tennant (1976, 122) notes the reassertion of female differences, the revitalized interest in maternal roles in the early twentieth century, all clearly in keeping with masculinist ideology.

There were four main organisations: (1) The National Council of Women, still important in coordinating the interests of women in New Zealand through a multiplicity of organisations, (2) The Women's Christian Temperance Union, "for God and Home and Humanity", particularly concerned with solving the drink problem by removing it altogether, (3) The Society for the Protection of Women and Children, prominent in the sphere of women's domestic duties, and (4) The Society for Promoting the Health of Women and Children, originally founded by Sir Truby King and now known as The Plunket Society. This organisation was particularly

effective in propagating ideas associated with the professionalisation of motherhood (Reiger, 1985).

It has been argued by Dalziel (1977) that prevailing conceptions of women's role as wife, mother, homemaker and guardian of society's morals were closely associated with agitation for suffrage. She claims that early New Zealand feminists argued from a position solidly based on the family and the home and were often closely associated with temperance. The most important of the activists came from the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the organisation dedicated to removing the evils of drink.

Very few of the women in the study appear to have had access to these women's organisations even in the early twentieth century. (Every respondent was asked about this specifically. Many said there was no women's organisation at all in their area). Only one of my very youngest respondents' mothers' was a member of the Plunket Society. However, there were four members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union including Mrs Wishart's mother.

While women's organisations in early twentieth century were clearly acting in terms of the material interests of women as housewives and mothers, according to the precepts of domestic feminism, they do not have appeared to have attracted the popular support they enjoyed in later decades. It seems that it was only later that new concepts of motherhood and ideas about children were propagated

widely through women's organisations. Nevertheless, the ideas and activities of the W.C.T.U., the organisation centrally concerned with 'the drink' and moral reform would have been very attractive among working class women who had lost control of the common purse, and who had known prolonged insecurity as a result of the spending habits of their husbands.

The degree to which individual women would have perceived their interests would, of course, have varied widely, as suggested above. In his study of *The Pleasures of the Flesh* in New Zealand before 1915, Eldred-Grigg points out that all women did not favour Temperance. Women in 'High Society' and lower working class women were hostile to prohibition (1984, 219). Support for prohibition came from the middle reaches of society, the middle and lower middle class and the skilled working class, generally.

It is almost certainly the case, that some working class women were instrumental in trying to effect social change through collective political endeavour in opposition to their husbands. Since they could not make their influence felt in direct confrontation or negotiation in the private sphere, they sought resolution in the public one fighting for legislation to vanquish the enemy of respectability and security.

It is clear from the interview material on sociability and leisure, that many working class and lower

middle class men were homecentred and conscientious providers. Most of them did not drink, and according to their children, some were teetotallers. Indeed, some areas in which my respondents lived were 'dry', in which case, anecdotes or information about sly-grogging might be offered.

There is no way of knowing to what degree the men themselves, chose or adopted a life of sobriety, and to what degree they were influenced by their wives. It seems likely, however, that during the period in which we are particularly interested that the economic foundations of the new family roles were beginning to be quite well established in New Zealand in the working class. The means for adoption of new standards were there, in the sense of sufficiently high wages, but on the part of individual men, grown accustomed to controlling their wages, a shift in responsibility towards the family was required.

Ryan's account of change in definitions of feminity with the advance of capitalism in antebellum America is relevant to New Zealand. Rapid industrialisation and urbanisation caused immense social dislocation, creating the same desire for order and stability in America as in industrialising Britain. We marked that this was also the case in New Zealand (see above).

Support for my interpretation of changes in the reallocation of spending and social change related to family

life comes from a similar account given by Ryan (1979, 1981). During the period of about 1820 to 1860, some American firms started to expand rapidly so that in cities "small-scale independent production flourished alongside the massive routinized factories of large capitalists" as manufacturers started to take advantage of steambased production methods and cheap labour. This was a period during which small workshops coexisted with the large. In the farming sector, the family farm was being replaced by units increasingly dedicated to high profits through mechanisation, necessitating higher capital investment (Ryan, 1979, 153-4).

In this situation, women's work in the family economy was being transferred to socialised production, taken over by men with their machines, so that goods once produced in the household, were now more cheaply available as commodities to be purchased.

While the modernisation process in New Zealand did not feature the establishments of factories on the scale that Ryan describes, the same anxiety for order, perhaps a panic resulting from the appearance of Old World problems in the New Society, was certainly prevalent in New Zealand around the turn of the century. It was also a period when many women were recognising their total economic dependence on men.

Ryan argues that in antebellum America, women's temperance and other moral reform associations operating as early as 1813 antedated injunctions for women to control and reform their husbands through their domestic rectitude and moral influence. Further, she claims that the women's literature of this period had a "subtly coercive function - to provide stability and order amid the tensions and disruptions of industrialization". This, presumably could be effected through the work of women in the home, as moral guardians of the hearth.

We have noted that in New Zealand (and in Australia too), that concepts of the 'really useful' woman and colonial helpmeet, were increasingly becoming inconsistent with the reality of household work. Indeed, Dalziel argues that it was women's new roles as dedicated wives and mothers which won them the vote. This can be interpreted in terms of their success in reclaiming the social order. Women's success as domestic moral reformers can also be seen in the very narrow margin with which total prohibition was narrowly defeated in New Zealand during the World War I.

It was primarily on the initiative of middle class women that the vote was won. Within localised working class networks there is evidence of support for some limited acceptance of ideas of "piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity" which Ryan considers comprised the virtues of the "cult of true womanhood" (1979, 155). If these ideas

were accepted by some aspiring working class women, it was because they served their material interests, helping assuage the economic insecurities of the time.

The point is that working class women were already economically dependent on their husbands, and their physical domesticity assured by that fact. If these kinds of women were beginning to accept domesticity as an ideal, part of package was acceptance of their husband's dominance. It was, however, a peculiar kind of subversive submission, in which women as wives, demanded a degree of familial responsibility from men which was new to them. The working class men who accepted this kind of responsibility may also have accepted their new role as a price to be paid for successful claims to status and respectability.

We will return to the implications of the new roles in terms of changing sources of identity and self esteem for men and women. In the meantime, however, we must now turn our attention to the relationships between parents and children. We will then be in a position to come to some general conclusions about the ways in which modern forms of the family emerged in New Zealand. Both these matters will be dealt with in Chapter 10.

Parents and Children

In an interesting and perceptive paper, New Zealand historian, Arnold (1982) compares the experience of country childhood in later Victorian New Zealand with the interpretations of European scholars who have sought to describe and explain changes in family relationships over the last few centuries. Arnold refers to the work of what Anderson has termed the Sentiments School, a group of scholars who have concentrated on changes in meaning, that is they have been concerned not with structures but ideas (Anderson, 1980 39). The best known exponents of the Sentiments School are Aries (1962), Stone (1977), Flandrin (1979) and Shorter (1979).

The most important thrust in their work has been the identification of a breakdown in patriarchal, authoritarian relationships coupled with a low degree of intrafamilial affection, to be replaced by an increase in affection between parents and children, freedom in sexual expression, and romantic love between spouses. This has been accompanied with a withdrawal of the conjugal unit from the community into privacy and domesticity. The beginnings of the emergence of the modern family is located around the sixteenth century.

The findings of this thesis suggest a very slow emergence, spurred by industrialisation, and spreading much more rapidly throughout Western societies in quite recent

times. Both my findings and those of Jamieson (1983) who has investigated familial relationships among urban families in Edinburgh indicate the presence of distinctly non-modern patterns of behaviour in the first two decades of the twentieth century.

Writers of the Sentiments School typically fail to give sufficient recognition to the importance of structural factors and in general, gloss over regional variations. In addition, the meanings associated with family life appears independent of the materially based relations of family members. A useful critical account is given in Anderson (1980a, 39-64).

According to Arnold, the New Zealand experience was different to that of England in that the circumstances of colonial life were unfavourable to "the reshaping of the family by the rise of sentiment" (Arnold, 1982, 23). While the reshaping of the family probably continued among the Victorian middle class minority among the founding stock who became the leaders of society, both the domestication of women and the creation of protected childhood were unattractive options to the farmer aspiring to enlarge his assets and pay off his mortgage.

Rescued childhood and domesticated homes were unnecessary handicaps. Survival and success went to the family that could throw young and old, male and female, into its labour force. Not private domesticity, but

the give and take of the settlement association, the working bee, the co-operative dairy factory, were the way ahead (Arnold, 1982, 26).

Arnold suggests something of a potential opposition of interests between the farmer and his wife, who had most likely spent her young adulthood as a domestic servant in some great house or prosperous farm in England, would have seen more than a glimpse of the material advantages and relief from menial labour enjoyed by her mistress and her daughters.

... many a frontier settler's wife, underscrubbing on the bush section, must have been dreaming of the day when she would glow over her daughter's virtuosity on the piano, and must have nurtured hopes that both the sentiments and the fashionable trappings which she had seen as a child ... would one day come her way. In one way or another, the 'modern' pattern for home and childhood will have brought its influence to bear on the colonial homemakers of this generation (Arnold, 1982, 26).

In the meantime, however, she had to be contented with her heavy duties as a farming wife, and perhaps her daughter did as well. Adherence to the cult of domesticity and the means to shelter, educate and properly launch one's children to have a better life than one's own requires high material standards in order to withstand the long years of extended, dependent childhood.

It also requires a distinct break with patriarchal relations in that having aspirations for one's children beyond one's own requires a radical re-thinking on the part of parents, resulting in a freeing of individual life chances. This applies to mothers as well as fathers. In this connection, Anderson (1971, 5) discusses the question of power "not in the sense of control over the behaviour of others, but in the more general and prior sense of ability to control one's own life chances and increase one's attainments of one's goals". In the section which follows, we will see much evidence of the control of parents over their children, rather less of radical re-thinking on the part of parents. However, some parents were concerned about their children's chances, especially in regard to education, an opportunity arising out of the implementation of first compulsory, and then secondary education.

Another Public Issue, Private Trouble

In a previous section we considered the problem of 'the drink' which threatened the position of economically dependent working class wives in their subordinate but somewhat subversive relationship with their husbands. In this one, we will the matter of compulsory schooling which threatened the livelihood and the power of farming and other parents who relied on their children's work around the late

nineteenth century. In each case, we are concerned with the declining patriarchal power of men, as husbands and as fathers. We are also concerned with the power of mothers over children.

Evidence from other societies indicates that parents' rights over their children's labour clashed with the interests of legislators as a result of the imposition of compulsory education. This suggests the strength of patriarchy in the sense of the right of heads of households to demand the labour of their own children as they saw fit. There was also a significant clash between their interests and those of the bourgeoisie.

In Canada, middle class observers and social workers accepted the conventional wisdom of the time that urban families were dependent on the father's wages and the home management of the mother. They were then surprised that

... in many instances children were kept at home for the most frivolous reasons by their parents, such as to run messages, assist in domestic duties, cut wood, and many such reasons that I am compelled to accept, although reluctantly, as the law at present only requires their attendance four months in the year (quoted in Bullen, 1983, 7).

Closer to New Zealand, is Davey's work on schooling and the family economy in urban Australia which shows a similar lack of enthusiasm by working class parents for schooling (1985).

These reactions to compulsory schooling indicate a great gap in the values of bourgeois educators and parents demanding the labour of their own children.

According to McDonald (1978), children in nineteenth century New Zealand were legal chattels, tools of their parents in the business of survival (1978, 45). One of the most important indicators of parents' rights to their children's labour were their negative reactions to the Education Act of 1877 and the difficulties encountered in enforcing the Act (McKenzie, 1982).⁵

It is hardly surprising that farmers showed greatest resistance to compulsory schooling since they relied on children's labour. Many farming and smallholding children said they got to school late because of their milking duties.

One of my rural working class respondents whose mother had been a schoolteacher before her marriage, commented that local farmers had no interest in education for their children, and still resented the State's intrusion of their rights. While I found no evidence of the irregular attendance or truancy, schooling was often cut short because of the need to find a job and help bring up the rest of the family. Many working and lower middle class interviewees and their brothers and sisters left school very early (often only too willingly), in order to earn. A

couple took the matter into their own hands, found a job, then told their mothers (not their fathers).

Where education was valued, it was most often in situations where the parents themselves had had a good education, or where at least one of them was socially aspiring. Even where education was considered important, it was usually not possible in families other than the upper middle class for parents to afford to keep their children at school for long after the statutory leaving age. Their foregone earnings could not be spared.

The reader should note, however, that there were several cases in which youngest children were allowed to remain at school and occasionally took some form of training which was a charge on the rest of the family. These children, both boys and girls, were able to avail themselves of some of the opportunities opening up in the public service and other bureaucracies, something not possible for their older siblings. In other words, parents might have wished for a better education for the older ones, but the family purse would not allow such a luxury, even when secondary education was free and locally available.

Parental Control

One of the most interesting findings of the research was the high degree of control imposed on children's use of time and physical and social space by their parents and others. What was also remarkable was the relative absence of overt conflict when one considers the great burden of parents' demands on them. To obey was to acknowledge one's own subordination, to defer to the power of one's parents.

The absence of overt conflict is less surprising when the strength of traditional authority around this period is demonstrated as I have done above. However, there were clear instances of rebellion and resentment among children, and a few of my respondents felt that they had been exploited by their mothers and/or fathers.

In general, parents' control over children's labour was associated with the division of labour in the household generally. On farms, mothers certainly directed the household and dairying activities of girls, although elder daughters supervised younger children. It was almost certainly the father who managed all the work of the farm itself, delegating work to appropriately aged and sexed children and to wives depending on individual circumstances. It was mothers in urban households who managed children's time and saw to it that they did their chores, though fathers may have been called in from time to time to

administer punishment (see below), and some fathers may have checked up on their boys to make sure the chores were done.

Although we are primarily concerned in this thesis with forms of male domination over women using Ehrenreich and English's (1979) concepts of patriarchy and masculinism, a striking correspondence of these two forms with different ways of controlling children was observed. This will be discussed towards the end of the Chapter.

Resentment and Exploitation

There were clear differences in the amount of labour contributed by boys and girls especially in working class households. This did cause resentment, but only among the girls who could see no need for the differences in treatment. Good examples were given in some detail earlier (see the extracts from Pratt and Yarrow interviews in Chapter 6 for instance). Other girls do not seem to have recognised their exploitation or accepted it fatalistically as part of the female lot.

There were examples questioning the legitimacy of adults other than parents to exploit one's labour. Mrs Oswald suffered as a domestic servant at the hands of employers, but her work and responsibilities barely changed (Chapter 6). Even although she was physically punished for failing to control her sister's behaviour for which she

alone was held responsible, she does not appear to have resented her parents' right to her labour and to punishment.

In one case a little girl (from the age of nine) did a great deal of housework, the shopping and cooking of the weekday meals after school. Her parents were both full-time, skilled workers, recent migrants from England, keen to own their own home. The daughter was the only child in a household remarkable for its egalitarianism and its relative lack of conjugal role segregation. It was also the only working class family whose members enjoyed holidays every year.⁶ On their camping holidays, and in their leisure time, this family enjoyed almost all their spare time together. No resentment seems to have been felt by the daughter who remembers her (adopted) parents with warmth although she acknowledged how strict they were.

A different situation was the case in which a schoolboy started his day with a 3-7 a.m. milk round after which he would go to school. In the afternoon, he went home, cooked an evening meal for the family which included his self-employed artisan father, full-time laundryworker mother, and a younger brother. This was also a family of particular interest.

As the respondent said drily, his father was not interested in anything that did not have a cork in it. He clearly resented his father and felt exploited. Question after question was inappropriate since there had been no

leisure time, no play, no enjoyment of beach or bush so readily available to other children in the community, at least after their chores were done. The respondent's whole childhood appears to have been taken up with going to school and providing services for the family, earning extra money through paper runs and other casual work for which he was paid.

One point which should be made is that his brother who was four years younger contributed to the household in no way, either through services or by providing the mother with a modest addition to the housekeeping money through wages as a child.

A second point to be noted is the resentment expressed by the informant. He clearly felt that his father was responsible for his unhappy 'childhood', that his father's drinking was the cause of his mother's being employed at a time when married women's employment was socially unacceptable and very difficult to manage in practical terms.

There was a case of gross exploitation, where a daughter was regularly beaten by her father, worked like a slave in the house and vegetable garden, and was responsible for the other children. Her mother was also employed. None of the others contributed similarly; the boys did nothing, she said. Both of these fathers were despised and their

legitimacy questioned by their children, not only in retrospect.

Children were exploited or used by or helped their parents unequally in many families. Let us note that inequality may not have been on the grounds of gender alone. Some boys played the role of 'elder sister', performing the duties usually done by women and girls, inside the house. This was unusual, however, and associated with situations in which no appropriately aged female was available. This does not appear to have caused any great anxiety, although the boys might well have preferred (like the daughters in other families) to be doing something else.

There was a strong impression that where a great deal was demanded of children this was not a function of the parents' deliberate training for future life. It was partly because parents simply could not manage without help. It can also be partly explained in terms of ideas that children should serve their parents, and that females should serve males.

These findings are consistent with patriarchal households of past time, and what McDonald noted about nineteenth century New Zealand, the idea of child as chattel. These features can be explained in terms of the continuity of old ideas in new situations. There were other households where this was not so (see below).

Discipline and Punishment

The material on discipline and punishment was difficult to evaluate. Although everyone was asked about how the parents kept order in the household, many interviewees were somewhat puzzled by the question. I suspect that this was because control was so well established that many children barely questioned it. They accepted their parents' legitimate right to obedience.

Children did their work as required, behaved properly and were rewarded by getting freedom when the work was finished. Parents defined how much they should do and who should do it.

Children themselves seem to have supported their parents in matters of discipline making sure everything ran smoothly within the household unit. The following extract gives a good idea of households where there was a great deal of collective endeavour and control was strong.

They did their jobs, then - as much freedom as they could have desired! Mum was quite strict.

HOW DID THEY KEEP A FAMILY OF NINE IN ORDER?

Well, you had your things to do. I think one of the best disciplines of the lot was every Saturday everybody had to have a load of physic which was Epsom Salts or Castor Oil or Senna Tea. You could take your pick. Always someone rebelled and had to be held down!

WHO WOULD HOLD THEM DOWN?

Oh, the rest of them. It was lovely holding your brother down [much laughter].

... I SUPPOSE EVERYBODY HAD TO PULL THEIR WEIGHT AND IF ONE CHILD DIDN'T DO IT, ANOTHER WOULD ...
Oh, yes. Big families were marvellous. It's like the New Zealand cricket team.

TEAMWORK?

That's right. The loyalty was terrific, the sense of loyalty. Goes with you all your life.

SOMEBODY SAID, 'OH, YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND, IN THOSE DAYS FAMILIES WAS FAMILIES'. WHAT DO YOU UNDERSTAND BY THAT?

Just what he said.

CAN YOU ELABORATE ON THAT?

[Hesitation] ... I suppose it's a sense of loyalty. You don't let the team down. That's uppermost, you don't let the family down. It's still the same today, that's how I feel ... You mightn't ever have to call on them but you know they're there. (Saunders: 7 boys, 2 girls: farmer)

An example of the pervasiveness of control throughout the community was offered by this respondent. Several other male respondents said much the same thing. Mr Saunders told me that the local police sergeant used to dispense his own summary justice. "If the kids went home from their little bit of birch, or whatever, the parents would give them another half dozen." The local policeman, himself part of the closeknit network which appears to have been a particularly important influence in effecting social control. As part of the community, he would have been well acquainted with the standards required by parents, and was prepared to make decisions in line with these rather than on the basis of loyalties to his official position.

Almost all of the New Zealand respondents regardless of sex commented on the strictness of their upbringing. Some people said they feared their parents, others that they were afraid to displease or discomfit them, or that they knew their parents needed their help, counted on their support and they (the children) were pleased to give it. A woman who had been brought up in a lower middle class household observed, *Of course, you see your parents working so hard, and you try to help them.* Her exact words were echoed by others (see also Jamieson, 1983, 157).

Although the vast majority of respondents considered their parents were strict, in families where children did a great deal of work, physical punishment was used as a deterrent rather than anything else. Sometimes older boys would be thrashed for some rebellious or wasteful or dangerous act. Knowing about it created such fear in the other children that they would be too afraid to do anything which might remotely rouse their parents' anger.

The strictest fathers were found among those who had to struggle hard to make ends meet as a result of the gap between cash income and expenditure. Smallholders and some of the working class fathers were hard on their children, who said something like, *Dad could 'straighten 'em out'*, meaning that they were sometimes beaten.

Sometimes mothers tried to make up for their husbands' harshness to children. *Dad was too hard. That*

used to break her heart. He was kindness itself to outsiders but, well, he was the type of man who was very hard at home." Assisted by her mother, this particular person got a resident job as domestic servant to get away from her father who clearly regarded it as his right to bully his wife and daughter. He had also refused to allow his daughter to stay on at school despite the intervention of the local Headmaster who recognised her talents (she was later to become a fully qualified nurse without her father's help). From the evidence provided in the interview it is clear that the mother was prepared to assert herself in order to give her daughter a better chance in life.

In many such cases, mothers were strict, but very fair, achieving more what she wanted with guidance rather than anything else. She was very strict with me up to a point, but she used to coax me along. In other words, although they might be strict, the mothers used reason far more than their patriarchal husbands.

Upper class mothers and countrywomen generally were remembered as having been gentle, though firm. None of them administered physical punishment according to the interview material.

Whereas strictness in fathers was associated with shortage of money, the strictest mothers were found in status dissenting working- and lower middle class families anxious about respectability. This was usually, though not

always, associated with keeping up appearances in the community (Thompson, 1975, 1977). It was also associated with widows who presumably had anxieties about money and had difficulties otherwise managing on their own.

It was usual for urban mothers to control children's behaviour on a day-to-day basis. Few people said that mothers would wait till the father came home to administer punishment. In general, mothers were more likely to punish than fathers. They were also more likely to spend time with the children.

The relationship between parents and children observed among my sample illustrates the tension between identification and differentiation associated with the 'deferential dialectic'. Parents who were seen to be too harsh and too demanding, lost the love of their children, and they sometimes lost legitimacy as well. Others demanded much and got what they wanted because their children recognised their needs and supported them.

Writing about the oppression of children by adults in Edwardian England, Thompson makes the point that children generally are less likely to resist their most immediate oppressors because "their point of contact with the oppressing group is through the members of it they most value personally. For most children, parents are likely to be the best adults they know" (1975).

My findings on parental control and punishment are similar to those of British oral historians. Thompson explodes the myth that physical punishment was a "universal, day-to-day instrument of child control in Edwardian families" (1975: 1984, 521). Parental authority was not challenged in general. However, in industrial areas there was much more frequent use of slapping and harshness towards children which he attributes to the legacy of the strains of the industrial revolution. It is interesting that the most 'progressive' parents in regard to childrearing methods were also the most 'primitive' in terms of their economic life, Shetlands parents whose work and leisure was shared with their children, and who showed least evidence of punitive forms of control (1984, 522).

Control, Class and Gender

Burnett (1982) comments that according to his analysis of childhood biographies in England during the period of the 1820s till the 1920s, that degree of parental control, particularly in respect of prohibitions, increased with social class. We noted how hard some children had to work among farming and working class children, especially in urban households. Once the prescribed chores were done, there were fewer proscriptions than among middle class children whose parents were generally very status conscious

and concerned that their children's behaviour should not bring dishonour on them.

Nevertheless, virtually all mothers were concerned with table manners. While this varied somewhat by class, even very poor families insisted on silence, or confined children's chatter in some other way. Many also commented on the high standards demanded by their mothers in setting the table properly.

At the top end of the social scale, the following extract usefully characterises the nature of mealtimes controlled by a father feared by his children. Three or four upper middle class informants who ate with parents (rather than the couple of cases where they ate separately in the nursery) described mealtimes in this way.

HOW DID YOUR PARENTS KEEP YOU UNDER CONTROL?

Well, I really don't know. My father used to sit at the head of the table. My father was the father, took the best of everything ... you know what I mean. He was the Father. And we had a dining room out off the sitting room and the table fitted in and there was a seat round like that. The walls were covered with blue and gold tapestry, and there was a leadlight window with bullrushes on it. And there was a stick behind him. Kids were seen and not heard. And if I would do anything, the stick would come out and just give a whack! But I don't remember it being used very often, you know. (Heath: 2 boys, 2 girls: architect)

Parents in the upper middle class were very careful about where and with whom their children should play.

Children of their own class were invited to the house or garden to play. Some played with their cousins who lived close by. Meetings with 'strange' children were followed by harangues from parents about the background and social status of these children's fathers and mothers. This continued into young adulthood.

YOUR PARENTS WOULD KNOW THE PARENTS OF THESE OTHER CHILDREN?

Yes. You see everything was done on class. The working class ... and that was that! Christchurch was a most terribly place, and I think, still is for class. Who was he? Who was his father? Who is his mother? These things were very important. (Malcolm: 1 boy, 1 girl: top civil servant).

Upper class parents able to afford servants also kept a high degree of social distance from their children (Vigne, 1975). This was particularly so of fathers. As we observed in Chapter 8, some of them were 'absent' in the sense that they spent long hours at work. Like the shadowey working class fathers, they also had their Clubs and sporting interests.

The distance was not only physical, but was also apparent in the ways in which fathers handled their children. For instance, it was they who decided what children's treats were to be, they who defined what children should enjoy - not the children themselves. There was usually some evidence of interest in children's education.

This invariably took the form of passing on to the children some special interest of the father, rather than the child. Upper class children were introduced to adult activities through their fathers' sporting and intellectual interests.

My interests were all in a mechanical and scientific direction, not that I ever accomplished anything much. That was the direction my interests took. Of course there was a lot of science in the family ... My father was very interested in all manner of science. He was president of the Astronomical Society for a time, he was a member of what was then the Wellington Philosophical Society, now a branch of the Royal Society. I used sometimes to go with him to lectures which I didn't understand (Harrow: 3 boys, 1 girl: general practitioner)

The importance of education was stressed in these upper middle class families. All of their children had secondary education, usually till the age of seventeen or eighteen, and many of the girls appear to have had music and dancing lessons at least.

There was not much evidence of parents participating in things that children wanted to do, but rather that the parents organised some form of amusement which would please them, and the children being taken along and expected to absorb the information as in the above examples.

Not all families were totally adult-centred. There were clear signs of a recognition by a minority of parents that childhood should be a special time, a time for

exploration and growth and that an active part should be taken by the parents.

Notable in this respect was Mrs Allen who told me that her parents were well ahead of their time. In particular, her mother was interested in modern methods of childrearing and well read in educational philosophy. Her mother's sister was deeply involved in the development of preschool education in New Zealand, and the family were acquainted with Sir Truby King himself.

YOU'D PLAY A LOT WITH YOUR BROTHERS AND SISTERS?

Oh, yes. To live so many years of your life ... in so much freedom! My parents - they left you free - they were well ahead of their days. (Allen, 5 boys, 2 girls: top civil servant).

While all other children in all classes were sent to Sunday School,⁷ Mrs Allen's mother told the Curate that she preferred to keep her children's religious instruction in her own hands. I should think we were regarded as savages, which we were, I'm glad to say. Her mother had strong ideas about formal education and firmly believed that children should not go to school till they were seven. Her views on childhood and the role of parent is evident from the following extract.

The outstanding thing I can remember is that she 'would employ someone to wash the dishes, not to mind the children. It was very common in those days to let the nurse take the children. She wouldn't let anyone do this.

... AND WHAT ABOUT DISCIPLINE?

I don't remember particularly, but I do remember my middle brother getting into trouble for teasing me. My mother would not have it - and that was ahead of her time. It used to be a common thing for people to be amused when people teased little boys and girls. They thought it was amusing. My mother would have tackled anyone. (Allen: 5 boys, 2 girls: top civil servant)

It should be emphasised that this mother was very unusual indeed in that she was obviously well informed about educational theory and took her duties as mother seriously. She also had a fine sensitivity to the sorts of degradation suffered by small children in those days as a result of teasing. Indeed, there was no other mother in the sample who acted towards her children in quite this way. Although many parents showed signs of affection, and did consider the feelings of their children, on the whole the vast majority were decidedly adult centred and emotionally rather cool if judged in today's terms. It seems that their duty towards their children was discharged by adequate feeding, clothing and any other attention when they, the parents, had the inclination and the time.

In terms of modern concepts of childhood and parenting, the respondents' childhoods and the lives of their parents

present quite a contrast. Control over farming and working class children's time and behaviour by parents was reinforced by expectations of older siblings, kin, and neighbours, made possible because of the closeknit nature of the communities in which many of them lived. This kind of hegemony was a condition for the continuation of patriarchy, a legacy of the Old World which lagged on in farming and rural communities. Control of girls especially, by powerful working class mothers, could also be expected to last long into the twentieth century in closeknit communities.

Patriarchy also appears to have survived in some forms among the upper middle class, though it showed itself principally in the relationships of fathers and children, rather than mothers and children (see below).

Among some middle class families, however, there were signs that more liberal attitudes towards children were beginning to appear, especially in regard to their protection from responsibilities associated with contribution towards the household. In several cases, boys and girls did roughly similar work, but not very much of it. This was also a far greater concern for children's education, rather than the sudden leap into full-time work at the age of fourteen or so which was the lot of most working class children.

However, few middle or upper middle class families showed any signs of the child-centredness considered to be characteristic of 'the modern family'. Domesticated mothers on the whole were very concerned with appearances, very houseproud and very self-reliant, housewives rather than mothers in terms of today's folk concepts (see below).

FOOTNOTES

¹ All but one of Roberts' 160 subjects spoke of their mother's control of the family purse into which the wages of father and adult children were paid. The earners were then allowed pocket money. See also Zweig and Madge's work referring to the 1940s in which women's management of the household budget was still common. The management of household resources and the sexual politics in contemporary households are dealt with by Pahl (1980), Comer (1982) and Whitehead (1981). James (1983) has examined the situation of working class New Zealand couples in a small town in this regard.

² It has been estimated that a fifth to a quarter of working class expenditure went on alcohol in the late nineteenth century in England (Burnett, 1982, 237). After 1870, beer consumption dropped, but some households spent a third to a half of their earnings on drink around this period. Although problems caused by 'the drink' seem to have been a fairly common pattern among some sections of the working class, it was certainly not general. While drinking was not totally a male preoccupation, it clearly created a great deal of misery - and wives lacked power to advance their interests and those of their children. See also Vincent, 1981, 196-172.

³ I did not ask for information on the management of the father's pay since the earlier interviews indicated that a number of sensitive matters were never discussed. The few who were asked about money-management did not know how money was managed and it seems unlikely that in those days, where the distance in relationships between parents and children was greater than it is today, that they would have talked about money matters.

⁴ They must have complained enough, or showed their disapproval obviously enough for their children to remember. Indeed, many of my working class and middle class respondents have always been teetotallers basing their condemnation of drink on its destructiveness of family relationships, a view which in some cases was based on childhood experience or on their mother's beliefs in temperance (in turn, the result of having had a drunken father).

⁵ Children from five to fifteen were entitled to receive free education; between the ages of seven to thirteen, attendance was compulsory, unless the child was exempted, for at least one half of the period in each year during which the school was usually open (McKenzie, 1982, 7).

It should be noted, however, that discretion in allowing exemptions was placed in the hands of local school committees to allow for variations in local conditions. This should be seen as a recognition by legislators of the rights of parents, and the realities of running a family farm. It was not until 1901 that various Amendments to the Act tightened up the legislation, at the same time overriding parents' objections to their loss of rights.

⁶ It appears that this was not the case in England where working class children seem to have been far more likely to have annual holidays.

⁷ Thompson (1975, 29) has noted the virtually universal Sunday School attendance in England that I found in New Zealand. Children attended Sunday School regardless of whether their parents had any attachment to religion or not.

CHAPTER 10:

RE-MAKING THE NEW ZEALAND FAMILY:
NEW ROLES FOR OLD?

In this final discussion, I will attempt to draw together the main threads of this thesis in an effort to present a coherent gestalt of the process through which familial relationships changed as a result of the impact of modernisation. The Chapter should be seen as presenting the main conclusions associated with the findings.

Two main themes have been addressed. The first was the changing relationship between household and family. This involved investigating the impact of new ideologies about the 'proper' roles of men, women and children. As was pointed out in Chapter 2 (page 26), ideologies associated with motherhood and housework and those relating to wage labour could be reconciled in terms of broader ideologies of gender. The same may be said of notions of childhood and its relation to cultural expressions of differences in age and generation.

The second theme was the relationship between the economic and material activities of households and the formal economy. Ehrenreich and English (1979) defined relationships governed by the Market as 'the public' sphere

of endeavour. 'The private' was the sphere of intimate relations, the family (see Chapter 3).

In both of these themes, the household was seen as the nexus through which 'the public' and 'the private' was negotiated as concrete individuals accepted, rejected or recreated social definitions. The terms are, of course, ideological constructions which have become deeply embedded in our notions of family and economy. Their meaning varies in salience and in their implications for social life at different levels of society.

Let us first consider the question of the development of 'the modern family' in relation to these two themes. Other conclusions which are set out separately, are concerned with some of the more general issues raised by my research.

The Modern Family?

There is considerable consensus on the dominant form of family in modern capitalist/industrial society according to Marxist theorists as well as functionalists (Close, in Close & Collins, 1985: see also Chapter 2). In addition to the boundaries which mark its inviolability from kin and neighbours, and its division of labour in which age and sex provide the axes for differentiation, it is also considered to be distinguished by its emotional intensity and its

child-centredness, with a set of related themes of "privacy, intimacy, the personal, the individual and self-realisation" (Morgan, 1979, 15).

Access to means of earning a living through the labour of household members is also of crucial importance. Harris considers that once the capitalist mode of production and industrial means of production are established, family types cannot be distinguished on an economic basis alone.

The vast majority of families in ... [modern Western] ... societies are 'proletarian' families in the sense that their members subsist by selling their labour power, or are dependent upon someone who does sell his/her labour power. Equally they are all 'bourgeois' families in the sense of being 'closed domesticated nuclear families'. (Harris, 1983, 154).

To what extent can the sample families be said to resemble this type? Much of the evidence has already been provided in detail. We know that apart from farmers owning their own means of production, the vast majority of the sample families in New Zealand were proletarian families in the sense that they required access to the formal economy, relying on the father's wage labour to support them. We also know that to most intents and purposes they were nuclear in structure.

However, it was quite clear that farming and working class families were deeply embedded in closeknit networks,

and that farmers and some middle class urban families had close economic involvement with kin. Many of the farmers and middle class had kin living close by who were important to them in terms of sociability. By contrast, working class families had social ties within the neighbourhoods in which they lived, especially in the form of women's support networks.

The interview material relating to the articulation of the family with kin and community networks indicated that for broad sections of the population, 'the modern family' had by no means arrived. On the other hand, we noted that among some working class families and generally among the middle class, there was a marked degree of closure.

In the following section, we will concentrate on how the process of privatisation (through increasing homecentredness among men and domesticity among women) was related to class, status and a desire, in the face of economic insecurity, to withdraw into the 'Home'. As we shall see, the question of family roles was a matter of considerable public importance at this period in New Zealand history.

Homecentredness and Privatisation

'Homecentredness' should be understood as "the normative salience of 'home' as against other ties" (Harris, 1983, 226). This may be interpreted in terms of the cheerful

gregariousness of the pub, or the more sedate pleasures of the Gentleman's Club. It may also be interpreted in terms of the greater attraction of home and hearth versus community service, or indeed, the more 'open' arena of business and industry.

'Home' in the sense it is popularly used in contemporary society is indeed a social construction in modern society conjuring up images of cosy domesticity. For men, Home has become 'the haven from a heartless world' according to Lasch (1977). Home is also the locus of private, intimate relationships, the 'private' sphere where individuals can be 'themselves', protected from 'the public'.

The reader will recall that on the basis of evidence about struggles with 'the drink' in Chapter 9, it was suggested that some working class women may have had influence in weaning their husbands away from the public house. This may well have had the effect of leading to a higher degree of homecentredness in men, paralleling the domesticity of their wives, and more generally, to a more general trend to privatisation.

'Privatisation' according to Harris (1983, 226) applies to the "attrition of external contact and activities" and refers to the withdrawal of family from kin and community into the privacy and intimacy of the home.

The trend to privatisation is one aspect of the more general process of industrialisation.

As we have already marked, some working class women and almost all middle class ones 'kept themselves to themselves'. It was suggested in Chapter 8 that this was associated with status dissension among the working class, to anxieties about entering into reciprocities with other women and to values about self-reliance among the middle class particularly.

Economic change and residential mobility would have served to hasten this aspect of privatisation. It may well be that these same processes had been taking place in earlier decades so that other generations of working class people achieved a measure of middle class status, and their children, a middle class position.

Among middle class mothers, there was plenty of evidence suggesting the spread of values of self-reliance, as well as a highly self-critical stance to their own work in the service of their families. These women were committed to housewifery. In those days, cleanliness, domestic efficiency, competence in controlling one's children and keeping them in good health, appear to have been the hallmarks of 'the good mother'. A good home was also seen in terms of its attraction for the husband who, as a good responsible provider should not stray too far from it.

Domesticity as a Social Issue

Lacking other access to earning a living, New Zealand women had historically been largely confined to the home. Around the turn of the century, public concern with domestic proficiency in women is apparent from the pronouncements of such prominent medical practitioners and self-appointed reformers. For instance, in 1909, Dr F.C. Batchelor told the assembled conference of the Society for Promoting the Health of Women and Children that he had no doubt that "the main function of womanhood [is] the raising of a healthy and vigorous race" (quoted in Olssen, 1980, 167). He thought schools ought to prepare girls for domestic life, a sentiment shared with the designers of the curriculum for schools and implemented with considerable enthusiasm. A measure of the high value placed on domesticity and the high status of domestic science was acknowledged in the establishment of the School of Home Science at the University of Otago, offering degrees in the subject (Olssen, 1980, 176).

Olssen considers that the centrality of motherhood and domesticity emerged between 1890 and 1920, a period when ideas like Dr Batchelor's attracted much favour. It was not until the end of World War II, however, that modern ideologies of motherhood associated with childcentredness, started to become prominent (Cook, 1985).⁽¹⁾

P.580

There is little doubt that the women of New Zealand took to their new roles as efficient mothers through the work of the Plunket Society, devoted especially to the care of babies and young children and founded by Sir Truby King in 1907. However, the use by mothers of the Plunket Society, and its establishment throughout the country took time to develop, and to become universally accepted. As I have previously pointed out, only one of my respondents' mothers was associated with 'The Plunket'.

The reader should note that rational methods of baby and child care were not calculated in terms of promoting loving relationships between mothers and their children, but rather as strict adherence to the clock, and the rapid attainment of potty training. Instructions to mothers make it quite clear that though they may have occupied the basic rung of the hierarchy in the professionalisation of motherhood, they were expected to control their baby - and not the other way around.

In considering the long-term development of the emergence of 'the modern family' it is helpful to distinguish between equating 'true womanhood' with what might best be termed 'instrumental domesticity' and 'expressive domesticity'. In both types the link between household and formal economy had been established in terms of the dependence of women on their husband's wages, but

adoption of bourgeois ideology favouring childcentredness, and indeed - emotional intensity - had not yet taken place.

It was found useful to distinguish between instrumental and expressive homecentredness among fathers. Fathers who worked in their gardens and on the maintenance of the house but remained aloof from children were usually married to women inclined to instrumental domesticity. Most of these fathers did not play with their children and were often seen as distant, shadowy figures (Ritchie, 1970). One of my respondents said his father did not acknowledge him on the street, and a couple specifically said that it was not considered 'manly' for fathers to be associated with children too closely.

Both instrumentally oriented domesticity and homecentredness were associated with the protection of children from most household labour, particularly with the monopolizing of housework by mothers who regarded their children's efforts with impatience. Some of these mothers preferred to do everything themselves. *She rather did things to the exclusion of us with the cooking and things like that. She had to do it herself.*

Apart from one case, there was no evidence among them of the special singling out of elder daughters as their mother's unpaid domestic servants. However, this does not mean that children were free to do as they liked. Children

were expected to be unobtrusive, quiet, clean and above all, obedient, 'seen and not heard'. Children's roles had been redefined, like those of their mothers and fathers, and responsibility for household work and wage earning had moved to parents, almost exclusively.

We must now come to some conclusions. It seems quite clear that 'closed' working and many middle class families were similar to the dominant family form in modern society, according to some criteria. They were proletarian, nuclear families, but at one and the same time, sought privacy from the outside community, without having developed the more emotional qualities associated with the nuclear family today. They could not be described as emotionally intense, nor in general, could they be considered childcentred (see also Jamieson, 1983).

I suggest that this is related to the slowness in replacement of patriarchy by masculinism suggested by Ehrenreich and English (1977) and outlined in Chapter 3 (276-278). This was a process which involved children as well as women. With the evidence at hand, it seems that the necessity for children's labour had the effect of prolonging parental power and control well into the twentieth century. These circumstances were hardly conducive to the emergence of childhood in the sense that we use the term today. It seems that childcentredness, in the

sense of giving priority to their needs before those of adults required a radical shift in parental attitudes.

Emergence of the Modern Family in New Zealand

We must first look at situations in which the material conditions of existence demanded the labour of children, that is in most farming and working class households. On farms, husband and wife laboured somewhat independently of each other except when there were labour shortages. The need for self-sufficiency meant that children's freedom had to be severely curtailed in order to survive.

The situation in working class households was somewhat different, since fathers were away from home for long hours, either earning money or taking their leisure. Here men's and women's spheres of work were very clearly demarcated. It was mothers who were the most powerful, at least in the domestic domain, in working class households. They were the ones to manage the work of daughters and sons should they think fit. As we discovered earlier, however, absent fathers had absent sons. In many working class households, men were seen as providers of money, and boys' as potential earners.

Both farming and most working class women were managers of their households, delegating work to girls. Although the relationships of mothers and daughters were

warm, mothers' demands had to be met. In both cases, these women were carrying on old yeoman or proletarian patterns of domestic organisation in which their roles as mistress of the household allowed them legitimate authority to organise and delegate work. Girls accepted their mothers' authority.

The same was the case on farms where children accepted their fathers' right to command their time. When seen in the light of the kinds of communities in which they lived, and the homogeneity of experience of peers, it is hardly surprising that that social control was so complete.

We must note, however, that the social relationships involved in women's work on farms and in working class homes was substantially different. The economic basis of the marital relationship was most clear among farmers and working class women. Working class women were economically dependent on their husband's wages (and their own domestic skills). Operating within the cash economy on a day to day basis, inequalities in the relative positions of husbands and wives were much more obvious. In Chapter 8, this was demonstrated in terms of unequal access to leisure and spending money. It is also quite clear that these women had no spare time or money for themselves.

Farming women's labour and that of their children was a family affair, with production, reproduction and consumption subject to the control of their own household members (though the weather, the bank, the stock agent and

the desire of the British public for their products all diminished predictability no doubt). In other words, the interdependence of farming household members created a subtly different balance in the sense that they worked for each other, as well as distant markets and eventual profit. Relative to all others, ordinary farming families shared equally in the goods they produced and in the free time they enjoyed jointly. It is likely, however, that in the long term, that women and girls may not have shared equally in the profits, since the farms were more likely to be left to males. If this was the case, their surplus labour was eventually expropriated by their own kin.

Change did not come about because children rebelled, but because parents were able and willing to make changes. Only adults had the power to 'swing the norms', but this was only likely to happen where both economic circumstances and new ideas about the relationships between parents and children were available.

We noted earlier that in cases where finances allowed, usually as a result of the payment of adult children's wages into the common fund, it was possible that the very youngest children might be released not only from the heaviest chores, but also kept at secondary school long enough to get 'a good job', perhaps allowing them to acquire white collar status with the encouragement and obvious pride of parents. We may conclude that among some working class

families, at least, the desire to improve their children's chances was there even if the financial means were lacking. Some working class families, then, actively desired a better life for their children than they had had themselves, leading to the freeing of individual life chances (Anderson, 1971, 5).

Among a few upper middle class couples and a couple of the farmers, we found some evidence of modern familial relationships. First of all there was the joint leisure of parents both outside the home and also the sharing of personal interests within it. Sharing of interests and time was also associated with some degree of joint decision making on the part of parents. Although fathers were usually the boss, mothers were said to have influenced them. The testimony of their children made the differences between the camaraderie of these couples stand out sharply from the apparent workaday relationships of other couples.

These were also parents who planned the future education of their children, and encouraged them to learn independence and self-reliance. In general, I had the impression that they probably recognised that children should have some choice in their decisionmaking, and encouraged to think for themselves, as individuals, though there is little in the way of solid evidence to support this.

Here we begin to see something of the shape of future change. The parents were in a favourable position to allow their children to develop as individuals, and to plan for their education, both as a result of their economic security and their abilities to consider the implications of allowing their children more freedom for individual expression than they had themselves perhaps. They were the people with readiest access to new ideas about childrearing and they had the social skills and standing in the community to resist negative criticism, that is, they were able to put the 'new' ideas into practice.

These relatively childcentred families were also those in which there was least evidence of patriarchy in relation to women, although wives' social space was still severely limited.

Apart from the very few upper middle class families and couple of farming ones showing signs of a movement towards childcentredness, it is very doubtful that many of the mothers had fully adopted ideologies associated with genteel domesticity, far less modern forms of childrearing. Closed families were only domesticated in an economic and instrumental sense. Domestic technology was primitive as we have seen, requiring a considerable degree of physical strength and stamina. Even taking into account the smaller family size of most middle class families, housewives were hard worked.

While the 'really useful' woman of the farms and the 'Ruby without price' retained the management of their households delegating much of the menial work to daughters, the middle class housewife did the work largely on her own. The chances were that she had little control over the amount of housekeeping money. In sum, in her own workplace - her husband's Home - she was likely to labour alone in addition to having less control over her own and her children's wellbeing than women whose social relations of work were different.

It seems certain that in New Zealand, the situation of women in general would have been more nearly equivalent to one another than in Britain. Not only was the distribution of wealth far more equable, but the equivalent of the Victorian or Edwardian Lady would have found it hard to survive in New Zealand. The 'servant problem' would have had the effect of levelling women's work in the household, at least before the more widespread availability of labour saving devices.

Two sets of images of women were probably dominant at this time. The 'really useful woman' and her urban equivalent, the 'Ruby without price', definitions of femininity associated with farming and the working class, women whose flexibility in work and domestic skills made the survival of large families possible. Both of these were traditional folk concepts.

The 'moral guardian of the hearth', most closely associated with the Church going middle class in New Zealand was making her presence felt in society, in association with moral reform and temperance. She earned the vote (Dalziel, 1977) As a wife and mother she seems to have believed that 'cleanliness is next to Godliness'. It was also part of her duty to protect her husband and her children from the evils of the outside world, to provide a nest in which they could shelter.

It seems that public pressure for educated domesticity, followed by the professionalisation of motherhood in later years, had the effect of assisting the synthesis of these two images of femininity in early twentieth century New Zealand, embedding women even more deeply in the home and family, committing them to new standards of hygienic housewifery and motherhood.

There are interesting similarities with an earlier period of urbanisation in the United States. Sennett (1970) argues that the closed nuclear family was a maladaptive response to late nineteenth century American industrial society. In the pre-Civil War period community life among the middle class was strong and involved men as active participants in Church life. Philanthropic work involved personal visiting to the institutes they supported. In these families men were clearly dominant. By the 1880s, however, middle class life in the same area seems to have

changed dramatically in terms of both patriarchal relations and closure from the community.

Describing lower middle and middle class families, he singles out for closer attention the self-restricting and claustrophobic nature of their life together. Gone was the involvement in the community. In these homes it was the women, not the men who were leaders. Instead, men were

the supporters of directing mothers: the home had, in some way become the focus for a new kind of intense family life, a life that was private and isolated. While older families were home-oriented in their values, they were anything but isolated from others of the same set in Union Park (Sennett, 1970, 50).

It is not without note that Sennett's language displays a nostalgic regret for the passing of patriarchy, or so it would seem. A basic problem with the study is his comparison of incomparables. The families studied at different periods were not the same ones. My reasoned opinion is that these socially isolated families may have been socially mobile ones, afraid to lose their position, afraid to seek companionship outside the family circle in company where they might be open to criticism.

Sennett notes the lack of clubs, bars, restaurants for men's leisure and he writes "entertaining friends was a rare and special occasion ... women's contacts with each other occurred through Church and charitable work" (1970,

60). There is in fact, much in his book about family life which accords with my findings in New Zealand at a somewhat later period and also with Ryan's account of change in American women's situation in the home (1979, 1981).

Harris considers that Sennett's interpretation of familial change is important because (1) it questions the close fit of family form and societies with industrial systems of production, and (2) attempts to relate the psychological pressures to the type of family form (Harris, 1983, 167). In a useful critique which pulls together the threads of others of Sennett's writings, Harris sets up the interesting hypothesis

that the growing complexity and uncertainty of social existence in the city resulted in a flight from the cosmopolitanism, richness and diversity traditionally associated with urban as opposed to rural life, and a search for a simplification of social experience born out of a desire for order and stability (Harris, 1983, 167).

The mechanism creating change was status deprivation, "the absence of any recognised place, position, or standing in society at large" which is a result of the meaninglessness of employment and the lack of prestige or access to social position in society generally (Harris, 1983, 169).

In the first half of Chapter 9, I argued that in New Zealand, working class wives sought to remove themselves

from the net of neighbourhood reciprocities expected under certain conditions, and that middle class wives (and often their husbands) typically 'kept themselves to themselves'. In Chapter 1, I also suggested that the relatively low degree of class structuration in New Zealand society made social mobility relatively easy. It seems likely that many people would have been upwardly mobile, some would have been migrants from rural areas and others again, would have had some of the sorts of fears and anxieties associated with unaccustomed city living which prompted them to withdraw into their shells (see also Young & Willmott's discussion of neighbourhood relations in Greenlegh, 1957, 147-169).

Anxieties about one's success in work, unfamiliar social relationships, as well as economic insecurity threatening propulsion into the abyss of poverty which awaited unsuccessful Victorians and Edwardians, created a situation of isolated domesticity for many women, and homecentredness for men, the trend to privatisation.

Harris concludes that Sennett succeeded in isolating the mechanism which led to the closed, intense nuclear family, writing of this process, "It is a self-defeating search for self-respect, born out of status deprivation in a culture which makes each person feel individually responsible for what happens to them, and identifies self with badges of achievement" (Harris, 1983, 171).

We should now consider some of the subjective implications of changes in work in the household, in the community and the formal economy since these are connected with the process just discussed.

Networks, Status and Esteem

Work is probably the most important source of self-esteem for both men and women. Self esteem is a necessary condition for preserving personal integrity and status in the eyes of others (Harris, 1983, 229: Janeway, 1977, 176-191: Rogers, 1980, 31). It can be earned through personal evaluation in face-to-face communities in which both men and women have opportunities for judging themselves and others on the basis of their performances in adult roles. Among farming and working class women, the 'really useful' women, the 'rubies without price', networks of neighbours and kin would have established their value as persons of worth. In the same way, men would also have had confirmation of their personal worth and their success as workers and providers.

There have been dramatic changes in the sources of evaluation available to both men and women as a result of the long transition to capitalism, speeding up under industrialisation, everywhere. The decisive difference in the ways in which self-esteem may be generated among rural

and working class men and women whose networks are closeknit and associated with homogeneous communities and others, rests on the possession of knowledge.

Where evaluation cannot be made on the basis of observed personal qualities, status must be measured on the basis of material and occupational success. Seen in this light, families who chose to remove themselves from full participation in community life, and those whose "protected social environments of assured respectability" (McLeod, 1977, 71) or *élite* networks ensure their personal privacy can be evaluated only in terms of the universalistic standards of that particular creation of capitalism, 'the public', masculinist standards. This may take the form of status symbols of various kinds and occupational labels.

Writing about the relationship between role and status evaluation Loudon says

judgements as to whether role-performances are unusual or not tend to be in terms of flexible local norms which are adaptable to particular circumstances. Among middle-class people, however, evaluation of behaviour tends to be in terms of national norms which emphasize the expected capacity of the individual to control himself, his destiny and his environment (1966, 95).

This suggests a link between (1) radically different ways in which status is evaluated, i.e. in local status systems as opposed to societal stratification systems, (Plowman et al.

1962) and (2) standards associated with 'moral community' (Moore, 1974: Roberts, 1984) as opposed to those imposed from above, e.g. standards based on religious doctrine, bourgeois notions of gender and age roles, and their perpetuation through media and State intervention through the school curriculum.

Let us consider the implications of this for men and women separately. Writing about the aristocracy of labour in nineteenth century Britain, Gray observes

Economic structure and ideology were mutually reinforcing in perpetuating the sexual division of labour in industry, the home and society. The exclusion of women and the demand for a breadwinner's wage for men was an industrial bargaining strategy, enabling men to make sectional gains while women provided employers with a pool of casual labour at below-subsistence wages. For women confronted by the limited opportunities of this labour market, marriage could afford better chances of survival: moreover, the time devoted to household tasks could have an appreciable effect on the living standards of even the poorest families (Gray, 1980, quoted in Barrett & McIntosh, 1982, 74).

The introduction of the individual wage packet, and the clear separation of paid work from home had the effect of enhancing the position of working class men, relative to women. As discussed earlier in this Chapter, it was almost certainly the case that women thereby lost control of the family purse. With the economic basis of their power within the household firmly established the adoption of

ideologies associated with the 'family wage' become all the better established.

In terms of status and self-esteem, working class men in working class communities would still have been evaluated in terms of personal qualities and their abilities as providers. Other working class, and other men generally, would be much more likely to be evaluated in terms of the position they occupied as a result of their occupation and through the display of the products of their labour, their house and other symbols of success - or lack of it.

It was clear from the interview material that women in closeknit communities competed with others on the basis of their housewifely abilities. In doing so they created 'rep' or status for themselves and others (Wilson, 1973). Frankenberg suggests that working class mothers not only produce workers, but also esteem for, and through their children (1976, 35). In another work (1966) he cites British community studies which draw attention to working class women's efforts to make sure that their families stay on the right side of the rough/respectable division (see also Bell & Newby, 1971, 202). A more recent paper focussing on the rough/respectable cleavage (Finch, 1983) who specifically mentions the respectable, industrious, thrifty Victorian English artisan whose lifestyle was similar to that of many of the New Zealand families described in earlier Chapters of this thesis.

In contrast to working class women, middle class wives produce esteem to confirm their husbands' status, that is they use his job for their confirming or earning own status. In contrast to the relative flexibility of women's (and children) work content under local conditions favouring the household and wage economy, isolated instrumental domesticity adopted by the urban middle class was what was to become what Loudon calls a 'national norm', a creation of 'the public', a creation of ideology which fitted the concrete experience of economically dependent women and must have provided them with some basis for measuring their own worth.

As a result of privatisation, recognition of personal qualities and knowledge about performance of work becomes less and less easy to gauge. The situation of women is considerably worse than that of their husbands in this respect. While privatised men are evaluated in terms of their occupational title, women receive it through their husbands' work, not their own. Indeed, married 'women's work' is not regarded as work in modern society (Pahl, 1983, Chapter 1: Oakley, 1974). Even if they are employed, their self-esteem is at risk (Harris, 1983, 229).

Those who have studied the relationship between the decline in domestic service, improved public utilities, use of labour-saving devices and the time spent on housework fail to account for the fact that the numbers of hours spent

on housework and childrearing has not declined between the 1920s and the 1970s. Hartmann (1981) regards this phenomenon as evidence of the continuation of patriarchy in modern society (masculinism in terms of the present theoretical framework). How can its perpetuation be explained?

Greater demands placed on married women as a result of the professionalisation of motherhood (Reiger, 1985) and its attendant ideologies (Wearing, 1984) have been, and still are, important factors influencing women's hours of work. The process of privatisation, together with the 'experts' exhortations to contemporary standards of womanly perfection have created dangerous pressures for married women, especially mothers of small children, who lack adequate bases for the psychological rewards of knowing their work is positively evaluated, at least by other women.

In addition, rising material expectations have resulted in the acquisition of a large number of consumer durables all of which have to be cleaned and cared for - as well as used! Linder's critique (1970) of the 'harried leisure class' is instructive from this point of view. Changing consumption patterns experienced during the twentieth century have revolutionised women's household work (Wandersee, 1981). While much of the drudgery experienced by my respondents' mothers (some of my female respondents themselves) may safely be considered to have been greatly

lightened, relative material affluence has also created new kinds of work to fill the gap and created pressures for the development of new skills.

This is an area which begs for new research for in adopting new standards, new kinds of time-consuming needless work imposed through masculinist standards, women perpetuate their subsumption within the household, married to the job rather than the man, seeking identity and self-esteem for, and through others.

It is through the twin masculinist creations of 'the public' and 'the private' that a very high proportion of women today must seek status through their husbands because the standards of 'the public' have become those through which we typically evaluate ourselves and others, both in terms of stratification, and the kind of work which is valued.

Through the invention of the 'the public' women are recreated anew as 'relational' beings, that is, they are seen as So-and-So's mother, or So-and-So's wife. The importance of women's friendship networks probably lies in their confirmation of themselves as people (Park, 1982).

If women have come to believe that their household work lacks value, it is because they have been unable to resist the imposition of masculinist definitions of their role in the household and in society. Their lack of resistance stems from their original subsumption in the

household as a production unit, the 'helpmeet' of husbands. This subsumption appears to have weathered the storm created by the transition to capitalism.

In the course of generations of change during which male control over the means of production shifted from the household to the formal economy, the forms of power resulting in women's oppression have little changed but the content of their housework, methods of childrearing and balance of responsibilities between them and their children have altered radically. Male domination, reinforced through the blinkered avenues of communication open to women have served to perpetuate traditional forms of power in modern society.

However, the manner in which power is negotiated in everyday relationships between husbands and wives, parents and children have changed considerably. Masculinist forms of the deferential dialectic in modern society, demand a high degree of identification and a low degree of differentiation in family relationships. The widespread popularity of sex, marriage and childrearing manuals of today suggest that we are eager for guidance and change, but the assumptions underlying these basically polemical works are unstated.

Children no longer contribute to the household in a material sense. Indeed, they are privileged members of 'the modern family' who create anxieties for both fathers

and mothers who must come up to new expectations of material and emotional responsibilities. Husbands, vis à vis wives, are also privileged in the private sphere. They, and their children, expect the domestic services of wives and mothers. They may 'help'. Just as it is rare for husbands to take responsibility for housework and childrearing, so also is it rare (though less so) for wives to take full responsibility for breadwinning.

The high level of women's labour force participation in modern society is no indicator of 'liberation', not if a thorough analysis of the nature of their employment is undertaken. Largely confined to the poorly paid, low status, poor promotion prospects associated with the 'dual labour market' or 'reserve army' of the formal economy, women typically earn money for the family rather than themselves.

In Chapter 6, the question of women's values was raised in connection with Scott and Tilly's opinion that peasant and proletarian women's collective values lingered on, assisting them to adapt to new situations. I argued at that point that English and New Zealand women's situation was different and that collectivism of the European type probably did not exist in England where private property and proletarianisation were already established in the thirteenth century.

Instead, women's situation as workers in the household as a production unit ensured their subordination, just as it ensured the subsumption of junior males and non kin. In other types of households depending on wage labour the position was probably different, though solid evidence is lacking. It is most likely, as Engels has suggested, that these proletarian women were not similarly oppressed, but that their economic marginalisation as a result of men's takeover of access to the means of production, forced them into a situation of economic dependency and thereby changed the balance of power in most working class families.

The question of women's values seems more effectively answered in terms of their subsumption in the household as wives and mothers. The narrowness of their social experience, largely confined to immediate family, kin and community - or in modern times to family, kin, friends and knowledge available through formal communication channels has made the continuance of male hegemony possible, as it has also made it possible for women to continue to see themselves as 'relational beings'.

In terms of long term social change, masculinism has made possible dramatic changes in the balance of responsibilities of mothers to children, reinforcing women's oppression in the household. At the same time, the prolonged dependency of children has ensured the continuance of male dominance over women, making it safe for men to

'swing the norms' and allow such concessions as employment in jobs which (as extensions of domestic labour or deferential services to other men) they would, themselves, spurn.

FOOTNOTES

¹ A full account of the modernisation of the Australian family during the period 1880-1940 is given in Reiger (1985). Novitz (1976) has written about the overriding concern of New Zealand women for their motherhood role, while Wearing (1984) has studied different aspects of the ideology of motherhood in relation to contemporary Australian women. There can be little doubt that her findings may be applied to New Zealand today.

² The dearth of material on fatherhood in the sociological literature is quite extraordinary. Until quite recently there has been very little interest in this area. Parenthood has often been treated through investigation of mothers, a strategy which has raised little comment in the past. The neglect of this area has its roots in the private/public sociological division of labour. See McKee and O'Brien (1982) for a brief bibliography and review of the literature.

CONCLUSIONS

The inspiration for this present work came from two sources. Harris's recent book, *The Family and Industrial Society* (1983) pinpointed some of the important lacunae in existing work. Most useful was his suggestion that an analytical separation be made between the domestic and the familial, showing how social historians have revealed that it is only in modern times that it is possible to see them as "a distinctive historical conjunction" (1983, 246).

Thompson's *The Edwardians* (1977), was the second source. It revealed the potentiality of oral history to transform our knowledge about the recent history of the family. In New Zealand, there is little research on the history of European family (Koopman-Boyden, 1975: 1982). What is available is largely based on official statistics, diaries and other personal documents, literary works and travelogues, parliamentary debates and Royal Commission Reports. Furthermore, the pioneering period has received far more attention than the early twentieth century.

It therefore seemed important to try to document some of the changes which had taken place in the New Zealand family with oral histories as the main source of data, especially since other sources were lacking (see Appendix 1). Taken together with my special interest in the history

Conclusions

of work, oral history seemed to me to be ideal as a primary method for filling some gaps, and at the same time make some contribution to theoretical issues in sociology and feminism.

The themes which most clearly impinge on family and economy, on the interrelationship between household and family, and that between the household economy and the formal economy have been dealt with in detail and the conclusions already set out in Chapter 10.

Our concerns are now more general and relate primarily to some of the theoretical issues raised by the research. They are of two broad types. The first set of questions is concerned with the value of using New Zealand as a case study. The second set of issues is related to sociological and to feminist theory and praxis. Let us look at them separately.

New Zealand as a Social Laboratory

I have argued that New Zealand presents an interesting case study because of its somewhat unique economic and social conditions. First of all, those who migrated to the *Furthest Promised Land* (Arnold, 1981) carried with them in their cultural baggage, age and sex categories associated with their class situation which remained with them in the absence of alternative concepts.

Although New Zealand possessed some of the characteristics of other capitalist societies of the time, the agricultural basis of its economy, its general smallness of scale, high proportion of migrants, low population and population density, relative lack of manufacturing industry and employment opportunities for women, its essentially different modernisation process had the effect^{of} creating some conditions favouring the emergence of 'the modern family', while other conditions favoured the retention of 'old values operating in new and changing contexts' resulting in time-honoured forms of household organisation. What New Zealand offers the sociologist of the family is a unique opportunity to study the old and the new within the same time span.

Those who came to New Zealand in the nineteenth century, including many of my respondents' parents, came from rural areas and small towns bringing with them their ideas about the virtues and necessities of work. They would have brought with them ideas about who should do the work and how it should be done, about the meaning of marriage, work and children. We saw good evidence of this in the household activities of farmers, particularly.

Because it was possible for their fathers to buy land relatively cheaply, and to utilise family labour alone (providing the right balance and size of family was achieved), these households could achieve a high measure of

Conclusions

self-sufficiency in a capitalist society. Other strategies such as sending near-adult children out to earn money elsewhere, helped overcome problems of overabundance of children.

Opportunities for retaining preindustrial forms of household economic organisation would have been much greater in New Zealand than in industrialising England, where the rural class structure offered little opportunity for independence among those with modest means.

I suggest that the essentially early Victorian 'fragment' (Hartz, 1964, see Chapter 1 in this thesis) of preindustrial yeoman society was retained in ideology and practice for many decades to come, perhaps in some of its elements unto the present day.'

Around the first couple of decades of this century, there was a range of non-farming household and family forms in existence. In class terms, there were bourgeois and proletarian families as well as petty bourgeois in both rural areas and towns. In addition, social reality was complicated by the appearance of a 'new' middle class in the form of white collar workers needed to staff the new bureaucracies of the expanding economy.

For those for ^{whom} an independent lifestyle was still a dream, the combined strategies of wage earning and working small parcels of land was still a possibility. New Zealand was different because ordinary people could still buy land,

although by the twentieth century the possibilities were dwindling sharply. The rural myth was beginning to die and its urban frontier phase well established (Fairburn, 1975).

As we saw in Chapter 1, the New Zealand urban landscape was an untidy one in the sense that the land around workers' cottages was well used for the growing of vegetables - a buttress against the strike, illness or other sudden misfortune, not to mention the problems of raising a large family in an urban environment. Working class people, men, women and children, in town and country were able to add to their earnings in quite a wide variety of ways which would have been impossible in large centres of population in Britain.

There were also opportunities for cooperating with others in a range of forms of economy which involved others in the neighbourhood, in the informal or communal economies. Flexibility was the keynote for many families operating a 'family wage economy' (Scott & Tilly, 1980) in ways very similar to those of industrialising England and Europe, differing only in the nature of local natural environment.

If New Zealand as a colony attracted poor but ambitious and land-hungry settlers, it also attracted an elite who brought with them the bourgeois Victorian ideals of genteel domesticity. Families like this had the material means and ideological notions which not only favoured the encapsulation of females in the household, and

Conclusions

a childhood protected from the realities of the world, but also specific notions of femininity involving deference, submission to husbands and fathers and ideas of the delicacy, fragility and generally ornamental functions of upper class Ladies, a sharp contrast to the concept of the 'really useful' woman who contributed to the family purse.

However, social and economic conditions in colonial and later New Zealand, were totally alien to ideas about the fragility of women. Indeed, without domestic servants, such a lifestyle could not be sustained. More relevant, were those bourgeois ideals associated with piety and moral strength associated with Evangelicism, together with the physical stamina and domestic ability necessary to run a household and rear a family. As a result of the shortage of domestic servants the stage was set for a rapid (though by no means, complete) levelling of women.

At another level, New Zealand offered relatively high material rewards to working men, enabling them as a group to most nearly approximate the widely desired ideal of the 'family wage'. Because of high wages, heavy domestic responsibilities and lack of 'suitable' work, it was rare for married women in New Zealand to be employed at this period. Thus, total domesticity was the expectation and the reality for the vast majority of New Zealand women at this time.

Conclusions

This created the conditions for the rapid escalation and eventually general acceptance, of new ideas about the place of women, that is, that their place was in the 'Home'. New Zealand was a society in which the settled, married population was particularly susceptible to anxieties about economic security, respectability and therefore, open to the imposition of bourgeois ideology.

As I have shown, material conditions were ripe a long time before this ideology properly took hold in the working class. Proletarian homecentredness in men and domesticity in women were of a *de facto* and pragmatic nature, rather than the eager acceptance of new ideals imposed on them. Economic security resulted from hard work in one's job or one's domestic skills in stretching the family budget, from the delegation of household work to one's competent daughters, and to the earnings of sons.

Being a 'good provider' or 'good manager' was the hallmark of the 'good husband' and 'good wife' in many communities. It was not long, however, that being a better breadwinner or manager involved making sacrifices, taking on heavier responsibilities in order to better avoid the abyss of poverty which awaited the spendthrift dependent on cash and the formal economy.

Conflict between the material interests of husbands and wives was almost certainly influential in promoting temperance, and a better standard of living. Successful

negotiation by economically insecure, or status seeking wives was probably matched by husbands, who, as providers would have had gains to make in self esteem and status within their own communities. Thus the stage was set for the professionalisation of motherhood, and the imposition of other middle class ideas of how children should be brought up, the sacrifices demanded of parents superseding their own immediate interests. As we have seen in Chapter 9, there was already much public debate about the crucial role of women as 'moral guardians of the hearth' and the mothers of what were to become the healthiest children in the world.

Some Implications for Theory

This research on the New Zealand family has raised questions impinging on sociological theory, especially in the field of stratification.

Sociological Theory

There are two main issues which must be raised here. The first is related to the question of the problems raised by the concerns of the classic theorists in sociology, the second, the neglect by Marxists of the question of status and mobility.

As we discussed in Chapter 1, nineteenth century theorists were specifically interested in portraying the

features of emergent and victorious capitalism. In doing so they placed an emphasis on 'the public' which has continued to imprint itself on the discipline as a whole. Two implications of this are the continuing neglect of women's position in society (see Chapter 2), and a lack of concern with the unevenness of capitalist penetration.

Those who have studied small communities in Britain, many of them social anthropologists by training, have observed the slowness of economic and social change. The study of situations in which the old and new are juxtaposed in contemporary Britain, could reveal more of the nature of change in domestic and familial relationships. The most recent issue of the *Sociological Review* contains an article by Bulmer (1985) who notes a revival of interest in primary group relations among neighbours, friends and kin. We need to think more about divisions of labour in sociology which separate the study of community from that of 'the family' or 'the domestic'.

There is much to be learned about the past through oral histories. For instance, one area having a bearing on the historical sociology of familial relations is the way in which the operation of traditional authority associated with the social relations of production in small businesses and factories, may be interrelated with hierarchical relationships of age and gender among employer's and employees' families. Lown (1983) has researched this topic

using documentary material. Such a topic demands a move away from the specialisms which bind the sociological imagination.

Feminists are concerned with the oppression of women by men, rather than familial relationships as a whole. I have shown that the inclusion of children is of considerable importance. My research indicates that the power relationships between husbands and wives is inextricably associated with those between parents and children. The socially constructed dependency of children on their mothers is one aspect of this (see below).

Stratification, Status and Power

Marx himself, and Marxists in general, do not appear to be very interested in questions relating to status and respectability, or to social mobility. Presumably the conservative implications are politically unsavoury. Yet both theoretically and empirically, these are areas of tremendous importance in explaining the balance between social stability and social change.

By relegating women to the wings of the stage on which social life is played, the mechanisms by which individuals and families created status for themselves and others are only partially understood. It has been argued in Chapter 9 that women are central to this process, as

families are also central to maintaining or improving the class situation of their members (Chapters 7, 8).

The sociology of the family has something of a reputation as a low-status specialism. Since it relates to the private sphere, it has also tended to be associated with women as academics or as the subjects of study. Exciting new work by sociologists, historians, anthropologists, demographers, geographers, economists and feminists of many varieties,^{is} injecting a new enthusiasm as the lines between specialist areas become more blurred. There are clear indications that generalist interests are bringing new insight into a whole range of issues.

Feminist Theory

In a review and reformulation of Engels' theory on the oppression of women in capitalist society, Sacks (1975, 229) concludes that ownership of private property is not the basis of male supremacy. In the first place, many men do not own productive property and in the second place, some women do. Instead, class societies typically use the family to subordinate women and circumscribe their activities by creating a sharp dichotomy between public and private spheres of activities. The conditions of colonial life, and relative prosperity among the working class, made economic domesticity a virtual *fait accompli*. The creation

of supporting ideology came somewhat later. Exhortations to achieve new heights of domestic efficiency and motherly self-sacrifice imposed by bourgeois experts would ensure that they became even more firmly ensconced within the confines of the home (Reiger, 1985). I suggest that the monopolisation of housework and childrearing by mothers, and the declining probability that mothers would require any responsibility for household labour from their children is another aspect of this long-term process.

If, as Sacks suggests, class societies use the family to reinforce women's lowly status, it is achieved through the redefinition of familial roles and responsibilities involving work.

In class societies, women cannot achieve full social adulthood since their access to its source in socialised production is restricted. Even though they may enjoy power it is restricted to the domestic sphere. As wives and daughters, they remain social wards. The source of male power is access to the public sphere. Thus the relations of production extend through the sexual division of labour to relations of subordination and dependency of wives and children on men - themselves dependent on the formal economy to maintain their privileged position in the family (Edgell, 1980).

Privileged access to the means of production, and therefore with access to the forms of work which are those

valued in capitalist society also provides men with the power to define work in terms of the way they perceive their man-made social world. "My wife doesn't work. She's only a housewife" is a not uncommon response to questions asked of an acquaintance about his wife. A parallel to this is the inscription on a statue raised to the founders of the district in a South Island town which reads, "To the Memory of the Pioneers and their Wives".

In the same way that functionalists perpetuate the oppression of women through biological essentialism, some feminist material reeks of masculinist motherhood ideology. This is evident in ideas about the dependency of children on their mothers. While the contemporary Family division of labour makes it unlikely that anyone other than the mother has primary responsibility for the care for babies and small children, notions that grown children really require all the suffocating and self-sacrificing attentions which make them both economically and emotionally dependent, are very dubious. As Jagger says in her review of socialist feminism, we need to consider how far the 'helplessness' of women and the 'helplessness' of children is socially imposed. My material, together with that of many anthropologists, would indicate that indeed it is.

Implications for Theory and Praxis

In terms of the findings of my own research, it would appear that feminist sociologists and historians would do well to consider the means whereby women earn status in different sets of circumstances, and to map out more clearly the theoretical links between work, self-esteem and status.

The vexed question of why all women are not feminists is usually explained in terms of some or all of the following factors - false consciousness, all embracing dominant male hegemony, lack of options and/or trickery. In modern society, women like men are deeply identified with their socially constructed gendered roles, which supply both with bases for their self-evaluation. Women who do not identify with their situation as wife/mother may have no other basis for generating self-esteem.

The implications of embracing feminism for many women is that they must deny the only sources of self-esteem they feel they have.

Limitations of the Research

This study was conceived in the first place, in terms of the great gap existing in knowledge about the New Zealand family at a formative period in its history. The research was done in an exploratory spirit informed by a broad knowledge base and enduring interest in family and women's work in

other parts of the Western world. More generally, questions about kinship and familial relations raised by British community studies, now presumably unfashionable (but see Bulmer, 1985), also stimulated an interest in what Harris terms 'the articulation of the family and the community'.

Eighty-odd interviews with a wide range of informants can provide only a sketch of the reality of New Zealand family life in the first couple of decades of the century, no matter how careful and searching the skills of the interviewer, for this is a world we have largely lost. Others in New Zealand following me, will have a better grasp of New Zealand conditions as seen from the eyes of children of those times. Those who follow, will be in a better position to ask the 'right' questions, and to know when to probe, for my own respondents often suggested them, themselves. Those who follow, will also be in a better position to focus the research in terms of specific theoretical issues making possible the fulfillment of the promise of oral histories as a primary method of data collection in recent family history.

In the space available, it has not been possible to deal in any depth with a range of issues, even some for which I already have good interview material, (e.g. on adolescence, courting and getting married). I have said very little about women's employment, an area which has

always interested me, but one on which the informants could find little to say relating to their mothers.

Nor have I made any effort to bring together the findings and attempt to link them with family form or content in the period after 1925. While it would be desirable to try to do so, contemporary research on many of the areas I have tried to cover in any depth is either non-existent, or in some other way makes any comparison somewhat hazardous.

New Research

Research on the history of 'the New Zealand family' is only beginning if we are thinking in terms of the Pakeha (read European) forms rather than the Maori. There is an urgent need to continue the research begun in this thesis, if we are ever to profit from the experience of these aged children to fill in the gaps left by official statistics and accounts provided by predominantly middle class observers.

Much energy is being put into the gathering of oral histories in Britain and elsewhere. Researchers have access to oral history archives, and the interviewing carries on. It is essential that this material is gathered and used in association with theory in order to counteract on the one hand, the amassing of unusable material, and on the other, as a corrective to the abstract and sometimes wild

speculation which seems to dog such an emotionally laden and assumption ridden topic as The Family.

It is also important that the insights of those who have used community studies in order to try to generate sociological theory (as opposed to ethnography), should be employed in the generation of new studies. As I have shown, the articulation of women, men and children with the communities of which they were a part was clearly related to familial relationships within the walls of the home.

My findings suggest a whole range of matters for future research. Perhaps the most interesting are those relating to age/gender categories associated with different forms of earning the means of subsistence. For instance, it would be interesting to compare the domestic and familial relations of family farming New Zealanders with others involved in farming in Old World societies in the first two decades of the twentieth century.²

In the research design, care would have to be taken to allow for the inclusion of a number of structural conditions such as ownership and/or control by the father of the means of production, or his wage labouring, contract work and other means of supplementing the family budget by any family member. This would allow investigation of the differing abilities of parents to use their own labour resources, and to relate the social relations of their work to strategies associated with control and discipline by parents.

A major variable to be considered would be the relatively egalitarian, homogeneous rural communities in which my New Zealand farmers lived, when compared with British ones. This could be expected to have an important effect on the quality of family relationships, since rigid divisions based on class, status, ethnicity and religion in the local community have been shown to be associated with sharp inequalities between husbands and wives, parents and children (Thompson, 1984, 522-4).

In concluding a work concerned with the intersection of biography, structure and history, it is fitting that C. Wright Mills have the last word.

... know that many personal troubles cannot be solved merely as troubles, but must be understood in terms of public issues - and in terms of the problems of history making. Know that the human meaning of public issues must be revealed by relating them to personal troubles and to the problems of individual life. Know that the problems of social science, when adequately formulated, must include both troubles and issues, both biography and history, and the range of their intricate relations. Within that range the life of the individual and the making of society occur; and that within that range the sociological imagination has its chance to make a difference in the quality of human life in our time. (Mills, 1970, 247-8)

FOOTNOTES

¹ In 1984, the author attended a long weekend seminar for rural women in a remote area of the Northern Wairarapa featuring a range of courses in sheep shearing, wool classing, butchering, goat breeding, spinning, motor bike riding, computer use, wine-making, flower decoration. The weekend meeting was attended by well over one hundred women, all of whom worked on their own farms and many of whom were anxious to extend their skills. Several I spoke with already earned their living by shearing, most owned their own land together with their husbands. Many complained that although the farm was jointly owned, they had little or no say in the actual decision-making. Implicit in the whole conception of the seminar was the usefulness of these contemporary farming women.

² It is the author's intention to launch a comparative study involving some thirty Scottish farming families. This will require exploratory research on farming conditions in the early years of the twentieth century in different parts of Scotland before choosing a theoretically appropriate sample. Access to data on urban families in Edinburgh similar to that presented in this thesis - also inspired by Thompson's (1977) work and using oral histories - offers other comparative material (see Jamieson, 1983).

P A R T V:

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I:

RESEARCH METHODS AND INTERVIEW GUIDE

RESEARCH METHODS

When this project started, there was little research or interest in the history of the family in New Zealand (Koopman-Boyden, 1975: 1982). What is more, almost all the possible sources were documentary, based on middle class experience, and official aggregate statistics. While the latter provide some of the essential background material for a study of this nature, it was Paul Thompson's work (1977, 1978) based on oral histories, which provided the initial impetus.

Given the dearth of reliable, empirically based material on the period around 1900-25, the best strategy was a flexible, exploratory approach to the research, taking into account what knowledge was available about the New Zealand situation, and using the sociological literature on family and community to provide some guidance. My own unsystematic observations as a housewife and mother in a wide range of community settings in Britain, Australia and New Zealand sensitised me to the importance of what Harris calls 'the articulation of family and community'.

The approach and early field research was heavily influenced by strategies for the discovery of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) since I was unwilling to impose an imported theoretical framework which might finally turn out to be inappropriate to New Zealand conditions. The interview guide (see end of Appendix 1) was designed in such a way as to reveal what was important to my respondents in respect of their childhood within the home and in the community. However, structure was imposed on the situation in the sense that certain areas of interest had to be covered, and that the same basic questions had to be asked of each person - at least, after the first dozen or so interviews when a clearer picture of household work and family relationships was beginning to emerge. An account of fieldwork procedure and the subsequent marriage of grounded and existing theory is given later.

Like all methods, data based on oral histories presents problems related to the quality and limitations of the evidence it offers. These must now be reviewed, together with some of the particular advantages of the method to the sociologist of the family.

Oral History and Some Problems of Evidence

As Thompson observes, sociologists and social historians have been rediscovering the value of the retrospective depth interview, though calling it by different names, life and oral history respectively. These, and other 'documents of life' have been reviewed recently by Plummer (1983). Since the life history is generally a full length book in which the account of one person's life is given in their own words, providing their own subjective perspective, I consider the term, oral history, better suited to my own retrospective interviews.

How reliable is the evidence produced through the use of oral histories? Basically, the same rules for assessing other evidence apply also to oral history, that is we have to consider confirmation through other sources, internal consistency, and any sources of bias. There are, however, some special problems associated with retrospective interviewing, especially problems of memory and perception.

Confirmation of my findings lies in their similarity with those of other researchers concerned with household and family in past time. Allowing for the very important differences in location and the particular kind of economic and social conditions in New Zealand between 1900-25, my urban interview material is consistent with that produced by oral historians in Britain and elsewhere (see, for example, Thompson, 1975, 1977: Vigne, 1975, 1981: Roberts, 1984: Jamieson, 1983). I found little evidence of the extremes of poverty and wealth experienced by British children in this period. This is what could be expected.

Burnett's collection of working class autobiographies (1974, 1982) together with his analytical comment, helps validate much that the oral historians have discovered about the household economy, relationships with parents, the considerable influence of religion, of segregation by sex and social class, of discipline, cruelty and loving relationships, all of which add up to helping to demystify the past. The same may be said of Vincent's work (1981).

I have been unable to find any published material relating to farming families. Confirmation of the material on farming families was provided by perusal of indexes and taped interview material in the New Zealand Oral History Archive, through personal questioning of other oral historians in New Zealand and in Australia, and by my reading, visits to country museums and talks with older friends and colleagues (including one of my supervisors) who

Appendix 1

had been brought up in farming families. There is no reason to believe that my respondents were unusual in any way, at least in New Zealand.

During the actual interviewing, care was taken to ensure accuracy in fact, and to question perception where this seemed inappropriate. Some respondents were vague and inaccurate about dates, but most spontaneously stopped themselves and dated events in relation to important life cycle changes or crises. Some gave dates which conflicted with other respondents' accounts. These were also questioned. All interviews were checked for consistency during the typing and editing of the transcripts.

The narrowness of respondents' perceptions revealed much about the nature of their lives and the ideologies of the time. For instance, many declared flatly that married women did not 'work' in those days, meaning employment. Others swore that boys and men never did housework in those days. Others said that class divisions were rigid, while others were clearly mystified by questions designed to probe the nature of community stratification. Much depended on the community in which the respondents lived, and on their own social networks and personal circumstances. My interviewees lived in their own social worlds, limited by the narrow confines of childhood, and by the transport and communication technology of that time.

There was a high degree of correspondence in the accounts of respondents who lived in the same community as children. Sometimes, interviewees would describe some event or everyday occurrence which had been mentioned by others. Three respondents had lived in the same street and known each other as children. The brother of one of them had written a book about the street in which the three families lived. This was never published, but I was able to obtain the original manuscript from the stacks of the local library.

I interviewed the author at considerable length, not as a respondent, but as an acute though unsystematic observer and participant of his own culture as a child and young man. In general, the impressions I obtained from the sample, were in accord with his. I also spoke at length with members of local historical societies and with librarians and others who knew the area and the people as well as reading any material likely to be relevant to the communities directly involved, and New Zealand in general. All of them confirmed my belief that the material I had gathered was reliable.

There are undoubtedly problems of bias arising from the fact that my respondents, having lived into ripe old age, were almost certainly favoured in their life chances as a group. They were also more likely to have come from larger families than average. This kind of bias, which was discussed briefly in the Introduction to Part III, is inevitable in a sample of this nature. However, there is a sense in which these two forms of bias help cancel each other out, in that children from smaller families are likely to have had better life chances than those in larger ones, as a result of greater attention to their needs.

Other sources of bias, deliberately introduced, were discussed in the Introduction to Part III, and will be elaborated when discussing sampling procedures below.

We must now consider some of the problems associated with memory and perception associated with retrospective interviewing. Methodological justification for the validity of oral histories comes from the social psychology of memory and from the field of gerontology. The quality of memory depends on perception and interest. A longitudinal study of memory showed that the loss of memory is as great during the first nine months after the event, as during the next forty-seven years (Thompson, 1978, 102). However, when the person or event is a significant one to the subject recall may be perfect, even after such a long timespan.

Psychologists are familiar with the concept of the 'life review' in which old people experience

a sudden emergence of memories and of desire to remember, and a special candour which goes with a feeling that active life is over, achievement is completed ... there is a major compensation for the longer interval and the selectivity of memory process, in an increased willingness to remember, and commonly, too, a diminished concern with fitting the story to the social norms of the audience. Thus bias from both repression and distortion becomes a less inhibiting difficulty, for both teller and historian (Thompson, 1978, 113).

The phenomenon of the 'life review' was apparent from remarks made by about a quarter of my respondents to the effect that they were, themselves, aware of a desire to remember. Many of them, and others too, said that the interview itself had

stimulated their memories. Some of the questions asked forced them to reflect on matters which they had not thought about for years, but had remembered when prompted. Furthermore, I was frequently told that they welcomed the opportunity to talk about their childhood and about past time, since there was no one who would listen any more.

A detailed account of research supporting the use of retrospective interviews is available in Thompson (1978, 92-137) who concludes that on balance they present no difficulties not already present in an interview situation involving present social life.

Sampling

The principles which guided my sampling procedures were those set out by Glaser and Strauss (1967, 62-3) as appropriate to theoretical sampling. The adequacy of the procedures rest on the theoretical importance of the social groups from which respondents were drawn rather than statistical adequacy.

Sociological and other literature indicated that differences in household organisation and other aspects of domestic and familial behaviour would be associated with geographical location and social class. Since the early interviews indicated that this indeed was the case, I started to seek out respondents from specific social groups and locations. Initial lists of people who had spent their lives in two districts in the outer Wellington area were obtained from local libraries.¹ Names and addresses of others were suggested by respondents themselves. P. 29

Since these districts had been either largely working class or middle class in the days around the turn of the century, I could be sure of finding enough people to 'fit' the urban categories. One of the suburbs also provided enough people who had settled there in recent decades, most of them of upper class origin, providing me with material for a distinctly different set of interviewees in terms of their childhood experience.

Some of the respondents who were suggested to me by others, turned out to have been brought up in the country or on farms. This provided an unexpected bonus, since I had originally intended to interview only urban dwellers. The testimony of the farming 'children' seemed at the time so different to the others, that original plans were changed.

This necessitated fieldwork in a rural area in order to collect enough material and to ensure 'saturation' of, at least, family farmers (an extra five interviews).

It was necessary to set other criteria for inclusion in the sample. Since comparison with other work by oral historians was a future possibility, I tried to limit the sample to those people born before 1912. However, it is unacceptable to ask for age outright, and despite trying to ascertain from the respondents' friends or acquaintances beforehand, good interviews with several people were conducted before their age was finally revealed (there was little problem in asking for date of birth with most people, especially when this was left to the end of the interview, or even early in the interview for those with whom rapport was easily and quickly established).

There were never any set quotas in terms of numbers. Interviewing would carry on till I felt that 'saturation' had been reached, that is to the point that new material was not being added to that of subsequent interviews (Bertaux, 1981, 37). Given more in the way of resources, I would ideally have spent much more time (and money) searching for a wider range of farming families, for instance, more of those with employees, and families living on large, lonely sheep stations. This would have involved travelling (in addition to the one expedition I did make to a farming area), and then trying to locate people with the desirable characteristics.

Few difficulties were experienced in finding suitable respondents except that virtually everyone protested that they were very ordinary and that I couldn't possibly be interested in them. When persuaded that I was interested only in "ordinary" people, they almost all responded enthusiastically. Only one person refused to take part. Some interviews had to be discarded since the respondents' circumstances did not fit the theoretical criteria.

One problem was sociologically interesting. Having exhausted my library and 'snowballing' lists, I realised that I was getting few respondents who had not lived in the first area as a child. The reason for this appears to be that social networks of 'old' inhabitants and newcomers (Strathern, 1981) do not appear to have coincided much, a problem for which other researchers using so-called 'snowball' samples should anticipate.

At all times I avoided turning down an interview because a person was unsuitable, e.g. because they were too young. I did the interview, and in the cases of the younger

ones included them having discovered during the course of interviewing that their experiences did not appear to differ in any substantial way from that of the others. Social change affecting family life takes place very slowly.

The Interview

The interviews were conducted by myself and by a graduate student of mine who was thoroughly initiated into the nature of the literature on the history of the family. He was chosen on the basis of his sociological undergraduate work, his keen interest in history, his maturity and broad life experience. Interviewing began in the middle class suburb, but it became apparent that we were not going to find anything like enough working class people there to satisfy my criteria for saturation. As it happened my assistant, had himself, been brought up in the working class area just round the harbour. His intimate, social knowledge of the area in the 1940s and 1950s was an invaluable asset surpassing anything written on the area, at least as far as my purposes were concerned.

All possible interviewees were first contacted by letter informing them about the broad aims of the research. This was followed up by a phone call, and sometimes a visit, asking for their answer, always by me. Making appointments was a time-consuming and sometimes difficult and frustrating task. Sometimes people were deaf or preoccupied as the aged often are, and took a long time to answer the phone. Many respondents were very active people and often out, visiting, shopping, playing golf. Having answered the phone, many wanted to chat and it was sometimes difficult to conclude the call.

We allowed three hours for an interview in the sense that we should meet for a break after that time. Even with this time allowance, we were often late for our rendezvous at the local library, or waiting outside for the other. Although the taped interviews took an average of about forty minutes, we took a leisurely approach to getting started. While interviewing, we were treated to morning or afternoon tea in virtually every case, usually with a fine collection of homebaked cakes and quite often offered a meal. Much time was taken up finding and examining photographs and other memorabilia.

Most of the interviewing took place over the summer of 1981/2, the May vacation of 1982, and spasmodically after

that period. My assistant conducted about half of the interviews up to the end of May 1982. The others, eight or nine - some of them second interviews with people whom we had seen in the very earliest days, others with farmers in a rather remote area, were conducted by me.

Since I intended from the outset to interview both men and women, I originally felt it was essential to have a male interviewer and one of sufficient maturity and social skills to establish a comfortable rapport with a wide range of aged people. There was a distinct and deliberate division of labour in interviewing. In general, my assistant interviewed working class and male respondents, while I saw the rest. There was, however, considerable variation depending on whoever was available. Apart from a tendency to ask extra questions in areas which particularly interested each of us, there were no obvious problems as a result of having two interviewers or of cross-sex interviewing, either from the point of view of the interviewees, or ourselves (see Williams, 1981, 201).

Occasionally, two respondents were interviewed at the same time (in the case of siblings), and in two cases, a combined interview was attempted. While these experiments were satisfactory in terms of the material obtained, the tendency to interruptions made transcription difficult, especially given the rather poor quality of our tape recorders.

Although some of the respondents initially expressed fear at the thought of being taped, they appeared to have forgotten their anxiety by the time the tape recorder was actually switched on. Almost all of them appeared to have enjoyed the interview, although it sometimes took some time to put them at their ease. The experience of meeting them was for us both, both pleasurable and taught us much about the more positive aspects of aging.

Data Manipulation, Analysis and Interpretation

The immediate task after interviewing was the thorough discussion between interviewers of the material gathered that day, comparison with earlier interviews and transcripts and efforts to link the findings with theory. In the first two or three weeks, very few interviews were undertaken, but these were analysed in detail so that a more appropriate interview guide could be evolved (see end of Appendix 1).

As soon as possible after interviewing, usually the same evening, I typed the interviews myself. When a backlog occurred as interviewing progressed two typists was engaged to help out (between them, they typed about twenty five interviews). The interviewers together edited the transcripts, carrying on the process of analysis and notetaking at the same time.

It is important to listen to the tapes, not only during the tasks of typing and editing but also for the meaning grasped through hearing the tone of voice, the hesitation, the embarrassed or relaxed laughter (Thompson, 1978, 95). During much of the time between interviewing and writing up the thesis, I had two tape recorders conveniently placed in different parts of the house, ready for listening as I carried out the other time-consuming tasks of housework and domestic self-provisioning. The experience was an invaluable one since I picked up new insights which only became clear as the products of theory and fieldwork started to merge into a coherent picture.

More formal qualitative analysis was based on the flagging of interview extracts using coloured pens, and the marking of comments on the margin. Information was then collated in files appropriate to areas of specific interest, which finally became the basis of Chapter and section headings.

My earlier training and experience in quantitative methods made me uneasy about trying to make statements involving the proportions of households or individual members in such vague terms as "the vast majority of respondents", "few women appear to have done such and such" and so on. While it would be inappropriate to present my material in numerical form, I backed up these statements (for my own satisfaction), by creating computerised worksheets on a database and counting the responses to make sure that I was not misrepresenting the material.

My modest home-based microcomputer was of tremendous help for this kind of research, and for the writing up of the work. The databases mentioned immediately above were invaluable in helping me find needed material without having to read through every interview yet again. In any similar project for which a microcomputer was available, I would certainly use it from the beginning

Data Base for the management of field research, recording names and addresses of potential and actual respondents, together with notes

Word Processor for field notes and interviews - with theoretical flags electronically embedded for easy reference

Spreadsheet for expenses and numerical analysis.

The integrated software which I acquired when the project was almost at the writing-up stage was ideal for small-scale, qualitative research. It has the potential for stimulating new ways of organising research, for analysis and, with appropriate software, for the development of theoretical models in association with the researcher's own data.

FOOTNOTE

¹ When I was starting to make enquiries about a good location for finding respondents, I was approached by the Mayor of Eastbourne who wanted someone to collect oral histories which could be stored for use by an historian for writing its Centennial History in 2006. I agreed to do this on the understanding that I would have control over the content of the interviews. In return, I was supplied with a list of names so that I could get started, and received support from the Eastbourne Public Library in the form of a room and telephone which we could use as a base. Eastbourne Borough Council also provided me with some travelling expenses in respect of the interviews done for them.

The tapes and transcripts have been deposited in the Alexander Turnbull Library and may not be used before that date. However, because of their interest, some people were asked for their permission to release their tapes to the Public Library for general use.

In the case of Petone, too, the enthusiasm and encouragement of the Librarian and her staff was of very considerable help. Many of the tapes from Petone have been copied by me for the Settlers' Museum where they will be available in a forthcoming exhibition. Permission was granted by all the interviewees concerned and their anonymity guarded where this was desired.

Appendix 1

INTERVIEW GUIDE

The questions asked of the first ten to twelve interviewees were based on that used by Thompson in his study of *The Edwardians* (1977), but confined to matters specific to the topic of this thesis. The original may be found in his methodological work on oral history (1978, 243-52). This is the interview guide which developed after interviews with the first of my respondents since their experiences suggested a lines of enquiry more appropriate to their own circumstances in New Zealand.

The schedule was never intended to be more than a guide, a reminder to the interviewer(s) that certain topics and certain concepts - shown here in square brackets - needed to be covered. Questions were not necessarily asked in the order in which they are shown below. Others were asked if the circumstances warranted probing or if especially interesting topics arose during the course of interviewing.

In general, the basic information on the interviewee and his or her childhood household composition was collected after a leisurely settling-down period. The schedule is presented below in schematic form. The original interview included many questions on growing up. Very little of this material was used for the present thesis.

Basic Information

Name, date and place of birth, mobility history until adulthood.

Household composition in childhood, including coresident kin and other temporary or permanent residents.

Schooling, leaving age and level, own job, age at marriage, own children.

Father's job

Self - At Home

Jobs done around the house, farm (prompting appropriate to circumstances, e.g. farming)

Jobs done by brothers and sisters (related to the respondents own work? younger and older children? boys and girls)

Games played with other children [SEGREGATION BY CLASS AND GENDER]

Did their parents know these children? [NETWORKS]

Self - Community

School. With whom did they play at school. [RANGE OF FRIENDS, SEGREGATION BY CLASS AND GENDER]

Organised sport played at school. [COMPETITION]

Hobbies while a schoolchild [LEISURE] Membership of clubs [NETWORKS]

Leisure as a Family

Picnics, excursions as family? Visiting as family (who?) [NETWORKS, LEISURE, OBLIGATIONS TO KIN, OTHERS]

Church? [NETWORKS, LEISURE]

Holidays as a family, or otherwise [KIN, FRIENDS, RECIPROCATION]

Mother in Home

Work done by mother round the home/farm [HOUSEWORK, DOMESTIC SELF-PROVISIONING]

Help with work [DOMESTIC SERVANTS]

Mother's work in family business/farm. Mother's work for pay [EMPLOYMENT, COMMUNAL/FORMAL ECONOMY]

Relationship with mother [RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER, SOCIALISATION]

Discipline in respect of mother, father [DISTANCE, CONTROL, PUNISHMENT]

Table manners

Differential treatment [GENDER, AGE]

Final authority in the house - mother or father? (This question was usually phrased "Who was the final authority in the house - mother or father?" and was followed by probing).

Mother in Community

Shopping as a social event. Did she take the children? Who did she talk with [NETWORKS]

Mother's visiting. Did the people know each other? [MONOSEXUAL NETWORKS, KIN, NEIGHBOURS]

Mother's hobbies? [LEISURE, SOCIABILITY] Did she have any interests outside the home? [NETWORKS, ASSOCIATIONAL INTERESTS, MOTHER/WIFE ROLE, VOLUNTARY WORK]

Who helped out when younger children were born [KIN? NEIGHBOURS? DOCTOR? MIDWIFE? ELDEST DAUGHTER] (This question elicited interesting information about children's complete ignorance of mother's pregnancy, usually followed by comments about the absence of any information about sexual matters of any kind - all quite spontaneous).

Did mother help out other people in this sort of way? (Probing for help with sickness etc. in other households) [NETWORKS, NEIGHBOURING, RECIPROCITY, HELPFULNESS AS ETHIC, WOMEN'S SUPPORT GROUPS]

Did neighbours 'pop in'? Did they perform services for each other [RECIPROCITY, NETWORKS, NEIGHBOURING]

Father's Work

Occupation, where he worked [FORMAL ECONOMY, RELATIONSHIPS OF WORK, PATERNALISM, AUTHORITY RELATIONS] Close to home?

Did he know his boss personally? Did 'child' know boss? [NETWORKS, PATERNALISM]

Hours father worked, overtime, nightwork, Saturday work [WORK/LEISURE BALANCE]

Trade union membership. Political affiliation [CLASS IDENTIFICATION] Different from mother's [CLASHES OF INTEREST, DOMINATION/SUBORDINATION] (This question elicited interesting answers from many people sometimes indicating strong proletarian or bourgeois orientations)

Father - at Home

Work father did around the house [HOUSEWORK, DOMESTIC SELF-PROVISIONING]

Time spent by father with children [RELATIONSHIP WITH CHILDREN, GAMES, SOCIALISATION]

Hobbies and interests. The pub. [NETWORKS, INDIVIDUALIST/COLLECTIVE ORIENTATIONS]

Associational membership, office bearing [COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP]

Growing Up

This section asked a wide range of questions covering the respondent's job, paid work as a child, the 'common fund' and boarding money paid into the household, work contributed to the household, leisure at home and in the community as a young adult, friends and courting, engagement and preparing for marriage. Only the material on the financial arrangements of young workers was analysed.

APPENDIX 2:

LISTING OF SAMPLE FAMILIES

The following pages give an alphabetical listing of each family involved in the project. The essential characteristics, arranged schematically, are shown immediately below.

Pseudonym	Date of Birth
Sex of Respondent,	Place in Family
Number of boys, girls	Location
Father's birthplace	Father's occupation
Mother's birthplace	Mother's occupation
Type of domestic organisation	Status Group (see Intro- duction to Part III)
Notes	

The notes include information on international mobility of parents, death of either parent and other material which may be necessary.

Care has been taken to preserve anonymity without prejudicing the integrity of the data, so that some of the characteristics listed may have been altered slightly in individual cases.

LISTING OF SAMPLE FAMILIES

ALLEN			1892
F	Boys: 5	Girls: 2	Youngest
NZ			Urban Predominantly
NZ			Professional engineer
CONS U			Upper Middle Class
ANDERSON			1908
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 6	Younger Daughter
UK			Rural
NZ			Farmer
FAMECON			Middle Class
ANDREWS			1898
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 1	Youngest
NZ local			Urban
NZ local			Merchant
CONS FB			Upper Middle Class
BABINOVICH			
M	Boys: 5	Girls: 3	Middle
Southern Europe			Scattered Suburb
Southern Europe			Fisherman
FAMECON			Working Class
Parents emigrated as adults. Father worked on his own account			
BRIERLEY			1912
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 0	Younger Son
NZ			Scattered Suburb
NZ			Engineer
CONS M			Lower Middle Class

BURTON			1910
M	Boys: 3	Girls: 3	Youngest Son
			Urban
NZ			Watchmaker
NZ			
CONS W			Lower Middle Class

BRENDON			1891
F	Boys: 1	Girls: 2	Elder Daughter
			Scattered Suburb
NZ			Solicitor
NZ local			
CONS U			Upper Middle Class

BREWSTER			1914
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 1	Youngest
			Urban
NZ			
NZ			Typist
			Lower Middle Class

Father died when respondent was young.

BRIGHT			1909
M	Boys: 5	Girls: 0	Middle
			Rural
NZ local			Farmer
NZ			
FAMECON			Middle Class

CALDWELL			1909
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 1	Youngest Son
			Urban
NZ local			Carrier
NZ			
CONS FB			Upper Middle Class

Father owned large firm.

CHAMBERS 1911
 F Boys: 0 Girls: 2 Elder Daughter
 Urban
 NZ deceased Journalist
 NZ Bookbinder
 Lower Middle Class
 Father died and original family split. Grandparents
 took two boys.

CHARLES 1895
 F Boys: 2 Girls: 1 Eldest
 Scattered Suburb
 NZ Hotelier
 NZ Hotelier
 CONS FB Lower Middle Class
 Co-resident mother's sister and brother-in-law.

COCHRANE 1905
 F Boys: 1 Girls: 1 Eldest
 Urban
 UK Draper
 NZ
 CONS M Middle Class
 Father emigrated as adult

CRANSTON 1905
 F Boys: 0 Girls: 3 Middle
 Rural, Isolated
 UK Farmer
 NZ local
 CONS U Middle Class
 Father emigrated as child, settled locally.

CRAMER 1897
 M Boys: 4 Girls: 6 Middle
 Urban
 UK Clerk
 NZ local
 CONS M Lower Middle Class

CRAMOND 1913
 F Boys: 0 Girls: 1 Only Child
 Scattered Suburb
 UK Plasterer
 UK Domestic (temporary)
 WAGEEC Working Class
 Parents emigrated when respondent four. Father very
 ill in her teens

CREIGHTON 1897
 M Boys: 4 Girls: 2 Middle
 Scattered Suburb
 NZ local Builder
 Australia
 CONS FB Working Class

CULWICK 1895
 F Boys: 1 Girls: 4 Youngest
 Urban
 NZ Secretary
 NZ
 CONS M Lower Middle Class

CUTHBERT 1893
 M Boys: 2 Girls: 0 Elder Son
 Small Town
 NZ Stationmaster
 NZ
 CONS M Lower Middle Class

DAWSON 1909
 F Boys: 0 Girls: 2 Younger daughter
 Urban
 NZ Driver
 Australia Lodgers
 CONS W Working Class
 A brother died very young. Mother had a 'bad leg'.

DARROCH			1901
F	Boys: 7	Girls: 3	Youngest daughter
			Rural
Ireland			Farmer
NZ local			
FAMECON			Middle Class
Father died when she was in her early teens.			
DUCKWORTH			1908
F	Boys: 0	Girls: 1	Only child
			Small Town
UK			Deceased
UK			Postmistress
			Lower Middle Class
Parents migrated as adults, father died when she was 2.			
EADE			1912
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 0	Elder son
			Urban
UK			Housepainter
NZ local			Laundryhand
WAGEEC			Working Class
Father 'blacksheep'. No communication with local kin.			
FISHER			1901
M	Boys: 4	Girls: 3	Middle
			Urban
NZ local			Plasterer
UK			
CONS FB			Middle Class
Mother emigrated as a child.			
FORRESTER			1913
F	Boys: 1	Girls: 1	Eldest
			Scattered Suburb
NZ			Bricklayer
NZ local			Dressmaker (temporary)
CONS W			Working Class

Appendix 2

FRENCH			1917
M	Boys: 4	Girls: 0	Middle
			Rural, Isolated
NZ local			Smallholder/Labourer
NZ local			Farm work
WAGEEC			Working Class
Father also owned some property			
GAUNT			1911
F	Boys: 0	Girls: 1	Only Child
			Scattered Suburb
UK			Skilled Operative
UK			Skilled Operative
			Working Class
Respondent was adopted when her parents died at two.			
GILBERT			1914
F	Boys: 3	Girls: 3	Eldest
			Rural, Isolated
NZ local			Farmer
NZ local			Farm work
FAMECON			Middle Class
GRAINGER			1892
F	Boys: 3	Girls: 2	Middle
			Urban Predominantly
UK emigrated as adult			General practitioner
UK			
			Upper Middle
Mother died when respondent was sick. Father married invalid.			
GRAY			1905
M	Boys: 4	Girls: 0	Youngest Son
			Urban
NZ			Contract Boner
NZ			
CONS W			Working Class
Another son died young. Father had incapacitating accident.			

GRENFELL			1906
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 6	Middle
			Urban
NZ			Contract Butcher
NZ			
CONS W			Working Class
Relatives in the neighbourhood.			
GOUGH			1899
F, F	Boys: 3	Girls: 2	Eldest Daughter,
			Middle Daughter
			Urban
UK			Tallow inspector
UK			
CONS W			Working Class
Parents emigrated as children			
HALL			1913
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 1	Youngest
			Scattered Suburb
UK			Labourer
NZ			Charwoman
			Working Class
Parents divorced, co-resident mother's brother			
HAMILTON			1916
F	Boys: 0	Girls: 1	Only Child
			Scattered Suburb
NZ local			General practitioner
NZ local			
			Upper Middle
Father killed when respondent a baby.			Co-resident
grandparents			
HARRIS			1906
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 3	Middle
			Urban
NZ			Labourer
UK			
CONS W			Working Class
Mother emigrated as a child			

HARROW			1907
M	Boys: 3	Girls: 1	Eldest
			Scattered Suburb
NZ local			General practitioner
NZ local			
CONS U			Upper Middle
HEATH			1901
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 2	Elder Daughter
			Scattered Suburb
UK emigrated as adult			Architect
NZ			
CONS U			Upper Middle
Second marriage.	Mother died	when respondent was	
fifteen			
JAMES			1917
M	Boys: 3	Girls: 2	Youngest
			Scattered Suburb
NZ			Engineer
NZ			Teashop (temporary)
CONS M			Lower Middle Class
JEFFREY			1897
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 3	Eldest Daughter
			Urban
NZ			Carpenter
UK			
CONS W			Working Class
Father emigrated as a child			
LEE			1900
F	Boys: 4	Girls: 2	Middle
			Rural, Isolated
NZ local			Farmer
UK, stepmother US			
FAMECON			Middle Class
Mother died when respondent was 7.	Father married	one	
year later.			

LYSAGHT			1900
M	Boys: 5	Girls: 6	Middle
			Urban
NZ			Carpenter
NZ			Midwife
CONS W			Working Class
MACALLISTER			1899
F	Boys: 8	Girls: 5	Middle
			Rural
NZ local			Farmer
NZ local			
FAMECON			Middle Class
MACARTHUR			1886
M	Boys: 6	Girls: 7	Second Eldest Son
			Scattered Suburb
NZ			Labourer/Smallholder
NZ			Produce
WAGEEC			Working Class
MCINTOSH			1904
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 4	Middle
			Urban
NZ local			Blacksmith
NZ local			
WAGEEC			Working Class
MACIVOR			1908
F	Boys: 1	Girls: 2	Younger Daughter
			Rural
NZ local			Farmer
NZ local			
FAMECON			Middle Class

MALCOLM
 M Boys: 1 Girls: 1 1895
 Only Son
 Urban
 UK Surveyor
 Australia Nurse before marriage
 Upper Middle Class
 Father emigrated as adult, died when respondent was
 about 12.

MALONEY
 F Boys: 3 Girls: 1 1908
 Youngest
 Urban
 d/k d/k
 NZ Charwoman
 Working Class
 Respondent's father died when she was baby. Mother
 remarried much later

MASTERS
 M Boys: 5 Girls: 2 1907
 Second Eldest Son
 Small Town, Rural
 NZ Dairy Factory Manager
 NZ Teacher (temporary)
 CONS W Working Class
 Father sole charge, manual work: also agricultural
 labourer

MESSENGER
 F Boys: 2 Girls: 3 1906
 Eldest
 Rural
 NZ Stock & Station Agent
 NZ Produce
 CONS W Lower Middle Class
 Father deserted family when she was in her teens.

MONMOUTH
 F Boys: 0 Girls: 2 1916
 Younger Daughter
 Scattered Suburb
 NZ Cashier
 NZ
 CONS M Lower Middle Class

MOODIE			
F	Boys: 6	Girls: 2	Eldest Daughter
			Rural, Isolated
UK			Carpenter
NZ			Laundrywoman
WAGEEC			Working Class
MORRIS			1907
M	Boys: 4	Girls: 4	Middle
			Small Town
UK			Labourer/Smallholder
NZ			
WAGEEC			Working Class
MURDOCH			1907
M	Boys: 1	Girls: 0	Only Child
			Small Town
NZ			Teacher
NZ			
CONS M			Lower Middle Class
Mobile because of father's job			
MURROW			1900
M	Boys: 5	Girls: 1	Second Son
			Small Town
UK			Farmer
UK			Grew, Sold Vegetables
FAMECON			Middle Class
Parents emigrated as children			
OSBORNE			1914
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 2	Eldest Daughter
			Rural
NZ local			Farmer
NZ local			
FAMECON			Middle Class

OSWALD			1914
F	Boys: 5	Girls: 5	Eldest Daughter
			Rural, Isolated
NZ			Farmer
NZ			
FAMECON			Middle Class
PARSONS			1900
M, F	Boys: 3	Girls: 2	Middle, Youngest
			Urban
NZ local			Tallow Refiner
UK			
CONS W			Working Class
Mother emigrated as a child.			
PATERSON			1910
M	Boys: 4	Girls: 0	Middle
			Urban
NZ			Clerk
NZ			
CONS M			Lower Middle Class
PAULICH			1908
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 1	Eldest
			Urban
Germany			Labourer
NZ local			Domestic (temp)
WAGEEC			Working Class
Father interned during World War I			
PORTER			1914
F	Boys: 1	Girls: 5	Eldest Daughter
			Urban
NZ			Factory Worker
NZ			Outworker
WAGEEC			Working Class

PRATT			1905
F, F	Boys: 7	Girls: 4	Middle, Youngest
			Urban
NZ			Compositor
NZ			
CONS W			Working Class
RITCHIE			1906
F	Boys: 5	Girls: 2	Younger Daughter
			Rural, Isolated
UK			Farmer
UK			Farm work
FAMECON			Middle Class
Parents emigrated as children			
RICHARDS			1902
F	Boys: 0	Girls: 2	Elder
			Urban
NZ			Professional soldier
NZ local			
CONS U			Upper Middle
RICKARD			1895
M	Boys: 3	Girls: 0	Eldest Son
			Rural
NZ local			Labourer/Farmer
NZ			Farmer
WAGEEC			Working Class
RIVERS			1912
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 2	Youngest
			Urban
NZ			Businessman
NZ			
CONS M			Lower Middle Class
Family occupationally and socially mobile as a result of father's job.			

ROWLAND			1910
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 0	Elder Son
NZ local			Scattered Suburb
NZ local			Engineer
CONS FB			Lower Middle Class
RUSSELL			1901
M	Boys: 1	Girls: 0	Only Child
UK			Urban
UK			Engineer
CONS W			Midwife
			Working Class
SALMOND			1912
F	Boys: 1	Girls: 1	Younger child
UK			Urban
UK			Boilermaker
CONS W			Working Class
Father emigrated as a child.			
SAUNDERS			1918
M	Boys: 7	Girls: 2	Youngest Son
NZ local			Scattered Suburb
NZ local			Farmer
FAMECON			Middle Class
Mother 'adopted' eldest son's			orphan baby in her
forties.			
SHEPPARD			1919
M	Boys: 4	Girls: 1	Middle
Australia			Scattered Suburb
Australia			Builder
CONS FB			Middle Class
Parents emigrated as children			

SILVER			1899
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 3	Middle
			Scattered Suburb
NZ			Businessman
NZ			
CONS FB			Lower Middle Class
SMALL			1904
F	Boys: 1	Girls: 5	Middle
			Urban
NZ local			Draper
NZ local			
CONS M			Lower Middle Class
SORRELL			1899
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 1	Middle
			Scattered Suburb
UK			Company Executive
NZ			
CONS U			Upper Middle Class
Father emigrated as adult, parents joined him later.			
SPOONER			1912
M	Boys: 3	Girls: 5	Eldest
			Small Town
NZ			P.O. Linesman
NZ local			Produce
WAGEEC			Working Class
Posthumous child, mother remarried when he was two.			
THOMSON			1895
M	Boys: 2	Girls: 3	Youngest Son
			Small Town
NZ			Dairy Factory Manager
NZ			Stationer (temporary)
CONS W			Lower Middle Class
Father occupationally mobile, mostly white collar,			
younger brother died			

TRANTER			1919
F	Boys: 0	Girls: 1	Only Child
			Rural
NZ local			Farmer
NZ local			
CONS U			Upper Middle Class
WALLACE			1910
M	Boys: 1	Girls: 0	Only Child
			Scattered Suburb
UK			Skilled Operative
UK			
CONS W			Working Class
Family emigrated when respondent			was three
WARRINDER			1889
F	Boys: 5	Girls: 2	Second Youngest
			Urban
UK			Plumber/Gasfitter
UK			
CONS W			Working Class
Mother emigrated as a child.			
WATSON			1898
F	Boys: 0	Girls: 1	Only Child
			Rural, Isolated
NZ			Smallholder/Labourer
NZ			Farmer
WAGEEC			Working Class
WESTON			1911
M	Boys: 3	Girls: 2	Eldest Son
			Rural
UK			Farmer
NZ local			
FAMECON			Middle Class

WISHART			1899
F	Boys: 5	Girls: 4	Middle
			Urban
UK			Butcher
NZ local			
WAGEEC			Working Class
WRIGHT			1900
F	Boys: 2	Girls: 3	Eldest
			Urban
NZ			Solicitor
NZ			
CONS U			Upper Middle Class
YARROW			1896
F	Boys: 4	Girls: 4	Eldest Daughter
			Scattered Suburb
UK			Engineer
UK			
CONS W			Working Class
Family emigrated when respondent			was fourteen

APPENDIX 3:

TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1. Proportion of Workforce in Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Sectors (Percentages)
- Table 2. Comparison of Percentages of Urban Population to Total Population Between New Zealand and England and Wales
- Table 3. 1881 Census: Occupations by Age Groups (Under 20 Years, 20 Years and Over)
- Table 4. 1911 Census - Occupations by Age Groups (Under 20 years, 20 Years and Over)
- Table 5. 1881 Census: Occupations by Age Groups (Under 20 Years, 20 Years and Over) (Percentages)
- Table 6. 1911 Census - Occupations by Age Groups (Under 20 Years, 20 Years and Over) (Percentages)

Table 1: Proportion of Workforce in Primary,
Secondary and Tertiary Sectors
(Percentages)

	1896	1926
	%	%
Primary (including extractive)	42	30
Secondary (including construction, power supply, processing)	22	25
Tertiary (white-collar work, services)	36	45
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100	100

[Source] New Zealand Census of Population and
Dwellings, 1896, 1926.

Table 2. Comparison of Percentages of Urban Population to Total Population
Between New Zealand and England and Wales

Year	Towns over 100,000	Towns of 50,000- 100,000	Towns of 20,000- 50,000	Towns of 10,000- 20,000	Towns of 2,500- 10,000	All Urban	All Rural
1881	36.20	7.30	9.40	6.60	10.50	70.00	30.00
1881 NZ	0.00	0.00	21.96	0.00	10.47	32.43	73.56
1891	39.40	8.60	9.10	7.10	10.20	74.50	25.50
1891 NZ	0.00	0.00	23.32	0.00	9.93	33.25	64.75
1901	43.70	7.40	9.90	8.10	8.90	78.00	22.00
1901 NZ	0.00	21.65	6.05	0.00	10.70	38.40	61.60
1911	43.80	8.00	10.40	7.90	8.80	78.90	21.10
1911 NZ	10.18	21.34	0.00	6.40	10.04	47.96	52.04

[Sources]:

For New Zealand, Census of Population and Dwellings, 1881, 1891, 1901, 1911
For England & Wales, Waller, 1983, 7-8.

Table 3. 1881 Census: Occupations by Age Groups
(Under 20 Years, 20 Years and Over)

	Under 20			Over 20		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
Domestic Domain	215477	101414	114063	81129	654	80475
Paid Domestic	7380	687	6693	12558	4217	8341
Farming	10199	9987	212	44248	43782	466
Textiles	3852	1518	2334	8078	4871	3207
Other Occupations	13605	12291	1314	91594	88387	3207
TOTAL Specified Occupations	250513	125897	124616	237607	141911	95696

[Source] New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings, 1881, 1911

Table 4. 1911 Census - Occupations by Age Groups
(Under 20 years, 20 Years and Over)

	Under 20			Over 20		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
Domestic Domain						
Domestic Duties (Unpaid)	20817	478	20339	202579	130	202449
Dependent Scholars	187400	94965	92435	377	225	152
Dependent Relations, etc.	126876	64432	62444	5011	1409	3602
Total Domestic Domain	335093	159875	175218	207967	1764	206203
Paid Domestic Work						
Agriculture, Farming	19046	16758	2288	111314	106128	5186
Professions	3422	1929	1493	29199	17791	11408
Commerce	11532	7894	3638	54122	45016	9106
Transport	4009	3783	226	32359	31365	994
Industrial	19778	12673	7105	113571	100819	12752
TOTAL Specified Occupations	400986	203758	197228	584604	312900	271704

[Source] New Zealand Population of Census and Dwellings, 1881, 1911.

Table 5. 1881 Census: Occupations by Age Groups
(Under 20 Years, 20 Years and Over)

	PERCENTAGES					
	Under 20			Over 20		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
Domestic Domain	86.01	80.55	91.53	34.14	.46	84.09
Paid Domestic	2.95	.55	5.37	5.29	2.97	8.72
Farming	4.07	7.93	.17	18.62	30.85	.49
Textiles	1.54	1.21	1.87	3.4	3.43	3.35
Other Occupations	5.43	9.76	1.05	38.55	62.28	3.35
TOTAL Specified Occupations	100	100	100	100	100	100

[Source] New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings, 1881

Table 6. 1911 Census - Occupations by Age Groups
(Under 20 Years, 20 Years and Over)

	PERCENTAGES					
	Under 20			Over 20		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
Domestic Domain						
Domestic Duties (Unpaid)	5.19	.23	10.31	34.65	.04	74.51
Dependent Scholars	46.73	46.61	46.87	.06	.07	.06
Dependent Relations, etc.	31.64	31.62	31.66	.86	.45	1.33
Total Domestic Domain	83.57	78.46	88.84	35.57	.56	75.89
Paid Domestic Work	2.02	.42	3.68	6.17	3.2	9.59
Agriculture, Farming	4.75	8.22	1.16	19.04	33.92	1.91
Professions	.85	.95	.76	4.99	5.69	4.2
Commerce	2.88	3.87	1.84	9.26	14.39	3.35
Transport	1	1.86	.11	5.54	10.02	.37
Industrial	4.93	6.22	3.6	19.43	32.22	4.96
TOTAL Specified Occupations	100	100	100	100	100	100

[Source] New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings, 1911

Table 7. Size of Family by Location

	Children	Boys	Girls	Families	Children
<hr/>					
RURAL LOCATION					
Working Class	23	18	5	5	4.6
Lower Middle Class	5	3	2	1	n.a.
Middle Class	80	45	35	12	6.7
Upper Middle Class	1	0	1	1	n.a.
<hr/>					
All Rural Location	109	66	43	19	5.7
<hr/>					
SMALL TOWN LOCATION					
Working Class	16	7	9	2	8.0
Lower Middle Class	8	5	3	3	2.7
Middle Class	6	5	1	1	n.a.
Upper Middle Class	0	0	0	0	n.a.
<hr/>					
All Small Town	30	17	13	6	5.0
<hr/>					
SCATTERED SUBURBAN LOCATION					
Working Class	39	21	18	7	5.6
Lower Middle Class	19	11	8	6	3.2
Middle Class	14	11	3	2	7.0
Upper Middle Class	14	8	6	4	3.5
<hr/>					
All Scattered Suburban	86	51	35	19	4.5
<hr/>					
URBAN LOCATION					
Working Class	92	47	45	17	5.4
Lower Middle Class	35	15	20	6	5.8
Middle Class	9	5	4	2	4.5
Upper Middle Class	15	7	8	5	3.0
<hr/>					
All Urban Location	151	74	77	30	5.0
<hr/>					
TOTALS	376	208	168	74	5.1
<hr/>					

Table 8. Size of Family by Class

	Children	Boys	Girls	Families	Children
<hr/>					
WORKING CLASS					
Rural	23	18	5	5	4.6
Small Town	16	7	9	2	8.0
Scattered Suburb	39	21	18	7	5.6
Urban	92	47	45	17	5.4
<hr/>					
All Working Class	170	93	77	31	5.4
<hr/>					
LOWER MIDDLE CLASS					
Rural	5	3	2	1	n.a.
Small Town	8	5	3	3	2.7
Scattered Suburb	19	11	8	6	3.2
Urban	35	15	20	6	5.8
<hr/>					
All Lower Middle Class	67	34	33	16	4.2
<hr/>					
MIDDLE CLASS					
Rural	80	45	35	12	6.7
Small Town	6	5	1	1	n.a.
Scattered Suburb	14	11	3	2	7.0
Urban	9	5	4	2	4.5
<hr/>					
All Middle Class	109	66	43	17	6.3
<hr/>					
UPPER MIDDLE CLASS					
Rural	1	0	1	1	n.a.
Small Town	0	0	0	0	n.a.
Scattered Suburb	14	8	6	4	3.5
Urban	15	7	8	5	3.0
<hr/>					
All Upper Middle Class	30	15	15	10	3.0
<hr/>					
TOTALS	376	208	168	74	5.1
<hr/>					

APPENDIX 4:

MAPS

MAPS

Two maps are included. The first is a general one of New Zealand showing the location of the childhood homes of my respondents *who were not brought up in the Wellington area*. The map also shows the location of the main towns and regions.

The second map shows the childhood homes of respondents who lived predominantly in the Wellington area. The black areas indicate the inner city area of Wellington, and relatively close settlement in Petone and Lower Hutt. Soames Island lies in the middle of Wellington Harbour. All the areas named were mentioned by respondents as featuring in their childhood lives, either because they had relatives there or lived there themselves at some time.

MAP OF NEW ZEALAND
SHOWING CHILDHOOD
HOMES OF RESPONDENTS
1900 - 1920

0 50 100 150 KMS.
 0 50 100 150 MILES

APPENDIX 5:

PHOTOGRAPHS

PHOTOGRAPHS

In general, New Zealand was well served by its amateur and professional photographers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Included in this Appendix are some photographs to provide the reader with some impression of scenes which may be unfamiliar. Some text is also provided.

I experienced difficulty in finding suitable photographs, especially of women's work. The Alexander Turnbull Library which houses the largest collection in the country, could provide me with only one photograph specifically relating to housework at the period of interest. According to the Librarian, there are many requests for photographs depicting women's work, and always problems meeting these requests. During the period of interest, most people did not own cameras. It is likely too, as the Librarian suggested, that women did not like to be photographed while engaged in their work.

The photographs are as follows.

Plate 1. A montage of photographs showing conditions experienced by some farmers around the 1920s, possibly Resettlement farming, following World War I. Top left: weatherboard farmhouse with corrugated iron roof, showing watertank at the back. Top right: finishing off the clearing of the bush. Middle left: fencing as a cooperative activity. Middle right: milking. Bottom left: ditching, son (?) looks on. Bottom right: probably temporary shelter or storage.

Only one of my farming respondents showed me a photograph of her childhood home. This resembled Plate 4, but was larger and had a verandah totally surrounding it. This respondent came from a very prosperous family. Other farming respondents mentioned that their parents and older siblings had had to clear the bush, and many gave the impression that the homestead was rather primitive in terms of domestic technology.

Plate 2. Inner suburb, Newtown, Wellington (see map of area, Appendix 4) mentioned by two or three respondents. Note the gardens, outhouses of the predominantly single-storied workers' cottages, most of them with verandahs and corrugated iron roofs. The area is well

Appendix 5

served with Churches. The photograph was taken from a factory chimney. Note the hills which surround Wellington inhibiting its growth, the 'green belt', protected by Bye-Laws even to the present day. It is still possible to meet others also collecting pine cones for domestic fires in the woods close to the city.

Plate 3. Petone, 1909 (see map of area in Appendix 4). This shows the Gear Meat Company, a large slaughtering and freezing company, surrounded by paddocks (fields for grazing). Several of the fathers worked for 'The Gear'. The wharf was used primarily for coastal shipping, frozen meat being railed to Wellington some six miles away. There some small factories and warehouses in the photograph, a saddler, a real estate agent's office and some rows of workers cottages as in Newtown. Many of my respondents came from this suburb, and from the scattered suburb where the road in the foreground leads.

Eastbourne, can just be seen on the coast across the harbour to the left of the photograph. Eastbourne was even less densely populated than Petone, except during the height of summer when holidaymakers arrived to take up residence in their baches (holiday-homes). A ferry linked Eastbourne to the city of Wellington, providing a regular service for commuting fathers and adult children. One of my respondents fathers worked on the wharf. Another, an inner-city dweller, spent World War I interned as an alien on Soames Island clearly visible in the middle of the harbour.

Plate 4. This shows a solid, well-built villa in Petone, a house in Bay Street from which one respondent came. Note the people posed in front of the dwelling. Note also the verandah with cast iron tracery work, the ornate chimneys and fancy paintwork displaying this family's status, as well as the neat hedges and the curtains ensuring privacy. Note also the lack of tar seal on the road or pavement. The kerbs, however, were solid.

Plate 5. According to the Librarian, this is a family photograph, taken by an enthusiastic amateur photographer. Although the photo itself shows no identification, other photographs of the family exist. It is thought that the women were mother and daughter. They are clearly posed in their best aprons and domestic headgear, clasping their tools, while the spade, rake and hoe await them in the garden when the housework is done. The watertank is clearly seen, as is the pipe leading to the kitchen (?). A meat safe is attached to the wall of the back porch.

(Alexander Turnbull Library)

PLATE I

(S.C. Smith Collection, Alexander Turnbull Library)

(S.C. Smith Collection, Alexander Turnbull Library)

(Goodber Collection, Alexander Turnbull Library)

(Alexander Turnbull Library)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADDENDA

BANTON, Michael (1965) *Roles: An Introduction to the Study of Social Relations*. London, Tavistock Publications.

THOMPSON, Paul (1978) *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

LONDON: a study of the family...
al. (ed.) *The Changing Experience of Women*, 30-44.

ANDERSON, Michael (1971) *Family structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

ANDERSON, Michael (1980a) *Approaches to the Study of the Western Family, 1500-1914*. London, Macmillan, Studies in Economic and Social History.

ANDERSON, Michael (ed.)(1980b)(2nd edition) *Sociology of the Family*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

ANDERSON, Michael (1984) "The historical study of family structure" in Bulmer, M. *Sociological Research Methods*, 175-191.

ANSHEN, R. (ed.)(1959) *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*. New York, Harper & Row.

ARDENER, Shirley (1981) *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps*. London, Croom Helm.

ARENSBERG, Conrad M. & KIMBALL, Solon T. (1940) *Family and Community in Ireland*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

ARIES, P. (1962) *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life* London, Jonathan Cape.

Bibliography

ARMITAGE, Susan (1979) "Housework and childrearing on the frontier: the oral history record", *Sociology and Social Research*, 63, 3, 467-474.

ARNOLD, Rollo (1972) "English rural unionism and Taranaki immigration, 1871-1896", *New Zealand Journal of History*, 6, 1, 20-41.

ARNOLD, Rollo (1976) "The village and the globe: aspects of the social origins of schooling in Victorian New Zealand", *Australia and New Zealand History of Education Society*, 5, 2, 1-12.

ARNOLD, Rollo (1981) *The Farthest Promised Land: English Villagers, New Zealand Immigrants of the 1870s*. Wellington, Victoria University Press.

ARNOLD, R.D. (1982) "The country child in later Victorian New Zealand", *Comment*, April 1982, 22-27.

AUSUBEL, David P. (1965) *The Fern and the Tiki*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

B*

BAILEY, Peter (1978) *Leisure and Class in Victorian England: Rational Recreation and the Contest for Control, 1830-1885*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

BAMBERGER, Joan (1974) "The myth of matriarchy: why men rule in primitive societies", in Rosaldo, M.Z. & Lamphere, L. (eds.), *Women, Culture and Society*, 263-280.

BANKS, J. (1954) *Prosperity and Parenthood*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

BANTON, Michael (ed.) (1966) *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*. London, Tavistock Publications.

BARKER, Diana Leonard & ALLEN, Sheila (eds.) (1976) *Sexual Divisions and Society: Process and Change*. London, Tavistock Publications.

BARKER, Lady Mary Ann (1870). *Station Life in New Zealand*. London, Macmillan.

BARRETT, Michelle (1980) *Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis*. London, Verso.

- BARRETT, Michelle & MCINTOSH, Mary (1979) "Christine Delphy: towards a materialist feminism?", *Feminist Review*, 1, 95-105.
- BARRETT, Michelle & MCINTOSH, Mary (1980) "The "family wage": some problems for socialists and feminists" *Capital and Class*, 11, Summer, 51-72. (Also in Whitelegg, E. et al. *The Changing Experience of Women*, 71-87.
- BARTON, Ruth (1985) "Household technology in Western Australia, 1900-1950". Unpublished paper presented at the 4th Conference of the Oral History Association of Australia in Melbourne.
- BECHHOFFER, F. & ELLIOTT, B. (1981) *The Petite Bourgeoisie: Comparative Studies of the Uneasy Stratum*. London, Macmillan Press.
- BEDGGOOD, David (1980) *Rich and Poor in New Zealand*. Auckland, George Allen & Unwin.
- BEECHHEY, Veronica (1977) "Some notes on female wage labour in capitalist production", *Capital and Class*, 3, Autumn, 45-66.
- BEECHHEY, Veronica (1978) "Women and production: a critical analysis of some sociological theories of women's work" in Kuhn, A. & Wolpe, A-M. (eds.) *Feminism and Materialism*, 155-198.
- BELL, Colin (1968) *Middle Class Families: Social and Geographical Mobility*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- BELL, Colin & NEWBY, Howard (1971) *Community Studies*. London, Allen & Unwin.
- BELL, C. & NEWBY, H. (1976) "Husbands and Wives: the dynamics of the deferential dialectic" in Allen, S. & Barker, D.L. (eds.) *Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage*, 152-168.
- BELL, Daniel (1962) *The End of Ideology*. New York, Free Press.
- BENSTON, Margaret (1969) "The political economy of women's liberation", *Monthly Review*, 21, 4, 13-27.
- BERK, Sarah Fenstermaker (ed.) (1980) *Women and Household Labor*. Beverly Hills, Sage Publications.

BERKNER, L.K. (1972) "The stem family and the developmental cycle of the peasant household: an eighteenth century Austrian example." *American Historical Review*, 7, 398-418.

BERKNER, L.K. (1973) "Recent research on the history of the family in Western Europe" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 35, 395-405.

BERKNER, L.(1975) "The use and misuse of census data for the historical analysis of family structure" *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 5, 4, 721-38.

BERNARDES, Jon (1985a) "Do we really know what 'the Family' is?" in Close, P. & Collins, R. (eds.) *Family and Economy in Modern Society*, 192-211.

BERNARDES, Jon (1985b) "'Family ideology': identification and exploration", *Sociological Review*, 33, 2, 275-297.

BERNARDES, Jon (1985c, 1986) "Multidimensional developmental pathways: a proposal to facilitate the conceptualisation of 'family diversity'". Mimeography, to be published, *Sociological Review*, February, 1986.

BERTAUX, D. (ed.)(1981) *Biography and Society: The Life History Approach in the Social Sciences* Calif., Beverly Hills, Sage Publications.

BILTON, Tony, et al. (1981) *Introductory Sociology*. London, Macmillan.

BLAU, Peter M. (1964) *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York, Wiley.

BOTT, Elizabeth (1971)(1st ed., 1957) *Family and Social Network*. London, Tavistock.

BOURNE, George (1984)(1st ed., 1912) *Change in the Village*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.

BRADBURY, Bettina (1979) "The family economy and working in an industrializing city: Montreal in the 1870s", *Historical Papers*. A selection of papers presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association held at Saskatoon, 71-96.

BRADBURY, Bettina (1982) "The fragmented family: family strategies in the face of death, illness and poverty, Montreal, 1860-1885" in Parr, J. (ed.) *Childhood and the Family in Canadian History*, 109-128.

- BRANCA, Patricia (1974) "Image and reality: the myth of the idle Victorian woman" in Hartman, M. & Banner, L.W. (eds.) *Clio's Consciousness Raised*, 179-191.
- BRANCA, Patricia (1975) *Silent Sisterhood: Middle Class Women in the Victorian Home*. London, Croom Helm.
- BRAVERMAN, Harry (1974) *Labour and Monopoly Capital*. New York, Monthly Review Press.
- BROOKING, Tom (1981) "Economic transformation", in Oliver, W.H. (ed.) *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, 226-249.
- BROOM, Dorothy H. (1984)(ed.) *Unfinished Business: Social Justice for Women in Australia*. Sydney, George Allen & Unwin.
- BULLEN, John (1983) "Hidden workers: child labour and the household economy in early industrial Ontario." Unpublished paper prepared for the Canadian Historical Association.
- BULMER, Martin (ed.)(1984) *Sociological Research Methods: An Introduction*. (2nd edition). London, Macmillan.
- BULMER, Martin (1985) "The rejuvenation of community studies? Neighbours, networks and policy", *Sociological Review*, 33, 3, August, 430-448.
- BUNKLE, P. & HUGHES, B.(eds.)(1980) *Women in New Zealand Society*. Auckland, George Allen & Unwin.
- BURNAM, Sandra (ed.)(1979) *Fit Work for Women*. London, Croom Helm.
- BURNETT, JOHN (ed.)(1974) *Useful Toil: Autobiographies of Working People from the 1820s to the 1920s*. London, Allen Lane.
- BURNETT, John (1982) *Destiny Obscure: Autobiographies of Childhood, Education and the Family from 1820s to 1920s*. London, Allen Lane.
- BURR, W. et al. (eds.)(1979) *Contemporary Theories about the Family*, Volume 1. New York, Free Press.
- BURRIS, Val (1982) "The dialectic of women's oppression: notes on the relation between capitalism and patriarchy", *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 27, 51-74.

C*

CALDWELL, John C. (1976) "Towards a restatement of demographic transition theory", *Population and Development Review*, 2, 3/4.

CAMERON, Jan (1984) "Why Have Children?: A Study of Method and Meaning in Value". Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in Sociology, University of Waikato, Hamilton.

CARTER, Jan (1981) *Nothing to Spare: Recollections of Australian Pioneering Women*. Melbourne, Penguin Books.

CASS, Bettina (1984) "Comment" (on Tulloch, P.) in Broom, D. (ed.) *Unfinished Business*, 38-45.

CHAMBERLAIN, Mary & RICHARDSON, Ruth (1983) "Life and death", *Oral History*, 11, 1, 31-43.

CHAYTOR, Miranda (1980) "Household and kinship: Ryton in the late 16th and early 17th centuries", *History Workshop Journal*, 10, 25-60.

CHRISTENSEN, Harold T. (1977) "Relationship between differentiation and equality in the sex role structure: conceptual models and suggested research" in Lenero-Otero, L. (ed.) *Beyond the Nuclear Family Model*, 205-224.

CLARK, Alice (1982)(1st ed. 1919) *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

CLOSE, Paul (1985) "Family form and economic production", in Close, P. & Collins, R. (eds.) *Family and Economy in Modern Society*, 9-48.

CLOSE, Paul & COLLINS, Rosemary (eds.)(1985) *Family and Economy in Modern Society*. London, Macmillan.

COCKBURN, Cynthia (1981) *The material of male power*, *Feminist Review*, 9, Autumn, 41-58.

COHEN, Anthony P. (ed.)(1982) *Belonging: Identity and Social Organisation in British Rural Cultures*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

COLLIER, Jane, et al. (1982) "Is there a family? New anthropological views", in Thorne, B. and Yalom, M. (eds.) *Rethinking the Family*, 25-39.

Bibliography

COLLINS, Randall (1985) *Three Sociological Traditions*. New York, Oxford University Press.

COMER, Lee (1982) "Monogamy, marriage and economic dependence", in Whitelegg, E. et al. (eds.) *The Changing Experience of Women*, 178-189.

CONDLIFFE, J.B. (1959)(1st ed., 1936) *New Zealand in the Making: a Study of Economic and Social Development*. London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

COOK, Helen (1985) "The art of marriage as a career for the 1950s", *Women's Studies Journal*, 2, 1, August.

CROSSICK, Geoffrey (1977) *The Lower Middle Class in Britain, 1870-1914*. London, Croom Helm.

CROSSICK, Geoffrey (1977) "The emergence of the lower middle class in Britain: a discussion" in Crossick, G. (ed.) *The Lower Middle Class in Britain, 1870-1914*, 11-60

CROZIER, Dorothy (1965) "Kinship and occupational succession", *Sociological Review*, New Series, 13, 15-43.

D*

DALLA COSTA, M. & JAMES, S. (1975) *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*. Bristol, Falling Wall Press.

DALZIEL, Raewyn (1977) "The colonial helpmeet: women's role and the vote in nineteenth century New Zealand", *New Zealand Journal of History*, 11, 2, 112-123.

DAVEY, Ian (1985) "Growing up in a working-class community: school and work in Hindmarsh" in Grimshaw, P. (ed.) *Families in Colonial Australia*, 163-172.

DAVIDOFF, Leonore (1973) *The Best Circles: Society, Etiquette and the Season*. London, Croom Helm.

DAVIDOFF, Leonore (1976) "The rationalization of housework", in Barker, D.L. & Allen, S. *Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage*, 121-151.

DAVIDOFF, Leonore (1979) "The separation of home and work? landladies and lodgers in nineteenth- and twentieth-century England" in Burnam, S. *Fit Work for Women*, 64-97.

- DAVIDOFF, Leonore, L'ESPERANCE, Jean & NEWBY, Howard (1976) "Landscape with figures: home and community in English society" in Mitchell, J. & Oakley, A. *The Rights and Wrongs of Women*, 139-175.
- DAVIDSON, C. (1982) *A Woman's Work is Never Done: A History of Housework in the British Isles, 1650-1950*. London, Chatto & Windus.
- DEGLER, Carl N. (1980) *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- DELPHY, Christine (1976) "Continuities and discontinuities in marriage and divorce" in Barker, D.L. & Allen, S. (eds.) *Sexual Divisions and Society*, 76-89.
- DELPHY, Christine (1979) "Sharing the same table: consumption and the family" in Harris, C.C. (ed.) *The Sociology of the Family*, 214-231.
- DELPHY, Christine (1984) *Close to Home: a Materialist Analysis of Women's Oppression*. London, Hutchinson.
- DEMOS, John & BOOCOCK, Sarane Spence (1978) *Turning Points: Historical and Sociological Essays on the Family*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- DENNIS, N., HENRIQUES, F.M. & SLAUGHTER, C. (1957) *Coal is Our Life*. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- DOIG, W.T. (1946) "Standards of Life of New Zealand Dairy-farmers". Wellington, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Social Science Research Bureau, Research Publication No.1.
- DRUMMOND, Alison (1960) *Married and Gone to New Zealand*. Hamilton, Paul's Book Arcade.
- DRUMMOND, Alison & DRUMMOND, L.H. (1967) *At Home in New Zealand: an Illustrated History of Everyday Things before 1865*. Auckland, B. & J. Paul.

E*

- EBBETT, Eve (1981) *Victoria's Daughters: New Zealand Women of the Thirties*. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed Ltd.
- EDGEELL, Stephen (1980) *Middle Class Couples: A Study of Segregation, Domination and Inequality in Marriage*. London, George Allen & Unwin.
- EDHOLM, Felicity, HARRIS, Olive & YOUNG, Kate (1977) "Conceptualising women". *Critique of Anthropology*, 3, 9/10, 101-130.
- EEKELAAR, John & KATZ, Sanford N. (1980) *Marriage and Cohabitation in Contemporary Society*. Toronto, Butterworth.
- EHRENREICH, Barbara & ENGLISH, Deirdre (1979) *For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women*. New York, Anchor Books.
- EISENSTEIN, Zillah R. (ed.)(1979) *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. New York, Monthly Review Press.
- EISENSTEIN, Zillah R. (1979a) "Developing a theory of capitalist patriarchy and socialist feminism", in Eisenstein, Z.R. (ed.) *Capitalist Patriarchy*, 5-40.
- EISENSTEIN, Zillah R. (1979b) "Some notes on the relations of capitalist patriarchy", in Eisenstein, Z.R. *Capitalist Patriarchy*, 41-55.
- ELDER, Glen H. Jr. (1978) "Approaches to Social Change and the Family", in Demos, J. and Boocock, S.S. (eds.) *Turning Points*, 1-38.
- ELDRED-GRIGG, Stevan (1984) *Pleasures of the Flesh: Sex and Drugs in Colonial New Zealand, 1840-1915*. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- ELSHTAIN, J.B. (ed.)(1982) *The Family in Political Thought*. Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press.
- ENGELS, Frederick (1969)(1st ed. in English 1892) *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. London, Panther.
- ENGELS, Friedrich (1972) *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*. New York, International Publishers.

F*

- FACEY, A.B. (1981) *A Fortunate Life*. Melbourne, Penguin Books.
- FAIRBURN, M. (1975) "The rural myth and the new urban frontier: an approach to New Zealand social history, 1870-1970", *New Zealand Journal of History*, 9, 3-21.
- FAIRBURN, Miles (1979) "Social mobility and opportunity in nineteenth-century New Zealand", *New Zealand Journal of History*, 13, 1, 43-64.
- FERGUSON, Ann & FOLBRE, Nancy (1981) "The unhappy marriage of patriarchy and capitalism", in Sargent, L. (ed.) *Women and Revolution*, 313-338.
- FINCH, Janet (1983) "Dividing the rough and the respectable: working-class women and pre-school playgroups", in Gamarnikow, E. et al. *The Public and the Private*, 106-117.
- FINCH, Janet & GROVES, Dulcie (1980) "Community Care and the Family: A Case for Equal Opportunities?" *Journal of Social Policy*, 9, 4, 487-511.
- FINLEY, M.I. (ed.)(1974) *Studies in Ancient Society*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- FINLEY, M.I. (1974) "Aristotle and economic analysis", in *Studies in Ancient Society*, 26-52.
- FIRESTONE, Shulamith (1971) *The Dialectic of Sex*. New York, Bantam Books.
- FIRTH, Raymond (ed.)(1956) *Two Studies of Kinship in London*. London, Athlone Press.
- FIRTH, Raymond & DJAMOUR, Judith (1956) "Kinship in South Borough" in Firth, R. (ed.) *Two Studies of Kinship in London*, 33-66.
- FIRTH, R. (1964) "Family and kinship in industrial society" in Paul Halmos (ed.) *The Development of Industrial Societies*. Sociological Review Monograph No.8.
- FIRTH, Raymond, HUBERT, Jane & FORGE, Anthony (1969) *Families and their Relatives*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bibliography

- FLANDRIN, J-L.(1979) *Families in Former Times: Kinship, Household and Sexuality.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- FOSTER, John (1974) *Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution.* London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- FOX, Bonnie (1980) "Women's double work day: twentieth-century changes in the reproduction of daily life" in Fox, B. (ed.) *Hidden in the Household*, 173-216.
- FOX, Bonnie (ed.)(1980) *Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism.* Toronto: The Women's Press.
- FOX, Robin (1967) *Kinship and Marriage: An Anthropological Perspective.* Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- FRANKENBERG, Ronald (1966) "British community studies: problems of synthesis" in Banton, M. (ed.) *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*, 123-154.
- FRANKENBERG, Ronald (1966) *Communities in Britain: Social Life in Town and Country.* Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- FRANKENBERG, Ronald (1976) "In the production of their lives, men (?) ... sex and gender in British community studies", in Barker, D.L. & Allen, S. (eds.) *Sexual Divisions and Society*, 25-51.
- FRANKLIN, S.H. (1969) "The self-employed society", *Pacific Viewpoint*, 10, 1, 25-56.
- FREIRE, P. (1972) *Cultural Action for Freedom,* Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- FRY, Ruth (1985) *It's Different for Daughters: A History of the Curriculum for Girls in New Zealand Schools, 1900-75.* Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- G*
- GALT, M.N. (1985) "Wealth and Income in New Zealand c. 1870 to c. 1939". Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in Economic History, Victoria University of Wellington.
- GAMARNIKOW, Eva et al.(eds.)(1983a) *Gender, Class and Work.* London, Heinemann.

- GAMARNIKOW, Eva et al.(eds.)(1983b) *The Public and the Private*. London, Heineman.
- GARDINER, Jean (1976) "Political economy of domestic labour in capitalist society" in Barker, D.L. & Allen, S. (eds.) *Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage*, 109-20.
- GARDINER, W.J. (1981) "A colonial economy" in Oliver, W.H.(ed.) *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, 57-86.
- GEORGE, Margaret (1973) "From 'Goodwife' to 'Mistress': the transformation of the female in bourgeois culture", *Science and Society*, 37, 2, 152-177.
- GERSHUNY, J.I. (1979) "The informal economy: its role in industrial society", *Futures*, February, 3-15.
- GIDDENS, Anthony (1973) *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies*. London, Hutheson University Library.
- GILSON, Miriam (1967) "The changing New Zealand family" in *The New Zealand Family and Child Development*. New Zealand University Press, 1968 Lectures: Association for the Study of Childhood.
- GILSON, Miriam (1970) "The changing New Zealand family: a demographic analysis", in Houston, S. (ed.) *Marriage and the Family in New Zealand*, 41-65.
- GITTENS, Diana (1982) *Fair Sex: Family Size and Structure, 1900-1939*. London, Hutchinson.
- GITTENS, Diana (1985) *The Family in Question: Changing Households and Familiar Ideologies*. London, Macmillan.
- GLASER, Barney G. & STRAUSS, Anselm L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.
- GLASS, D.V. & EVERSLEY, D.E.C.(eds.)(1974) *Population in History: Essays in Historical Demography*. London, Edward Arnold.
- GLUCKMAN, Max (ed.)(1964) *Closed Systems and Open Minds: The Limits of Naivety in Social Anthropology*. Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd.
- GOFFMAN, Erving (1969) *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London, Allen Lane, the Penguin Press.

Bibliography

- GOLDTHORPE, J.H., LOCKWOOD, D., et.al. (1969) *The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- GONZALEZ, Nancie L.S. (1969) *Black Carib Household Structure: A Study of Migration and Modernization*. Seattle, University of Washington Press.
- GOODE, William J. (1963a) *World Revolution and Family Patterns*. London, Collier-Macmillan.
- GOODE, William J. (1963b) "Industrialization and the family", in Hoselitz, B. & Moore, W.E.(eds.) *Industrialization and Society*, 237-255.
- GOODE, William J. (1980) "The resistance of family forces to industrialization" in Eekelaar, J. & Katz, Marriage and Cohabitation in Contemporary Society, ix-xviii.
- GOODY, Jack, THIRSK, Joan & THOMPSON, E.P. (et al.)(1976) *Family and Inheritance: Rural Society in Western Europe, 1200-1800*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- GORHAM, Deborah (1982) *The Victorian Girl and the Feminine Ideal*. London, Croom Helm.
- GRAY, R.Q. (1977) "Religion, culture and social class in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Edinburgh", in Crossick, G. (ed.) *The Lower Middle Class in Britain, 1870-1914*, 134-158.
- GREVEN, Philip J. (1970) *Four Generations: Population, Land and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- GRIMSHAW, Patricia et al.(1985)(eds.) *Families in Colonial Australia*. Sydney, George Allen & Unwin.
- H*
- HAJNAL, J. (1974) "European marriage patterns in perspective" in Glass, D.V. & Eversley, D.E.C. (eds.) *Population in History*, 101-143.
- HALL, Catherine (1979) "The early formation of Victorian domestic ideology" in Burnam, S., *Fit Work for Women*, 15-32.
- HALMOS, Paul (ed.)(1964) *The Development of Industrial Societies*. Keele, Sociological Review Monograph No.84.

Bibliography

- HAMILTON, Cecily (1981)(1st ed., 1909) *Marriage as a Trade*. London, The Women's Press.
- HAMILTON, Roberta (1978) *The Liberation of Women*. London, George Allen & Unwin.
- HARDING, S. & HINTIKKA, M. (1983) *Discovering Reality*. Dordrecht, Holland, D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- HAREVEN, Tamara K. (1971) "The history of the family as an interdisciplinary field", in Rabb, T.K. & Rotberg, R.I. (eds.) *The Family in History*, 211-226.
- HAREVEN, Tamara K. (1976) "Modernization and family history: perspectives on social change", *Signs*, 2, 1, 190-206.
- HAREVEN, Tamara K. (1978) "The dynamics of kin in an industrial community" in Demos, J. & Boocock, S.A. *Turning Points*, 151-182.
- HAREVEN, Tamara K. (1982) *Family Time and Industrial Time*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- HARRIS, C.C. (1969) *The Family*. London, George Allen & Unwin.
- HARRIS, C.C.(ed.)(1979) *The Sociology of the Family: New Directions for Britain*". Keele, Sociological Review Monograph, No.28.
- HARRIS, C.C. (1983) *The Family and Industrial Society*. London, George Allen & Unwin.
- HARRIS, Olivia (1984) "Households as natural units" in Young, K. et al.(eds.) *Of Marriage and the Market*, 136-156.
- HARRISON, Alan (1975) "Farmers and family business in England". Miscellaneous Study 62, University of Reading, Dept of Agricultural Economics & Management.
- HARRISON, J. (1974) "The political economy of housework", *Bulletin of the Conference of Socialist Economists*, 3, 35-52.
- HARTMAN, Mary S. & BANNER, Lois (eds.)(1974) *Clio's Consciousness Raised: New Perspectives on the History of Women*. New York, Harper Colophon Books.
- HARTMANN, Heidi (1979) "The unhappy marriage of marxism and feminism: towards a more progressive union", *Capital and Class*, 8(Summer), 1-33.

- HARTMANN, Heidi (1981) "The family as the locus of gender, class and political struggle: the example of housework", *Signs*, 6, 3, Spring, 366-393.
- HARTSOCK, Nancy C.M. (1983) "The feminist standpoint: developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism" in Harding, S. & Hintikka, M. *Discovering Reality*, 245-282.
- HARTZ, Louis (1964) *The Founding of New Societies: Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada and Australia*. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World.
- HOHEPA, Patrick W. (1964) "A Maori Community in Northland". Auckland, Department of Anthropology, University of Auckland.
- HOLCOMBE, Lee (1973) *Victorian Ladies at Work: Middle-Class Working Women in England and Wales, 1850-1914*. Newton Abbot, David & Charles.
- HOMANS, George C. (1951) *The Human Group*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- HOSELITZ, Bert and MOORE, Wilbert (1966) *Industrialization and Society*. The Hague, Mouton.
- HOUSTON, Stewart (1970) *Marriage and the Family in New Zealand*. Wellington, Sweet & Maxwell.
- HOUSTON, Stewart (1970) "The New Zealand Family: Its Antecedents and Origins", in Houston, S.(ed.) *Marriage and the Family in New Zealand*, 21-40.
- HUGHES, Beryl (1980) "Women and the professions in New Zealand", in Bunkle, P. & Hughes, B. (eds.) *Women in New Zealand Society*, 118-138.
- HUMPHREYS, Alexander J. (1966) *New Dubliners: Urbanization and the Irish Family*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- HUMPHRIES, Jane (1982) "The working-class family: a Marxist perspective" in Elshtain, J.B., *The Family in Political Thought*, 197-222.
- HUNT, Christine (1979) *Something in the Hills: Yesterdays in Central Otago*. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- HUNT, Christine (1981) *Speaking a Silence*. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.

I*

IMRAY, Linda & MIDDLETON, Audrey (1983) "Public and private: marking the boundaries", in Gamarnikow, E. et al. (eds.) *The Public and the Private*, 12-27.

INTERRANTE, Joseph & LASSER, Carol (1979) "Victims of the very songs they sing: a critique of recent work on patriarchal culture and the social construction of gender", *Radical History Review*, 20, Spring/Summer, 25-40.

J*

JAGGER, Alison (1983) *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Brighton, Harvester Press.

JAMES, Bev (1983) "Money and power in the family". Unpublished paper presented to the New Zealand Sociological Association Conference.

JAMIESON, Lynn (1983) "A Case Study in the Development of the Modern Family: Urban Scotland in the Early Twentieth Century". Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in Sociology, University of Edinburgh.

JANEWAY, Elizabeth (1977) *Man's World, Woman's Place: A Study in Social Mythology*. London, Penguin.

JONES, Gareth Stedman (1977) "Class expression versus social control", *History Workshop*, 4, Autumn, 163-170.

JOYCE, Patrick (1980) *Work, Society and Politics: the Culture of the Factory in later Victorian England*. London, Methuen.

K*

KAWHARAU, Ian (1975) *Conflict and Compromise: Essays on the Maori since Colonisation*. Wellington, Reed.

KEITH, Hamish (1984) *New Zealand Yesterdays*. Sydney, Reader's Digest Service Pty. Ltd.

KELLY, Joan (1979) "The doubled vision of feminist theory: a postscript to the 'Women and power' conference", *Feminist Studies*, 5, 1, 216-227.

KING, Dorothy (1982) *Seen and not Heard*. Eastbourne, D. King.

- KITTERINGHAM, Jennie (1975) "Country work girls in nineteenth-century England" in Samuel, R. (ed.) *Village Life and Labour*, 73-133.
- KLEIN, Josephine (1965) *Samples from English Culture*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- KOOPMAN-BOYDEN, Peggy G. (1975) "A Bibliography of the New Zealand Family". Christchurch, Department of Psychology and Sociology, Research Project 25, University of Canterbury.
- KOOPMAN-BOYDEN, Peggy, G. (1978) *Families in New Zealand Society*. Wellington, Methuen.
- KOOPMAN-BOYDEN, Peggy G. (1982) "New Zealand Families: A Bibliography 1975-1980." Working Paper No.3, Department of Sociology, University of Canterbury.
- KOOPMAN-BOYDEN, Peggy G. & SCOTT, Claudia D. (1984) *The Family and Government Policy in New Zealand*. Sydney, George Allen & Unwin.
- KUHN, A. & WOLPE, A. (eds.) (1978) *Feminism and Materialism: Women and Modes of Production*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- KUMAR, Krishan (1978) *Prophecy and Progress: The Sociology of Post-Industrial Society*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- L*
- LAKE, Marilyn (1985) "Helpmeet, slave, housewife: women in rural families 1870-1930", in Grimshaw, P. et al. (eds.) *Families in Colonial Australia*, 173-185.
- LAND, Hilary (1980) "The family wage", *Feminist Review*, 6, 55-78.
- LASCH, Christopher (1977) *Haven in a Heartless World*. New York: Basic Books.
- LASLETT, Peter (1971)(2nd edition) *The World We Have Lost*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- LASLETT, Peter (ed.) (1972) *Household and Family in Past Time*. London, Cambridge University Press.

- LASLETT, Peter (1979) "The traditional English family and the aged in our society", in Van Tassel, D.D. (ed.) *Aging, Death and the Completion of Being*, 97-114.
- LASLETT, Peter (1977) *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- LASLETT, Peter (1983) "Family and household as work group and kin group: areas of traditional Europe compared", in Wall, R. et al. *Family Forms in Historic Europe*, 513-563.
- LEE, Gary R. (1978) "Effects of social networks on the family" in Burr, W., et al. (eds.) *Contemporary Theories about the Family*, 27-56.
- LENERO-OTERO, Luis (ed.)(1977) *Beyond the Nuclear Family Model: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Beverley Hills, Sage Publications Ltd.
- LINDER, Steffan B. (1970) *The Harried Leisure Class*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- LONG, N. (ed.)(1984) *Family and Work in Rural Societies: Perspectives on Non-Wage Labour*. London, Tavistock Publications.
- LOUDON, Joe (1966) "Religious Order and Mental Disorder: A Study in a South Wales Community", in Banton, M. *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*, 69-95.
- LOWN, Judy (1983) "Not so much a factory, more a form of patriarchy: gender and class during industrialisation" in Gamarnikow, E. et al., (eds.) *Gender, Class and Work*, 28-45.
- LUKES, Steven (1973) *Individualism*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- LUPTON, Tom & WILSON, C. Shirley (1970) "The kinship connexions of top decision makers" in Worsley, P. (ed.) *Modern Sociology*, 151-64.
- LUMMIS, Trevor (1982) "The historical dimension of fatherhood: a case study 1890-1914" in McKee, L. & O'Brien, M. (eds.) *The Father Figure*, 43-56.

M*

- MCCALMAN, Janet (1984) *Struggletown: Public and Private Life in Richmond, 1900-1965.* Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.
- MCDONALD, Dugald J. (1978) "Children and young persons in New Zealand society", in Koopman-Boyden, P.G. (ed.) *Families in New Zealand Society*, 44-56.
- MACFARLANE, Alan (1970) *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- MACFARLANE, Alan (1978) *The Origins of English Individualism: The Family, Property and Social Transition.* Oxford, Blackwell.
- MCINTOSH, Maureen M. (1978) "Domestic Labour and the Household", in Burnam, S. (ed.) *Fit Work for Women*, 173-191.
- McKEE, Lorna & O'BRIEN, Margaret (1982) *The Father Figure.* London, Tavistock Publications.
- McKENZIE, David (1982) *Education and Social Structure: Essays in the History of New Zealand Education.* Dunedin, New Zealand College of Education.
- McLAUGHLIN, Virginia Y. (1971). "Patterns of work and family organization: Buffalo's Italians" in Rabb, T.K. & Rotberg, R.I. (eds.) *The Family in History*, 111-126.
- MCLEOD, Hugh (1977) "White collar values and the role of religion" in Crossick, G.(ed.) *The Lower Middle Class in Britain, 1870-1914*, 61-88.
- MANN, Michael (ed.)(1983) *The Macmillan Student Encyclopaedia of Sociology.* London, Macmillan Press.
- MARRUS, Michael R. (ed.)(1974) *The Emergence of Leisure.* New York, Harper & Row.
- MARX, Karl (1976) *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy.* Penguin Books in Association with New Left Review.
- MATTHAEI, Julie A. (1982) *An Economic History of Women in America: Women's Work, the Sexual Division of Labour, and the Development of Capitalism.* Brighton, Harvester Press.
- MEDICK, Hans & SABEAN, David W. (eds.)(1984) *Interest and Emotion: Essays on the Study of Family and Kinship.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Bibliography

- METGE, Joan (1976)(rvd.ed.) *The Maori of New Zealand: Rautahi.* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- MIDDLETON, Chris (1983) "Patriarchal exploitation and the rise of English capitalism" in Gamarnikow, Eva (ed.) et al. *Gender, Class and Work*, 11-27.
- MILLEN, Julia (1984) *Colonial Tears and Sweat.* Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- MILLER, Joanne & GARRISON, Howard H. (1982) "Sex roles: the division of labour at home and in the workplace", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 8, 237-62.
- MILLS, C. Wright (1970) *The Sociological Imagination.* Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- MINGAY, Gordon E. (1977) *Rural Life in Victorian England.* London, Heinemann.
- MITCHELL, J. Clyde (1966) "Theoretical orientations in African urban studies: methodological approaches" in Banton, M. (ed.) *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*, 37-68.
- MITCHELL, Juliet (1966) "Women: the longest revolution", *New Left Review*, 40, Nov./Dec., 11-37.
- MITCHELL, Juliet (1973) *Women's Estate.* New York, Vintage Books.
- MITCHELL, Juliet & OAKLEY, Anne (1976) *The Rights and Wrongs of Women.* Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- MITTERAUER, Michael & SIEDER, Reinhard (1982) *The European Family: Patriarchy to Partnership from the Middle Ages to the Present.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- MOGEY, J.M. (1956) *Family and Neighbourhood: Two Studies in Oxford.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- MOLYNEUX, M. (1979) "Beyond the domestic labour debate", *New Left Review*, 116, 3-28.
- MOORE, Robert (1974) *Pitmen, Preachers and Politics: The Effects of Methodism in a Durham Mining Community.* London, Cambridge University Press.
- MORGAN, David H.J. (1975) *Social Theory and the Family.* London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

MORGAN, David H.J. (1979) "New directions in family research and theory" in Harris, C.C. *The Sociology of the Family*, 3-18.

MORGAN, David H.J. et al. (1983) "Introduction to class and work: bringing women back in", in Gamarnikow, Eva et al. *Gender, Class and Work*, 1-10.

MORGAN, D.H.J. (1985) *The Family, Politics and Social Theory*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

MORRIS, Lydia (1985) "Local social networks and domestic organisations: a study of redundant steel workers and their wives", *Sociological Review*, 33, 2, 327-342.

MURGATROYD, Linda (1985) "The production of people and domestic labour revisited", in Close, P. & Collins, R. (eds.) *Family and Economy in Modern Society*, 49-62.

MYRDAL, Alva & KLEIN, Viola (1970)(2nd ed.) *Women's Two Roles: Home and Work*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

N*

NELSON, Linda (1980) "Household time: a cross-cultural example", in Berk, S. (ed.) *Women and Household Labor*, 169-190.

NETTING, Robert McC. (1984) *Households: Comparative and Historical Studies of the Domestic Group*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

NEWBY, Howard, BELL, Colin, ROSE, D., SAUNDERS, P. (1978)(eds.) *Property, Paternalism and Power*. London, Hutchinson.

NEWBY, Howard (1975) "The deferential dialectic", *Comparative Studies in Society & History*, 17, 2, 1975, 139-64.

NEWBY, Howard et al. (1981) "Farming for Survival: the small farmer in the contemporary rural class structure", in Bechhofer, F. & Elliott, B. (eds.) *The Petite Bourgeoisie: Comparative Studies of the Uneasy Stratum*, 38-70.

NEW ZEALAND CENSUS OF POPULATION AND DWELLINGS. Wellington, Government Printer.

NOVITZ, Rosemary (1976) "The Priority of the Mother Role: an Investigation of the Importance Women give to their Role as Mothers and its Relationship to their Employment Behaviour". Unpublished M.A. Thesis in Sociology, University of Canterbury.

NOVITZ, Rosemary (1982) "Feminism" in Spoonley, P. et al.(eds.) *New Zealand: Sociological Perspectives*, 293-324.

NOVITZ, ROSEMARY (1983) "'Domestic labour' and the 'informal economy'". Unpublished paper read at the New Zealand Sociological Association Conference.

O*

OAKLEY, A. (1972) *Sex, Gender and Society*. London, Temple-Smith.

OAKLEY, A. (1974) *The Sociology of Housework*. London, Martin Robertson.

OAKLEY, Anne (1982) *Subject Women*. Glasgow, Fontana.

O'BRIEN, Denise & TIFFANY, Sharon W. (eds.)(1984) *Rethinking Women's Roles: Perspectives from the Pacific*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

OLIVER, W.H. (1960) *The Story of New Zealand*. London, Faber.

OLIVER, W.H.(ed.)(1981) *The Oxford History of New Zealand*. Wellington, Oxford University Press.

OLSSEN, Eric (1980) "Women, work and family, 1880-1920" in Bunkle, P. & Hughes, B.(eds.) *Women in New Zealand Society*, 159-183.

OLSSEN, Eric (1981) "Towards a New Society", in Oliver, W.H.(ed.), *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, 250-278.

OLSSEN, Erik & LEVESQUE, Andree (1978) "Towards a history of the European family in New Zealand" in Koopman-Boyden, P.G. (ed.) *Families in NZ Society*, 1-26.

OREN, Laura (1974) "The welfare of women in laboring families: England, 1860-1950" in Hartman, M. & Banner, L.W. *Clio's Consciousness Raised: New Perspectives on the History of Women*, 226-244.

Bibliography

P*

- PAHL, J. (1980) "Patterns of money management within marriage", *Journal of Social Policy*, 9, 3, 313-335.
- PAHL, R.E. (ed.)(1968) *Readings in Urban Sociology*. Oxford, Pergamon Press.
- PAHL, R.E. (1968) "The rural-urban continuum" in Pahl, R.E. (ed.) *Readings in Urban Sociology*, 263-305.
- PAHL, R. E. (1980) "Employment, work and the domestic division of labour" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 4, 1, 1-19.
- PAHL, R.E. (1984) *Divisions of Labour*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- PARK, Julie (1982) *Doing Well: An Ethnography of Coping*. Auckland, Department of Anthropology, University of Auckland.
- PARKER, Stanley (1971) *The Future of Work and Leisure*. London, Paladin.
- PARKER, Stanley (1983) *Leisure and Work*. London, George Allen and Unwin.
- PARKIN, Frank (1979) *Marxism and Class Theory: a Bourgeois Critique*. London, Tavistock.
- PARR, Joy (ed.)(1982) *Childhood and the Family in Canadian History*. Toronto, McClelland & Stewart Ltd.
- PARSONS, Talcott (1943) "The kinship system of the contemporary United States." *American Anthropologist*, 45 (Jan-Mar.) 284-92.
- PARSONS, Talcott (1956) "The American family: its relations to personality and the social structure", in Parsons, T. & Bales, R.F. *Family: Socialisation and Interaction Process*, 3-34.
- PARSONS, Talcott, (1959) "The social structure of the family" in R. Anshen, (ed.) *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*, 241-274.
- PARSONS, Talcott (1980) "Reply to His Critics" in Anderson, M. (ed.) *Sociology of the Family*, 223-224.

Bibliography

- PARSONS, Talcott & BALES, Robert F. (1956) *Family: Socialisation and Interaction Process*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- PEARSON, David (1980) *Johnsonville; Continuity and Change in a New Zealand Township*. Sydney, George Allen & Unwin.
- PEARSON, David G. & THORNS, David C. (1983) *Eclipse of Equality: Social Stratification in New Zealand*. Sydney, George Allen & Unwin.
- PHILLIPS, Jock (1980) "Mummy's boys: Pakeha men and male culture in New Zealand", in Bunkle, P. & Hughes, B. (eds.) *Women in New Zealand Society*, 217-243.
- PHILLIPS, Roderick (1983) "History writ small", *New Zealand Listener*, February 26, 1983, 40.
- PINCHBECK, Ivy (1981) *Women Workers and the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*, London, Virago.
- PITT, David & MACPHERSON, Cluny (1974) *Emerging Pluralism: The Samoan Community in New Zealand*. Auckland, Longman Paul Ltd.
- PLOWMAN, D.E.G. et al. (1962) "Local social status in England and Wales", *Sociological Review*, New Series, July, 116-129.
- POLLOCK, Linda (1983) *Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relations from 1500 to 1800*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- POLLOCK, Nancy J. (1972) "Women and the division of labour: a Jamaican example", *American Anthropologist*, 74, 3.

Q*

- QVORTRUP, Jens (1985) "Placing children in the division of labour", in Close, R. & Collins, R. *Family and Economy in Modern Society*, 129-161.

R*

- RABB, T.K. & ROTBERG, R.I. (eds.) (1971) *The Family in History: Interdisciplinary Essays*. New York, Harper & Row, Publishers.

- RAPP, Rayna, ROSS, Ellen & BRIDENTHAL, Renate (1983) "Examining family history", in Newton, J.L. et al. *Sex and Class in Women's History*, 232-258.
- RAPP, Rayna (1982) "Family and class in contemporary America: notes toward an understanding of ideology", in Thorne, B. & Yalom, M. (eds.) *Rethinking the Family*, 168-187.
- REEVES, William Pember (1969)(1st ed., 1902) *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand*. Melbourne, Macmillan of Australia.
- REIGER, Kereen M. (1985) *The Disenchantment of the Home: Modernizing the Australian Family 1880-1940*. Melbourne, Oxford University Press.
- REITER, Rayna R. (ed.)(1975) *Towards an Anthropology of Women*. New York, Monthly Review Press.
- REITER, Rayna R. (1975) "Men and women in the south of France: public and private domains" in Reiter, R.R. (ed.) *Towards an Anthropology of Women*, 252-282.
- RITCHIE, Jane & James (1970) *Child Rearing Patterns in New Zealand*. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- ROBERTS, Elizabeth (1984) *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working-Class Women 1890-1940*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- ROBERTS, Elizabeth (1984b) "The working-class extended family: functions and attitudes, 1890-1940", *Oral History*, 12, 1, Spring, 48-55.
- ROBERTS, Robert (1971) *The Classic Slum*. Manchester.
- ROGERS, Barbara (1980) *The Domestication of Women: Discrimination in Developing Societies*. London, Tavistock Publications.
- ROSALDO, M.Z. (1980) "The use and abuse of anthropology: reflections on feminism and cross-cultural understanding", *Signs*, 5, 3, 389-417.
- ROSALDO, M.Z. & LAMPHIRE, L. (eds.)(1974) *Women, Culture and Society*. California, Stanford University Press.
- ROSS, Ellen (1983) "Survival networks: women's neighbourhood sharing in London before World War One", *History Workshop Journal*, 15, Spring, 4-27.

ROSSER, C. & HARRIS, C. (1983)(Abridged ed.) *The Family and Social Change*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

ROTH, Margot (1980) "The New Zealand Family: Cornerstone of Civilisation". Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in Sociology, University of Auckland. ^{M.A.}

ROWBOTHAM, Sheila (1974) *Hidden from History: Rediscovering Women in History from the 17th Century to the Present*. New York, Random House, Vintage Books.

RUBIN, Gayle (1975) "The traffic in women: notes on the 'political economy' of sex" in Reiter, R. (ed.) *Towards an Anthropology of Women*, 157-210.

RUSHTON, Peter (1979) "'Marxism, domestic labour and the capitalist economy: a note on recent discussions", in Harris, C.C. (ed.) *The Sociology of the Family*, 32-48.

RYAN, Mary P. (1979) "Femininity and capitalism in antebellum America", in Eisenstein, Z. (ed.) *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*, 151-172.

RYAN, Mary P. (1981) *Cradle of the Middle Class: the Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

S*

SACKS, Karen (1975) "Engels revisited: women, the organization of production, and private property" in Reiter, R. (ed.) *Towards an Anthropology of Women*, 211-234.

SAMUEL, Raphael (1975) "'Quarry roughs': life and labour in Headington Quarry, 1860-1920. An essay in oral history" in Samuel, R. (ed.) *Village Life and Labour*, 139-243.

SAMUEL, Raphael (1975) *Village Life and Labour*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

SAMUEL, Raphael (1981) *East End Underworld: Chapters in the Life of Arthur Harding*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

SARGENT, Lydia (ed.)(1981) *Women and Revolution: The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*. London, Pluto Press.

- SARGISON, Patricia A. (1984) *Victoria's Furthest Daughters: A Bibliography of Published Sources for the Study of Women in New Zealand, 1830-1914.* Wellington, Alexander Turnbull Library.
- SCANZONI, John (1978) *Sex Roles, Women's Work and Marital Conflict; a Study of Family Change.* Lexington, Mass., Lexington Books.
- SCANZONI, Letha & SCANZONI, John (1981)(2nd ed.) *Men, Women and Change: A Sociology of Marriage and Family.* New York, McGraw Hill.
- SCASE, Richard & GOFFEE, Robert (1982) *The Entrepreneurial Middle Class.* London, Croom Helm.
- SCHNEIDER, David. (1968) *American Kinship: A Cultural Account.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Inc.
- SCHNEIDER, David (1984) *A Critique of the Study of Kinship.* An Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- SCHWARTZ COWAN, Ruth (1974) *A case study of technological and social change: the washing machine and the working wife, in Hartman, M. & Banner, L.(eds.) Clio's Consciousness Raised, 245-252.*
- SCOTT, Joan W. & TILLY, Louise A. (1980) "Women's work and the family in nineteenth century Europe" in Anderson, M. (ed.) *Sociology of the Family*, 125-163.
- SECCOMBE, Wally (1974) "The housewife and her labour under capitalism" *New Left Review*, 83, Jan./Feb., 3-24.
- SEGAL, Lynne (ed.)(1983) *What Is To Be Done About The Family?* Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- SEGALEN, Martine (1983) *Love and Power in the Peasant Family.* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- SENNETT, Richard (1970) *Families Against the City: Middle Class Homes of Industrial Chicago.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- SHANIN, Theodor (ed.)(1971) *Peasants and Peasant Societies: Selected Readings.* Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- SHORTER, Edward (ed.)(1973) *Work and Community in the West.* New York, Harper & Row.

Bibliography

- SHORTER, Edward (1977) *The Making of the Modern Family*. Glasgow, Fontana.
- SIMPSON, Helen M. (1940) *The Women of New Zealand*. Wellington, Department of Internal Affairs.
- SINCLAIR, Keith (1959) *A History of New Zealand*. London, Pelican Books.
- SMELSER, N.J. (1959) *Social Change and the Industrial Revolution*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- SMITH, Dorothy (1974) "Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology", *Sociological Inquiry*, 44 (1), 7-13.
- SMITH, Neil (1984) *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- SMITH, Richard M. (ed.)(1984) *Land, Kinship and Life-Cycle*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- SMITH, Raymond T. (1956) *The Negro Family in British Guiana: Family Structure and Social Status in the Village*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- SOCIETY FOR RESEARCH ON WOMEN IN NEW ZEALAND (INC.)(1982) *In Those Days: A Study of Older Women in Wellington*. Wellington, Johnsonville, P.O. Box 13-078.
- SOMERSET, H.C.D. (1974) *Littledene: Patterns of Change*. Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- SPENDER, Dale (ed.)(1981) *Men's Studies Modified: The Impact of Feminism on the Academic Disciplines*. Oxford, Pergamon Press.
- SPOONLEY, Paul, PEARSON, David, & SHIRLEY, Ian (1982) *New Zealand: Sociological Perspectives*. Palmerston North, Dunmore Press.
- STACEY, M. (1981) 'The division of labour revisited, or overcoming the two Adams' in P. Abrams et al. (eds.), *Development and Diversity: British Sociology 1950-1980*, Allen & Unwin.
- STACEY, Meg (1982) "Social sciences and the State: fighting like a woman", *British Sociological Association Presidential Address - April 1982*, *Sociology*, 16, 3, 406-421.

Bibliography

- STACEY, Margaret & PRICE, Marion (1981) *Women, Power and Politics*. London, Tavistock Publications.
- STEARNS, Peter N. (1975) *Lives of Labour: Work in a Maturing Industrial Society*. London, Croom Helm.
- STEARNS, Peter N. (1980) "Working-class women in Britain, 1890-1914" in Vicinus, M. (ed.) *Suffer and be Still*, 100-120.
- STONE, L. (1979) *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. Harmondsworth, Pelican Books.
- STRASSER, Susan (1980) "An enlarged human existence? Technology and household work in nineteenth-century America", in Berk, S. (ed.) *Women and Household Labor*, 29-52.
- STRASSER, Susan (1982) *Never Done: A History of American Housework*. New York, Pantheon.
- STRATHERN, Marilyn (1981) *Kinship at the Core: An Anthropology of Elmdon, a Village in North-West England in the Nineteen-Sixties*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- STURT, George (1973) "The wheelwright's shop", in Shorter, E. (ed.) *Work and Community in the West*, 54-79.
- SUNDT, Eilert (1980) (1st ed. 1855) *On Marriage in Norway*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- SUTCH, W.B. (1966) *The Quest for Security in New Zealand, 1840-1966*.
- SUTCH, W.B. (1973) *Women with a Cause*. Wellington, New Zealand University Press.
- SWAIN, David (1978) "Parenthood", in Koopman-Boyden, P. (ed.) *Families in New Zealand Society*, 27-39.
- SYNGE, Jane (1976) "Immigrant communities - British and Continental European - in early twentieth century Hamilton, Canada", *Oral History*, 4, 2, 38-51.
- T*
- TAIT, David (undated) "Respectability, property and fertility: the development of official statistics about families in Australia". Unpublished paper.

- TENNANT, Margaret (1976) *Matrons with a Mission: Women's Organisations in New Zealand, 1893-1915*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis in History, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- THOMPSON, E.P. (1977) "Happy families", *New Society*, 8 September, 499-501.
- THOMPSON, Flora (1973) *Larkrise to Candleford*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- THOMPSON, Paul (1975) "The war with adults", *Oral History*, 3, 2, 29-38.
- THOMPSON, Paul (1977) *The Edwardians: The Remaking of British Society*. London, Paladin.
- THOMPSON, Paul (1981) "Life histories and the analysis of social change", in Bertaux, D. (ed.) *Biography and Society*, 289-306.
- THOMPSON, Paul (1983) *Living the Fishing*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- THOMPSON, Paul (1984) "The family and child-rearing as forces for economic change: towards fresh research approaches", *Sociology*, 18, 4, November, 515-530.
- THORNE, Barrie (1982) "Feminist Rethinking of the Family", in Thorne, B. & Yalom, M. (eds) *Rethinking the Family*, 1-24.
- THORNE, Barrie & YALOM, Marilyn (eds.) (1982) *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*. New York, Longman.
- TIFFANY, Sharon W. (1984) "Feminist perceptions in anthropology", in O'Brien, D. & Tiffany, S.W. (eds.) *Rethinking Women's Roles*, 1-11.
- TILLY, Louise A. & SCOTT, Joan (1978) *Women, Work and Family*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- TOLSON, A. (1977) *The Limits of Masculinity*. London, Tavistock Publications.
- TOWNSEND, P. (1957) *The Family Life of Old People*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- TOYNBEE, Claire (1979a) "Class and mobility in nineteenth century Wellington Province: an exploratory study of immigrants arriving 1840-1880". Unpublished M.A. Thesis in Sociology at the Victoria University of Wellington.

TOYNBEE, Claire (1979b) "Class and social structure in nineteenth-century New Zealand", *New Zealand Journal of History*, 13, 1, 33-42.

TOYNBEE, Claire (1984a) "The 'really useful' woman: an historical perspective on farming wives and daughters". *Women's Studies Association Conference Papers*, 330-342.

TOYNBEE, Claire (1984b) 'Gender, work and leisure in an early twentieth century New Zealand community', *New Zealand Cultural Studies Working Group Journal*, No.8, Autumn 1984, 20-28.

TRUMBACH, Randolph (1978) *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth Century England*. New York, Academic Press.

TULLOCH, Patricia (1984) "Gender and dependency" in Broom, D. (ed.) *Unfinished Business*, 19-37.

TURNER, Jonathan H. (1974) *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Homewood, Illinois, The Dorsey Press.

TURNER, R.H. (1970) *Family Interaction*. New York, Wiley.

U*

UNGERSON, Clare (1983) "Women and caring: skills, tasks and taboos" in Gamarnikow, E. et al. (eds.) *The Public and the Private*, 62-77.

V*

VANEK, Joann (1980) "Work, leisure, and family roles: farm households in the United States, 1920-1955", *Journal of Family History*, Winter, 422-432.

VAN TASSEL, David D. (ed.)(1979) *Aging, Death and the Completion of Being*. Pittsburg, University of Pennsylvania Press.

VICINUS, Martha (ed.)(1980) *Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age*. London, Methven & Co. Ltd.

VIGNE, Thea (1975) "Parents and children 1890-1980: distance and dependence" *Oral History*, 3, 2, 6-13.

VIGNE, Thea (1981) *Edwardian Childhoods*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bibliography

- VINCENT, David (1981) *Bread, Knowledge and Freedom: A Study of Nineteenth-Century Working Class Autobiography*. London, Europa Publications.
- VOSBURGH, Miriam G. (1978) "The New Zealand Family and Social Change: A Trend Analysis". Victoria University of Wellington, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Occasional Papers in Sociology and Social Welfare No.1.
- W*
- WALKER, Kathryn & WOODS, Margaret (1976) *Time Use: A Measure of the Household Production of Family Goods and Services*. Washington, American Home Economics Association.
- WALL, Richard, ROBIN, Jean & LASLETT, Peter (1983) *Family Forms in Historic Europe*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- WALLER, P.J. (1983) *Town, City, and Nation: England 1850-1914*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- WALLMAN, Sandra (ed.)(1979) *Social Anthropology of Work*. New York, Academic Press.
- WALVIN, James (1978) *Leisure and Society, 1830-1950*. London, Longman Group Ltd.
- WANDERSEE, Winifred D. (1981) *Women's Work and Family Values 1920-1940*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- WATSON, W. (1964) "Social mobility and social class in industrial communities" in Gluckman, M. & Devons, E. (eds.) *Closed Systems and Open Minds*, 129-57.
- WATTERS, R.F. (ed.)(1965) *Land and Society in New Zealand: Essays in Historical Geography*. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- WEARING, Betsy (1984) *The Ideology of Motherhood*. Sydney, George Allen & Unwin.
- WEBER, Max (1968) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. New York, Bedminster Press.
- WEBSTER, A.C. (1972) "Kinship systems in New Zealand society." Papers for the 12th Science Congress, Palmerston North. New Zealand Royal Society.

Bibliography

- WERTHEIMER, Barbara M. (1977) *We Were There: The Story of Working Women in America*. New York, Pantheon Books.
- WHITEHEAD, Ann (1976) "Sexual antagonism in Herefordshire", in Barker, D.L. & Allen, S. *Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage*, 169-203.
- WHITEHEAD, Anne (1981) "'I'm hungry, Mum': the politics of domestic budgeting", in Young, K. et al. (eds.) *Of Marriage and the Market*, 88-111.
- WHITELEGG, Elizabeth et al. (eds.) (1982) *The Changing Experience of Women*. Oxford, Martin Robertson.
- WILLIAMS, Claire (1981) *OpenCut: The Working Class in an Australian Mining Town*. Sydney, George Allen & Unwin.
- WILLIAMS, W.M. (1956) *The Sociology of an English Village: Gosforth*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- WILLIAMS, W.M. (1963) *A West Country Village: Ashworthy*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- WILLMOTT, Peter & YOUNG, Michael (1967) *Family and Class in a London suburb*. London, NEL Mentor.
- WILSON, Peter (1973) *Crab Antics: The Social Anthropology of English speaking Negro Society of the Caribbean*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- WOODS, N.S. (1963) *Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration in New Zealand*. Wellington, Government Printer.
- WORSLEY, Peter (ed.) (1978) (2nd ed.) *Modern Sociology*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Y*
- YOUNG, Iris (1980) "Socialist feminism and the limits of dual systems theory", *Socialist Review*, 10, 23, March-June.
- YOUNG, Iris (1981) "Beyond the unhappy marriage: a critique of dual systems theory", in Sargent, L. (ed.) *Women and Revolution*, 43-70.
- YOUNG, Kate, WOLKOWITZ, Carol & MCCULLAGH, Roslyn (eds.) (1984) *Of Marriage and the Market: Women's Subordination Internationally and its Lessons*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bibliography

YOUNG, Michael & WILLMOTT, Peter (1957) *Family and Kinship in East London*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.

YOUNG, Michael & WILLMOTT, Peter (1962) *Family and Kinship in East London*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.

YOUNG, Michael and WILLMOTT, Peter (1973) *The Symmetrical Family*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Z*

ZARETSKY, Eli (1982) *Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life*. New York, Pluto Press.

AUTHOR INDEX

A

ADAM, J. 11
 ADAMS, B. 362
 ALLEN, G. 65-6, 323, 358, 365
 ALEXANDER, S. 158
 ANDERSON, M. 2, 36, 74, 75-7, 132, 134, 136, 141, 150,
 165, 242, 336, 405, 409, 410, 444-5, 447, 483
 ARDENER, S. 309, 321
 ARENSBERG, C & KIMBALL, S. 32
 ARIES, P. 138, 147, 444
 ARMITAGE, S. 155, 160
 ARNOLD, R. 17, 18, 30-1, 275, 278, 444-6, 502

B

BAILEY, P. 368-9
 BAMBERGER, J. 104
 BANKS, J. 73
 BANTON, M. 38
 BARKER, M. 159, 275
 BARRETT, M. 99, 129
 BARRETT, M. & MCINTOSH, M. 99, 118, 126, 261, 492
 BARRON, R.D. & NORRIS, G.M.
 BARTON, R. 101, 160
 BEDGGOOD, D. 171
 BEECHEY, V. 53, 54, 70, 93,
 BELL, C. 335, 379, 421
 BELL, C. & NEWBY, H. 61, 120, 315-6, 321, 493
 BELL, D. 67, 354
 BENSTON, M. 90,
 BERKNER, L. 136, 165
 BERNARDES, J. 46, 129, 130
 BERTAUX, D. 525
 BILTON, T. 50
 BLAU, P. 321
 BOTT, E. 36, 65-6, 409, 412
 BOURNE, G. (see also Sturt) 124, 144, 148, 263, 265
 BRADBURY, B. 76, 155, 340
 BRANCA, P. 100, 158, 291-2

Author Index

BRAVERMAN, H. 102
BROOKING, T. 19
BULLEN, J. 448
BULMER, M. 509, 515
BUNKLE, P. & HUGHES, B. 8, 24, 57,
BURNAM, S. 116,
BURNETT, J. 155, 259, 304, 386, 461, 468, 521
BURRIS, V. 105, 109

C

CALDWELL, J. 162
CAMERON, J. 162
CARTER, J. 159
CASS, B. 366
CHAMBERLAIN, M.
CHAMBERLAIN, M. & RICHARDSON, R. 349, 426
CHAYTOR, M. 75, 136-9, 340
CHRISTENSEN, H. 60
CLARK, A. 156
CLOSE, P. 108, 165
CLOSE, P. & COLLINS, R. 47, 93, 471
COCKBURN, C. 105-6
COHEN, A. 33
COLLIER, J. 129
COMER, L. 468
COOK, H. 56, 476
CROSSICK, G. 172-4
CROZIER, D. 67, 85, 335

D

DALLA COSTA & JAMES 90
DALZIEL, R. 12, 278, 297, 438, 486
DAVEY, I. 155, 448
DAVIDOFF, L. 101, 131, 157-8, 213, 419
DAVIDOFF, Leonore, L'ESPERANCE, J. & NEWBY, H. 318
DAVIDSON, C. 156
DEGLER, C. 116, 160,
DELPHY, C. 97-9, 103, 123, 139, 254
DEMOS, J. & BOOCOCK, S. 165
DENNIS, N. 417
DOIG, W. 205
DRUMMOND, A. 20, 159, 275
DRUMMOND, A. & DRUMMOND, L.H. 158

Author Index

E

EBBETT, E. 159, 266
 EDGELL, S. 59, 64, 276, 312, 366, 368, 421, 425, 513
 EDHOLM, F., HARRIS, O. & YOUNG, K. 105
 EHRENREICH, B. & ENGLISH, D. 57, 110, 112, 114-6, 120, 452, 470, 479
 EISENSTEIN, Z. 106, 126
 ELDER, G. 165
 ELDRED-GRIGG, S. 429, 439
 ELSHTAIN, J.
 ENGELS, F. 32, 89, 499

F

FACEY, A. 155
 FAIRBURN, M. 31, 142
 FERGUSON, A. & FOLBRE, N. 105-6
 FINCH, J. 493
 FINCH, J. & GROVES, D. 364
 FINLEY, M. 139-40
 FIRESTONE, S. 96
 FIRTH, R. 67, 130
 FIRTH, R. & DJAMOUR, J. 323, 365
 FIRTH, R. 327, 339
 FIRTH, R., HUBERT, J. & FORGE, A. 135, 337
 FLANDRIN, J-L. 134-5, 444
 FOSTER, J. 126
 FOX, B. 90
 FOX, R. 126
 FRANKENBERG, R. 34, 44-5, 85, 108, 151, 242, 297, 327, 338, 379, 405, 409, 414, 493
 FRANKLIN, S.H. 38
 FREIRE, P. 99
 FRY, R. 24,

G

GALT, M. 260, 435
 GAME, A. & PRINGLE, R.
 GAMARNIKOW, E. 48,
 GARDINER, J. 16, 90,
 GARDINER, W.
 GEORGE, M. 125, 278, 418
 GERSHUNY, J. 146
 GIDDENS, A. 20, 43, 171
 GILSON, M. 11, 351, 365
 GITTENS, D. 74, 111, 122, 129, 246, 383

Author Index

GLASER, B. & STRAUSS, A. 520, 524
 GOFFMAN, E. 420
 GOLDTHORPE, J.H. & LOCKWOOD, D. 358
 GONZALES, N. 62
 GOODE, W. 69-73, 76, 78, 144, 305, 336, 339, 357, 359
 GOODY, J. 337, 339
 GORHAM, D. 291
 GRAY, R. 172, 492
 GREVEN, P. 322, 338
 GRIMSHAW, P. 159,

H

HAJNAL, J. 26, 242
 HALCOMBE, L. 116
 HALL, C. 43, 158, 383
 HAMILTON, C. 97
 HAMILTON, R. 93, 115-6, 124, 383
 HAREVEN, T. 2, 75, 165, 406
 HARRIS, C.C. 2, 3, 8, 11, 37, 62, 70-1, 74, 76, 78-82,
 102-3, 112, 117, 121-2, 124, 161, 165, 174, 250, 252,
 357, 359, 413, 472-3, 474, 488-90, 494, 501
 HARRISON, A. 255-6
 HARRISON, J. 90
 HARTMAN, M. & BANNER, L. 116
 HARTMANN, H. 59, 93, 97, 101-2, 106-7, 118-9, 139, 250,
 495
 HARTSOCK, N. 88, 126
 HARTZ, L. 13, 504
 HOHEPA, P. 44
 HOMANS, G. 327
 HOSELITZ, B. & MOORE, W.
 HOUSTON, S. 11
 HUMPHREYS, A. 32,
 HUMPHRIES, J. 36, 76, 90, 131
 HUNT, C. 159

I

IMRAY, L. & MIDDLETON, A. 93
 INTERRANTE, J. & LASSER, C. 110, 116

J

JAGGER, A. 87, 94-5, 108-9, 110, 126, 151
 JAMES, B. 468
 JAMIESON, L. 8, 259, 445, 458, 479, 519, 521
 JANEWAY, E. 38, 490

Author Index

JONES, G. 367
JOYCE, P. 2, 74, 125, 317

K

KAWHARAU, I. 44
KEITH, H. 14
KELLY, J. 110
KING, D. 208-10
KITTINGHAM, J. 115, 158, 264
KLEIN, J. 151, 409
KOOPMAN-BOYDEN, P. 8, 11, 520
KOOPMAN-BOYDEN, P. & SCOTT, C. 221, 318
KUHN, A. & WOLPE, A. 126
KUMAR, K. 31, 34

L

LAKE, M. 255, 275, 295-8
LAND, H. 101, 289
LASCH, C. 77, 474
LASLETT, P. 120-2, 131, 133-5, 140, 143, 252, 346-7
LEE, G. 37, 66
LINDER, S. 495
LONG, N. 2, 146-7, 150
LOUDON, J. 402, 415, 491
LOWN, J. 86, 106, 109, 111, 119-20, 122, 125, 317-8
LUKES, S. 57
LUMMIS, T. 307
LUPTON, T. & WILSON, C. S. 85

M

MCCALMAN, J. 155, 159
MCDONALD, D. J. 11, 449
MACFARLANE, A. 135, 251, 332
MCKEE, L. & O'BRIEN, M. 500
McLAUGHLIN, V. 75, 406
MCLEOD, H. 402-4, 491
MCKENZIE, D. 449, 469
MANN, M. 22, 105, 310
MARRUS, M. 368
MARX, K. 16
MATTHAEI, J. A. 160
MEDICK, H. & SABEAN, D. W. 2, 165, 354, 362
METGE, J. 44
MIDDLETON, C. 98, 100-1, 121, 123, 258
MILLEN, J. 159

Author Index

MILLER, J. & GARRISON, H.H. 58, 101.
 MILLS, C. 519
 MINGAY, G.E. 18
 MITCHELL, J. 96
 MITCHELL, J. & OAKLEY, A. 116
 MITTERAUER, M. & SIEDER, R. 135, 165
 MOGEY, J.M. 151, 410, 433
 MOLYNEUX, M. 91
 MOORE, R. 39, 74, 403, 492
 MORGAN, D.H.J. 53, 54, 66, 72, 75, 322-3, 353, 361, 365, 472
 MORRIS, L. 37, 376, 413
 MURGATROYD, L. 108
 MYRDAL, A. & KLEIN, V. 55

N

NETTING, R. 2
 NEWBY, H. 255, 275, 314-5
 NOVITZ, R. 24, 48, 128, 148, 500

O

OAKLEY, A. 50, 54, 59, 93, 101, 494
 O'BRIEN, D. & TIFFANY, S.
 OLIVER, W.H. 14, 16
 OLSSSEN, E. 22, 23, 26, 29, 30, 157, 476
 OLSSSEN, E. & LEVESQUE, A. 11
 OREN, L. 426-7

P

PAHL, R.E. 2, 31, 32, 42, 45, 101, 138, 140-1, 144, 146-8, 151-4, 468, 494
 PARK, J. 76, 85, 496
 PARKER, S. 367, 369
 PARKIN, F. 170
 PARR, J. 155
 PARSONS, T. 50-68, 72, 78
 PEARSON, D. 171
 PEARSON, D. & THORNS, D. 20, 171
 PHILLIPS, J. 411, 429
 PHILLIPS, R. 100, 430
 PINCHBECK, I. 144, 156-7
 PITT, D. & MACPHERSON, C. 78, 354
 PLOWMAN, D.E.G. 39, 402, 491
 PLUMMER, K. 520
 POLLOCK, L. 136, 138, 155
 POLLOCK, N. 62

Author Index

Q

QVORTRUP, J. 112, 156

R

RABB, T.K. 147
 RAPP, R. 76, 103, 129, 130
 REIGER, K. M. 56, 96, 438, 495, 500, 512
 RITCHIE, J. 478
 ROBERTS, E. 8, 36, 75, 77, 143, 155, 259, 289, 402-3, 405, 406, 410, 426, 428-9, 431, 492, 521
 ROGERS, B. 38, 99, 490
 ROSALDO, M.Z. 98
 ROSALDO, M.Z. & LAMPHERE, L. 50
 ROSS, E. 36, 426
 ROSSER, C. & HARRIS, C. 131
 ROTH, M. 11
 ROWBOTHAM, S. 127
 RUBIN, G. 105-6
 RUSHTON, P. 112, 254
 RYAN, M. 116, 298-9, 441-2, 488

S

SACKS, K. 512
 SAMUEL, R. 144, 155, 264
 SARGENT, L. 126, 158
 SCANZONI, J. 60, 321
 SCASE, R. & GOFFEE, R. 173-4
 SCHNEIDER, D. 85, 129
 SCHWARTZ COWAN, R.
 SCOTT, C. 221
 SCOTT, J. W. & TILLY, L. A. 72-3, 99, 143, 247-50, 254, 260, 278, 295, 335, 498, 505
 SECCOMBE, W. 90
 SEGAL, L. 129
 SEGALEN, M. 124
 SENNETT, R. 486-7
 SHANIN, T. 252
 SHORTER, E. 138, 444
 SIMPSON, H. M. 20, 23, 159
 SINCLAIR, K. 14, 16
 SMELSER, N.J. 74
 SMITH, D. 49
 SMITH, N. 31
 SMITH, R. 2, 133
 SMITH, R.T. 62
 SOCIETY FOR RESEARCH ON WOMEN IN NEW ZEALAND 159

SOMERSET, H.C.D. 256-7, 381, 414
 SPENDER, D. 49
 STACEY, M. 48, 314
 STEARNS, P.N. 427
 STONE, L. 73, 444
 STRASSER, S. 101, 156
 STRATHERN, M. 103, 146, 347, 525
 STURT, G. (See Bourne)
 SUNDT, E. 99
 SUTCH, W. 221
 SWAIN, D. 165
 SYNGE, J. 405, 409

T

TENNANT, M. 437
 THORNE, B. 58
 THORNE, B. & YALOM, M. 129
 THOMPSON, E.P. 136
 THOMPSON, F. 264
 THOMPSON, P. 8, 155, 304, 404, 460-1, 469, 501, 518-9, 520-1, 523, 528
 TIFFANY, S. W. 50, 145-6
 TILLY, L.A. & SCOTT, J. 179-81, 206-7, 241-3
 TOLSON, A. 146
 TOWNSEND, P. 151, 358
 TOYNBEE, C. 17, 18, 21, 26, 142, 171, 256
 TRUMBACH, R. 136, 138
 TULLOCH, P. 313
 TURNER, J.H. 51
 TURNER, R. 312

U

UNGERSON, C. 364

V

VANEK, J. 101, 160
 VIGNE, T. 155, 463, 521
 VINCENT, D. 468, 521
 VOSBURGH, M. G. 26, 28, 247, 275

W

WALKER, K. & WOODS, M. 101
 WALL, R. 2, 133

Author Index

WALLER, P. 554
WALLMAN, S. 146
WALVIN, J. 428
WANDERSEE, W. 495
WATSON, W. 366, 379, 421
WEARING, B. 57, 495, 500
WEBER, M. 120
WEBSTER, A.C. 44
WERTHEIMER, B.M. 44
WHITEHEAD, A. 468
WILLIAMS, C. 527
WILLIAMS, W. 338
WILLMOTT, P. & YOUNG, M. 151
WILSON, P. 493
WOODS, N.S. 13

Y

YOUNG, I. 88, 110
YOUNG, K., WOLKOWITZ, C. & MCCULLAGH, R.
YOUNG, M. & WILLMOTT, P. 58, 73, 76, 358, 362, 405, 410-1,
428, 489

Z

ZARETSKY, E. 115, 117