INFORMATION TO USERS

DEFINING WORK:

GENDER, PROFESSIONAL WORK, AND THE CASE OF RURAL CLERGY

Muriel Mellow

Department of Sociology

McGill University

August, 1999

A Thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Canada

ABSTRACT

The goal of this thesis is to question conventional definitions of work through the detailed study of a professional group--specifically rural clergy--whose work falls outside the parameters of accepted definitions of work. According to the feminist literature, work and non-work are differentiated typically by dichotomies which privilege a masculine model of work and devalue women's experience; thus, "real work" is defined as an activity which is paid rather than unpaid, public rather than private, instrumental and intellectual rather than emotional. Professional work definitions also obscure the way in which "work" relies on activities which are linked with the feminine in these dichotomies. Through in-depth qualitative interviews with rural clergy, I explore the extent to which women and men draw on these gendered dichotomies to define work. In some ways, the approach of clergy counters conventional work norms: for them, emotional labour is a priority, work is not limited to a specific time or place, and public and private lives frequently overlap. I demonstrate how clergy define their work in terms of obligation, context, visibility, and time. Furthermore, I also argue that clergy delineate work in terms which still reflect a masculinized work norm specific to their profession. This "clergy masculinized mode" professionalises emotional labour by separating it from the facilitating work of female volunteers; it assumes a worker free from domestic demands in order to fulfil professional obligations within a flexible time frame; and it overlooks how the overlap of the public and private spheres is sustained by the work of wives. Thus, delineating work is particularly problematic for female clergy because professional demands are confounded with demands for adjunct work typically performed by women. My findings 1) highlight alternative markers of work which are suggestive for feminist theory; 2) point to a gap in theorizing about the gendering of work when conventional dichotomies fail to reinforce each other (as in the case of public, yet unpaid, volunteer work); and 3) recognize the possibility that varying masculinities define work.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette thèse vise à mettre en question les définitions classiques de travail à travers l'étude détaillée d'un groupe professionnel, en l'occurrence les pasteurs ruraux, dont le travail tombe à l'extérieur des paramètres de ces définitions. Selon la littérature féministe, le travail et le non-travail se différencient d'habitude sur la base des dichotomies qui privilegient un modèle masculin de travail et qui diminuent l'expérience des femmes. De cette façon, "le travail réel" se définit comme une activité qui est remunérée plutôt que non-remunérée, publique plutôt que privée, fonctionnelle et intellectuelle plutôt qu'émotive. A travers des entrevues qualitatives en profondeur avec des pasteurs, j'ai exploré le degré d'utilisation des dichotomies, basées sur le genre, par les femmes et les hommes. D'une certaine façon, l'approche des pasteurs va à l'encontre des normes classiques de travail: par exemple, pour eux le travail émotif constitue une priorité, le travail ne se limite pas à un endroit ou une heure spécifique, et fréquemment leur vie publique et privée se chevauchent. Je démontre que les pasteurs, en effet, définissent leur travail selon les jalons de l'obligation, le contexte, la visibilité et le temps. De plus, je mets en avant la proposition que les pasteurs tracent leur travail sur la base des dimensions qui reflètent toujours une norme masculine de travail et qui est spécifique à leur profession établie. Ce "modèle masculin des pasteurs" professionalise le travail émotif en le séparant du travail des femmes bénévoles qui le facilite, il présume un travailleur qui est libéré de exigences domestiques afin de répondre aux obligations professionnelles à toute heure, et il ignore que le travail des épouses soutiennent le chevauchement des secteurs public et privé. De cette façon, définir le travail devient particulièrement difficile pour les femmes pasteurs car les exigences professionnelles se confondent avec les exigences du travail adjoint, entrepris traditionnellement par les femmes. Mes conclusions sont les suivantes: 1) elles soulignent des jalons alternatifs de travail qui s'avèrent prometteurs pour la théorie féministe; 2) elles mettent en lumière une brèche dans la théorie du travail des femmes et des hommes quand les dichotomies classiques ne se renforcent pas (tel que le travail bénévole qui est public mais non-remunéré); et 3) elles accordent aux masculinités diverses la possibilité de définir le travail.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to

...the women and men who participated in this study. I appreciate their willingness to share their work experiences with me.

...my supervisor, Professor Peta Tancred. Her insight, feedback, and encouragement have been invaluable. I wish to express special appreciation for her detailed, written comments on my drafts during her sojourn in France, and for her seven-day-a-week availability during the last phase of editing. At that stage, there were few boundaries around her work-time! I also wish to acknowledge that Peta has been an important role model for myself as a feminist and female academic.

...other members of my committee. Professor Joan Stelling and Professor Patricia Kirkpatrick offered helpful comments at early stages. I am also grateful to Joan for her support at all stages of my graduate student career; she is a mentor and a friend.

...the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for providing me with four years of funding in the form of a doctoral fellowship.

...others who offered important practical support at various stages. Anne Bridge of the Assiniboine Community College in Brandon, Manitoba, Joan McConnell, a Conference Personnel Officer with the United Church, and Reverend Kerry Craig of St. Paul's United Church in Morden, Manitoba provided room to meet with respondents. Valerie McConnell and Jane LeBrun assisted with the transcription of the interviews. Gayle Chisholm offered her fax machine as a link between rural Quebec and Montreal _and_ her swimming pool as a balm for body and soul during a high-pressure summer of writing. The staff at McGill's various computer support offices rescued me from some tight technical spots. Guy Paquette worked on the translation of the abstract. Department of Sociology administrative staff, Sharon Barqueiro, Luvana Di Francesco, and Linda Power, helped in innumerable ways over the years.

...all the good friends and colleagues who gave emotional and intellectual support along the way. Producing a thesis is a lonely job where accomplishments are sometimes difficult to measure. As a result, it meant a great deal whenever these friends asked, "how's your _work_ going?" I especially want to thank Gretchen Schirmer, who deserves a gold star for providing essential last minute information and feedback;

vi

Virginia Thomas, who kept telling me I could do it; Marcia Beaulieu and Kiran Mirchandani, who made it to "the finish line" before me; and Alyson Champ, who, as an artist, understood exactly what I meant when I spoke about ambiguity in defining work.

...Tad Mitsui, my husband, and Estra, my cat. More than anyone else, Tad knows the amount of time and energy that has gone into producing this dissertation. He has lived with me through many tense and uncertain days, but never doubted my ability to succeed. And many times, he has been "the wife" in this household: cooking, cleaning, bringing me cups of tea and cookies, and maintaining some order in our lives. His love and encouragement have been boundless. And Estra has taught me a lot about not working. That has been important, too.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation focuses on the issue of **how work comes to be defined, and particularly professional work.** The separation of work and non-work is a socially constructed division; the degree of differentiation between the two, in terms of conceptualization, practice, and location, varies according to the historical and cultural context. Central to this investigation is the feminist critique of the way in which conventional definitions of work and non-work are gendered. Definitions of work which reflect "a masculine work norm" (Kobayashi et al. 1994:xv) and a "cultural code" of masculinity (Davies, in press) may be used for women as well as for men, but may have different consequences for each. Thus I am also led to consider **how women and men construct and negotiate the boundaries around their professional work, and how the challenges in this process differ by gender.** These questions are applied in **an investigation of the work and lifestyle of rural clergy** since their profession and milieu present numerous situations where the process of deciding what is or is not work is often ambiguous.

Feminist research has problematized conventional notions of work. In the past, sociologists have tended to accept, a priori, that work refers to that which is done for pay. Furthermore there was the assumption that real work was

1

located only in the public sphere, and thus was clearly differentiated from non-work and the private realm which included home, family, emotion and sexuality. Feminist research has strongly criticized these assumptions on the basis that they serve to systematically undervalue many of the contributions that women make to society and fail to capture the empirical reality of people's lives. Attention to reproductive work, to its inter-relationship with paid work responsibilities, and to how certain kinds of work have been made invisible, have combined to raise broader questions about how we conceptualize work. The feminist critique has made us pay attention to how the distinction between work and non-work parallels the construction of dichotomies of public and private, paid and unpaid, and most importantly, masculine and feminine. But in doing so it has also begged the question of how to consider definitions of work that move beyond these dichotomies and their gendered underpinnings.

Professional work, compared to other jobs, appears to be less clearly distinguished by parameters of pay, place, time or activity. Professional work is not defined in terms of hours worked or rates of pay. Professional networking may merge into social time or volunteering. Work may be done at home and professional reading may blur into recreational reading. Spouses of professionals may be called upon to host business associates and directly act as informal assistants in their partner's work. Nevertheless arguments have been made

as to how professional work is also structured around cultural codes of masculinity. Notions of professional control and autonomy over work and the ideal of professional distance which minimizes emotional involvement parallel ideals of masculinity (Davies, 1996). Studies which consider the feminization of a profession from the perspective of the numbers of women who enter it often fail to consider how their presence has not necessarily changed gendered notions of what constitutes legitimate work for those within its ranks. On the other hand, it is precisely because of professionals' control over defining and organizing their work that they offer a rich context in which to investigate how individuals may be reproducing or resisting gendered ideals.

WHY CLERGY?

Clergy work in an institution where dichotomies between work and non-work or public and private are particularly ambiguous. Rural clergy, especially, live and work in a situation where it is often impossible to differentiate one's clientele from one's neighbours, and where individuals shift from being "clientele" to (unpaid) "co-workers". As a result, rural clergy are continually engaged in the process of negotiating what should be understood as work. I use the word "negotiate" for two reasons. It implies a balancing of demands or expectations--in this case, between clergy, their congregations, and their families. It also has connotations

of finding one's way through a difficult passage; for clergy notions of work and non-work are not always easily clarified. Part of this process of negotiation may occur explicitly as clergy account for their work to the congregational committees to which they are responsible, but a large part occurs within themselves as they try to rationalize whether they are "working enough" or, more often, how to limit the tendency to work too much. Furthermore, clergy live in a "fishbowl", with their private lives open to public view; they are seen as role models for the community and their families have traditionally been expected to be involved in church activities. Thus they are not only faced with the question of what should be counted as work, but how to manage the relationship between their public and private lives, and the demands of professional and family work.

This process of negotiating boundaries and constructing definitions does not occur in a void. It occurs within a context of received professional ideology about what constitutes valued and legitimate activity, of historical developments within the profession, of community notions of what is "real work" and how work and family should be related, and most importantly, of cultural codes of gender which underwrite how work is defined and organized and include assumptions about who should perform what kinds of work. Thus clergy in their efforts to legitimate their activities as work or define the boundary between work and family bring a variety

of cultural resources into play. Interviewing clergy reveals how these factors dynamically influence their everyday lives.

Protestant clergy are also important since they represent a profession which women are entering in increasing numbers. The growing number of women offers a chance to compare how women and men face different challenges in legitimating their professional work and balancing it with domestic work and with leisure. In the past 30 years, the number of women who are ministers of religion has greatly increased[1]; in 1961 there were only 272 women in the profession in Canada, whereas in 1991 there were 2850 (Canada 1961, 1991). This ten-fold increase in absolute numbers also represents a substantial increase relative to the number of male clergy; the percentage of all ministers of religion who are women has increased from 1.6% to 12% over the same period. Similarly, in the United States, women represent between 10 and 12% of all Protestant ministers (Simon, Scalon, and Nadell, 1992:115). At first glance 12% may seem like a relatively small proportion given women's representation in other professions such as law (29%),

---

[1] The Census of Canada definition of ministers of religion includes leaders from all religious groups; it may refer to Christian clergy, Salvation Army officers, Jewish rabbis and Muslim imans. The Census, however, has separate categories for Catholic brothers and nuns, and for those in other religious occupations such as paid lay leaders or deacons. Thus, the figures for women include those who are Protestant clergy as well as female rabbis within more liberal branches of Judaism. Many religious groups, such as Catholicism, Islam, and more orthodox branches of Judaism still categorically deny women the opportunity to serve as institutionally recognized leaders.

medicine (27%), or architecture (19%) (Canada, 1991). However, it is nearly comparable to women's presence in dentistry (15%) and higher than in engineering (9%) (Canada, 1991). Furthermore this proportion must be understood as a measure of women's achievements, despite formal barriers within many religions which still prevent women from entering the profession. The proportion would be much higher if figures for only Protestant clergy were considered.[2]

For example, within the United Church of Canada--Canada's largest Protestant denomination, and the one from which all of my informants were drawn--the number of women clergy has grown from 172 in 1983 to 682 in 1994 (McConnell, 1994). This substantial jump in absolute numbers means women now make up about 25% of those within paid ministry in the United Church. It is likely that this proportion will continue to increase as women now constitute almost 50% of the students in some United Church seminaries (McConnell, 1995).

The demographic profile of clergy is changing in ways that go beyond gender composition. Both men and women are more likely now, than in the past, to enter the ministry as a second career and women tend to enter at an older age than men (Charlton, 1987:306-7). Women are also less likely to be married than men (Carroll et al. 1983; Nason-Clark, 1987).

---

[2] Unfortunately the Canadian census data on which these figures are based does not present statistics for Protestant clergy alone. Instead totals are presented for clergy from all denominations and religions, including those which do not allow women to become religious leaders.

However, if they are married, women are more likely than their male colleagues to have spouses within the same profession; male clergy are more likely to have wives in other occupations or working in the home (Carroll et al., 1983:191). Furthermore, married clergy women are more likely than clergy men to be in dual career families (Carroll et al. 1983:192). All of these factors are relevant to gauging what challenges women and men face in this profession as they negotiate the relationship between domestic and professional life.

This research does not examine all aspects of clergy work in equal detail. I have inquired much more intently about the kinds of activity that would be ambiguous or invisible if one were using conventional definitions of work. Ritual leadership, work with committees, and administrative work have not been considered to the same extent as attendance at social events, informal visiting, and various ways of nurturing relationships with parishioners. In other words, I have focused on areas which have usually been marginalized in the theoretical separation of work and non-work. Just as Green, Hebron and Woodward (1990:19) have suggested that it is important for research to focus on "the 'grey' areas between work and play" in order to better situate leisure in context, I would argue that it is important to examine the grey area between various types of work and play in order to understand professional work more fully as well. We learn as much, if not more, about practices of definition by considering

marginal cases as we do by categorizing what occupies the central position. Because an important part of the work of rural ministers is located in such "grey areas", clergy offer a particularly rich site for the investigation of how individuals reproduce and resist accepted definitions of work.

THE PERSPECTIVES WHICH INFORM THIS STUDY

This study is written from particular disciplinary, theoretical and personal perspectives. Each brings particular strengths and weaknesses to the research process. In this section, I wish to outline how this study is sociological, rather than theological, that it is written from a feminist and gender relations perspective, and examine how this endeavour is influenced by my personal experience of being married to someone who is a minister in a rural church.

There are many possible lenses through which to examine any empirical phenomenon. By choosing one over another, the researcher both heightens and limits the focus of her research. I have chosen to examine clergy's experience from the perspective of the sociology of work rather than from the perspective of theology. This necessarily means that I tend to talk about "work" rather than "call" or "vocation", and use language appropriate to sociological discourse. In doing the interviews, however, I tried to give respondents the chance to use their own preferred terminology. Some respondents were comfortable with labelling ministry as "work". Others

challenged me on the use of the term, preferring instead to talk about ministry as a lifestyle, a calling, or something which was a part of who they were, rather than an objective category of activity. It is worth noting that such theological descriptions tend to emphasize the inseparability of different spheres of life, rather than their differentiation within an individual's experience. Nevertheless, since this research is sociological in nature, I have tended to set aside my respondents' theological interpretations of their experience in favour of their descriptions of the organization of their professional activities, and their practical attempts to balance work, family, friendships, and leisure.

Various schools of thought within sociology bring their own richness to the research process. As should be clear from the previous section, this research is informed by feminist perspective. This means that I have tried to use women's experience as a starting point, rather than accepting conventions about work which have evolved based on experiences which are more common for men. It means that I assume "work" refers to more than what is done for pay, and focus on the ways that gender shapes people's experience of work. It also means that, in the analysis of my data, I began by analysing women's accounts and then analyzed those of their male colleagues. And inasmuch as feminist sociology tries to make a difference, I hope that this research might inform practical

interventions which would lessen the stress that comes from constantly negotiating ambiguity within rural ministry for both women and men.

While rural clergy represent a sub-group within a specific profession, I wish to emphasize that I am studying how work is defined, and not the professions as an institution in our society. In this sense, my research differs, for example, from the work of Abbott (1988), Crompton (1987), or Witz (1990). Rather than looking at professions as a social structure as these and many other authors have done, I am approaching the professions as one way of organizing work and rural clergy as a particular case of heuristic interest. Accordingly I begin with the accounts of the workers themselves as data for my analysis rather than with a discussion of issues related to professionalization or professional closure.

Furthermore, I analyze the work of clergy from a gender relations perspective. This perspective informs the work of Acker (1990, 1998), Davies (1996), Stivers (1993), and Tancred (Mills and Tancred, 1992; Adams and Tancred, in press) amongst others. A gender relations perspective is concerned with the way that gender appears as an organizing principle or relation in the constitution of work and organizations. This approach is in contrast, for example, to the so-called "gender attributes" perspective which underlines the gendered characteristics of women and men. Writing from a gender

relations perspective, Acker (1990) describes the way that organizations are shaped by an ongoing gendered substructure; underlying organizational assumptions and practices reflect social stereotypes about the relationship between women's and men's roles. Others have drawn attention to how our common sense and sociological definitions of "work" and "non-work" have evolved within a particular historical and cultural context where men have been dominant (Davies, 1996; Stivers, 1993). Thus, a gender relations perspective draws attention to how conceptualizations of "work" tend to reflect experiences which are culturally masculine—for example, that work and leisure can be clearly separated, and that the worker functions as a unit isolated from domestic concerns. In addition, this approach questions how these masculine "codes" serve to negate or marginalize aspects of work which are culturally feminine, while the organization of work simultaneously depends on the "veiled inclusion" of the feminine (Davies, 1996). For example, consider how the importance of emotional work may be down-played or excluded within a profession, even while the organization of professional work depends on that same work being done by others within an adjunct role.

It is important to note that this perspective sees the masculinity or femininity of work as a cultural construct; it does not assume that any inherent qualities are linked to the sex of the workers involved. Nor does it presume that the

gendered nature of work is fixed, or is absent if women work in the same way as men. As Adams and Tancred (in press) point out in their introductory chapter, "given that the gendered sub-structure is the outcome of ongoing gender relations within [a] profession...the emerging gendered substructure is in constant flux." Women, as well as men, may act to reproduce or challenge masculinized conceptualizations of work. By extending the analysis of gender beyond the representation of women within an occupation or a comparison of women's and men's experiences, this perspective has allowed me to consider how the work of ministry continues to be gendered, even though women's numbers in the profession are growing and my female and male respondents share many of the same understandings and experiences in their work. It also opens the door to considering ways in which ministry may be feminized in its constitution, as suggested by its apparent ambiguity, or reflect an alternate model of masculinity.

Finally, my own personal experience of being married to a rural minister provides me with a particular perspective which must considered. When I first conceived of this research, it was the theoretical questions which intrigued me. Because I grew up in a small town and had experience as a volunteer within the church, I suspected those questions could be fruitfully applied to the experience of rural clergy. At that point, however, my husband, who is an ordained minister, was <u>not</u> working within a parish. Furthermore, he had not been

for many years--working instead in bureaucratic positions within the church and other organizations--nor had he any intention of returning to the parish. However, after my initial research proposal was in, we found our life circumstances changing. My husband switched jobs to become the minister of a rural church, and we moved into a town of 600 people. Suddenly, and unintentionally, I was living in the same universe as my informants!

Consequently, I have brought an insider perspective to the research process. While this has presented a few dilemmas, I feel that it has been a strength overall. Many feminist researchers argue that using one's own experience is a useful strategy within the research process for the ways that it allows one to frame questions, test insights, and gain the trust of those whom one studies (see, for example, DeVault, 1990; Harding, 1987:8-9; Reinharz, 1992:26-34, 258-263; Smith, 1987:69-78). Living in the same kind of situation as my informants helped me formulate appropriate questions during interviews and understand the dynamics of which they spoke. My personal situation also helped to guard against over-simplifying the analysis. I knew I had to account for some of the positive features that came with working in a job with few fixed boundaries as well as explaining the difficulties of living in "the fishbowl".

A particular problem which I faced while doing the research was how much of my personal situation to reveal to my

informants. At some point, I told all of them that I had grown up in, and presently lived in a rural community. I also revealed that my past involvement with the church meant that I understood some of the terminology involved. Both of these points facilitated the interview process. However, I did not reveal to all of my informants that I was married to a minister. Generally, I told those who lived within the same region as we did. This seemed to be a reasonable courtesy since it was possible that they could discover this anyway. However, I did not bother telling those clergy who lived elsewhere. I had several reasons for this. I did not want them to assume that I was already overly familiar with their circumstances; I wanted to be free to ask the "obvious" questions and have them explain their answers fully. And I did not wish to define myself in reference to my husband's occupation unless it was necessary. The consequence was that about a third of my respondents knew what my husband did for a living. In retrospect, I can see no obvious differences between the interviews with individuals who knew and those who did not know. If I had to do the research again, I would probably inform all of my respondents of that aspect of my identity in hopes that it would enhance the rapport during the interview.

WHY THIS RESEARCH IS IMPORTANT

Clergy are far from being a modal case in terms of how

paid work is defined and linked with other life domains, even within the professions, and rural clergy are a particularly extreme case. Yet, the relevance of a case does not necessarily depend on its generalizability. Because of the peculiar nature of the profession, the clergy offer a case where both men and women, married and unmarried, must deal with ambiguity in the relationship between their professional activities, their domestic work and leisure. Thus their practical experience of constantly negotiating the way that paid work is interwoven into other life domains offers insights into how gendered definitions of professional work are reproduced and how alternative conceptualizations of work may be modeled. From a feminist perspective, it is essential to develop a more adequate definition of work that does not rigidly dichotomize experience. This dissertation speaks directly to this problem.

Beechey (1988) has argued that it is necessary to theorize gender in the sphere of work. Ministry presents an interesting case for it seems to stand in a paradoxical relationship to some of the dynamics which are usually considered to "gender" work. On the one hand, because ministry is a "male" career, with its maleness built on both tradition and sacred authority, gender issues should be magnified; it is a situation where women's increased presence in the profession is less likely to offset their anomalous status. On the other hand, ministry confounds parameters that

typically are used to differentiate work from non-work, and "masculine" from "feminine" domains. For example, it oddly straddles the public and the private spheres, with ministers' homes sometimes being, literally and figuratively, public property and with part of their professional work occurring within the private homes of others. Furthermore, a significant part of the work is concerned with dealing with people's emotions and nurturing relationships—kinds of work associated with the feminine. The way in which male and female ministers differentially encounter this ambiguity, whether as a problem or resource, may illuminate the gender dynamics which are at play in defining work. Furthermore, a comparison of women and men's experiences within ministry tests the assumption that they tend to have different work styles, a point which is disputed in the literature.

In certain occupations, the separation of public and private cannot be taken for granted. The way individuals in such occupations reproduce dichotomous conceptualizations of work and non-work or develop alternative understandings has been examined in studies of teleworkers (Mirchandani, 1996, 1999), lawyers (Seron and Ferris, 1995) and farmers (Wright, 1995; Ghorayshi, 1989). These issues, however, have not been examined within a sociological study of the clergy. This research, therefore, furthers our empirical knowledge of how individuals use dichotomies to define work by considering the experience of a different occupational group.

The consideration of the clergy also highlights activities which are not so easily captured within the public-private dichotomy. Their work raises important questions about how to conceptualize the work of building community through social events and the volunteer work done to maintain public institutions--areas largely left untheorized in the feminist literature. Most discussions of the relationship of professional work to unpaid work focus solely on its relationship to the reproductive work done in the private domain of family. An examination of clergy work also raises the question of how professional work gets set apart from volunteering or may be embedded in community socializing. Should volunteer activity be seen as unpaid work in the public sphere, or an extension of private activity? Or should it be seen as occupying a third realm which has been obscured by the theoretical focus on public and private? The consideration of how professional work may be both set apart from and dependent on volunteer activity is also an important topic for those outside feminist sociology. Gordon and Neal (1997) in outlining a new research agenda for the study of voluntary organizations, highlight the importance of research on "the relationship between paid workers and volunteers" and between volunteer and paid work. A study of how clergy define their professional work relative to community involvement and the work of volunteers speaks to these issues.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS

Chapter 2 outlines how conventional definitions of work reflect a masculinized model of work and the feminist critique of these gendered conceptualizations. I also consider a variety of proposals for re-conceptualizing work. I move from there to look specifically at the gendered nature of professional work. I then consider the literature on paid ministry in particular, looking at some of the factors which may shape the way individuals in rural ministry define their work. For example, I discuss professional norms and institutional definitions of work, the ideological "feminization" of ministry, the ambiguity of public and private boundaries, gender and marital status, work style and gender, and congregational expectations.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology used in this research, including how my sample was selected, interview techniques and the process of analysis. This chapter includes an overview of who was in the sample; I summarize the variations among respondents in terms of age, work experience, family status, living arrangements, and the presence of children in the home.

Chapter 4 considers how ambiguity is an essential component in the work of rural clergy. I describe how the work of clergy is embedded in the events and relationships of community life, particularly in situations which appear to be unworklike. In some of these situations, clergy themselves have no difficulty in delineating what work is--although it

may not be apparent to their parishioners--while in other circumstances, professional and private life may merge to the point where these categories are undefinable for clergy themselves. I draw attention to how the apparent ambiguity of their work confounds the kinds of dichotomies which conventionally are used to differentiate work and non-work, and how this raises questions about the way their work is gendered.

The focus of Chapter 5 is on how clergy define work in accountable ways. Although professionals are usually described in terms of their autonomy and control over their work, I point out how clergy, nevertheless, must account for their work to congregational committees and legitimate their activities in the light of community expectations about what a minister should do. This chapter outlines some of the strategies clergy use to define and legitimate various activities as professional work, for themselves and for others. I close by considering how these strategies may reflect masculinized models of work, and how this presents different challenges for women and men.

Chapter 6 looks at how clergy define their professional work by negotiating boundaries around relationships. It is concerned with how clergy maintain professional distance even while they are working at developing relationships and dealing with emotions, thus balancing the tensions between apparently feminine and masculine components of their work. I examine how

the focus on emotional labour as part of ministry places female clergy in the role of being expert nurturers even though it does not guarantee their professional status.

Chapter 7 examines how my respondents negotiated the boundary between public and private, work and home, in light of living in a context where these spheres are not always easy to separate. I examine the effects on clergy of having offices in their homes, of constantly being "on call", and of having spouses and children involved in their sphere of work. Given the demands of their work, clergy must "work at" family time and escaping work. In particular, I consider whether this blurring of the public-private divide are rooted in a kind of masculinity that may be peculiar to ministry as a profession and how this has different implications for the lives of women and men in the profession.

The conclusion summarizes my findings in response to my research questions. I also consider how the case of rural clergy may raise questions about work in other occupations, and pose challenges for the feminist project of re-conceptualizing work.

Chapter 2

CONCEPTUALIZING WORK

This chapter is organized in two parts. The first deals with the feminist critique of the conceptualization of work, including professional work, and the second with literature which focuses on the work of the clergy. In the first part, I review the feminist critique of how work has been conventionally conceptualized; this includes the ways that pay, time, place and activity have been used to normalize a definition of work that reflects men's experience to the exclusion of women's. I then move on to review notions of professional work and how they too may be masculinized, even though they depart in many ways from the parameters which most often define work. Thirdly, I look at some particular attempts to reconceptualize work based in the feminist literature.

The second half of the chapter reviews the literature on the work of clergy. Its purpose is to illustrate why ministry is a particularly good site in which to study the way individuals reproduce gendered definitions of work and also use alternative understandings. I consider various factors which may come into play as clergy define their professional work and negotiate its relationship to domestic and family responsibilities. I also review the way these factors may have different consequences for women and men.

21

CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF WORK AND THE FEMINIST CRITIQUE

By and large, the sociology of work has "focused on the meaning of work for the individual while all but neglecting the meaning of the term work" (Tancred, 1995: endnote 3). Work, if defined at all, is often distinguished from non-work by using parameters such as pay, time, place, and activity. The primary problems with conventional definitions are two-fold. First, they on based on men's experience to the exclusion of women's; the aforementioned parameters reinforce each other to systematically normalize the notion of work as paid employment. Second, they do not reflect the empirical reality of how women and men's lives are actually organized; they overlook the way that paid work in the public realm is impossible to carry out without the supportive work done in the private realm. Such definitions perpetuate the myths of "the masculine work norm" and of "separate worlds" (Kobayashi et al., 1994: xv). Feminist analysis has challenged the conceptual adequacy of these definitions (for example, Tancred, 1995). By drawing attention to women's experience, they have highlighted realms of work that the foregoing parameters have made invisible. This has broadened the definition of work for both women and men.

The masculine norm: work as defined by pay and time

"Work" has most typically been defined as that which is done for pay. In addition to reflecting men's activities as

the standard by which "work" is defined, the dominance of this definition is linked to "the structure of values and rewards in a market-based economy" and theoretical constructs such as the identification of work with productive labour in Marxist writings (Tancred, 1995: 12). Sociologists seem to have a difficult time freeing themselves from this convention. For example, Thompson, in his book entitled The Nature of Work (1983), fails to define what work is, although it becomes obvious that the author is referring to what one does for pay. Or consider how Rinehart defines work broadly as "any activity that entails the provision of goods and services for others" and acknowledges that "it is misleading to insist that only activities resulting in wages or salaries constitute work," but then goes on to state that his book will concentrate only on paid labour (1987: footnote 10). Furthermore, Watson (1980: 83) speaks of work as "the carrying out of tasks which enable people to make a living within the environment in which they find themselves," and elaborates by saying that making a living involves both the material and cultural aspects of our existence. Although "making a living" is typically used to refer to paid renumeration, with this definition one could also include domestic work as something which enables the "living" to be made. Despite this definition, Watson also focuses on paid work.

In non-professional jobs, pay is often set at an hourly

rate[1], so time becomes linked to pay as a means of making work visible (Daly, 1996: 8-9). We have a cultural norm for the number of hours one should work for pay within a given day. The standard of an eight-hour day which occurs between 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. remains the ideal and serves as metaphor for normal and legitimate work even although many jobs deviate from this because of shift work, split shifts, overtime, flexi-time, or part-time work. We distinguish between full and part-time workers and differentiate their entitlements as workers on this basis, as well as using these categories to judge their commitment to their work. Such distinctions have disadvantaged women because the demands of the domestic sphere have meant that they have typically spent less time in the paid labour force than men (Wilson, 1996: 111-119). Overtime may be necessary as a symbolic gesture of one's dedication to a career, regardless of whether it increases one's productivity (Hochschild, 1997: 69). Professional and managerial workers may not receive an hourly wage, but the number of hours they work may be taken as a measure of how committed they are to their job (Seron and Ferris, 1995).

A wage attaches an economic value to work and makes work visible culturally. Consequently, the work of women in the home is treated as non-work partly because it is not paid. Neo-Marxist theorists have drawn attention to the importance

---

[1] Pay may also be linked to the number of items or tasks completed, as in piece-work.

of domestic or reproductive work for the maintenance of the productive sphere (Armstrong and Armstrong, 1990: 67-98). Reproductive work refers not only to biological and generational reproduction, but also to the daily reproduction of labour power through such things as the preparation of meals, the maintenance of a congenial home environment, and care-giving. The devaluation of contributions from the reproductive sphere to society has meant the marginalization of women as those primarily responsible for this sphere. Yet the eight-hour norm for paid work is predicated on the notion of a worker who is able to free himself completely from domestic responsibilities for that amount of time--something which men have done more successfully than women, because women have continued to do the reproductive work (Acker, 1990: 149-150).

Although the focus on reproductive as well as productive work has broadened the scope of what is discussed as work, several problems remain with this conceptualization. The literature has tended to assume that reproductive work is unpaid and in the private sphere, as much as productive work is paid and in the public. In essence the dichotomy remains and we are still implicitly chained to earlier conceptions of work. Without challenging these linkages, we fail to theorize the place of much activity. For example, a great deal of market-related work occurs within the reproductive sphere, including work in the informal economy, and telework (Tancred,

1995: 13). Furthermore, given the definition of reproductive work, it is quite possible to talk about the work of nurses, clergy, counsellors, childcare workers, and house cleaners as paid reproductive work (for example, Giles and Koç,1994: 1-2). Finally, the reproductive and productive definitions fall short of providing a conceptual resting place for the work involved in planning workplace celebrations and parties, work which often falls to female office workers (Mellow, 1993b) or the volunteer work which supports public institutions such as hospitals, churches, and community centres.

Work as public activity

The industrial revolution led to the widespread separation of "work" from "home": where one made a living was separated from where one lived. The dichotomization of life into the public realm of work and commerce separate from the private world of home, family, and emotion has had a particular historical evolution, even though it is frequently accepted as a "natural" division within social life. However, the concept of public and private shifts in meaning, depending on the author who uses it and the context in which it appears (Mirchandani, 1996: 11-48). A critical examination of the literature and of people's experience shows the division between the public and the private is more than a spatial division (Imray and Middleton, 1983; Kobayashi et al., 1994; Mirchandani, 1996: 11-48). It is a division which has been

confounded with gender: men have come to be associated with "the public" and women with "the private," men with work and women with non-work. Imray and Middleton emphasize how this division is linked to gender when they state, "it is not work per se which is valued and is part of the public sphere but work done by men" (1983: 16). Thus the public-private divide is a division between what is valued and therefore culturally "visible", and what is not—and within our culture, what men do is valued more than what women do.

This dichotomization serves to delineate work from non-work and, in the process, ignores the interconnectedness of various life domains. Finch argues that the notion of family and work as separate spheres is "empirically unsupportable...[and]...theoretically naive" and "serves to actually obscure certain important features of social life" (Finch, 1983: 4). Women's experience differs from that of men since women carry a disproportionate responsibility for work done to balance and coordinate the two spheres. Women are confronted with the task of articulation or the continual work-out, reproduction and management of the relationship between the various spheres of life (Daune-Richard, 1988: 262). This articulation involves a keen management of time, space and relationships (Christenson 1988; Daune-Richard, 1988; Kirchemeyer, 1993; Seron and Ferris, 1995). If one pays attention to the notion of the articulation between these spheres—the "balancing act" that is necessary to keep both

enterprises afloat--it appears that even the notion of women's double day makes invisible an important component of the work that women do. The whole of their work is greater than the sum of the energies expended in the two parts, for they are also left to do the bridging work between them.

While the feminist analysis of work has drawn attention to the interface of the public and private, it has also contributed somewhat to the reification of this dichotomy by failing to adequately theorize work which is done neither inside the home, nor in the workplace, such as volunteer work within the community. Even what is done publicly, if it is unpaid, is not seen to be legitimate work. Thus volunteer work is more likely to be classified as leisure rather than productive activity. Daniels (1985) has written about the work of women as fund-raisers for community institutions and Margolis (1979) has drawn attention to female volunteers in politics but both have focused on the invisibility of women's contributions without situating these conceptually. One might argue that these are forms of unpaid work in the public realm, inasmuch as they occur and are carried out in the service of institutions other than the family. This subdivision of the public sphere subverts its alignment with components in other dichotomies: for example, public can no longer be so neatly equated with paid, male, or "work". But this, in turn, raises some interesting questions about how definitions of work and non-work are then reproduced.

Another option is to theorize a third domain which provides a theoretical niche for these anomalous activities. Hansen (1987) argues that the dimension of the social must be integrated to break down the public-private dichotomy. Drawing on the writings of Hannah Arendt, Hansen defines the social as including behaviours that "are not easily categorized as either public or private, that occur in both public and private space" and that "mediate public and private activities, tying individuals to institutions and other individuals" (Hansen, 1987: 107).[2] Hansen argues that using the notion of the social allows us "to see women's 'social' activities as 'work' weaving together the fabric of society"; she states that "[w]omen's role within 'the social' sphere consists of mediating the various forces of society--tying church to the household, neighbour to neighbour, the individual to the collectivity" (Hansen, 1987: 123).

In a somewhat similar vein, Parkin (1989, 1993), drawing on the work of Stacey and Davies (1983), argues for conceptualizing "an intermediate zone" to analyze settings which are public in their purpose but private in their design and atmosphere. Her examples include residential care units

---

[2] Although I feel that Hansen's proposal for a third realm of activity is useful, I would disagree with her overall conceptualization. She equates the public with the polity alone and locates the economy in the social along with civil society (see Hansen, 1987: 120). The location of both the economy in the social realm and not in the public seems to confuse the issue of various domains rather than clarify it.

for adults and adolescents and a family centre which offers government sponsored social services but is located in a remodelled house. These authors also use this concept to capture the ambiguity around the work that occurs in the setting as much as ambiguity about the physical setting itself. Parkin (1993) locates part of the management of emotion in this intermediate zone such as in the form of organizing "semi-private realm support groups" for the workers in the family centre. Stacey and Davies (1983) discuss the division of labour in child health care and point out that this work occurs in both the public and private sphere and is done, in part, by family members who move between both domains. They also note that it is "always, or almost always women's work" and that "[w]ork which straddles the domains tends to be denigrated in public domain terms" (Stacey and Davies, 1983: 13-14 in Parkin, 1989).

Like the authors cited above, I wish to argue for conceptualizing a third realm. The notion of a third domain is an important step away from the original dichotomy with its gendered underpinnings, and a greater leap theoretically than simply retaining the notion of the public sphere and subdividing it. It pushes the public-private distinction away from a simple geographical dichotomy. However, unlike Hansen I would choose a term other than "the social" to name it in order to avoid semantic confusion since both the public and the private are also social domains. Instead, I would propose

the term "communal" to designate this arena. This word invokes the notion of the community as the site of the work, bringing people together as its intent, and the shared nature of the work as its primary mode of organization. This point will be taken up in the conclusion.

Work as a specific category

The notion of work as activity discrete from non-work or other social institutions is a particularly Western and 20th century construct (Glucksmann, 1995). A straight-forward demarcation of work and non-work becomes tricky as one begins to look at people's real experiences, and is particularly problematic when one looks at the lives of women and of professionals. For example, "unpaid labour can merge into paid work, as in the case of women who contribute directly to household revenues by taking in children, boarders, and laundry" (Rinehart, 1987: footnote 10). And for professionals, how is one to understand social occasions at which personal contacts are developed which may later have professional pay-offs? Once one begins to question the parameter of pay as a marker of work, it becomes increasingly difficult to specify particular activities as work in all situations or for all people. Glucksmann (1995: 65) notes that, with the exception of the market sphere, work in all other times and places is embedded in other activities or social relations. It is then almost impossible to separate

out "pure work" as a discrete activity; work may be embedded in non-work and vice versa.

Feminist sociology has drawn attention to the way that emotional work is often embedded in other tasks, and is frequently difficult to separate out as a specific activity (James, 1989: Mellow, 1993b). For example, within the household it is difficult to disentangle the mundane tasks of food preparation and serving from the emotional work involved in nurturing group life within the family (DeVault, 1991). Job descriptions in paid employment, are more likely to itemize instrumental tasks rather than emotional ones. In paid work, even if emotional labour is codified--such as in the case of the flight attendants discussed by Hochschild (1983)--it is unlikely to be performed as a separate task. Flight attendants welcome and mollify passengers in the course of directing them to their seats, serving refreshments, and providing them with blankets and pillows. And in the course of doing other things, these workers also attend to their own emotions, making sure they wear a smile. The embeddedness of emotional labour, along with the fact that it is disproportionately done by women, contributes to its invisibility (Daniels, 1985; Hochschild, 1983; Stelling, 1994; Mellow, 1993a).

While women's lives reveal that it is difficult to separate various types of work, they also show that it is difficult to separate work from leisure. The literature

suggests that women's understanding of the relationship between work and non-work is qualitatively different from that of men's. Much of women's leisure is embedded in their domestic work responsibilities (Chambers, 1986; Henderson, 1990); reproductive work leaves little time for leisure as·a separate activity (Deem, 1982, 1986; Thompson, 1990). Women's reproductive work typically includes the creation of leisure for others; by taking on the primary responsibilities for childcare and housework, women enable men's leisure, but not their own (Thompson, 1990). Dorothy Smith points out how inappropriate it is to divide work and leisure in women's experience:

> If we started with housework as a basis, the categories of "work" and "leisure" would never emerge....it is hard to imagine how, using housework as our basic framework, it would be possible to make "work" and "leisure" observable. The social organization of the roles of housewife, mother and wife does not conform to the divisions between being at work and not being at work. (Smith 1987: 68)

Women's ability to combine work and leisure is seen by many writers as a product of how women have been victimized by a patriarchal society. Fewer authors (Gregory, 1982) discuss how the women's ability to combine work and leisure, while being the result of unequal gender relations, also represents a cultural achievement of women.

Professional Work

Conventional definitions of work not only fall short when describing women's experience but also appear to do so when

applied to professional work. Professional work appears to deviate in several ways from the conventional parameters used to distinguish work from non-work. Yet it would be wrong to assume that this necessarily suggests that gender is less salient in its organization. Professions have been characterized as a quintessentially male domain, despite women's gradual entry into these occupations. It can be argued that they, like other kinds of work, are undergirded by masculine norms which define professional practice (Davies, 1996). This section first examines the ways that professional work appears to confound the dichotomies which typically are used to differentiate work from non-work, and then goes on to consider how professional activity is nevertheless structured by a masculinized model of work.

Professionals are seen as having a vocation or career rather than a job which is simply done for pay. This includes having an expressive rather than instrumental orientation to their work; that is to say that they are motivated to do the work for its own sake rather than simply as a source of monetary rewards. The notion of vocation or career emphasizes that there can be no distinct limit on the hours that one devotes to one's work; availability may be an important marker of social "trustworthiness" which in turn lends legitimacy to professional control and authority (Seron and Ferris, 1995). Earnings are not directly linked to the hours one puts into the job. Thus the notion of career or vocation confounds the

notion of pay as a defining parameter of work in two ways: much more is done in the course of work than can ever be paid for, while, at the same time, the indirect relationship of pay to work means that there are few limits on what may be construed as work.

In addition, boundaries between leisure and work may be less clear for professionals than for those in other occupations. Conventionally, leisure is defined in terms of activities "which people pursue for pleasure and which are not a necessary part of their business, employment or domestic management obligations" (Watson, 1980: 119). Yet Parker (1982) has argued that where a person derives a high degree of autonomy and intrinsic satisfaction from their occupation that there is a greater likelihood that leisure activities will be an extension of paid work. For example, engineers may apply their knowledge to hobbies (Watson, 1980: 119), academics may use free time to read professional literature, and social workers tend not to see a sharp distinction between their "work" and "non-work" lives (Parker, 1983). Thus the boundaries around the professional workplace are "permeable and fluid" :

> Public time may, for example, seep into private time as a position demands networking, socializing, and informal politicking; office tasks that impose strict deadlines, emergencies, and strategizing may easily absorb hours left for private time (Seron and Ferris, 1995: 26).

Divisions between the "public" world of work and the "private" world of the family become muddled in the face of

professional work. Kern (1972) describes how doctors' families are constantly under pressure to keep the phone free for incoming emergency calls. Wives of professional men have typically been called upon to make the necessary adjustments in the domestic sphere to make it "fit" with professional demands (for example, see Whyte, 1962, on managers' wives or Hochschild, 1972, on ambassadors' wives). If the home is used for professional work, especially seeing clients, the home must be maintained, not just for family life, but also as a place suitable for public viewing (Finch, 1983: 57-58). This means "particular pressures [for wives] to produce a neat and tidy house derive from the possibility that one's husband's position, as well as one's own, will be undermined if domestic appearances are not kept up" (Finch, 1983: 58). Thus housework becomes directly consequential for the "productive" as well as the "reproductive" realm. Furthermore, Finch demonstrates how women's labour may contribute directly to their husbands' work, using the wives of clergy as one example of this (Finch, 1983: 88-106). Clergy wives have served as unpaid assistants by taking responsibility for certain church groups such as the choir, Sunday School, or women's group, or doing the work of relaying messages to their husbands and managing social relationships.

Despite these ways in which professional work fails to be clearly set apart from what would conventionally be termed non-work, professional work is deeply gendered in its

constitution. Davies (1996) considers professional work through the lens of gender relations analysis. Professional work was formulated as men's work and reflects images of masculinity specific to the historical context of the nineteenth century, when many professions were developing institutionally. This historically specific masculinity "represents men as striving to be strongly bounded, autonomous and agentic selves and...represses and denies interdependency and emotional ties" (Davies, 1996: 666 citing Bologh, 1990). Thus, professional work has come to be defined in terms of autonomy, authoritative expertise based on scientific principles, control over others, impartiality, and impersonality. Davies also makes the point that these codes of masculinity which define professional work, and have been institutionalized in its organization, may or may not reflect images of masculinity that are current today,

Furthermore, Davies argues that gendered thought takes a binary form; in order to "valorize the masculine" it must repress, devalue, and marginalize qualities which we culturally associate with the feminine. Consequently it renders invisible the work done by women in support of professional activities. For this reason, Davies asserts that in the analysis of professional work, it is essential to explain not just how the feminine is excluded from the professional realm, but also the "hidden inclusion of the feminine" in an adjunct role. Professional availability and

vocational commitment are only able to be realized when the work of running the household is done by someone else; detached social relations within professional work can only be maintained when some other worker is assigned the role of buffering the need to attend to emotions. In its ideal form, professional work is set apart from what we culturally define as feminine, yet in reality, it is also dependent on it.

That professional work is defined and organized in gendered terms has varying consequences for female and male professionals. Seron and Ferris illustrate how the "social boundaries around the professional workplace are qualitatively different for... men and women" (1995: 42). A study of lawyers revealed that men were far more likely to work extended hours than women, since they were more likely to have support in the household which freed them from domestic duties (Seron and Ferris, 1995). Women more often lacked a partner who was willing to buffer the demands of domestic responsibilities on their paid work.[3] Moreover, when professionals were asked to describe a "typical day," married women frequently began their descriptions with getting up in the morning and any domestic tasks done before departure for the office. In contrast, men were more likely to answer by describing the day beginning at the time they arrived at the office. Seron and Ferris (1995: 27) point out that "[t]he

---

[3]   Wacjman (1996, 1998) shows how this is so for professional managers, as well.

privileges of professional autonomy (including control over one's time) and the demands of professionalism (a willingness to work until the job is done) rest on the negotiated release from private time to have access to professional time." The organizational arrangement within the family which allows the professional to engage freely in overtime work is described by these authors as an "institutional system of social capital" to which men have greater access than women. Or in the terms used by Davies (1996), one might say that the professional ideal of autonomy and freedom to engage in overtime rests on the hidden inclusion of women's work in the home, and that this has profoundly different implications for professional women and men.

Reconceptualizing Work

Clearly, both women's experience and professional work lead us to question the parameters conventionally used to define work. This presents sociologists with the problem of how to re-conceptualize the notion of work to better fit the empirical reality. But there are several dangers in attempting to do so. First, broadening the category of work to include a larger variety of activities may stretch the concept too thin to be of any analytical use (Glucksmann, 1995; Karlsson, 1995). We need to be able to distinguish when someone is not working as much as when they are. Second, pointing to the grey areas between various life domains only

adds confusion if we do not take up the additional task of improving our conceptual framework. As Glucksmann (1995) argues, if we are to deconstruct existing definitions, we are also responsible for reconstructing alternatives. Third, re-thinking the concept of work is stymied by the inadequacies of language; it is difficult to re-conceptualize "work" when our attempts to do so rely on metaphors that are grounded in terms which are necessarily linked to gender or reproduce dualitistic understandings. This section reviews several attempts to re-think the concept of work and considers their strengths and weaknesses.

Beechey (1988) contributes to the enterprise of re-defining work by emphasizing the need to theorize gender in the sphere of work. She calls for systematic empirical research on both men's and women's experience to determine how gender matters within paid and unpaid work. Such gender-conscious theorizing has to account for 1) the basis of the separation of public and private and its consequences for men and women; 2) how workplace cultures maintain inequalities between women and men; and 3) how people's identities are bound up with the public-private split and with gender relations at work. Thus any definition of work has to account for the gendered nature of work experiences, and how the definition of work may come to be constructed differently for women and men. While her attention to the role of gender is extremely important, it also begs the question of whether we

can theorize the relation between gender and work in terms which are not dualistic.

Armstrong and Armstrong assert that feminist theories of work "must consider all labour involved in acquiring what is deemed necessary for survival by different social classes in different racial and cultural groups and in different historical periods" (1990: 13). They broaden the category of work to include, among other things, unpaid domestic work, volunteer work and the unpaid labour in family firms, as well as emphasizing that the conceptualization of work may be variable across time and amongst social groups. They also draw attention to how those who theorize work must pay attention to the subjective definition of work; "what is deemed necessary for survival" may not be the same for all social classes or groups. The danger here is that the subjectivity of the definition may limit broader attempts to theorize work.

Glucksmann (1995) raises the question of where to draw the line between work and non-work. She cautions against collapsing everything into "work," thus risking conceptual confusion, as we attempt to broaden our framework of analysis.[4] At the same time, she rejects conventional definitions of work that link it to the money economy. Glucksmann attempts to re-define work in terms of "economic"

---

[4] She particularly criticizes those who have written about emotional work for doing this.

relations, but she broadens the definition of economic to refer to a "social" rather than simply market economy. For her, economic relations are those which are necessary "for the physical survival of the species and...the production and reproduction of the conditions of living" (Glucksmann, 1995: 70). To look at work is to focus on tasks which have some economic input or output or are done under relations of economic restraint. Glucksmann's attempt to broaden the definition of economic relations suffers from the fact that the term "economic" is overloaded with existing connotations; thus the choice of this term is ill-advised and could be misleading without a careful reading of her text. However, like Armstrong and Armstrong (1990), her concept of "work" is linked to providing what is necessary to survival and to perpetuate the conditions of living.

Glucksmann also rejects the dualisms that tend to define work (i.e. work/leisure, paid/unpaid, production/consumption, work/home). She suggests the more holistic notion of the "total social organization of labour" to conceptualize the interdependence of household and market economies and how work crosscuts these spheres (Glucksmann, 1990). She sees the domestic and public spheres as "two poles" which are linked by the wages and labour of women and men, and the purchase of commodities for use in the domestic economy (265ff). Thus, for Glucksmann, the sexual division of labour in paid work becomes just one part of the sexual division between the

spheres of production and reproduction. In addition, the sexual division of labour between the two spheres affects the conditions under which women's and men's labour power is sold in the productive sphere. Finally, the sexual relations within this total division of labour are integrated into class relations and may change over time. The strength of her approach is in its focus on explicating the dynamic linkages which exist between various kinds of work, rather than treating the spheres separately.

Wright (1995) tries to conceptualize some of the areas which are ambiguous in more conventional conceptions of work and, like Glucksmann, tries to move away from dichotomous theorizing. She proposes a multi-dimensional "continuum model" of work, basing her discussion on the experience of rural women. Within her model, she considers the physical location of work, work's economic benefits, and the individual's control over when and how the work is done. She argues that labour performed by any one individual at any time can range from formal labour market work, to informal sector work, to unpaid household work. Rather than defining the world of work as "either/or or public/private", Wright suggests that a continuum model allows us to "see the world as a continuous piece of experience in which people move from the extreme public end to the extreme private end, but most of the time people (women and men) are operating in parts of the world that have characteristics of both the public and the

private" (1995: 232).

Daune-Richard (1988) attempts to theorize part of the grey area which arises from dualistic definitions. She proposes the category of "women's work" as a way of framing individuals' participation in both domestic and paid work, and of recognizing the work of coordination between the spheres. It is an attempt to provide a concept which incorporates and transcends "the duality of female labour" (Daune-Richard, 1988: 261). Although "women's work" may be an appropriate moniker given that it is usually women who do the majority of the articulation work, she makes it clear that this does not mean that such work must necessarily be done by women. The same label could also be applied to the work a single father does in arranging daycare for his child during his working day. Nevertheless, I would argue that calling it "women's work" runs the danger of reproducing the notion that it is women who naturally do this work.

These attempts have several things in common. First, they incorporate gender into the analysis. Second, they develop conceptualizations of work which analyze both productive and reproductive work under the same rubric. They try to overcome the analytic division between public and private spheres and other dualisms, by explaining the links between reproductive and productive work--including the articulation work done to bridge the two--and treating each component with equal importance. Third, they suggest a need

to move away from purely market terms to analyze productive work--both conceptually and at the level of language. Some succeed better than others in regards to language; defining work in terms of "necessity" rather than part of a "social economy" may be more useful at a heuristic level. It is these guidelines which form a basis for analyzing the way that clergy construct their work, and the implications for the women and men who serve as ministers.

THE CASE OF THE CLERGY

The profession of ministry is a fertile area for examining questions relative to how work is defined and the role that gendered codes play in shaping these definitions. Of all professions it may be the one where boundaries between paid work and other life domains are the most blurred. Despite theological orientations which may lead them to assert that ministry is not work but a vocation or a way of life, setting professional work apart becomes a concern for clergy for two reasons. "What is work" becomes a question which must be asked daily in order to legitimate the use of one's time whether to oneself or to others, such as church committees with whom ministers work. Furthermore, defining and delimiting professional activity also becomes an issue in terms of balancing work with one's personal life. The way in which women and men respond to ambiguity in their work is an issue worthy of investigation. This section considers some of

the factors which influence how individuals within rural ministry define their work and negotiate boundaries around this ambiguity. I discuss professional norms and institutional definitions of work, the ideological "feminization" of ministry, the ambiguity of public and private boundaries, gender and marital status, work style and gender, and congregational expectations.

Professional norms and institutional definitions

Professional norms and institutional definitions of ministry make it difficult to differentiate clergy activities into conventional categories of work and non-work. The notion of ministry as vocation or a divine call means work is not confined to a particular place, time or social sphere.[5] Traditionally, it was not just what the minister did within the church building that was important, but how he conducted his personal life as well. Expected to be a role model and the epitome of moral behaviour at all times, the minister's "private life" was anything but private. In recent decades there has been some shift in this work role. A humanistic trend within theological education, described by Kleinman (1984) and by Carroll (1992), emphasizes being a "real person" rather than always remaining within the professional role, and

---

[5] This is not to say that a sense of vocation is necessary for other kinds of professionals to experience a similar overflow of work. In the case of the clergy, however, the reference to a divine call justifies such an overflow as normal and expected.

advocates the development of personal and egalitarian relations with parishioners. Although such a philosophy allows clergy to climb down from their pedestals, I would argue that it perpetuates the ambiguity of what is defined as professional work. A professional ideal which requires the job incumbent to be a "real person" seems to prescribe that all aspects of life are potentially relevant to occupational activities just as much as the expectation that she or he should be a model of Christian behaviour.

Formally, United Church clergy are ordained into a ministry of word, sacrament and pastoral care. These three factors define the major components of their work. "Word" refers to the duty to preach, teach, and evangelize--all means of sharing the Christian message. "Sacrament" refers to the responsibility for providing ritual leadership. Both of these categories denote, for the most part, highly public acts[6] and ones that would seem easily recognizable as professional work. They are concerned with the exercise of esoteric knowledge and the performance of a highly specialized role. The third component, pastoral care, refers to the work of nurturing individuals and community in a spiritual and emotional sense. Finally, it should be noted that although this triad of "word, sacrament and pastoral care" expresses the ideal conceptualization of ministry, in practice, administration

---

[6] However, teaching and evangelism could occur privately, as well, in one-on-one encounters.

forms a fourth category of work.

The category of pastoral care allows for a highly flexible understanding of what constitutes work. Pastoral care means that anything which builds trust, nurtures relationships, and expresses caring can be counted as work. It is significant that clergy have a language for calling these activities work; feminist scholars have noted that the "invisibility" of these activities as work when performed as part of women's caregiving is perpetuated by a lack of language to name such activities as work (Aronson and Neysmith, 1996; DeVault, 1991). While certain kinds of activities are traditionally included in pastoral care, such as visiting the sick and shut-ins, in practice such care may be linked to a much more diverse range of activities. The notion of pastoral care opens the door to acknowledge work in informal encounters with congregational members as well as in more formal circumstances. This elasticity of definition, along with the notion of work as vocation, adds to the ambiguity about the boundaries of clergy's professional work.

It is also important to note that "ministry" per se does not constitute paid work in United Church parlance. The United Church has a well-articulated rhetoric about the ministry of all believers, which in theory recognizes the value of the ministry of the laity as well as the ministry of

ordained persons.[7] However, this rhetoric falls somewhat short in practice; laity, themselves, may not conceive of what they do as "ministry", nor are they held accountable for this. Ordained clergy are differentiated from laity in that they work within what the United Church describes as "paid, accountable ministry" and do so with a background of formal education. The rhetoric of ministry as not being specific to clergy theoretically blurs the division of labour at some levels; this allows clergy to work alongside laity in similar tasks while still seeing this as a legitimate use of their time. Nevertheless, the reality of clergy as paid professionals inevitably distinguishes their work as more significant than that of volunteers.

The feminisation of ministry?

While women are present in growing numbers in parish ministry, as outlined in my introductory chapter, they nevertheless work in a profession which, traditionally, is not just male in orientation but "sacredly male" (Carroll, 1992: 296). Thus women not only have to deal with gendered expectations of work styles and professional self-

---

[7] A third category of ministry is also institutionally recognized: this is diaconal or commissioned ministry. Diaconal ministers are commissioned (rather than ordained) to a ministry of education. They receive formal credentialized training and work as paid employees. However, I have not focused on this category since diaconal ministers form only a small group of employees within the United Church as a whole and are rarely employed by rural churches.

presentation, but also with those which are reinforced explicitly by "sacred" authority. In other words, the cultural construction of masculinity which Davies (1996) argues underlies the conceptualization of professional work is augmented by religious beliefs.

However, many scholars assert that women's increased presence in the occupation is changing the way that theology is understood and ministry is practised.[8] Clergywomen are more likely than clergymen to be strong feminists (Carroll et al. 1983: 101, 232) and their feminist theology[9] provides a "hermeneutic through which life in all its spiritual and mundane aspects is understood and lived" (Hunter and Sargeant, 1993: 553). Feminist praxis is emphasized as a way of understanding theology. Authors who argue that there is a specifically feminine approach to the ministry claim that women are more likely than men to draw on their personal experiences as a resource in their pastoral duties, particularly those experiences which are unique to them as women, such as pregnancy, childbirth, motherhood, and women's traditional role in the home (Barksdale, 1981; Bell, 1981: Park, 1981; Nason-Clark, 1987; Wallace, 1992b). Thus, women would seem more likely than men to enter the pastorate with a

---

[8] See for example, Charlton, 1987, and my discussion of work styles and gender in the section which follows.

[9] Feminism has re-shaped theology in the same way as it has influenced other disciplines like sociology. From a sociological standpoint, feminist theology provides the basis for a re-cast professional ideology.

professional ideology which predisposes them <u>not</u> to separate paid work from their experience in the domestic or communal sphere. A feminist orientation towards work may have mixed consequences for women. On one hand, it can potentially give value to types of experience previously devalued. On the other hand, it may turn professional work into something that is more "invasive" than it already is with the consequence that everything has the potential to become work. Although feminism makes an important theoretical contribution by drawing attention to the inter-relationship between productive and the reproductive work, in practice there may be a need to draw boundaries between the two spheres to limit the spill-over of one into the other, thereby keeping them in balance.

Other authors have argued that religion and ministry have been "feminized" for reasons other than the entry of women into this occupation. Ruether and McLaughlin (1979: 26) point out that in the nineteenth century, industrialization and secularization led to a privatization of religion which linked it to the domestic sphere and romanticism; consequently, clergy came to be seen "as exercising something less than a 'masculine' profession" (Ruether and McLaughlin, 1979: 26). Although clergy still were predominantly male--and the divine still male in its referents--their work placed them in close contact with women who were keepers of family religiosity, and thus marginalized them in men's domain of public commerce and work. It would appear that history has left religious

professions uneasily straddling the gender construct. Kleinman (1984a) and Carroll (1992) consider more recent developments within religious thought; they note that in the past 30 years there has been a move away from a hierarchical and authoritarian approach to ministry--something which might be typified as particularly masculine--and towards a more humanistic and egalitarian stance. If the latter is not necessarily feminine or feminist, it is, at least, more open to the different voice that women may bring to their work. In sum, these authors draw attention to significant historical shifts in religious ideology besides, and predating, feminism which may provide a basis for changing understandings of work among clergy. The question remains open as to whether these trends have truly given rise to a cultural feminization of the ministry, or, more conservatively, to newly masculinized codes of work.

Work style and gender

A number of studies have considered whether the work style of women in ministry differs from that of men. These are relevant to this research since one's work style may give clues as to how one understands the overlap of various life domains. There is a marked difference of opinion among authors as to whether women tend to have a different approach to ministry than do men and what the reason for such differences may be. Unfortunately, only a few texts

(Kleinman, 1984a; Lehman, 1993a; Nason-Clark, 1987; Carroll et al. 1983) directly and systematically compare male and female clergy using the same measures, scales or questions to assess both sexes and compare responses. More often comparisons are based on anecdotal evidence or personal evaluations by interviewees or authors. Thus the present research contributes to the literature by providing a deliberate comparison of both men's and women's approaches to work within this profession.

Many authors claim women's work style is less hierarchical and rigid, more collaborative, and places a greater emphasis on relationships than men's (Christ and Plaskow, 1979; Nason-Clark, 1987; Daly, 1973; Wallace, 1992 a,b; Weidman, 1981). For example, a comparison of female rabbis and female Protestant clergy by Simon, Scalon, and Nadell (1993) showed both groups believed they were more approachable and less formal than their male colleagues, and that they spent more time with people and less on administrative tasks than did men. Furthermore, women believed they were more likely than men to speak in relational terms and from a first person perspective. However, among the authors asserting significant gender differences in work style, most base their claims on the self-perceptions of either female clergy themselves or of their parishioners rather than on a direct comparison to male clergy. Often these studies appear to either support or refute something

very near to an essentialist argument for the way gender affects work--that is to say, there is an essentially feminine style of ministry--rather than questioning how gender informs the process of conceptualizing work regardless of the sex of the workers involved.

Others claim gender differences in style are spurious or largely unsupported by the evidence (Lehman, 1993 a, b; Robb, 1985; Stoltenberg, 1990). These authors argue that gender is a social construction and not an inherent trait; they lay emphasis on the structural location of women and men (i.e. the similarity of their positional power and authority) as the source of shared characteristics. For example, Lehman (1993b) asserts that it is not just an issue of whether men and women work differently but under what conditions. Lehman (1993a) carried out an extensive survey of male and female clergy within the United States, using a variety of scales specifically developed to capture characteristics attributed to a feminine work style. He concludes that gender differences in work style do exist but only on certain dimensions (for example: willingness to use coercive power; striving to empower congregations; desire for rational structure; ethical legalism). In many other areas, such as "general interpersonal style," no gender differences were apparent. Furthermore, gender differences which did exist were minimal in terms of statistical significance. In contrast, race and ethnicity were far more predictive of

differences in style than was gender.

The review of the above studies shows that the issue of gender differences in work styles is still open for debate. It is possible that work styles between women and men vary minimally because, for both, notions of what is valuable or useful work is shaped by the same male model of work. A major shortcoming of these studies is that they all limit "work style" to something which relates only to paid employment rather than also examining how women and men in ministry manage the ambiguous boundaries between what they do for pay and other life domains.

The ambiguity of public and private spheres

Ambiguity around the interface between paid work, domestic work and leisure is faced by both women and men in rural ministry. The structure of the manse and the general visibility of rural life calls into question the notion of the "private sphere" as a concept relevant to describe clergy life. Traditionally, the minister's office was not located in the church but in the manse; clergy continue to live with this legacy and frequently have their offices in their homes. In addition, there is a tradition of family members being involved in congregational activities. Rural ministers and their families feel that they are constantly living "on stage" or in a fishbowl (Carroll et al. 1983). In rural life, a minister is easily identified by others and may be judged on

how well she or he fits into a small community (Carroll et al. 1983: 169). Ministers who are in isolated villages may face the dilemma of whether or not to develop close friendships with parishioners and thus create a local support system. In these circumstances, maintaining professional distance is not so easily accomplished; the trend towards "being a real person", mentioned earlier, further problematizes this professional norm.

With little or no separation of place of work and residence, "the realities of the profession pervade both public and private life" (Gannon, 1981: 203). For example, consider this situation: a minister's family goes out to a local restaurant and the minister encounters a parishioner who relates the recent decision of a particular committee and adds that another church member has just gone into hospital. How is this encounter to be understood? At some level, the interchange has contributed to the minister's professional work--significant information has been exchanged--and yet, at the same time, the encounter occurs within the context of a family outing, so it might also be understood simply as gossip in a leisure setting. While the same event could occur in the city, the likelihood is much higher if the minister is living and working in a rural setting. Within this profession perhaps more than any other--and particularly in a rural setting--the conceptualization of activity into public work and private domestic activity is highly problematic.

Gender and Marital Status

Research shows that clergywomen have a greater difficulty than their male colleagues in separating their ministerial duties from their private lives (Carroll et al., 1983: 190-197). In part this is due to the fact that clergywomen, even more than clergymen, find themselves living in a fishbowl, due to their still anomalous status within the profession (Carroll et al., 1983: 190-197). The overlap between social domains may have different implications for women and men. A study by Carroll, Hargrove, and Lummis (1983) compares the experiences of female and male ministers, and provides insights into how men's experience of balancing paid and domestic work compares to that of women. Although more clergy men than clergy women were likely to have spouses who did not work outside the home, they were also less likely to have spouses who were supportive of their work. This is because the men were less likely to be married to someone within the same profession than were the women; the understanding of role-conflicts that comes with both spouses sharing a common profession exists alongside the time demands of balancing two professional careers with domestic responsibilities. Men with ordained wives were more likely than those without to report difficulty in balancing paid work and family demands due to the professional pressures placed on both spouses.

This same study also found that there was no relationship between marital status of clergywomen and how easy or

difficult it is for them to balance their personal and professional lives (Carroll et al., 1983: 190). Both married and single women struggled to balance demands, although the specific challenges they faced were somewhat different. Whereas married female clergy had to balance professional duties with demands for family caregiving not faced by single women, single women had difficulty keeping time for themselves, since they did not have "the 'legitimate' excuse of a husband or children to use in keeping over-demanding parishioners at bay" (Carroll et al. 1983: 191). It is especially difficult for single women to create personal support networks for themselves to buffer job stress if they are in a rural area. In addition, they may face the particular problem of developing romantic relationships since "no one wants to date the minister" (Howe, 1982: 192). Unmarried female clergy are not allowed the freedom of stepping out of the work role even when they attempt to secure more leisure and personal time for themselves; who they see or what they do in their own time is often of interest to parishioners (Carroll et al., 1983: 191).

The demands on married clergywomen may be buffered for a number of reasons. Married clergywomen are more likely than most women to be in marriages where there is a somewhat equitable distribution of domestic duties and childcare between spouses (Carroll et al. 1983: 192); this is true since they are more likely to be married to other clergy, or to

other professionals, who are supportive and understanding of their paid work role. However, a two clergy couple faces the dilemma of both having highly stressful jobs which threaten to encroach upon personal and family time. One strategy which clergy couples have used to balance these responsibilities has been to share a single position within a parish (Carroll et al., 1983; Howe, 1982; Donovan, 1988); both carry out pastoral duties part-time and share in the domestic work. The loss of salary is offset by the greater ease in meeting domestic responsibilities and in coordinating ministerial obligations.

Congregational expectations

Among conditions which affect how clergy negotiate the linkages between their professional and personal roles are the attitudes and the expectations presented by their "clientele" or congregations (see for example, Howe, 1982: 185-211). Although clergy may enter the parish with their own notions of what paid work activities are important and what is the appropriate relationship between their professional duties and personal lives, these worker attitudes are lived out in the context of local expectations of the clergy work role and of appropriate behaviour for women and men. Evidence shows parishioner expectations differ for male and female clergy. These may constrain the ways individual clergy negotiate the relationship between paid work and other life domains.

Kleinman (1984) explains how the humanistic ideology

taught to seminary students makes women feel comfortable within the seminary, but actually disadvantages them when they enter full-time ministry. Women, already in an anomalous position, have an even harder time legitimating themselves to parishioners, since this ideology endorses behaviour which is at odds with how parishioners expect ministers to behave. In contrast, men had "fewer problems legitimating the humanistic role to parishioners because they could rely on the authority inherent in their social status as males" (Kleinman, 1984b: 214). Kleinman suggests that men who behaved humanistically were judged to be exceptionally caring whereas women who did the same were judged to be doing only what comes naturally. She states:

> ...female ministers cannot prove they are as competent as male ministers by appealing to an ideology that delegitimates authority generally and calls for acting and thinking in ways conventionally associated with feminity. (Kleinman, 1984b: 215)

Thus, the differential judgements by congregational members means that the work done by female clergy may be less visible than that done by men, regardless of how that work is viewed by clergy themselves.

Wallace presents evidence of parishioners erasing the line between professional and personal domains in a way which is detrimental to women and not men.[10] She tells the story

---

[10] Wallace's study is of women who worked as lay pastors in the Catholic church. Lay pastors take on all the day-to-day work of ministry within the parish, with the exception of certain ritual duties.

a congregation which deliberated over whether or not to dismiss the house-cleaner for the parish house once the woman pastor took up residence; this was after a long history of employing domestic help for the priest to assist with ordinary housekeeping as well as with whatever job-related entertaining occurred in the parish house (Wallace, 1992a: 161). The assumption was that, although the new female incumbent had the same pastoral duties as the male priest, she would also be able to do her own housework and preparation for visitors in addition to other pastoral work because she was a woman. The female pastor objected to this change and managed to retain the housekeeper's services, thus re-establishing the same boundaries around what "work" the parish would receive from her as from her male predecessor.

Carroll et. al. (1983: 195) asked clergy how they thought parishioners viewed their ways of balancing marriage, family and career. Clergy stated that they felt lay people expected more of a clergyperson's wife than of a husband, in terms of the spouse's participation in church activities. This was true even if the "wife" was also a clergy in a different church with her own pastoral duties. If a clergy couple was serving together in a single parish, often the woman was viewed firstly as the minister's wife, rather than as a minister equal to her husband. These findings echo those of Nason-Clark (1987: 335); in her study over two-thirds of female clergy felt that greater time demands were placed on

them than on men in the profession. Female pastors spoke of having to play both the role of clergyman and wife, even if they were not married. Thus women, although they themselves have entered the profession, do not so easily escape the adjunct role.

In reviewing the existing literature, it is apparent that the expectations of parishioners are crucial in how clergy come to understand and negotiate the total social organization of labour. Regardless of how a minister may define his or her work, he or she does so within a particular local context. The local context affects the way that broader cultural notions of masculinity and feminity serve to gender work definitions. To ask about how "work" is defined and about how the interface between paid work and personal lives is negotiated and managed requires sensitivity to these contexts.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have reviewed how definitions of work have conventionally undervalued women's experience and taken men's experience of paid, public work as the norm. Consequently, work and non-work have come to be conceptualized in reference to various dichotomies, such as paid versus unpaid, public versus private, instrumental versus emotional, and ultimately, masculine versus feminine. These dichotomies interact to reinforce each other, reproducing categories of activities which are culturally valued and devalued, visible

and invisible. Inasmuch as the masculinity or feminity of an activity is reproduced by this dynamic, and the feminine is devalued, negated, or marginalized, we may say that work is gendered. While professional work confounds some of these dichotomizations, its organization also appears to rest on a cultural code of masculinity which is historically grounded in the nineteenth century.

I have also reviewed various attempts to reconceptualize work. These sources have pointed to the need to theorize gender in the sphere of work; to broaden the definition of work without reducing its theoretical usefulness; and to develop concepts which overcome previous dualistic understandings and do not privilege economic models of work. Finally, I have considered some of the literature which describes the work of the clergy to illustrate why this profession is a heuristically rich case in which to investigate the way work comes to be defined. This includes the extent to which women and men reproduce gendered understandings of work or model alternate conceptualizations, and the differential consequences of doing so for each. It is precisely because clergy's experience so poorly fits the dichotomies that have conventionally been used to differentiate work and non-work, and because women's increasing presence in the profession may further show up the masculinity of professional practice, that this ambiguous case can help us to re-think the notion of work.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE

This dissertation is a qualitative study of the work experiences of twenty female and twenty male clergy. This chapter outlines the study design and gives a demographic summary of my sample. It consists of three main parts: first, a description of how data collection was carried out; second, an outline of how the data were analyzed; and third, a demographic profile of the respondents.

DATA COLLECTION

Selecting and matching respondents

Respondents were selected from presbytery lists within The United Church of Canada Yearbook and Directory. The presbytery is the administrative grouping within the United Church which brings together many pastoral charges[1] within a

---

[1] A pastoral charge is the unit which is served by a single minister (or team of ministers). In other words, it is the responsibility or "charge" of a particular minister. In the city or in larger rural centres where congregations are large, the pastoral charge may include only one congregation. In smaller places, a pastoral charge may include two or more congregations in neighbouring towns. This latter situation is the case for the majority of my informants. In addition, as the rural population decreases and congregations struggle for survival there are an increasing number of cases where a single clergy person may be hired part-time by one pastoral charge and part-time by another. Until the United Church administratively joins them, they still formally constitute two pastoral charges with separate boards and committee structures, even though they may happen to be served by a single minister.

region. Presbytery lists give the names of pastoral charges alphabetically (followed by the names and addresses of the congregations which are a part of them), and then list the name of the minister serving there (i.e. it is not the names of the clergy which are listed alphabetically).

Presbyteries tend to be primarily urban or rural in nature, thus somewhat simplifying the process of locating rural churches. Thus I chose presbyteries which I knew to be primarily rural in nature, and since my intent was to do as many face-to-face interviews as possible, I also chose presbyteries that were accessible by road from a major city. While this excluded respondents in highly isolated areas such as in the north, it did include individuals who were far enough from a major centre that they could not easily drive elsewhere to escape the lack of anonymity which was a feature of their professional role. I also selected respondents from two distinct regions of the country; this proved useful in guaranteeing some confidentiality to respondents.

I had initially planned to select clergy who served in towns with a population of not more than one thousand--the Census Canada definition of a rural place--but found that I had to include clergy from somewhat larger places in order to find enough for my sample without having to cover an unreasonably large geographical territory. In the end, less than one quarter of my sample (nine individuals) worked in towns of more than one thousand people, with the largest town

having fewer than three thousand residents. These villages and towns varied as well in their degree of isolation ranging from approximately twenty to four hundred kilometres from a major city. Without a doubt, the experiences of my respondents were shaped as much by this degree of isolation as by the size of the community in which they served.

Since the clergy themselves are "randomized" in these lists in regards to any characteristics relevant to this study, I simply selected the first ten female clergy in each region who were willing to participate and then selected the first ten men in each region who approximately matched the women on the basis of a number of criteria to discussed below. These lists also give the year of ordination for all clergy, and the year in which they began serving that pastoral charge. While the year of ordination is not necessarily indicative of age, and this is especially true for women who often enter the profession as a second career or after raising children, it did offer some minimal clue as to age when trying to match the men to the women in my sample.

Female respondents were selected first. Male respondents were then chosen who matched the women as closely as possible in terms of a number of criteria. Men were asked their age, marital status, and parental status when contacted by phone and were included or rejected based on this information. The primary criteria for matching the two groups was age. It was decided not to make years of experience the determining factor

for several reasons. First, this does not reflect the reality of the population being studied; since the number of women entering the ministry in recent years has increased significantly, there are far fewer women than men with fifteen or twenty years of professional experience. Second, when interviewing the women it became apparent that parenting, prior work experience and volunteering had all contributed to the expertise they now used in their professional capacities. Thus, general life experience was as important as professional experience in understanding women's lives, so age seemed to be a more appropriate criterion upon which to match the groups than years ordained.

In addition to age, as far as possible individuals were matched in terms of the presence of children (or elderly parents) in the household and also in terms of marital status. Having children or elderly parents who required care was treated as a more important matching criterion than marital status since the work involved in either form of caregiving was seen as a bigger demand on one's time than the presence of a spouse who could look after him or herself. In addition, marital status proved to be a difficult factor along which to compare the two groups. There were seven single women among those chosen, but only two single men could be found. This was not surprising given the fact that other studies have shown that women in ministry are more likely to be single than are men (Carroll et al., 1983; Nason-Clark, 1987). In order

to allow for this difference among the two populations, I matched single women with men who were married but who either did not have children or no longer had children living at home.

Response rate

The response rate of clergy contacted was extremely high. Initially, a letter was sent out to explain the purpose of the study, and then this was followed up by a phone call to confirm their participation. Fifty-eight clergy were contacted by letter. Of all the clergy contacted, only one refused to participate. Five others were excluded because they had moved into urban churches or had retired. The remaining clergy who received a letter but did not participate were either men who did not adequately match the women chosen or individuals who were not able to be contacted by phone. Indeed, one of the greatest challenges of researching this group of rural professionals was difficultly of making phone contact. Because most of them serve churches with limited resources, few have secretarial support, many do not have answering machines, and because of the nature of their work, many do not have regular office hours.

The interviews

Of the forty interviews, twenty-eight were done in person and twelve were done by phone. In both cases, the interviews

were taped. All respondents were assured of the confidentiality of the interview. Signed consent forms were obtained from respondents for all in-person interviews, and verbal consent was obtained on tape for the phone interviews. On average, interviews lasted about one and three quarter hours. These were open- ended interviews, with an "interview guide" used only to ensure that certain topics were covered during the conversation. However, the precise wording of the questions and the order in which they were asked were decided in the context of the interview (Patton, 1990:228). Often the topics were covered or introduced by the informants without having to ask about them directly. The interview guide covered the following areas:

i)   the nature of their work (tell me what your work involves?)

ii) the overlap of paid work and personal lives (are there ways in which your professional life affects your personal life or that your personal life affects your professional life? is/are your spouse/children involved in church activities?)

iii) the ambiguous nature of their professional work (are there things that you consider to be work that might surprise a lay person? are there things that you do that you don't consider to be work, but that typically might be labelled as such? do you use your home for work in any way?)

iv) time off and leisure (do you have a regular day or days off? is it possible to have friends? how do you know when you're not working?)

v) the impact of their gender on their work (does being a woman/man affect the way you do your work or the expectations others have of you?)

In addition, at the beginning of the interview, respondents were asked about their work history, their marital and family status, their spouse's employment (if applicable), whether they lived in the church manse, and the location of their office (i.e. in the church, the manse, or both).

Five pilot interviews were carried out at the beginning of this stage of research. Three were with women and two with men. These interviews were reviewed and informally coded before I continued with the remainder of the interviews. Some modifications were made to the interview guide as a result. For example, it was decided to broaden the inquiry about the ambiguity of work from simply asking "are there things that you consider to be work that might surprise a lay person?" to also inquire whether there were things that did not seem like work to them, although outsiders might label them as such. In other words, the pilot interviews triggered me to think about whether "play" might not might spill over into "work" as much as "work" seemed to spill over into "play". Another example of how the interview guide was modified included the decision to explicitly ask about respondent's attitudes to developing

friendships within the congregation as a possible indication of how they negotiated the divisions between work and personal life. Although the interview guide was modified slightly after the pilot interviews, it was decided that the pilots were nevertheless rich enough in data that they should be included in the final analysis. Thus, these five make up part of the total of forty interviews. For the remainder of the sample, interviews with the women were completed before interviewing the men in each region.

DATA ANALYSIS

Coding

Taped interviews were transcribed and transcripts checked for accuracy. Once transcribed, the interviews were formatted for introduction into the computer software program, QSR NUD*IST which was used in the subsequent analysis. This involved dividing lengthy sections of "talk" into paragraphs, to serve as the coding unit within the program. The use of paragraphs as the coding unit--rather than sentences or lines--was decided upon since this allowed coded statements to remain embedded somewhat in their context. Although dividing a verbal exchange into paragraphs is somewhat artificial, in most cases, it was not difficult to identify shifts in topic or different stages of a narrative within a lengthy response.

Based in part on the preliminary analysis of the pilot interviews and on impressions developed during the checking of

transcripts, as well as on a sensitivity to the theoretical concerns of this dissertation, a partial list of codes was developed. This was used to begin the actual coding of interviews. This coding list was gradually modified and expanded with new codes derived from a systematic reading of the transcripts. In short, coding proceeded according to the constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) with the majority of codes grounded in the interview texts. For example, in addition to coding for the integration of family and work, I came to realize that people also spoke about the importance of "balancing" work and family time as separate activities. Accordingly, a code which captured this was added to the list. When a new code was added, I tried to review previous interviews as much as possible to incorporate that code. As coding progressed notes were kept on coding decisions to ensure the consistency of coding across interviews. As new codes were added, their definitions, rationale, and where they were first used, were also recorded in these notes. By the time the interviews with women were coded, no new codes were being generated although the possibility of adding a new category remained open. Codes were grouped into eight major categories, with a number of individual codes in each one. The major categories included: areas of ambiguity in work; negotiating the grey areas; definitions of work; not working; impact of gender; consequences or payoffs of work; context of work; and

miscellaneous. (A complete list of all codes is included in the Appendix.) These included both "literal" or descriptive codes as well as "interpretive" codes (Mason, 1996:109). Multiple codes were attached to a single text unit if it was relevant to more than one concept.

All female interviews were coded first in order to allow women's voices to shape the conceptualization of the coding scheme. Pilot interviews with women were re-coded at this stage while the pilot interviews with men were re-coded later with the bulk of the male interviews. Although some qualitative approaches, such as grounded theory, advocate coding interviews as they are carried out this was not possible due to practical considerations. Since half of the interviews were carried out in a different region of the country, there was no time to transcribe and code these interviews while I was interviewing in that region. Thus the majority of interviews were carried out before the coding was begun.

Computer-aided Data Analysis

Interviews were coded first on paper and then the codes were entered into the computer. Although QSR NUD*IST supports on-screen coding, I felt that the screen display limited the way I was able to view text units in context so I did not use this feature. Entering the codes into the computer at a later point also allowed for double-checking of codes.

Primarily, I used the computer program for the retrieval of coded passages, the "cross-tabulations" of data (for example, of references to a specific code by the sex of the respondent), and some investigation of where and how often certain terms were used. A case of this later function included a search across interviews for the use of the words "balance" and "boundary"; this allowed me to consider, in the first case, what else people might be "balancing" besides work and family and, in the second case, how else people were talking about boundaries other than in the physical sense for which I had coded. Computer-aided retrievals allowed me to check which of my codes were relatively empty and, in a few instances, collapse categories. Any retrievals carried out by the computer were checked for content before they were used for any further coding or analysis. Thus, I considered the contents of my coding categories more as "unfinished resources" for further interpretation (Mason, 1996:115-117) rather than simply measures of the frequencies of variables within the data-set.

Analysis of Searches and Retrievals

There are two main approaches to qualitative data analysis. One is a "variable-oriented approach" and the other is a "case-oriented approach" (Miles and Huberman, 1994:172-177). In the variable-oriented approach, one identifies and compares theoretically significant patterns which cut across

the cases or interviews. In the case-oriented approach, one looks at the case or interview as a "whole entity" striving to understand the patterns and associations within the particular case. In practice, often a mixture of these two approaches is used. My decision was to focus largely on a variable-oriented approach, but with the recognition that it is also important to consider how variables are contextualized within any particular case. Thus, although I structure my discussion around the way in which various strategies are used to define professional work, or the number of women or men who mention these, from time to time I also try to explain the importance of these references within the broader scope of a particular individual's experiences. This a particularly important strategy when trying to make sense of exceptions to the norm.

Theoretically significant patterns in the data were determined in two ways. First and foremost, "indigenous" and "sensitizing" concepts (Patton, 1990:390) were inductively teased out of the data, and secondly, "counting" was used to assess how common certain understandings or experiences were across the sample. Indigenous concepts were those "categories developed and articulated by the people studied to organize the presentation of particular themes" (Patton, 1990:390). These terms and concepts were suggested by the words and phrases actually used by respondents within the interviews. An example would be the categories of "visibility" or "balancing" work and family. Sensitizing concepts are

"labels" developed by the researcher to capture experiences that people talked about but for which they themselves lacked a distinct term (Patton, 1990:390).

"Counting" was used in conjunction with these inductive methods. Caution exists in the literature in regards to the use of counting within qualitative research (for example, see Mason, 1996); one must guard against measuring qualitative understanding by quantitative methods. However, counting may be used within an inductive framework to draw attention to experiences which are common across many specific cases (Miles and Huberman, 1994:253) and equally, I would argue, to highlight exceptions to these commonalities. QSR NUD*IST presents several "quantitative" summaries for every data retrieval performed--for example, the total number of text units retrieved and the percentage of total text units that retrieval represents. Within this research, these summaries were treated as meaningless in and of themselves because of the kinds of concerns discussed in the qualitative research literature. What was used was a tally of the number of interviews in which a code appeared; however, this was treated only as a signpost pointing towards the need for further investigation.

A DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE

As mentioned, forty interviews were conducted: twenty with women and twenty with men. My respondents reflected a

great diversity of experience. They ranged in age from twenty-seven to sixty-five. The average age of the respondents was 45.6 years. Since the women were selected first and then the men matched to them with the primary criterion being age, both groups have similar averages (45.75 years for women and 45.45 years for men.) They also embodied different levels of professional experience and career paths. Respondents had anywhere from one and a half to thirty-two years of experience within formal paid ministry. Seventeen of my respondents had less than five years of experience. This skewing of the sample towards those who had spent a relatively short time in ministry is explained by the rural location of my respondents. Usually newly ordained individuals are assigned[2] to small churches for their first job and thus are over-represented there. Women are also over-represented in this least experienced cohort; thirteen women (compared to only four men) had less than five years experience. In contrast, none of the women had more than twenty years of experience, whereas five of the men did. That level of experience was skewed by gender is not surprising; as is the case in many professions, it is only relatively recently that

---

[2] Within the United Church structure, newly ordained ministers are "settled" or assigned to charges. They are obligated to remain in that charge for three years. Thereafter, they are free to seek employment wherever they wish. Usually the "settlement charges" are congregations who cannot successfully attract a minister in another manner and thus agree to accept whoever the church courts assign to them. Thus many small rural churches receive new ordinands.

women are entering this occupation in large numbers.

It should be noted that years of professional experience does not necessarily correspond with age. As suggested above, ministry is a profession which many individuals enter as a second career. This is reflected in my sample. Sixteen individuals entered the ministry after having other long-term work experience, or in the case of several women, after raising a family. Consequently, the women only had, on average, 6.3 years of experience, whereas the men had 14.9 years. It is also of note that although several individuals did not acquire their formal training and begin their professional career until later in their lives, they brought with them a wealth of volunteer experience within the church, in addition to general life experience, which they were then able to apply to their formal work situation. In many cases, respondents explicitly stated how such experience aided them in their professional duties.

I had initially intended to select only clergy who were living and working full-time on their pastoral charge. However, in the selection process I encountered several individuals who had very different work and residency configurations such as working part-time or living away from their pastoral charge. After the first interview with such a person, it became apparent that the experiences of managing arrangements such as part-time work or commuting to the charge from a residence elsewhere revealed as much about how the

boundaries of work were negotiated and defined as the experience of full-time work and residency within a single place. Thus my final sample included thirty-five clergy in single full-time positions; five working part-time in one or more positions; thirty-two individuals living full-time on the charge; four individuals living on the charge part-time; four individuals living off the charge and commuting to work.

For clergy, the issue of whether or not they live in the manse may be a factor in determining the degree of privacy they experience; manses are owned by the church, not the minister, and have a history of being treated almost as an extension of the church building and used for meetings, counselling, etcetera. Thus it is significant to note that of the individuals who lived within their charge, thirty lived in the church manse. Some lived in the manse part-time (commuting to their own homes for days off), and others lived in their own homes on the charge.

Marital and parental status varied among respondents. Thirty-one were married and nine were not married (i.e. never married, divorced or widowed) at the time of the interview. Seventeen clergy had children still in their care, though some of these included children in their teens who required less attention. All clergy who had children were also married. In addition, two individuals were caring for an elderly parent within their household. It is also interesting that among the married clergy, four lived apart from their spouse part-time.

This was the case for three of the female clergy who had husbands who worked full-time in another place. Only one of my male respondents lived in such a configuration. While children may constitute a demand on individuals, several clergy also acknowledged them as a providing an important link with the community, personally and professionally. Thus while not all clergy faced the same demands in balancing work and childcare responsibilities, nor did they all have access to the same social resources that children provided.

Of the thirty-one married clergy interviewed, sixteen had spouses who worked full-time or were self-employed, eight had spouses who were employed part-time, and seven had spouses who were not employed outside the home. Six of the married respondents were married to other clergy, though not all their spouses worked within the same denomination. Three of these individuals, however, were jointly hired with their spouses by their present charge and thus had to additionally face the challenge of the interlocking nature of their marital and professional relationship.

This brief summary outlines some of the variations in experience (paid and unpaid), living arrangements and domestic responsibilities faced by my respondents. It is within the context of these variations that they sought to find workable strategies for legitimating professional work and negotiating its relationship to their personal lives.

Chapter 4

AMBIGUITY: AN ESSENTIAL COMPONENT OF THE PROFESSION

This chapter demonstrates how ambiguity is a central
feature in the work of clergy. As already discussed,
Glucksmann (1995:65) argues that the notion of work as
differentiated from other activities and situated in
specialized institutions is unique to the market sphere of
industrial society. She points out that in all other times
and places, including other spheres of industrial society
"work is embedded in, entangled with, conducted and expressed
through other activities and relationships which may be
social, political, kinship, sexual or familial." Although
ordained ministry is paid work, and therefore technically part
of the market sphere, the experience of the rural clergy whom
I interviewed provide a striking example of how work may be
"embedded in" and "entangled with" other activities and
relationships. In this respect, the work of clergy may
represent something other than a traditionally masculine model
of work. In examining how clergy define their work in the
context of this ambiguity, I consider how they reproduce and
challenge dichotomies which conventionally delineate work from
non-work, and which underlie the ways in which work is
gendered.

Within this chapter, I outline various ways in which
ministry is ambiguous as work. Clergy define nurturing

relationships as a priority in their work but accomplish it through informal, unworklike, interactions which occur in existing social activities. Clergy also extend the ambiguity of their work by intentionally creating situations where "chance" encounters with parishioners can occur. Sometimes work and community life sometimes merge to the point where clergy themselves may not be able to differentiate the two. Ministry as professional work is entangled with and must be differentiated from volunteer work. Finally, ministry is not always easily defined as work because it is not always public nor visible. I conclude by considering how these various facets of ambiguity figure in the gendering of this profession's work.

NURTURING RELATIONSHIPS: "BEING THERE IS HALF THE JOB"

For all of my forty informants, building relationships with people was seen as central to their work. This relational work was variously described as a "priority" (F1:384; M3:92)[1], "really important" (F6:125), "of core importance" (M31:134), and "fundamental" (M25:73) to their work. It was something that took "an enormous amount"

---

[1] This notation system identifies the respondent and location of the quoted text in my interviews. The letter preceding the number refers to the sex of the respondent (i.e.: "f" for female, "m" for male). The number before the colon refers to the interview number while the number following the colon refers to the text unit number in the NUD*IST data analysis program. See the section on "coding" in Chapter 3 for an explanation of how text units are created.

(F7:198) or "an awful lot" (M2:121) of time. Others spoke of how they could not make sense of what they did on a day-to-day basis without understanding the centrality of building relationships for their work (F19:166; M23:448). Although relationships were strengthened in times of crisis, such as at the time of a death, and informants acknowledged that their formal pastoral role on these occasions afforded them an "automatic trust" (M22:152-156), formal interventions were not identified as the most important way of "doing" relational work. Rather activities which seemed ambiguous as work in terms of conventional definitions were stressed by my respondents as having professional import. The work of building relationships was something which three-quarters of my informants (sixteen women and fifteen men) identified as occurring in informal interactions with parishioners. As one respondent put it, "being there is half the job" (F19:129).

Informants identified a wide variety of contexts in which this work occurred. Six women and five men identified attendance at special social occasions such as community parties to celebrate anniversaries or birthdays or at private parties as significant. One respondent pointed out that although "the congregation [doesn't] define them as work when they invite me...if I don't go, it will affect work" (F1:84). In addition, thirteen women and ten men emphasized the importance of attendance at community or congregational events, such as potluck suppers, school concerts, and

community fairs as crucial to developing trust with parishioners. This was true for the great majority of them even when they did not have any particular leadership role at these events. On such occasions, "working the room" (M18:168) becomes important even if one is not performing as master or mistress of ceremonies, saying grace, or giving formal leadership in another way. Several women identified special leadership roles at these events, but never to the exclusion of the informal interaction that also occurred, whereas three men focused only on such leadership roles.

Activities which might otherwise be identified as leisure also had important repercussions for ministry. Half the men and approximately one-third of the women discussed such situations. On-going leisure activities like curling, watching local hockey games, or taking part in card parties were enjoyable but also allowed them important access to information and contact with people in the community. Several respondents mentioned how they had learned to curl in order to enable them to participate to a greater extent in the community. Curling with other couples allowed one woman to pick up on information about illnesses in the community and family concerns (F4:255). Similarly, one man said that he and his wife attended local hockey games as recreation, but "in between periods and while standing in the stands, I often find myself listening to somebody who's sharing something that they probably wouldn't be sharing if I wasn't the minister"

(M23:163). For all of my respondents, spending time with people in a "totally other" (F4:255) set of circumstances than in Sunday morning worship was an essential part of their work.

Finally, three quarters of my respondents talked about the importance of chance encounters with individuals while they were "doing something else." Both women and men told stories of encountering parishioners while shopping, going to the post office, or having coffee or lunch in a restaurant. In addition, eight women and seven men cited how even brief encounters on the street often allowed for significant pastoral engagement with people. One could not rush doing errands around town since these were often the source of important contacts (M21:169-175; M40:122-123).

Respondents capitalized on informal social situations in order to increase both the effectiveness and efficiency of their work. Getting to know parishioners better in informal settings meant work of a more formal nature such as crisis counselling or funeral planning could happen more effectively (F6:158; F13:268; M15:81; M23:150-153):

> And it feels to me important that I be visible in the community and that people have an opportunity to get to know me, um, in other places. And not just on a Sunday morning or not just coming to my office. So that, if they feel a need to come to my office, they have a sense of--a little bit of a sense at least of who I am and not that they're having to knock on my door and introduce themselves to me before they can come in and sit down and talk about whatever that issue is in their life. (F10:108)

Respondents also recognized the importance of socializing in

making meetings run more smoothly (F1:274; F9:288-296; M2:362; M39:198-200) and, in some cases, avoiding a formal meeting altogether (F32:360; M40:85). Furthermore, socializing with congregational members helped clergy preach better sermons; "being sensitive to where people are at" was essential to making the sermon relevant to people's lives (F17:104-105; also F6:158; F30:157). Finally, a third of my respondents (eight women and five men) pointed out that social events allowed them to see a large number of people at once and, thus, saved time driving between individual homes for pastoral visits.

That clergy situate an important part of their work in these unworklike situations is notable in at least three regards. First, they challenge commonsense definitions of what work is. The work in which clergy are engaged in these situations is akin to the "sociability work" of the women volunteers described by Daniels (1985), though without some of the material preparations involved. It is work aimed at making people feel comfortable, at building solidarity within a group; their efforts certainly include elements of emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983). It is work which involves listening, nurturing, and comforting. Daniels (1987:409) points out that people commonly have difficulty conceptualizing "the warm and caring aspects of the construction and maintenance of interpersonal relations" as work. It is not surprising, then, that many of my informants

suggested that congregational members would be astonished to hear them naming such activities as work.

Secondly, as professionals, clergy have a certain amount of autonomy to determine what counts as work. This professional prerogative is exercised in the way they name social events and informal encounters as professional activity. This prerogative reveals the masculine roots of the profession (Davies, 1996:670); clergy have a tradition which allows them to legitimate these activities as work when performed by them, without necessarily extending that definition to the same kinds of activities when performed by those outside the profession, notably women. However, this professional prerogative to recognize the important work performed in these social encounters is not exercised in a vacuum. Clergy report to congregational committees, and also work in a context where community opinion is important. The fact that parishioners may not operate with the same kind of definition of work as clergy can create tensions when it comes to accounting to the parish for work performed. This is discussed further in chapter 5.

Thirdly, by naming social events, leisure activities, and on the street encounters as sites of work, clergy locate work in a social space which is problematic from a theoretical point of view. While usually outside the private domain—that is, beyond the household—these encounters occur in communal spaces, which are public in the most literal sense but are

also linked to categories of activity which we more frequently associate with private life: parties, sports, grocery shopping, eating, volunteering. These are activities which typically would be labelled as non-work in most occupations-- although a feminist critique of the notion of work would challenge this (see for example, Daniels, 1987). In short, clergy locate their work in a social space not fully conceptualized by present theory.

EXTENDING AMBIGUITY: "INTENTIONAL LOITERING"

Clergy capitalize on the ambiguity and informality which are a part of existing social situations to further the work of building relationships. In addition, many respondents tried to maximize the opportunity for chance encounters with parishioners by _deliberately_ creating informal ways to be visible in the community. Going to the post office in peak business hours, walking rather than driving to do errands around town, and regularly having coffee in local restaurants were all activities which allowed clergy to make themselves available to people:

> At 10:30 in the morning, I'm going to be at the coffee shop....that's not _every_ day, but if I'm home...not involved in something "heavy duty" or otherwise, I'll be at the coffee shop. And there is a sense in which the community there is not church community, that--that knows that, "gee whiz, if I want to see John, I'll pop on down at--in between 10 and 11 and likely we'll, you know, we'll be able to flag him." (M22:121)

As one woman put it, giving people a chance to strike up a conversation, when it appeared that they were not busy with

much else, overcame the problem of parishioners thinking that the minister was too busy for "their little problem" (F1:227). Informants used phrases like "intentional loitering" (F5:148) and "creative lounging" (M22:115) to describe these strategies. Dropping by community venues at different times of the day allowed clergy to connect with different crowds of people (M21:401) and meet community members beyond those who regularly attended church (M22:121). For many clergy, facilitating chance encounters was an intentional and routine part of work. Respondents stressed that some kinds of work could only happen in an informal setting. Seven respondents (two women, five men) pointed out how chance meetings gave them access to kinds of information that they would not otherwise receive:

> ...there are times when the only way I know that somebody is ill or is needing a call or needing some assistance is, you know, the chance meeting on the street--you know, somebody says, "oh, I just heard, or I know that--."....I get more feedback here than I did in the city too. Um. And that's part of the chance encounter... (M20:175)

Similarly, another informant pointed out that she was more likely to hear complaints or questions on the street than she was in more formal situations (F1:213-218). One male respondent suggested that some parishioners felt safer bringing up an emotional subject in a situation where they could easily excuse themselves, such as on the street, than in their homes (M21:175, 201-202). Another respondent spoke of the importance of "almost eavesdropping" as a way of learning about community history and relationships (F5:160); listening

to what people said to each other was sometimes a richer source of information than relying on what they directly told her. "[L]etting people know, by your physical presence, that you're around and you do care" (M22:115-127) accomplished what a more direct approach could not:

> people may not be ready and wanting to talk to you right now, but you just kind of hang around and then all of a sudden you'll get the question--or the statement of "you mentioned such-and-such" or, you know, "can I go have coffee with you?" (M22:93)

Building trust and relationships was not something that could be done in a formal, explicit, or a tightly scheduled manner. This was highlighted in the way that respondents distinguished between two types of visiting which they did. The first type was the formal pastoral visit where they were called to deal with a specific concern or crisis, such as the situation where there was grief counselling to be done. Such a visit could include a prayer or the intentional discussion of religious matters. However, respondents also identified a second, informal type of visiting, that was just as essential to their work. Visiting "with nothing religious about it" was still seen as ministry (M34:204-211). While visiting was expected of the minister, ambiguity may be said to exist because in the latter case, the purpose of the visit may be unstated or hidden.

Visiting in someone's home was seen to be important since "there's a vulnerability there on your part" by being in unfamiliar terrain (F6:126). Informal visiting could not be

rushed because "people don't get to the real stuff until you've been there for an hour" (F13:268). Time also allowed the sharing to go two ways; one respondent stressed that it was important to have time to talk about her life rather than just doing "attentive listening" since "why should [the parishioners] open up to me if they don't know anything about me?" (F13:268). Simply put, short visits were not valuable work (F19:167).

To sum up, clergy themselves were intentional about creating ambiguous situations to further their work and they could articulate a number of ways in which such situations accomplished specific goals. But they were also aware that in order to best use these kinds of social encounters for professional ends, it sometimes required that they maintain the illusion that they were not working. In that sense, they resemble the female volunteer fund-raisers described by Daniels (1985) who mystified their work in order to accomplish their goal of creating sociability. There was a clear recognition that although they, as clergy, might recognize the professional significance of certain interactions, it was not always necessary or desirable to explicitly define these as work for others.

THE MERGING OF WORK AND COMMUNITY LIFE

As mentioned in chapter 3, most of the clergy whom I interviewed lived in the rural communities which they served.

The size of the community combined with the nature of their work meant that it was extremely difficult to separate public from private life. Professional work became embedded in community life, and sometimes public and private life merged. Because of this it could be difficult for clergy themselves to discern what counted as work, and to find ways of "not working." While the potential for work was ubiquitous in all social encounters and even in "leisure", living among one's clientele also meant that one could never be just the minister. The professional role was intertwined with personal roles. From this perspective, ambiguity existed for clergy themselves; work and non-work merged. This section examines the points at which my respondents stated it was impossible even for them to decide if they were working.

Many informants stressed how living in a community enhanced their ability to do ministry, quite apart from what they might intentionally do while they were there. Living among one's parishioners was seen as an "incredibly important" part of their work since it allowed them to pick up on the "rhythms" and "nuances" of the community (F17:96-99). People spoke not just of working in a place but "becoming a member of the community" or "belonging to the community" or "becoming part of the life of the village". A third of my respondents stressed that simply living within a community for an extended

period of time[2] enabled one to do a better job; one came to better understand the complexities of the community and the connections between people, and thus were able to ask the right questions in short encounters.

In contrast, all but one of the individuals who commuted to their charges spoke of trying to compensate for their lack of residency. One woman who commuted suggested that she went "overboard to make sure she was visible" by spending long days in the community (F30:76); another said attending community concerts and plays was doubly important because he lived elsewhere (M38:266-270). Similarly, several of those with multiple-point charges stressed the need to work harder at being a presence in the towns in which they did not live:

> [w]hen you're in a three point pastoral charge, you can only live in one community.... [P]eople might think of something to mention to me when I walk down to the post office. Or, you know, I might touch a person's life just very accidentally because I happen to be on the street when they happen to go by with a concern. So the other communities also need that. And having lost it by not having a minister living in the town, then it becomes important that I still be perceived to be a minister in town....they still want to sense that there is a minister in [town]: she doesn't live here, but any of the big things, any of the important things, you'll see her there. (F13:82)

Non-residency meant one had to be far more intentional about being available to people, making this "work" more obvious.

By living in the community, clergy become more than just ministers--even if this remains their main status. They also

---

[2] Several people suggested at least four years was crucial.

function as parents, neighbours and community volunteers. The multiplicity of identities means that work cannot be easily separated from the rest of life. This is undergirded by a professional ideology which emphasizes a vocational understanding of work; ministry is seen as a calling which influences all of life. Many informants articulated this by stating that ministry "isn't just what I do, it's part of who I am" (F6:125). Children's activities often tied clergy-parents into broader community networks:

> ...the two--personal life--professional--really do mesh....[I]t's very much a family community and so...the things that our kids are involved in link me up with a lot of people....people who I normally wouldn't link up with...even though I'm in the public eye....(M2:281)

Two informants without children also acknowledged that they lacked this important link with the community.

A quarter of the respondents described how work and recreation blended for them. For example, one woman explained that participating in non-church activities constituted both play and work for her: "I may be there enjoying myself, but I'm also aware that I'm being supportive of them" (F11:181-183). Furthermore, she stated that going out for coffee allowed her to visit with people and also offset her own need for company after hours spent at her desk (F11:293). Although playing hockey, curling, participating in craft fairs might present opportunities to get to know parishioners better--and therefore contribute to professional goals--that did not necessarily take away their enjoyable qualities for clergy.

Because of the relative isolation of some rural communities, work and social life necessarily become intertwined. For one single woman this was a positive aspect of the job; even though one attended community events and was invited to private family celebrations as the minister, it was nevertheless "a going out" and consequently, "you have this social life which you might not have as a single person in a small town" (F7:202). Similarly, other clergy talked about enjoying social occasions with parishioners:

> we have a good time with a lot of people who are in the
> congregation we've become friends with. And, we have
> like a supper club of...about 10 couples...just a barrel
> of fun. Yeah, so I mean--you know on the professional
> side, I'm their minister...on the other side you become
> very close friends and--and we've done a lot of fun
> things together. (M2:282)

Living in a community also means that parishioners are more than just clientele, they are also neighbours and "co-workers" who serve on church or community committees. One clergy woman spoke of having coffee with a parishioner who was both a committee chairperson and a mother of young children like herself; in this situation, it was not always apparent to my informant when she was talking as minister to parishioner, as committee member to committee member, or as mother to mother (F10:258).

Work also merges with community life inasmuch as a minister's "clientele" is inseparable from the larger community. This is true in at least two ways. First, those who are members of the congregation are also members of other

community organizations and participate in non-church events.

One woman drew attention to the consequences of this:

> Even more ambiguous is my singing with these other two groups...because they are clearly not part of my job to sing with--cause they're both community choirs. And not everybody in them are members of our church.... And it is true that I _enjoy_ my time with both of those groups... there's definitely a social element to both of those, that's added. But the fact also is very true that the majority of people in both of those groups are United Church--people from my own pastoral charge. I AM their minister. And the fact is true that at both of those places, were something to happen with one of those people, I would not be the person who sings with them there, but I would be their minister. (F12:154)

Thus even if a minister is participating in something outside the church, she or he is still participating alongside parishioners.

Secondly, it is nearly impossible to separate clientele and community in terms of who calls on the minister for professional services. Since United Church clergy are frequently the only ministers in small rural towns, they become the community minister. They are called upon by non-church attenders and by those of other faiths for funerals, weddings and counselling:

> ...being the United Church is also about dealing with all those other people who don't quite fit any other category: disgruntled Lutherans and lapsed Catholics and, uh, Anglicans who don't want to drive as far as the next Anglican Church....which is fine. It just means that I am conscious that there aren't many people who I don't have some employment responsibility to.... (F19:195)

In addition, community institutions other than the church turn to them for ritual leadership, such as legions who request their help with Remembrance Day services or town councils who

ask them to say an opening prayer at the local fair.

Rural clergy work in a social context which tends to encourage a fluid understanding of the relationships between work and non-work. Most of the towns in which my informants worked are centred around a farming economy. Farming is not an occupation which is circumscribed by a nine-to-five routine or by a separation of work and home. As a result, the rural milieu facilitates an alternative work culture to the mainstream. This may be changing as, frequently, younger families do not carry on the farming tradition, and may vary with the proximity of the parish to an urban centre and the availability of non-farm jobs. Nevertheless, most clergy who had worked in urban contexts stressed that it was much more difficult for them to separate work and non-work in a rural context. Nine of my respondents suggested that this was also true for those in other occupations in rural settings.

The merging of ministry with the activities and relationships of community life means that it is difficult to maintain one's professional identity as entirely independent from one's other identities. Nor is one's professional role entirely fixed in relation to a particular group of people; neighbours may become clients, clients may also function as "co-workers" in their role as volunteers. This creates a dilemma for clergy: how and to what extent should they maintain professional distance in the context of such embeddedness (chapter 6)? Furthermore, it raises questions

about how they negotiate the boundaries between family, home and professional work (chapter 7). Nevertheless, there were occasions when my respondents could recognize unintended professional pay-offs in situations and relationships which arose from being a community resident. Many were relatively comfortable with the ambiguity that their professional position entailed; they did not always need to differentiate clearly between work and non-work.

MINISTRY AND VOLUNTEER WORK

One of the ambiguous frontiers which clergy are forced to negotiate is the relationship between professional and volunteer work. Given the structure of the organization in which clergy are employed, the majority of their "co-workers" are volunteers. Prevailing rhetoric and policy in the United Church stress the idea that the laity share in ministry, in a generalized sense.[3] In addition, clergy find themselves "at work" outside of church structures and their own "volunteer" involvements facilitate this. This feature of their work is interesting from a sociological standpoint because most discussions of how work comes to be socially constructed and gendered focuses on how work is located in the public realm and opposed to non-work--i.e. domestic work--in the private. Thus the relationship between professional work and volunteer

---

[3] Clergy serve as <u>ordained</u> ministers, occupying a specific position in an organizational division of labour that includes unpaid workers (the laity) in addition to paid ones.

activity goes largely neglected. Since volunteer work is unpaid and yet outside the private realm--that is, it is not centred on the household or an individual family--one cannot easily use a public-private dichotomization to situate volunteer work in opposition to non-work. Furthermore, although volunteer work is public, inasmuch as it is civic in nature, the relationship of clergy to volunteers is not reified in a formal division of paid labour, with a standardized hierarchy of power. Thus the relationship between professional work and volunteer work seems to muddle the usual parallels drawn between the dichotomies of work and non-work, paid and unpaid, public and private, masculine and feminine. In this section I wish to examine the relationship between my informants' professional work and volunteer activities, whether performed by others or by themselves.

Only one quarter of my informants stated that they did volunteer work in addition to what they considered to be ministry. For example, volunteer work beyond the church was understood by one informant to be "the price I pay for living in the community"; it would be his civic obligation regardless of whether he was the minister or not (M22:103-109). Another stated that clergy needed to take time to volunteer, just like anyone else who works full-time (F8:71-72). Seven informants mentioned involvements with community organizations outside of the church, such as working in canteens at community centres, coaching baseball teams, serving as volunteer ambulance

attendants or being a member of local service organizations such as the Lions Club. For some, these commitments came about due to having children involved in community activities; for example, one man stated that he and his wife had been put on the list for working in the rink canteen, just like all other parents (M25:95).

In addition, five of these respondents situated at least part of what they saw as volunteer work <u>within</u> the context of church activities, though <u>outside</u> of the professional sphere.[4] One female minister considered that learning a computer graphics program in order to produce "prettier" leaflets for Sunday morning worship was part of her volunteer contribution, since this was "not something the church ought to be paying" her to do (F10:261-275). Similarly, another women mentioned extra time spent on preparing music for worship as something which she did not count as work, since "it's not an expectation of the people" (F8:80). Others who helped to set up or wash dishes at church events understood this as part of being a volunteer like anyone else. One man made a clear distinction between lay work and ordained work, but also emphatically stated, that although he was ordained, "I do still have responsibilities as a lay person, so to offer to participate in [an event] was my free choice" (M40:211-218).

---

[4] In contrast, only one clergy, who was conscientious about controlling the number of hours that she worked as a part-time minister, saw a certain amount of professional over-time as her voluntary contribution to the church (9:116).

In all of these cases, individuals see themselves as doing something which is outside of their job. What is interesting for these individuals is that they situate work and non-work within the same institution, yet draw a line between the two based on obligation. The notion of obligation as a marker which defines work and the role of parishioner expectations will be taken up in chapter 5. It is also important to note that these clergy saw themselves as doing something which was identical to what lay persons did.

More frequently, however, clergy described their participation in activities, which for anyone else would be volunteer work, as extensions of their ministerial work and role. One women listed a number of ways that she participated in the community beyond the church, including such things as helping to put together a float for a local parade and sitting on the board of the community's family centre. She emphasized that this was "work" for her whereas it would be leisure for anyone else (F17:122). Another stated that the time he put into leading Scouts, while enjoyable, was also something which he considered to be an "extension of my ministry" (M2:123-127). Their statements parallel those of the majority of my informants who understood any community involvement as part of their professional work, even if it did not call on specific expertise or involve them in a formal leadership role.

This approach to understanding "voluntary activity" legitimizes it as real work. On one hand, this seems laudable

inasmuch as it gives value to these activities. Yet at the same time, an elasticity of work definitions means that professional work effectively expands until it leaves no room for any other public activity. Clergy voluntarism is clearly defined as having a different status--"real work" in the public realm--than the voluntarism of lay people, which remains as "non-work". As professionals, clergy have the power to classify their community involvements as part of their paid employment; lay people do not have the same discretionary power no matter how important they may consider the task to be.

It is important to note that even the minority of individuals who saw themselves as doing volunteer work separate from their professional activity acknowledged that volunteer work contributed unintentionally to their professional goals. Volunteering in the community centre canteen (F19:133-145) or to set up for a pot luck supper (M22:285) meant that one got to "rub shoulders with" people in the community and spend additional time visiting. Similarly, the woman who acknowledged that she spent extra time on music, also justified her actions by saying that it "enabled the ministry of lay people" (F8:80). The approach of these individuals differs from the majority in the sense that they seem to recognize that professional work may be embedded in voluntarism, without appropriating voluntarism entirely as professional work. These clergy recognize the importance of

voluntary activity without labelling these involvements as part of their paid work and therefore different in kind from the involvements of lay volunteers.

By either directly naming activities which would otherwise be voluntary as professional work or by naming volunteer work as something which inadvertently accomplished professional goals, clergy legitimate for themselves the time and energy spent on these activities. Both of these strategies reflect the power of a profession to define the way its work is done. However, even though clergy are able to define for themselves what is or is not a legitimate claim on their time, this may creates potential dilemmas in accounting for their work to church committees. This issue will be investigated further in chapter 5.

MINISTRY AS PUBLIC WORK AND AS INVISIBLE WORK

The public-private dichotomy which is typically used to differentiate work from non-work does not easily apply to ministry. As previous sections have illustrated, clergy situate their professional work in kinds of activities which would more conventionally linked with private life—for example, leisure, volunteer work, and socializing. In this section, I wish to consider how the professional work of clergy is not always public, in the sense of not being activity which is visible, known, or done outside the home. While ritual leadership is highly visible, several women and

men pointed out how even some of the specialized functions of ministry remain invisible as work to their congregational members precisely because they are performed "in private". One woman stated, "you get no points for the invisible work that you do" (F12:250). When asked what kinds of things this included she replied:

> Probably the most important things. I mean...if you're doing pastoral care, anything that's crisis but is confidential, you can't have points for that because nobody knows about it....You get a lot of points for a funeral, for example, because that's very visible. "Oh look, she's working very hard!" ...Anything that's invisible, like anything that's confidential, anything that is, um, like reading...that's not visible....You get no points for those.   (F12:254)

Thus the need for confidentiality means that counselling is not always easily accounted for as work.[5]

On the other hand, general pastoral visiting or visiting the sick and shut-ins may be highly visible work even though it is done in people's homes. While this is work done in a private space, and in that sense, out of the public eye, it is also work which takes on a public dimension when it becomes known within the community:

> ...like I know that you get points for visiting, because, uh, that's been the single biggest complaint about me since I've been here, is that I don't do it enough.... And one time after, you know, there had been a lot of complaining about it, I made this concerted effort to do it a lot. And, word got back to me that, "oh yeah, you've been doing some visiting." So, people talk about it. (F12:262)

---

[5]   The exception may be a certain amount of grief counselling after a death, since the death of a community member is known publicly and the family's need for support acknowledged as a natural outcome.

> ...if people know that you are visiting in the community
> in people's homes, that's all they need to know. They
> have said "okay, he's visiting, he's being present,
> that's what we want." (M35:184)

What is done in private space becomes public work when it is
talked about--and thus made known or visible--in the
community. Once it becomes known, it is acknowledged as work
and a legitimate use of clergy time. In this case, the notion
of public and private cannot be conceived in spatial terms
alone, since the acknowledgement of work rests on the clergy's
actions becoming public knowledge rather than on their being
performed in a public space.

In contrast, some activities which were clearly
professional work from the point of view of clergy may be
invisible to the congregation because of the locations in they
were carried out. For example, eight informants pointed out
that the amount of work involved in background reading, sermon
preparation, meditation, and administration may go
unrecognized by the congregation. One woman stated that she
took her present job precisely because she was "really excited
to see a congregation that recognized [personal Bible study
and prayer] as an important part of the WORK of ministry" and
"it wasn't even the last thing on the job description"
(F10:44). Her excitement points to the unusualness of this
situation. Part of the problem of recognizing such activity
as work lies in the fact that it is done "in private": the
majority of my respondents had offices located in their homes

rather than in the church building.[6]   Furthermore, work on Presbytery committees, while defined as a professional responsibility from the point of view of clergy, and not done in private, was however work which occurred outside of the pastoral charge. Because of this, congregations sometimes questioned it as a legitimate claim on a minister's time. Of the twenty-five who mentioned their involvements with the wider courts of the church, ten discussed this scepticism on the part of their congregations.[7]

The above examples show how the professional work of ministers may sometimes be invisible because it is done in private. These examples also show how the recognition of work transcends spatial notions of public and private; visibility or invisibility of work is linked to how that work is valued. Visiting, though done in people's homes, and outside of the public eye, is "visible" as work to the community because it is seen as an important for ministers to do; visits, other than confidential ones "get points" once they become known. In contrast, informants suggested that reading was obscured as work, not only because it was done in private but because reading was something which most individuals associated with leisure; intellectual work is not a common activity in rural

---

[6]   In chapter 7, I will discuss the reasons for and consequences of this location of office space in the home.

[7]   Ironically, three of my female respondents also characterized Presbytery or Conference involvements as a kind of escape from work; in contrast, none of the men did.

culture. In a similar way, professional work done to support the wider courts of the church was not valued and therefore "invisible" in a significant way. The cultural visibility of an activity was not necessarily linked to the physical location of the work.

AMBIGUITY AND THE GENDERING OF WORK

Various authors have argued that the gendering of professional work does not rest in the sex ratio composition of an occupation; rather it lies in how activities defined as professional "valorize the masculine" in opposition to the feminine (Davies, 1996:670; see also Alvesson and Due Billing, 1997:213-215; Stivers, 1993:4-6; Witz, 1990:675). Professional work gets defined by drawing boundaries which exclude any connections to the types of activities associated with either women's domestic work in the private realm or the work of "feminine" adjunct occupations in the public (Davies, 1996:672; Stivers, 1993:5).[8] Yet, such work also rests on the veiled inclusion of the feminine: it cannot be performed without dependence upon the supportive "feminine" tasks that others carry out (Davies, 1996:663, 670-671). This section considers the ways in which the various facets of ambiguity described in this chapter serve to create tensions in the ways

---

[8] An example of the latter would be nurses who function as adjunct workers to doctors. See also Grant and Tancred, 1992, for a full discussion of how women function as "adjunct control workers" in the public and private realms.

in which ministry is constituted as gendered work.

In some important ways, my respondents definitions of their work and their descriptions of how they do it suggest a less masculine model of work than might be expected of a profession. Firstly, my respondents stressed the centrality of the work of nurturing relationships--something associated with women's rather than men's work--and the way this can most effectively be accomplished through informal rather than formalized interactions. Emotional labour is a key part of the job. This is in contrast to the assertion made by Davies (1996:670-671) that the arena of emotion is associated with the feminine and therefore defined as outside of the masculinized professional domain, and frequently "delegated" to adjunct workers.

Secondly, clergy locate their work in activities which may be described as ordinary, everyday, and unspecialized. Typically, professional work is characterized by the application of abstract or esoteric knowledge to particular cases by an exclusive occupational group (Abbott, 1988:4-8). The application of esoteric knowledge along with strategies of control over who may have access to and use this knowledge, gives rise to specialized activities and domains of expertise. This is true of clergy inasmuch as they use a theological perspective to approach ontological concerns, to interpret the world around them, and as a guide for action. However, the accounts above show how a great deal of their work is also

accomplished through activity which is far from "esoteric".

Thirdly, it is not always easy (nor desirable) to clearly differentiate work from non-work. In this sense, the work of clergy seems to share a characteristic with the organization of women's domestic work and leisure. Indeed, as mentioned earlier, Smith (1987:68) raises the question of whether the categories of work and leisure would ever have arisen if we had taken women's experience as normative in analysing social life. As I have demonstrated, for rural clergy, professional activity is embedded in, and sometimes merges with, domestic life and leisure.

Finally, rural ministry seems to confound the way other dichotomies such as public/private or paid/unpaid reinforce the differentiation of work from non-work. Clergy must differentiate their professional work from the "non-work" of volunteers--i.e. activity which is unpaid and yet arguably outside of the "private" and "domestic" realms. Furthermore, the work of clergy confounds the way these dualisms are linked to cultural imagery of masculinity and femininity. For example, emotional labour, associated with the culturally feminine, becomes "public" and an important part of a "masculine" profession. Considering the foregoing evidence, the work of clergy seems to be, in part, ambiguously gendered. This raises the question of the extent to which rural clergy--both women and men--capitalize on or negate the potential for this androgyny in the constitution of their work. The

remainder of this section outlines one way in which this occurs.

In the case of the clergy, the way in which professional and volunteer work are gendered in their differentiation demands a more complex explanation than the one presented by the usual dualistic conceptualization. While it is true that the majority of church attenders and volunteers within the church today tend to be women (Bibby, 1993:10; also interviews 10 and 25), not all volunteer activities within the church or within the community can be labelled as feminine activities.[9] Volunteer work can range from serving as a community fire-fighter to chairing committees to baking bread for a church bazaar, with only the last typically being seen as "feminine". In addition, because volunteer work is communal in scope, it is not part of the private sphere. Thus it is difficult to see how the public-private dichotomy works to fix ministry as a masculine profession in opposition to volunteer work as feminine.

It is possible that the social location of volunteer work is influenced by the extent to which it resembles other paid or unpaid (i.e. masculinized or feminized) tasks: in other words, being a volunteer fire-fighter takes on a different status than baking cookies for the church bazaar. In

---

[9] It is also worth noting that based on a 1997 study, women made up 53% of the volunteers in all sectors of Canadian society (Statistics Canada, 1997:28). However, the difference in the proportion of men and women is narrowing; in 1977, women made up 57% and men 43% of the volunteers in Canada.

addition, volunteer tasks typically done by women may be less visible as work than those done by men (see for example, Margolis, 1979, on political volunteers). However, it is worthwhile noting that for my informants, the masculinity or femininity of a particular volunteer task did not necessarily affect whether they linked it to their professional duties. For example, washing dishes was as likely to be described as facilitating ministry as being a volunteer fire fighter or coaching a baseball team. This is important since these instances provide examples of the lack of a link between the gendered nature of an activity and its definition and value as professional work. Instead, it is the way in which these activities facilitate ministry--including the work of building relationships but not exclusive to this--which cause them to be included in the category of work.

However, the role of gender in mediating the relationship between professional and volunteer work was marked for my female respondents in a way that it was not for the men. Many of my female respondents had been asked, just like other women in the community, to cook some dish, such as a pie or a casserole, for a church event. They then had to face the dilemma of defining and communicating whether this was an appropriate claim on their time and energy. Some of my female respondents categorically rejected such requests since they

would not be asked of a male minister.[10] Others related that they faced no such expectation but only because female predecessors had already fought this battle; most expressed their relief at this, suggesting by their reaction that they too would consider it inappropriate. In contrast, just three informants took a pragmatic stance towards requests of these kinds, accepting them as a way of showing solidarity with the women of the community and valuing the work that they have typically done. In their definition, baking a pie, peeling potatoes or washing dishes became part of their ministry rather than being excluded from it.

The reactions of my female respondents suggest that most women saw volunteer work, when tied so directly to "feminine" domestic tasks (i.e. cooking), and requiring a time commitment apart from their public appearance at an event, as a threat to their professional status. While this might be conceived as resistance to sex role spillover (Nieva and Gutek, 1981:60)[11], it also has the unintended effect of drawing boundaries around professional work which reinforce the masculine terms in which it is most often defined. Thus, many of the women in my sample came to reinforce the masculinity of professional definitions. This occurred in two ways. Most obviously,

---

[10] However, three men stated that they regularly volunteered to bake things for church events. The difference is that they, unlike the women, were not asked to do this.

[11] To be fair to my informants, it may also be a practical reaction to limiting demands on their time.

these women viewed the work of food preparation as an inappropriate task for clergy. More subtly, my respondents perpetuated a division of emotional and instrumental labour; they separated the instrumental work of preparing food for a community event from the emotional work of building relationships. I would argue that in a feminine model of work, these two components are unlikely to be separated; see for example, how "caring for" (the instrumental tasks) and "caring about" (the affective dimensions) are joined by women in family meal preparation described by DeVault (1991) or in the work of nurses described by James (1992).[12] Clergy, however, divide the two components and, in contrast to many professions, retain the emotional component as a professional task while leaving to adjunct workers--that is to volunteers, who are frequently women--important parts of the instrumental work necessary to staging social events.[13] Only a minority of female clergy tried to avoid this gendered pattern by re-defining the food preparation requested of them as another component of their ministry.

---

[12] For a fuller discussion of the relationship between "caring for" and "caring about" in women's work see Dalley, 1988; Graham, 1983; Tronto, 1989.

[13] A parallel example can be found in the way that minister's make pastoral visits. By visiting in parishioners' homes, clergy take advantage of instrumental work, usually performed by women, such as providing a cup of tea, or creating a pleasant physical environment in which to have a conversation, to facilitate their professional work of building relationships and providing pastoral care.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has outlined a number of ways in which ambiguity is inherent in the work of ministry. Clergy carry out a significant part of their work--the work of building relationships--in kinds of situations (potluck suppers, in private homes), encounters (while grocery shopping or going to the post office), and roles (as "volunteers") which are not conventionally linked to the sphere of work. Not only do clergy take advantage of existing venues and situations, but they also intentionally and routinely create additional situations where they can encounter parishioners in informal circumstances. In most of these situations, clergy themselves have no problem defining what they do as work, but they are aware that their definition of "being at work" may not mesh with their congregation's. As professionals, clergy have a great deal of autonomy over their work; however, they do have to formally account for part of their work to congregational committees, and informally balance their idea of a "good job" against that of community opinion. The dilemmas which arise from defining work in accountable ways when much of it is located in ambiguous circumstances is the main thrust of the following chapter.

In the circumstances listed above, clergy can still identify what is work even if it is embedded in community life. There are circumstances as well where professional work merges with private life and clergy themselves have difficulty

in differentiating the two. These come about from living in the communities in which they serve and being involved as more than just ministers in community life. Chapters 6 and 7 consider how this embeddedness and merging of professional work with community life creates dilemmas in terms of drawing boundaries between public and private life. In Chapter 6, I take up this theme with an eye to how clergy do separate professional relationships from personal ones, and in Chapter 7, I discuss the problems of creating private and family space in this context.

This present chapter has also shown that ministry is not easily defined by dichotomies which conventionally are used to differentiate between work and non-work, or even by some of the conceptualizations of professional work current in the literature. For example, ministry is not simply work located in the public sphere as opposed to "non-work"—that is domestic work and leisure—located in the private. Any conceptualization of ministry as work must confront its location in reference to volunteer work, an activity which is variably gendered, and arguably outside of the private realm.

Furthermore, I have raised the question of the extent to which ministry represents a model of work which differs from the masculine conceptualization of professional work put forward by Davies (1996). There are certain components of ministry which are usually characterized as culturally feminine. Notable among these is the focus on nurturing

relationships and emotional labour. Both women and men defined these activities as priorities, and both capitalized equally on ambiguity to carry out this work. In practice, however, these culturally feminine characteristics may be negated, such as in the way that emotional labour is disconnected from instrumental labour in the differentiation of professional and volunteer work. Consequently, female and male clergy reproduce a model of work which prioritizes emotional labour--and, thus, is different than the professional model outlined by Davies (1996)--but is nevertheless masculinized in its constitution. The following chapters will continue to examine the ways that clergy constrain the potentially "feminine" components within their work, by delineating their work in masculinized terms which are specific to the context and history of the profession of ministry. Furthermore, I will consider how the reproduction of this clergy-masculinized model of work has different consequences for women and men.

Chapter 5

DEFINING WORK IN ACCOUNTABLE WAYS

The last chapter illustrated some of the ways in which ministry was ambiguous as work. This chapter addresses the question of how rural clergy account for their work, despite that ambiguity, both to themselves and to others. Although clergy's professional status allows them to define for themselves a great deal of what counts as work, they do not do this in a vacuum. Thus, I first discuss the context in which their work is legitimated, emphasizing the limits on professional autonomy for clergy, the formal committee structures, and congregational expectations within a rural culture. I then show how they use concepts of obligation, time, context, and visibility as markers to clarify the ambiguous boundary between their professional work and non-work. These markers represent a departure from conventional parameters of work such as pay, activity, and place, and a modification of how time boundaries are used to define work in waged occupations and even within other professions. On the one hand, the way clergy use these concepts to define work illustrates their exercise of professional autonomy to define and control work. On the other, the way in which the concepts are used also illustrates how professional autonomy may be tempered by the expectations and perceptions of one's clientele and by the embeddedness of work in the communal

117

sphere.   In my conclusion, I consider the ways in which clergy's use of these markers may both counter and reproduce a masculine work norm.

THE CONTEXT OF LEGITIMATION

Professional work is not typically linked to discussions of how one accounts for work. Legitimating what one does or accomplishes on a daily basis to those outside the occupation, or even to other professional colleagues is not seen as a major concern for most professionals. Yet because much of clergy work appears to be ambiguous this becomes an important issue for this profession. Clergy must be able to define what work is for themselves in order to justify when they have done enough work, and in order to maintain time for personal responsibilities and leisure. Defining work is also an issue in formally and informally accounting for work to congregations. This section outlines the context in which work is legitimated including limits on professional autonomy, formal committee structures, congregational expectations, and rural culture. I then move on to examine what markers my respondents used to differentiate work from non-work.

Limits on Professional Autonomy

Becker, in his classic discussion of what we think a profession should be like, includes the assumption that "[p]rofessionals, in contrast to members of other occupations,

claim and are often accorded complete autonomy in their work"
(1971:96). Our "folk concept" of the professions assumes they
are free to determine what counts as a legitimate use of their
time, and do not have to account for how their work is
performed. Stivers (1993:44) notes that most sociological
discussions of professionalism "centre around control over
content and conditions of work as a defining feature." For
example, studies have outlined how the control of professional
work is secured through political claims on the part of the
entire profession and formalized through licensure. In the
case of the clergy, notions of professional control have been
reinforced by their traditional association with divine
authority. In recent years, sociologists have drawn attention
to how professional autonomy is being curtailed by the
increasing inclusion of professionals within bureaucratic
organizations (for example, Leicht and Fennell, 1997).

Davies (1996) argues that the notion of autonomy is
central to how professional work is masculinized in its
organization. Professions developed in the nineteenth century
as male-dominated institutions and thus drew on ideals of
masculine identity which were current at that time. Then, as
now, we associate autonomy and independence with the masculine
and connectedness and dependence with the feminine (Gilligan,
1987). Expertise in specialized knowledge legitimated the
professional's independence from accountability to others or
control by bureaucratic organization but this expertise was

available only to men by virtue of educational restrictions on women. Thus the image of autonomy "stands at the very heart of both cultural concepts of masculinity and of professions." (Davies, 1996:670).

However, the image of autonomous professionals is misleading. It can be maintained only as long as the focus is on freedom from accountability to those above them in a formal hierarchy. This focus informs even the recent work on the loss of autonomy due to the bureaucratization of professionals. But professional work is performed within a web of relationships, which includes those working below or beside professionals in formal divisions of labour and those outside formal hierarchies. One of the strengths of Davies' discussion is that she frames autonomy not only as control over what counts as work but also as the freedom from having to acknowledge dependency on adjunct workers. Professions can present themselves as autonomous only by ignoring or devaluing the supportive work of others (Davies, 1996:670-671). Davies argues that these "others" are predominantly women, whether in allied occupations or in the home. In chapter 4, I suggested that adjunct work may also be carried out by volunteers doing unpaid work in the communal sphere. In addition, professionals perform their work in a context where clients make judgements about whether they are doing their job well (Becker, 1971:100; see also, for example, Kasteler et al., 1976 on "doctor-shopping"). For example, medical patients

may switch doctors based on their own experience and knowledge
or on the advice of friends and family. Thus professionals
must remain responsive to the perceptions of their clients,
even if they do not have to account for their work to them in
a formal manner. Clergy, too, while exercising professional
discretion over what they recognize as work and how they
organize their days, must nevertheless remain formally and
informally accountable to their congregations.

Formal committee structures

The United Church of Canada tempers the conception of
professional autonomy with democratic accountability. In
theory, a congregation is supposed to have a Ministry and
Personnel Committee which provides a "consultative and
supportive" function for the staff of the pastoral charge,
including the minister (The Manual 1998, Section 244, c,
pp.139-140).[1] This function includes reviewing and evaluating
the effectiveness of staff, overseeing their relationship with
members of the congregation, and reviewing responsibilities,
working conditions and remuneration.[2] In practice, however--

---

[1] The Manual is the "constitution" of the United Church
of Canada.

[2] However, disciplining of clergy lies with the
Presbytery, the administrative level above the congregation,
rather than with the congregation itself. In this way,
Presbytery can act as an arbitrator when there are serious
disagreements between the charge and the minister. A
minister's church membership also rests with Presbytery rather
than with the congregation. However, accountability to

and as described by many of my informants--this committee may be more or less effective. In churches where traditional norms about ministerial authority prevail, the committee may exist in name only. In other congregations, where lay people are used to taking a more active role in leadership, the Ministry and Personnel committee may be an important guide for the minister's work. While ministers are not technically accountable for all of their actions to congregational committees, they are expected to consult with church committees in the process of doing their work. In practice, the committee structure works as a check on professional discretion. The autonomy of the professional minister is circumscribed by her or his relationship to unpaid volunteers.

Congregational expectations and rural culture

Work is accounted for formally and informally. While congregations may vary in the extent to which their church committees function as a formal check on professional discretion, they inevitably operate with a set of informal expectations about what a minister's work should involve and how that work is defined. In some cases, these expectations may be formalized into job descriptions, but more often they remain uncodified. Thus clergy find that they are held "accountable" to others through community opinion. The

Presbytery is less important than the interactions with one's congregations in terms of the routine organization of one's work.

community's informal judgement of whether clergy are doing their work adequately may have just as large an impact on clergy's work experience as the formal bodies to which clergy are responsible.

Furthermore, professional understandings of work are put into practice in a particular cultural context. In chapter 4, I pointed out that my respondents felt that rural culture supported a less differentiated understanding of work than in urban centres. Hence, the way work is formally accounted for may vary between rural and urban pastoral charges. In addition in a rural context where at least part of one's professional activities are visible to and widely known in the community, an informal system of accountability may carry greater weight than in an urban setting.

PARAMETERS USED TO DEFINE PROFESSIONAL WORK

Accounting for work involves a minister defining work for herself or himself and for congregational committees. The apparent ambiguity around the work of ministry, already discussed in chapter 4, does not always make this an easy task. On the one hand, ministers may draw on professional definitions of work which are broad and elastic, and which give them the discretion to legitimate a wide range of activities as work. On the other hand, their understanding of these definitions may be at odds with the congregation's image of what a minister's work entails. The remainder of this

chapter examines how clergy use the notions of obligation, time, context, and visibility to define their work, and the ways in which these parameters gender work.

Obligation

Clergy, obviously, have much greater freedom to define what is legitimated as work than do non-professional workers. However, my respondents did not emphasize the dimensions of autonomy within or control over their work, as much as they did the notion of professional obligation to attend to the expectations and needs of their parishioners. The obligation to be responsive to people was what defined their work, even in apparently ambiguous circumstances. Having to respond to emergent demands often meant they felt that they had little control over how their work was organized within a particular week. Thus the reality for these clergy meant that any discretion over the content of work was tempered by a relative lack of control over how their work was organized.

While work clearly included the obligation to provide particular professional services, such as funerals or weddings upon request, obligation was a general marker of what separated work from non-work in areas which might otherwise appear to be ambiguous. The obligation to be visible at community events which were merely social occasions for others, and the obligation to respond to emotional needs whenever they arose helped to define clergy work. In

addition, obligation was expressed in terms of "being on call" for people. This focus on obligation in contrast to control raises the question of the extent to which rural ministry diverges from a gendered, that is masculinized, organization of professional work.

Eleven women and eight men discussed ways in which a lack of choice about attending social events led to their constitution as work regardless of how enjoyable these activities might be. This was due to their own understanding of their professional role as well as a sensitivity to the expectations of their congregations. For many individuals, an activity was work if they were doing it by virtue of their role as the minister of a particular congregation:

> ...whenever I'm there because I have to be--because I don't have a choice--that...I'm in that role because of my position: it's work. If I'm there because my son is--is a member of the band or--or some reason like that, then it's not work and I'm just being me. (M18:172) [3]

Several individuals mentioned that, by this definition, they also included the interview that they were doing with me as work. Furthermore, there was a keen awareness that not attending social events affected their professional work negatively because of the way that it undercut the trust between them and their parishioners:

> ...if you consistently don't go to any of the social events, if you hold aloof and don't become part of the

---

[3] Interestingly, this individual's spouse was also a minister, and he classified the congregational events he attended in his wife's pastoral charge as non-work because "I'm not being the professional...it's my choice" (M18:261).

> community in some way, then a certain amount of resentment builds up over time. I think you could miss one event and it wouldn't matter, but, if it's a consistent pattern, you're not there then people begin to feel that...you think you're...too good for them...that you're not taking them seriously.... (F1:88)

In other words, if you are to do the pastoral work of ministry well, you are obligated to be present at such events.

As minister, respondents attended events that they otherwise would not attend, and this sometimes prevented them from doing things which they might otherwise prefer to do. Part of the problem in accounting for their work to the congregation was that this sense of constraint in regards to "fun" events like wedding receptions or community dinners was not always apparent to the lay people involved. As one female respondent pointed out, "I don't think it would occur to some of them that I might choose to do other things, or that I might have friends outside of that life" (F30:186). Similarly, another male informant stated that:

> ...I'm becoming more and more aware of anything that I do-- specifically do because I'm hired as the minister of this church, then that's part of my work. ...[L]ike if I get invited to, uh, to say the Legion banquet--. I mean I don't particularly enjoy legion banquets but it is a nice meal. And, you know...some people would see that as I'm getting a free meal and I--I'm not working, but I realize, yeah, I've got to get dressed up and go to that thing and there are other things I'd sooner be doing, but I'm going because I'm the minister and they sort of expect me to be there. So it's work! (M38:392)

Respondents who thought they might attend an event for reasons other than work, were less likely to assume that such an event was work prior to attending. A good example of this were the clergy who talked about attending school functions because

their children were involved--therefore as a parent--but also realizing that being visible at such an event could accomplish part of their ministerial duties. Thus, an anticipated non-work outing came to have work dimensions. Conversely, choice in contrast to obligation, typically defined the parameters of non-work. One women carefully protected this domain of choice, clearly specifying for herself and, in some cases, also for her Ministry and Personnel committee what were the things she was doing voluntarily (F10:113, 271).

Almost half the sample (eighteen individuals)--a group equally split between women and men--stressed that the obligation to be emotionally attentive constituted work. For them, in addition to obvious duties and leadership responsibilities, work meant "being sensitive to where people are at, at all times" (F17:104) or "being ready to be there for people" (M24:97). This could be a facet of more obvious duties, or a responsibility which stood on it's own. When a casual conversation:

> ...turns into something that this person needs from you...you can't just say, "oh, isn't that too bad." This is someone hurting, and you would then have to put your work cap on and--and try to get involved. (F28:323)

The sense of obligation to respond to people's emotional needs meant my respondents also recognized that work could spill over to time spent off the pastoral charge such as when they were travelling, shopping in another town, or while on time off. A quarter of my respondents gave specific examples of this. One man related this example:

> You're having a coffee at the mall. And then sitting down, and talking with the guy who just sold you the binoculars, because he happens to be having his coffee break, too. And he tells you about his open-heart surgery he's going for. Oh yeah. Mall ministry. (M33:471)

There was only one person (M34) who talked about professional obligation as <u>not</u> including emotional attentiveness; this man phrased his discussion of professional obligation in terms of the readiness to respond to requests for practical help.

Freedom from emotional obligations constituted non-work. Conversations with parishioners might not count as work if "they're not needing anything from me" (F28:327). Time free from such demands may be found with other clergy (F14:347). One man described his time spent growing house plants as leisure precisely because "my house plants demand nothing of me and they never talk back" (M26:200).

Being "on call" was one of the clearest expressions of professional obligation. Respondents talked about checking their phone messages or worrying who might call even on a day off. Knowing that one could be contacted at any time made it difficult for respondents to relax during their time off, or to have a sense that they were free from professional obligation. This comes through clearly in one woman's account of the difficulty of leaving professional concerns behind:

> ... I think the intensity [of the work] for a minister is--is not knowing. You know, it's very, VERY difficult to plan, to say I'm going to go into the show in [the city], Friday. It's--I honestly don't know if I'm going to be able to go. And you can't say when you get a phone call from the funeral parlour, "Well, look, can you just tell

them I'm into the show--I'll see them Saturday."
(F28:118)

Men and women equally stressed how they were on call for
emergencies such as deaths and funerals, even on days off and,
in some cases, even when on vacation, such as when an
important member of the congregation was ill. In this sense,
although people might attempt to establish a day off, it was
often difficult to maintain. Even for individuals who were
adamant about maintaining clear boundaries around time off,
such emergency calls were seen as legitimate reasons to
interrupt private time.

Although the notion of obligation was key for clergy in
defining their work for themselves, it was not always a marker
which they could use in discussions of their work with lay
people. A case in point, is the difficulty pointed out by the
above informant who spoke of attending a Legion banquet; for
him it was clearly work because of the obligation he felt to
be there, while for community members it may seem to be
something other than work, because he was getting "a free
meal". Others respondents recounted similar scenarios. In
addition, as noted in chapter 4, respondents were aware that
it was not always conducive to building relationships to
explicitly define interactions or social occasions as work.
Being on call (regardless of whether any call came), being
emotionally available, and being involved in the community
typically met congregational expectations of how a minister
should behave, but they were not necessarily things which

could easily be accounted for as work to others.

Time

"Obligation" as a definitional element of work presupposes that work can happen at <u>any time</u>, and cannot be limited and therefore defined in terms of particular time constraints. This represents a very traditional approach to understanding the work of ministry. However, my respondents' accounts suggest that the way in which clergy delineate their work may be changing. Increasingly, clergy are being encouraged to keep track of their time and put limits on the hours worked. This is in order to recognize the amount of work done, and to limit the stress inherent in having a job without boundaries. My respondents varied in terms of whether or not they tried to fix working times, how closely they kept track of their hours for themselves, and the extent to which they accounted for hours worked to the congregation.

None of my respondents expected that their work would fit into a nine-to-five day. They were aware that their congregations expected them to be available for appointments in the evenings as well as in the daytime (F30:267). However, several individuals stressed that it was particularly difficult to fix any sort of office hours on a rural pastoral charge. As one man stated,

> ...in rural ministry, there is no way that you can set office hours and, uh, tell the church members that if you want to see the pastor then you have to visit between this and this hours on--on a particular day. This is a

> farming neighbourhood... when the weather is good, the
> people are out on the fields, working day and night. So
> I don't see them if the weather is too good, especially
> after a long rainy period. So you have to be available
> ...twenty-four hours a day. (M3:43)

In other words, the unpredictability of farming work led to a
corresponding unpredictability in this respondent's work
schedule. In addition the informality of rural culture meant
that the church office was not always a place which
facilitated work since it "didn't suit the community" (F8:65).
Several individuals pointed out that people avoided coming to
see them in the church office and people were less likely to
be open with them than in situations which were less formal.
Other individuals stated that fixed office hours were tricky
to establish since their offices were in their homes; people
knew when they were home regardless of whether they considered
themselves to be at work (F29:145-155; M40:43). Office hours
were a bigger priority for individuals who commuted to their
parishes; they maintained office hours in order to ensure a
clear sense of availability for their parishioners. Unlike
teleworkers who keep regular business hours in their home
offices as a way of making their work appear more legitimate
(Mirchandani, 1999:92-93) maintaining regular working hours
was not a strategy that helped clergy legitimate their work.
For most rural clergy, scheduled time and fixed routines were
inadequate for the task of defining work.

However, respondents did describe a variety of flexible
approaches to understanding time as a marker of work. The

remainder of this section describes these approaches. While fixed working hours did not help to legitimate work, some clergy did feel that keeping track of hours worked enabled them to make their work more visible to themselves, if not to others. Some respondents said they kept track of the hours worked simply as a way of reminding themselves of how much time they had spent on the job, regardless of whether they had accomplished specific tasks. This was particularly helpful in terms of accounting for the effort that went into creative work and reading, where the achievements may not be very concrete in other terms. It was also helpful to give themselves a sense of accomplishment when unanticipated events and demands kept them from completing planned tasks.

A quarter of my respondents discussed a trend within ministry to use formal time management skills, in particular a technique of time blocking. In this approach, one divides the day into three segments, working for two of the blocks taking the third one off. This is to ensure a balance between work and non-work, even if one cannot specify regular starting and ending times for work. Many learned this technique in seminary. A quarter of the men but only one of the women said they regularly used this technique to manage their work. Four individuals (three women and one man), including one woman who had tried to use this technique, suggested that this strategy for managing time was unrealistic. It was an unworkable solution because "you can't regulate when people are going to

need you" (F37:42, also M15:174-180). Furthermore, unlike a medical person, "you can't say, 'oh, I'm in my office from nine to five...come up and I'll see you.'" because "you don't have the same kind of professional detachment from the folks with whom you work" (M23:448). In addition, such a bureaucratic accounting of hours "took time away from more important things" (F8:140). These comments suggest an important insight: that temporal division of work from non-work rests in part on the exclusion of emotion from the field of work. Regulating one's hours of work is easiest when one does not have to attend to diffuse emotional needs.

The individuals who rejected the trend to a more formal accounting of hours were conscious, nevertheless, of balancing work time with time for relaxation on an ad hoc basis. Nine individuals described how they took "compensating time" or "overtime", as needed, to balance the demands of an especially busy day or week. Congregations rarely complained about this because a similar pattern of work organization occurred among farmers who alternated between peak periods of long days, such as harvest-time, and slower periods when they could relax (M2:179; M3:43; M15:175). It was also possible because of the tendency of clergy to devote far more than forty hours a week to their work:

> [I]f there's 5 fuzzy hours a week or 10, I don't sweat it very much because, you know, I'm already--they're already--the pastoral charge is getting more than the 40 hours a week out of me. (M39:102)

For this male informant the "fuzzy hours" which may combine

work and leisure, or during which he might not be working very intently, were unproblematic since he had already devoted a full working week, in conventional terms, to the pastoral charge.

Respondents acknowledged that the autonomy to balance work and leisure on an ad hoc basis was maintained by honouring the obligation--and congregational expectation--to be emotionally available to people. The results of their work and the way people were treated mattered more than the actual hours spent working:

> ...if they weren't happy with what was happening on Sunday morning, if they weren't happy with--with the way we handle crisis times in people's lives--lives weren't dealt with--then they would be quick to hold us to--to make us more accountable. (F8:65)

Taking time to listen when people needed you was more "valuable", and mattered more in people's estimation of you than keeping to "scheduled" hours (M35:177-182). Developing and maintaining an adequate level of trust freed both clergy and laity from accounting for the number of hours worked (M15:175). Flexibility in one's schedule and ad hoc compensation for "over-time" worked was legitimated by performing emotional labour as much as by professional authority or bureaucratic accounting for work done.

Regardless of how formally or informally individuals themselves kept track of hours they worked, informants expressed a strong ambivalence about explicitly accounting to the congregation or the Ministry and Personnel Committee for

the hours which they worked. More than a quarter of the clergy interviewed (six women and five men) specifically expressed doubt as to whether the congregation or the Ministry and Personnel Committee had a clear understanding of the amount of time required to do the work of ministry. In addition, almost all of my informants alluded to this presumed lack of understanding by citing the way that lay people joked that ministers worked only an hour a week while leading worship. More specifically, my respondents expressed concern over accounting for how long visits sometimes took; for example, six respondents wondered whether the congregation had a realistic expectation of how much time visiting required, including the time needed for driving to people's homes or to hospitals. Others thought that congregations had little idea of the time required for sermon preparation or for study, or for the administrative functions and miscellaneous demands which were a part of the job.

The ambivalence in accounting for their work time and the consequent inability to clearly define their work for the congregation comes through as well when individuals talked about the reactions that they either had received, or feared they would receive, if they did define such work. Several respondents discussed the awkward reactions they received from committees when they had actually accounted for their hours, and how these attempts had been discontinued (F8:148; F12:293-294; F13:258; F28:122). For example, one women recounted how

she and her clergy husband had stopped reporting their hours to the Ministry and Personnel committee because of such reactions, since they averaged far more than forty hours per week. Delineating the high number of hours worked for the committee:

> ...felt like we were wanting their sympathy, while we were just trying to be accountable--but they couldn't do anything about it. [It] made them feel uncomfortable because they said, "oh, you poor people; you're working so hard." (F8:148)

Individuals also reported that they anticipated negative reactions from congregational members about accounting for their work time, even if they had not actually tried to do so. Respondents were reluctant to explicitly say that they were taking time off to compensate for overtime worked or taking time for themselves in the middle of the day in order to make up for time spent on evening meetings. As one respondent put it, ministers live with a "phobia" that they'll be told "that can't count as work":

> I do know that although no one would get upset with it or threaten to fire me or anything like that--not that they can--but you know what I mean.... But nonetheless I know I'd get headshakes like, "oh! these minister types... (F13:103)

In only a few cases, did respondents report that their Ministry and Personnel committees were more conscious of accounting for the time demands of their job than they themselves were. For example, one female respondent who worked part-time, reported that her Ministry and Personnel committee noticed that she was not reporting the amount of

time which she spent on the phone in connection with work (F9:330), thus under-reporting work time. Other respondents pointed out that the committee's ability to understand the time demands of ministry also varied with the membership of the committee or congregation. Professional people or younger people had more understanding of the rationale for using time blocking (M38:181). Alternately, in the case of two female respondents, a high proportion of mothers on the Ministry and Personnel committee helped them account for and come to terms with the conflicting demands of professional hours and need for family time.

Thus, while time did not define work, in the sense of being "at work" during specific hours, formally counting the amount of time spent working, and managing one's time through time blocking, was a strategy which some used to draw limits around work in the midst of the ambiguous circumstances of their professional lives. However, a larger number rejected any formalistic method of accounting for work time because it did not suit the nature of their profession, preferring instead to balance time for professional duties with time for personal responsibilities and leisure on an ad hoc basis. Accounting for hours spent on the job to congregational committees was problematic for many clergy interviewed. On one hand, clergy reinforced the image of themselves as the autonomous professional and the expert judge of work content by claiming lay people did not understand how much time their

work took. On the other hand, many expressed concern or discomfort over the reactions of lay people if they explicitly stated the number of hours worked and what was included in that time.

Context

My respondents went beyond thinking of their work as a particular list of duties or activities to be performed. They frequently differentiated work from non-work based on the context in which an activity or event occurred. Thus any particular activity may be considered more or less work-like depending on where it happened, the emergent nature of the interactions within it, other demands within a limited time frame, or the outcome of a particular encounter. This contextual basis for defining work meant that the content of work was variable; often one could only determine retrospectively whether one had been "at work" in a particular period. More than one-third of the sample (nine women and six men) gave examples of how they used a contextual definition to determine what was work.

Respondents were aware that what might be considered work, by themselves or by the congregation, could vary depending upon the community in which it occurred. Rural pastoral charges frequently comprise more than one congregation in more than one village. While this means one minister serves several towns, that minister can still only

live in a single place. Thus, shopping for groceries or eating in a restaurant in a community other than the one in which they lived was more likely to be judged as work by the congregation. It was a way for clergy to be visible on the pastoral charge, outside their home community, regardless of what other interactions occurred. This contextual evaluation of activities based on locale, operated in a slightly different way for clergy's own evaluation of their work. While many of my respondents considered any interaction or activity on the charge as work, several also acknowledged that the character of various communities also affected their judgements. My respondents were more likely to count everything as work in communities where they felt less comfortable than in those that were more hospitable to them.

Ambiguity existed in that it was often difficult to anticipate when some situations would become explicitly work-related. All informants recognized the importance of informal interactions, but they varied in the degree to which they assumed that such occasions would be work. While attendance at community events was recognized as an efficient way of making connections with many parishioners at once, some of these individuals tried to take a less categorical stand in terms of viewing all such events as work:

> And I usually end up [thinking], it's NOT work unless something happens that--in that particular evening that MAKES it work. I mean people come and talk to me about assorted things, and I think, okay, so that was work tonight. (F10:158)

> I'm not sure...if there's something that I would go to
> that I would know I'm not working.... It's sort of a
> case that you know afterwards. You know? Uh. You know,
> there wasn't a lot of talk about so-and-so's heart
> operation or that kind of thing. (M24:201).

In other words, an event was only classified as work depending on the emergent nature of the interactions in a particular evening. Clergy may not attend as minister, or formally be "on duty", but it may or may not become work depending on "who's there, and what the circumstances are, what they have been in the community, and also...my energy level" (F8:154). For these individuals, it was not the activity itself which made it work, but what happened over the course of the activity and the context in which it occurred.

Both male and female respondents pointed out how heavy emotional demands over the course of a limited time period, including emotional "switching" between situations, were more likely to make them count a situation as work.[4] For example, a male respondent recounted how he had to go from an unexpected session of intense counselling to a birthday celebration held at the local rink:

> ...that event at the rink, which, you know, last week I
> was looking forward to and saying, "hey that's going to
> be a lot of fun," all of a sudden, you know, because of
> how things have gone...IS work!....Because from week to
> week things can change to me as to what becomes work,
> what is work, or what will be work. (M21:258)

Activities also felt more or less work-like to my respondents depending on the level of emotional connection within an

---

[4] See chapter 6 for a further discussion of emotional switching.

interaction. One male respondent stated that activities like planning funerals or weddings only felt like work "when we don't connect" -- but when that sense of emotional connection with individuals does exist then "it doesn't feel like work-- it's something really, really precious and special" (M20:360).

The variable nature of work as defined by context meant that work could only fully be accounted for "after the fact." While this contextual understanding might complicate the process of legitimating work done to a congregational committee, my respondents also suggested that in some circumstances lay people themselves recognized that context shaped work, as in the case of being visible in communities beyond the one in which the minister was resident.

Visibility

Three quarters of my respondents (fourteen women and sixteen men) explicitly addressed the importance of visibility in defining what was work. Respondents described visibility as important in at least two ways. First, for clergy themselves, visibility was equated with "doing" pastoral care; visibility provided a sense of pastoral "presence" and in this sense is one of the criteria that defined work. Visibility was important because it was linked with building relationships, as described in the previous chapter. "Creative lounging" or "just being there" (chapter 4) were part of work because they made clergy visible.

Secondly, my respondents recognized that being visible helped to show the congregation that they were working and met congregational expectations of what a minister should do. Seven men and seven women addressed the issue of visibility as a congregational expectation. There were a number of ways in which the congregation equated visibility with being at work; however, congregational understandings of this relationship did not always match my respondents definition of when they were at work. At the most simplistic level, having one's car parked at the church, or even being seen driving through town if one commuted to the pastoral charge, would lead congregational members to assume that the minister was "at work". However, this could create problems. For ministers who worked at home, or off the pastoral charge, the opposite assumption could also arise--that if their car wasn't seen, then they weren't working. Indeed, having one's car parked at the church sometimes made work visible (such as counselling) that should remain "invisible" for reasons of confidentiality.

Visibility in the community created a sense of availability or presence, which could over-ride any specific concern about justifying a single activity as work. For example, one informant emphasized that "...if you've taken the time when they've bumped into you or have approached you at what is supposed to be a social event to talk with them, they don't care if you call it work or not. You're present" (M35:172). While attendance at community events made clergy

visible and was an important symbol of their availability, and while the congregation might expect them to attend, the congregation did not necessarily see this attendance in itself as an unequivocal part of paid professional work. This was pointed out by one female informant:

> [O]n one hand they are very glad that I am participating in their community events and being present at them. ... Yes, they would see it as I am paid to be visible and involved, and yes, I should be there. But then it comes down also that well, we're here and no one's paying us to be here. (F13:103)

In other words, the legitimacy of visibility on its own as a marker of real work--of paid work--could get called into question because visibility can also occur in a situation which for congregational members is non-work. A few informants suggested that visibility is an expectation for other rural professionals as well.

As suggested in the previous chapter, however, what was visible as work was not always the same as what was done in public. Respondents drew attention to the fact that visiting, although often done in private homes, was an effective way of being "visible"--in part, because it met congregational expectations of what a minister should do. Although visiting congregational members who were not particularly in need was commendable, visiting was made even more visible as work when it involved intentional visits to the homes of individuals, for a more or less well-defined instrumental purpose--such as being a "flag bearer" for the church, encouraging lapsed members to attend Sunday services, consoling those who were

grieving, or visiting shut-ins. Visiting at community events was less likely to be recognized as work, because it appeared to be less intentional even though it was done in public, and literally, more visible than visits in private homes.

CONCLUSION

I have discussed how clergy used the notions of obligation, time, context, and visibility to define their work. While clergy's use of these concepts is a demonstration of their professional power to decide what counts as work, I have also examined how their use of these concepts is complicated by having to account for their work to volunteer committees and to consider congregational expectations. Autonomy is tempered within a context where professional work is linked to volunteer work and the communal sphere. Without a doubt some congregations, and particularly rural ones as some of my informants suggested, defer almost completely to the minister, imbuing him or her with almost total authority to control the organization of congregational life. And also, without a doubt, there are clergy who capitalize on this unchecked discretionary power. Nevertheless, based on my respondents accounts, there are also many ministers who take seriously the responsibility to attend to the wishes and needs of lay people. These individuals are faced with the complex dilemma of how to account for their work when their professional definitions do not match those of their

congregations.

At first glance, the parameters of work suggested by my respondents point to a somewhat different way of conceptualizing work than that represented by the masculine work norm. None of these parameters fixed work rigidly in·a particular place, schedule, or category of activity. By and large, clergy's understanding of these parameters did make conceptual space for the work of nurturing relationships along with their other more formalized tasks such as conducting funerals. However, some respondents criticized the notion of managing time in blocks as being unrealistic given the diffuse nature of emotional labour required by the job, particularly in the rural setting.

Two of these markers do replicate a masculine model of work in some important ways, however. Obligation as a marker of professional work rests on a masculinized notion of the worker as free from domestic demands. Ministers can be available to others only inasmuch as they are not available to their own families. Finch (1983) has shown how clergy wives have typically done the work which allows their husbands this freedom. The ability to respond to emergent needs and to be part of community events on an on-going basis is only possible if one can be free from demands from the domestic sphere.

Similarly, conceptualizing time as a resource that can be managed in blocks, also rests on the assumption that the worker is an isolated unit. This approach overlooks the fact

that the professional worker has a family and spouse who may
not have the same flexible schedule, and that extra
articulation work (Daune-Richard, 1988:262) is required to
coordinate family activities when one person's schedule is
highly variable. It also assumes that all blocks of time are
substitutable. Being able to legitimate a morning off if one
works in the afternoon and evening, does not allow for time
with either school age children or a working spouse. In
addition, when one has young children, not all time is equal
in value; some of my respondents who were mothers of young
children suggested that it was difficult to go out in the
evenings since it meant being away for bedtimes (F9:354,409;
F10:138). Missing bedtimes was not fully compensated for by
having time with the children in the afternoons or even at
supper. Thus, while time management techniques help to limit
the demands of professional work and save time for personal
recreation, they do not guarantee time for domestic life.

Chapter 6

DEFINING EMOTIONAL BOUNDARIES

The previous chapters have described how the work of
nurturing relationships and individuals is central to the work
of clergy. The work of nurturing is in no way marginal to the
more obvious work of ritual leadership, planning, or
administration. I have also outlined how much of this work
happens in unwork-like activities and is embedded in the
general activities and relations of community life. These
characteristics create a significant dilemma for rural clergy
and raise an important question for research: how do clergy
set their professional work apart from non-work when it is
concerned with the emotional and the relational--in other
words, with components which are conventionally excluded from
or marginalized within definitions of "real work"? Gendered
definitions of work typically link the emotional and
relational with the feminine, and therefore with non-work.

This chapter examines how rural clergy construct and
negotiate boundaries around the emotional and relational, thus
defining their professional work. I outline the ways in which
my respondents dealt with this potential ambiguity:

1) they defined emotional labour as a professional
responsibility and accepted professional norms for
emotional labour and personal involvement

2) they circumscribed relationships by referring to the

salience of the ministerial role

3) they were friendly without being friends, thus maintaining professional distance

4) they negotiated friendships within certain limits

In two final sections, I first consider how the emotional control represented by these strategies is a gendered attribute of the profession, and then how assumptions about women's and men's relative skill at emotional care-giving gender them as workers within the profession.

EMOTIONAL LABOUR AS A PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Conventional representations of professional work define it in terms of the objective application of intellectual knowledge and expertise. In other words, it is defined in terms of being something separate from emotion; professional distance and objectivity are necessary to doing the job well. Feminist critiques demonstrate how this masculine conceptualization overlooks the fact that professional workers are paid for their skill in the management of emotions—whether they are their own or those of others (see for example, Davies, 1996). Emotional labour is as much a feature of professional jobs as it is of routinized, face-to-face service occupations (Fineman, 1993:19; Hochschild, 1983; Pierce, 1995; Yanay and Shahar, 1998). However, the intent of the emotional labour may differ. Professionals may be more often concerned with using emotional labour to emphasize their

hierarchal relation to the client (Pierce, 1995:51-53), than those in lower level service sector jobs who encourage the correct behaviour from clients in a more egalitarian fashion (Grant and Tancred, 1992:121). While emotional labour in both cases may be used to control the behaviour of others, the emotional labour of professionals can be said to take a more masculinized form because of its emphasis on maintaining distance within the relationship. Professionals have greater control over when and how such work is done than do most service sector jobs (for example, see Hochschild, 1983 on flight attendants), but it is nevertheless a demand of the job. Professionals rarely have codified behavioral guidelines specific to their particular work organization, but feeling rules are written into professional standards of practice or codes of ethics, and upheld more generally through professional norms (Yanay and Shahar, 1998).

Clergy's focus on nurturing relationships and individuals means that emotional labour forms an important part of the work which clergy do. My respondents were clear about how attending to other people's emotions was an intentional part of the work that they did. The "deep acting" required to control one's outward emotional display is evident in their accounts. For example, one woman described the emotional switching which was required within the course of the day between situations which demanded very different kinds of emotional response:

> ...a family has a young child in the hospital sick--but when you go there and spend an hour or an hour and a half or two hours...you have to be FULLY there.... And then when you leave them and you go down the hall, to visit the woman who has just had a new baby and sure--her two...older children are in there with her. And her husband comes in with this big bunch of flowers and--then you have to be fully there for them. And I don't think people understand the--the amount of work that is. (F7:179-180)

Demonstrating empathy in these contrasting situations was hard work. However, as she points out it is not typically seen as work by non-clergy. Slightly later in the interview, she evaluated her performance as less than adequate when she was not "fully there" in an encounter; in other words, when she failed at deep acting and could produce only a surface response. Similarly, other women and men spoke of the difficultly of switching emotionally between situations such as funerals and weddings, or funerals and community events, when they occur within the course of a single day.

In addition to demonstrating the right emotion at the right time and place, several respondents also mentioned an awareness of professional norms of not showing too much emotion at certain times (F1:96; F5:337-350; F6:211). It is of note that those who draw attention to these norms are women, even though they are only a small fraction of my female respondents. Inasmuch as women in general are socialized to be more comfortable displaying emotions than men, women may be more aware of the imposition of a professional norm which limits emotional display in crisis situations. Feminized socialization and the expectations of others place them more

at odds with the masculinized ideal than their male counterparts. At this level, appearing "professional" may be a more difficult accomplishment for women than for men.

While clergy may exercise some control over <u>how</u> emotional management is accomplished, rural clergy often have little control over <u>when</u> it is demanded of them. This is a result of living in small towns among their clientele. The lack of control over where and when they must attend to others' feelings, and thus their own, turns their emotional care-giving into hard work. One woman describes how a personal shopping trip to a nearby town could suddenly turn into a professional encounter:

> ...if I run into somebody in the mall...I can talk to them about the weather and I'm their friend, with my kids in the mall, and then [snaps her fingers] I'm their minister. And I can--I always know when I've become the pastor. (Laughs.) And--and so--that's when my hat changes and that's when I go to work. ...They will ask me something that they would not ask a friend, I don't think. They expect something at that point and I sense that they need <u>something</u>. (F9:300, 304)

Another male respondent told how a trip to the post office led to a discussion with the post mistress about her grief over her sister's death (M21:170). The spontaneity of the encounter was underlined when he described how it began as he removed his mail from the postal box in the outer lobby of the post office and glimpsed her sorting mail on the other side of the wall. He had not expected a face-to-face encounter, but once begun it could not be deferred to a more appropriate time or place; he knew there might not be time in his agenda to

arrange another meeting that week. Other respondents describe similar encounters where they suddenly find themselves in the position of attending to a parishioner's emotions and concerns.

Wadel (1979:379) argues that we are less likely to count as work those activities which are sporadic and unplanned. Yet attending to emotions is precisely the kind of work that is difficult to plan and schedule (James, 1989). This quality, along with it's feminized associations, contributes to the "invisibility" of emotional labour as real work. Rural clergy are notable for how they consistently identify spontaneous interactions as real work. I can find no evidence within my respondents' accounts that the unpredictability of the demand for emotional labour differs for women and men.

THE SALIENCE OF THE MINISTERIAL ROLE

Clergy define their work in terms of role salience. They are potentially "minister" to anyone they meet, at any time, in any situation. Work is not limited to interactions with congregational members or to what goes on in formally recognized work settings. Theological understandings of ministry as call and vocation undergird this understanding of what work is: as already mentioned, ministry is understood as part of who they are, not merely what they do within a certain time or place.

The ubiquity of the work role is experienced in two ways.

First, clergy follow a professional injunction to always be prepared to minister to others--thus always to be "on call". Second, clergy realize that lay people always see them in the role of the minister, even if it is not always clear to the laity when clergy are working. Both women and men emphasized these aspects of their work experience:

> I mean even when you're grocery shopping, you're sometimes on--you go for the mail...you are always the minister. (F7:205)

> There is a sense that I am NEVER anyone but the minister in town. Even though there are people in town who have tried very hard to befriend me, and even though there are people in town that I feel more comfortable with just being myself than--than others.... You always have to realize that...you carry that with you always. You know? That you are...the minister. (F13:146)

> ...I think wherever you are in the community--a community like ours, people see you in the role of minister. And, uh, you're never in their eyes, out of that role, even when you're in recreational activities or, uh, doing grocery shopping or whatever. (M23:154)

> Sometimes you'd like to, you know, you'd like to take off the role and not have to be the--you know, be seen as the minister all the time. But that's--that's not likely to happen in the community.... [Y]our whole life is kind of the work....And it doesn't mean you're working every hour of the day, but it means--when you're there in a role...you have to be prepared for that. (M24:125-126)

The inescapability of the work role means that there is little social "space" left for non-work, even if one desires it.

Although clergy defined a significant part of their work as nurturing relationships, role salience meant that relationships were almost always circumscribed by the professional role. They were separated from the personal world of friendships or dating, and therefore from the private

of friendships or dating, and therefore from the private domain. Thus nurturing--work which is conventionally associated with the feminine, the private, and with non-work-- is associated with the professional domain. These bounded relationships, however, do not mean that ministers present themselves as distant professionals--an image that would be consistent with a masculinized conceptualization of professional work. The following section discusses how clergy work at "being friendly" without necessarily being friends.

BEING FRIENDLY WITHOUT BEING FRIENDS

Ministry, as described by one male respondent, is "a pretty dangerous profession...at an emotional level" (M39:346). He was referring to the difficulty of maintaining professional distance in the context of having to simultaneously deal with the emotional and relational aspects of people's lives. In other words, emotional labour for clergy included the monitoring and control of their own emotions to prevent a spillover of professional relationships into the private domain of friendship.

Both men and women repeatedly stressed the necessity to maintain some emotional distance from parishioners together with the building of trust and the nurturing of relationships:

> ...distance is necessary for perspective and, especially for counselling and stuff like that. You cannot be personally involved with someone you're counselling. It doesn't work. At least I don't think it works. It doesn't seem to for me. (F7:232)

...there's a certain boundary there, that always has to stay there or you cannot minister to them (F4:274)

...you have to be careful about that professional-friendship line, because, if you get too close, and you--you know, all of a sudden you start doing funerals for people who are your friends, that gets hard. You know? It's hard to keep a professional--maintain a professional kind of status at that point, because you have a loss too. And you REALLY have to be careful about that, because then they need you there as a minister, not as a friend. (M35:207)

...you can't really speak with and be with someone, uh, in the parish in quite the same way that you could with someone's who's not. And you can't, it just doesn't work that way I don't think. (M25:175-176)

By identifying limits on the extent of intimacy that they felt was possible with parishioners, clergy clearly constructed that relationship as professional. In doing so, they established an emotional boundary which separated work from non-work.

Clergy made an important distinction between "being friendly"--something that was part of the job--and being friends. Almost three quarters of my sample--fifteen of the women and twelve of the men--discussed the way they placed limits on socializing with their parishioners. In some cases, they did not feel obliged to follow the norms of reciprocity which conventionally govern friendships:

When somebody invites me out to dinner from the congregation, is that work or play? I consider that's work. I would probably not go to dinner with that person if they were not a member of my congregation. And I probably won't return the invite. I presume because they're work. (F17:123)

Socializing with parishioners in private situations for pleasure alone (in contrast to socializing at public functions

out of a sense of duty) was not an uncommon experience for my respondents. However, while they could "hang out" with parishioners, they never completely revealed their "uncensored" selves (F19:216). Feeling rules related to the job defined how they managed their emotions within a setting which was private in any other terms. When such socializing did occur, many respondents expressed caution about how they needed to circumscribe their behaviour in this context:

> ...sometimes we hang out with folks who are from the church. They're friends. We have to be careful about how that happens. Because, uh, we're still--like I'm still their minister. So, you know, I try to be careful about how--how intimate I get with them. [Later she mentions not drinking around church people but feeling free to drink with friends from outside the church.] (F37:100)

> Yes, they're friends, uh, but with, um, you know, inverted commas around the "friends", because one is also their minister. And so I'm very careful in using that term. They're not friends in the way that you have personal friends outside the charge. Because while one can have a wonderful time with them and share a lot of concerns, I would never expose myself, in terms of--I might share worries with them, but never say things um, that I wouldn't want to be repeated outside, which might pertain to myself or my family or something I'm anxious about, or about things in the pastoral charge. (F30:204)

> ...we have great social times together but there's that real intimate dimension that--that ministers tend to pull back on. Because it--it leaves them perhaps too vulnerable. (M25:177)

> ...when I'm with a friend who's also a colleague in ministry, I might say some things that...folk refer to as black humour around work, and funerals and death and all that kind of stuff. It's a way of coping with what we deal with. But [with friends in the congregation]...I would hopefully most times not lose some sensitivity to, uh, that I may need to be the one who helps this person that I'm with deal with death at some point in their life...they don't need to hear me say that kind of stuff....(M23:197)

Such socializing also had to be managed carefully since there was a concern over whether one was seen to be playing favourites (F16:329; M31:176-178). For example, one man described the relationship with friends on the pastoral charge in this way:

> The friends...that we go to mostly are those who don't make a big thing of our friendship. They don't talk to others about it.... We have privacy with our friendship. (M31:178)

He went on to explain how he also tried not to mention publicly if he and his wife had invited someone to dinner, out of the concern that then they would have to extend a similar invitation to others. Attention to confidentiality, self-presentation, self-disclosure, the use of humour and favouritism keep the professional image intact and "on-line" even while participating in an apparently private interaction. While respondents did not necessarily define these moments as work, they were constantly aware of the potential for work which could emerge out of them.

The skill and authenticity with which clergy delivered the emotional performance of "friendliness" is attested to in the observations that several respondents made about how parishioners evaluated such "friendships" differently than they themselves did:

> the one couple I'm thinking of that I spend time with...they would say yeah, we're really good friends, and that kind of stuff. And they would see it being a lot more mutual than what I really think it is. (F29:129)

> ...you would disappoint some people terribly if you let

> them know how you really saw your--your work because they like to think that the minister is their friend. ... [T]hey do want to feel that this person here is relating to them as just another person--that there is no professional relationship involved. And it's painful for people to recognize that.... (M40:99, 103)

Deep acting made their performance so believable to their congregational members that it cloaked the professional relationship. Furthermore, it was a performance which was sustained and built up over time. It is not until the point where ministers change parishes, and heed the professional ethic which discourages continuing ties with former congregations, that congregational members may have to confront the reality of this performance.

NEGOTIATING FRIENDSHIPS

Some individuals did state that they had developed friendships with congregational members. However, in these cases, individuals usually recognized that the fact that they were also minister to these individuals gave a different quality to the friendships. One woman, who had moved across the country to settle in a pastoral charge, said that she and her husband had made friends with parishioners and socialized privately with them because they did not know anyone else in the area (F6:262-266). While she stated that she felt that she could be herself with these congregational friends, she also admitted that questions of faith were far more likely to arise in conversations with them than in conversations with friends she had known before she had become a minister. Most

notably, she felt there was "more of a feeling of responsibility" for what she said. A male respondent remarked that he had friends in the congregation but also recognized that his role as minister made the friendship different since "nobody else gets to conduct their funeral" and he could "go places with them" in emotional terms that other people could not in the same amount of time (M33:369, 374). For individuals such as these, the distinction between "emotional labour"--the emotional management done as part of the job--and "emotion work"--the emotional management done in private life (Hochschild, 1983: 7n; 1990:118)--is blurred. Minister and friend become difficult to demarcate as public and private roles.

Most respondents who had friends among their congregational members acknowledged that they were breaking professional "feeling rules" (Hochschild, 1983:118-119) by doing so. Those who stated that they had friends among their parishioners, also acknowledged "you're not supposed to" (F32:239-253), or that "there would be people within the United Church who would say my boundaries aren't strong enough" (M39:264), or that such friendships "compromised" them professionally (F7:258-259). However, the ideal of professional distance was not always easy to maintain. It becomes more difficult to retain a separation of work and personal roles and emotional distance the longer one lives in an area (F10:249-250; F12:232). The relative isolation of

some pastoral charges also meant that it was necessary to cultivate friendships for the sake of one's psychological well-being. One man acknowledged that while "you have to be careful about that professional-friendship line" he also stated:

> I know that line's there, but you can't isolate yourself. You simply can't. That's the worst of the evil--those two possible evils, for lack of a better word. The isolation is worse. It makes you lonely, it makes you unloved, makes you feel that you can't be part of the community or part of people's lives. And I think that's worse than taking that risk. If you understand the boundaries, and you don't abuse them, I think friendships are possible. (M35:207)

Several respondents explained that they were able to successfully negotiate friendships only if the other person agreed that by choosing to be friends, they could no longer be the person's minister. A few clergy spoke of situations where they had not done this, and then found themselves in a compromised professional position at a later date. For example, one respondent spoke of how a friend had separated from her husband, who was also a parishioner (F7:231-232). This meant my respondent felt compromised because she was faced with the dilemma of how to support both her friend and her friend's husband. As a friend, she supported the decision to separate, but as the minister she felt as though she should counsel them to try to reconcile. My respondent also realized that the community knew of the friendship, but would expect her to act as the minister in this situation.

Other individuals spoke of trying to form friendships

among those in the community who were outside of their realm of care or who were themselves professional people within the community. For example, individuals formed friendships with other clergy or with individuals actively involved with a church of another denomination[1]; in both of these situations, the respondents could assume that they would never be required to be pastorally responsible for their friends. Other professionals, such as local undertakers or doctors, were also likely candidates for friendships because they, too, had jobs which required them to always be on the job in public gatherings, and to keep confidences.

One man suggested it was easier to be friends with individuals after one left the pastoral charge, because once the professional relationship is finished then "the barriers are down" (M26:185). Others cautioned that maintaining friendships after leaving a charge was possible only if one could be clear that friendship could in no way include professional duties, like returning to conduct a wedding or a funeral. This would be professionally unethical since it would be an encroachment on the duties of their successor.

Many of my respondents (8 women and 8 men) pointed out that limits on intimacy and friendship were also partly the result of parishioners' attitudes. Two individuals mentioned

---

[1] For many respondents, this was not an option, however. They were either the only clergy person in town (and thus also potentially minister to anyone in the community) or distance made it difficult to get together with colleagues.

how their relatively transient existence in the life of the community made it difficult for others to commit to friendships with them (F13:147-154; M24:15-197). More important however were the various reasons why parishioners kept their distance because of what the ministerial role represented--i.e. the aspects of life that were fearful or overwhelming. As one man put it:

> ...because I deal with the biggies of life, and particularly death, um, I'm almost in the same category as the funeral director....People keep a respectful distance.... (M20:240-244)

In addition, clergy stated that they felt parishioners expected them to behave differently from ordinary people, following a higher moral code. Consequently clergy sometimes found themselves excluded from certain social occasions where there was a lot of drinking, or felt that people were uneasy with relaxing or swearing in their presence.

Furthermore, role salience may limit the development of friendships, even when they are desired. Being the minister creates certain expectations in others. One informant poignantly describes an attempt to make friends which reverted to a work-like situation:

> I remember the first time we went out socially with another couple. And we didn't know them really well. And I was asking them about, you know, about how long they'd been here and just where they grew up--just those kinds of things--just to get to know them better.... BUT they never reciprocated the questions. And then I felt really put in my role as a minister, doing all--you know, doing all of the--the drawing out. And that's fine when I--when I view myself in my ministerial role,.... [but] in a social setting, then it--to me it needs to be give and take....I was a little hurt by that.... (F8:233)

Role salience undercut any reciprocity in this encounter and turned a social outing into something more like work. This was not the choice of my respondent but rather the result of the approach taken by the lay person involved.

Workplace friendships are common in most occupations. Clergy, however, must negotiate friendships in the context of feeling rules related to the profession and particular expectations on the part of congregational members. In addition, rural clergy must do so in situations where they may be isolated in time and space from either colleagues or friends outside of the church, to whom they have no professional responsibility. It is not always easy to maintain the delicate balance between their human need for companionship with the maintenance of their professional image. This is another way in which ministry becomes an emotionally "dangerous" occupation (M39:346).

EMOTIONAL CONTROL AS A GENDERED ATTRIBUTE

Davies (1996) argues that both bureaucracy and profession are based on "the social organization of work that valorizes the masculine" which includes "organizational forms that are controlled and controlling" and a model of "interpersonal relations that are distant and emotionally detached" (672). She gives the example of how doctors deal with emotions in a controlled way; the proper bedside manner shows the "right amount of concern" but does not permit the doctor to become

overly involved with the patient (670). Clergy accounts described above certainly reveal underlying professional norms about control over one's own feelings and the "right amount" of involvement with parishioners. But to what extent is it appropriate to argue that the work of clergy is defined in masculinized terms?

Acker asserts that an organization or any analytical unit is gendered when "advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity, are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine" (1990:146). Historically, ministry has been a masculine profession both in terms of who was in the occupation and also in terms of how it was constituted organizationally. Male ministers embodied the masculinity of Christ and of his disciples. One might argue that emotional control has been part of the constitutive masculinity of the profession. It has served to give the impression of clergy standing "nearer to God" than lay people by allowing them to appear less overwhelmed by the mysteries of life and more cognizant of them. Constraining friendships and limiting self-exposure helped to maintain a professional aura. In this light, practising emotional control reproduced the masculinity of the profession, and maintaining emotional distance helped to reproduce a hierarchical relationship with lay people.

However, such an explanation seems too simplistic in the

light of my data. It is difficult to argue how the clergy I interviewed exercise exploitation and control over laity. Descriptions of pastoral care seem to join action and emotion rather than differentiating them; attending to people's emotions is an important part of _doing_ one's work. The distinction between being friendly and being friends may be evidence of feeling rules which prevent clergy from entering a non-professional domain and occupying the same social plane as lay people, but this may reflect something other than a masculinized strategy of dominance.

Pierce (1995:71-82) outlines how lawyers use "strategic friendliness" to win over and dominate others. Although clergy are far from Pierce's "rambo lawyers", they too use "strategic friendliness" in order to make their work easier:

> If I go to visit with somebody, that's work for me. I'm there in a professional capacity. I'm there as their pastor. If they see me as their friend, that's even better, because that enhances my ability to minister to them. They'll trust me even further.... (F9:300)

However, clergy's strategic friendliness is of a significantly different style. Lawyers use "strategic friendliness" to manipulate a witness or a jury or to woo and win clients, thereby "doing dominance" and reproducing masculinized power relations. In contrast, clergy's use of professional friendliness is more benevolent; this investment of energy makes their work easier by facilitating later encounters around crises or concerns--and, in that sense, extending their control over their work--but it also benefits parishioners by

helping them to relax in those situations. Therefore in the case of my respondents, strategic friendliness is instrumental to the more "feminine" work of nurturing, rather than "doing dominance" and subordinating the parishioner. In this regard, clergy are similar to the female volunteers described by Daniels (1985) who use their friendliness in their sociability work.

The apparently feminine quality of clergy work can also be explained by recent historical trends in Protestantism which serve to minimize the hierarchical nature of the relationship between clergy and parishioners. Kleinman (1984a) outlines how ministerial work has been changed by modernity. As the transcendent has become less important in people's lives, ministers largely have lost their impersonal basis of authority as mediators of the divine (Kleinman, 1984a:10). Responding to this threat of deprofessionalization, ministers have become counsellors dealing with people's personal problems rather than arbitrators of spiritual and transcendent concerns. Furthermore, modernity has led to a valuing of relations that are interpersonally oriented over those which are structurally and institutionally prescribed. In response, the church has opted for a humanistic ideology that calls for personalized and egalitarian relations rather than traditional hierarchical ones. Clergy consequently "learn to establish rapport with clients, to 'affirm' rather than judge them" and to establish an egalitarian relationship with them by

revealing parts of their personal selves ((Kleinman, 1984a:11, 24-25). Thus culturally masculine features such as emotional distance and detachment are no longer the only images which define the professional work of clergy.

EMOTIONAL LABOUR AND GENDERED WORKERS

None of my respondents, either male or female, doubted that the work of emotional caregiving and nurturing was an important part of ministry. There is no strongly marked difference in my data in women's and men's description of their work. Their work styles and priorities were similar. Both described strategies used to develop relationships informally, the importance of "being there" for people, and of listening. Both women and men seemed to counter a masculinist interpretation of the relation between emotional caregiving and work. However, among my respondents there was a strong tendency to ascribe to women a greater ability to attend to the emotions of others and to nurture people.

Seventeen of the women and four of the men clearly stated that they felt women were more in tune with emotions than were men or that women were better able to nurture others than men. Women were described as better at "sensing moods" (F6:373), "more intuitive" about emotions (F11:395-97), more likely to provide a "sympathetic ear" (M35:272), and "naturally" able to provide the "glue" which strengthens relationships (M38:328). However, individuals varied in terms of how they delineated

the reason for this. Some described emotional caregiving and nurturing as something which women did naturally. Others attributed it to skills learned through female socialization and the experience of mothering. Yet others expressed the opinion that women were better able to do it, simply because people expected it more readily from a woman rather than a man. It is of note that it is women themselves, more than men, who highlight women's emotional acuity.

A smaller number of respondents also stressed that there could be exceptions; they could name cases where men were more attuned to emotions than were women. They pointed out that men are capable of attending to emotions as well as women, if they bothered to learn to do so. One woman mentioned that she thought in counselling situations men were able to attend to emotions very well since "they really focus on it. But when their task is something else, then they're focused on the task and the emotional stuff just kind of lays [sic] underneath and gets...[ignored]" (F1:328). A male respondent considered it to be "a tremendous gift to be a male in a situation where you have to work hard at being nurturing" (M39:313); but his remarks also point out how unusual a situation it was for men to be in. More often, dealing with emotions placed men in an anomalous situation, as this male respondent described:

> I jokingly say that somehow I'm considered by men
> to be sexless.... I had a baptismal class with a
> couple of families and we were in their home. And
> when the class was over the men sort of went into
> the kitchen and--sort of left me there with the
> women folk. [F]or the young women I'm still male,

> but for the men--they're not quite sure what to do
> with the minister because we deal with all of those
> things they're not too thrilled to talk about and
> deal with. You know, their emotions, feelings, of
> relationships....(M20:291)

This man's comments highlight how even though the emotional
and relational are part of the professional work of clergy,
this association exists in tension with the way such work is
usually gendered.

Respondents also emphasized that female clergy had
greater freedom in how they expressed caring than did men.
Specifically, women had more freedom to use physical touch to
express support and emotions. This is because media attention
in recent years to the sexual abuse of clients by men within
the helping professions has served to make men's use of touch
highly suspect. Almost half the men expressed concern over
managing their interactions with parishioners in such a way as
not to be perceived as sexual aggressors. This included being
careful not to touch or hug someone as well as making sure
that they were careful to never see female parishioners alone
in their homes or even in the church office. In contrast,
women's ability to provide pastoral care was not complicated
to the same extent by these considerations:

> [People will]...let you nurture them, where they might
> not let a man do that. Even men will let you nurture
> them, you know. So there's--and they don't look at it as
> sexual harassment either, immediately. I lay my hand on
> the man's arm as he's going out the door, and he doesn't
> think I'm getting fresh. Like, you know, he accepts that
> as caring. Now if a woman sees a--a male clergy do that
> to a woman, I don't think he could get away with a lot of
> things that I find quite comfortable to do--patting
> somebody's shoulder, touching somebody's--I'm freer to do

that as a woman than, I think, a man is. (F9:486)

Although women's use of touch may not be sexualized in the same way as men's, it is also partly due to the fact their caring is gendered in another way. They are more likely than men to be seen as natural nurturers; touch is not problematic because it is something a mother would do. Whereas this linking of women and mothering is usually a detriment to women's success in other jobs, in this case, it seems to work to their advantage. It allows them to do a significant part of their job more easily and in a broader range of venues than men.

Nevertheless, the predominant rhetoric which stresses women's skill in the nurturing work of ministry produces a double-bind for women. On one hand, it serves to value the skills which women bring to their professional work; some individuals stated that they thought this made women better ministers than men. On the other hand, it also serves to link emotional caregiving with femaleness and mothering and with the domain of non-work. Acker (1990:147) argues that one of the processes that gender an organization or other analytical unit is "the construction of symbols and images that explain, express, reinforce, or sometimes oppose" divisions along the lines of gender. While clergy's use of emotional control, strategic friendliness, and professional distance may not be as clearly linked with cultural notions of masculinity as they are in other professions, the image of women as more able

emotional caregivers than men reproduces notions of gendered work within the profession. The result, as one man pointed out, is that "men are allowed to do less pastoral work" by congregations and "there'd be more expected of [a woman] pastorally" (M40:173).

Descriptions of women as more able emotional caregivers, did little to guarantee that they were seen by congregations as more able ministers overall. Although the ministerial role was ubiquitous for both women and men, the data suggests its salience was nevertheless mediated by gender. Three quarters of my male respondents suggested that it was still easier for them to be seen as the minister in the community than it was for their female colleagues. This included men who had female predecessors in the communities which they presently served. Being male meant they fit the stereotype of how a minister should look, were more readily given authority, faced less criticism, and had doors opened more easily for them in the community. Being the minister was easier for men because of their maleness. Femaleness enabled women to do ministry, but mainly because they were associated with the non-professional role of care-giving. The literature suggests that because men better fit the stereotype of professional or managerial workers than do women, it is easier for men to legitimate what they do as real work (Sheppard, 1992:160). In the case of rural clergy, it is not necessarily those within the profession who are devaluing the care-giving role; in previous

chapters, I have already demonstrated the importance clergy attach to the work of pastoral care. Rather for clergy, it is their clientele, who reinforce the maleness of the profession by attributing male ministers with authority and status that they do not extend to women, and downplaying the importance of emotional care-giving as skilled work.

CONCLUSION

Pastoral care and nurturing relationships are defined as part of the work of ministry. Thus attention to the emotional and relational are clearly seen as real work by the clergy I interviewed. Clergy recognized emotional labour as hard work, to be performed within a variety of professional constraints. In addition to attending to the emotions of others, clergy were called upon to control their own emotions, most notably in terms of maintaining an appropriate emotional distance from parishioners. Relationships were nurtured but within a professional framework. Clergy worked at being friendly without actually being friends. In most cases, the salience of the ministerial role circumscribed relationships, framing them in terms of work, and leaving little social space for such relationships to shift entirely into the private, non-work realm. Thus work becomes defined by emotional boundaries more than by activity or place.

Notions of professional distance and emotional control serve typically to construct professional work as objective

and impersonal and thus culturally masculine. This may be true to some extent in the case of the clergy. They must neither show favouritism in their friendliness nor allow personal feelings to interfere with the performance of professional duties. However, objectivity and impartiality are located in a context of personableness; being friendly is part of their work. In my respondents' accounts, maintaining professional distance and emotional control were linked with doing a good job emotionally--but doing a good job emotionally was also linked to the work of nurturing, which is typically seen as feminine. Professional distance and emotional control in ministry do not seem to be aimed at creating a relationship of dominance with clientele. In this case, the emotional labour involved is similar in kind to that of a mother who controls her own emotions in order to better care for a child.[2] Strategic friendliness made the work of respondents easier, and in that sense gave them greater control over their work. Indeed, when the emotional boundaries that define professional work were compromised, crises were often the result. However, it would be wrong to say that strategic friendliness allowed respondents to exercise control over lay people in a hierarchical, that is conventionally masculinized, fashion. Ministry may represent a case where professional

---

[2] For example, remaining patient rather than giving into anger when a child is misbehaving is such a form of emotional control. Or another example would be not showing favouritism despite liking one child more than another.

work is gendered rather differently from the image that the literature suggests is true for many other professions. I will return to this theme in my concluding chapter.

Even while emotional caregiving is clearly defined as professional work by the clergy, and appears to be performed equally by women and men, it is also gendered through a rhetoric which asserts that women are more able emotional caregivers. This discourse, however, does not ensure that women are seen as more able ministers by parishioners. Men still fit more easily the stereotype of the minister in the eyes of parishioners. Women's competence in the relational and emotional domain is linked to the non-professional feminine role of mother and thus down-played within the professional context.

This chapter has demonstrated how the relational and emotional fall within the professional domain for ministers, rather than being marginalized or excluded from definitions of real work. In addition, I have shown how emotional boundaries serve to set professional work apart from non-work and limit the ambiguity within ministry. The following chapter turns to look at how clergy negotiate ambiguity between public and private life in terms of family relationships, time off, and the use of their home for work.

Chapter 7

NEGOTIATING THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

A masculine model of work rests on the separation of work and home, of public and private. Real work is what men do in the public domain. By implication, what is done in private--what women do, including caring for families--is not work. The reproduction of this division has served to culturally define professional and other paid activity as real work, and reinforce its masculinity. Feminist writers, however, have demonstrated that the organization of paid work at all class levels is dependent on the organization of work in the domestic realm (Glucksmann, 1990; Seron and Ferris, 1995; Wajcman, 1998:132-157). One cannot understand one without the other. Thus any consideration of how a group defines work must involve a discussion of how they negotiate the interface between these spheres, and the extent to which they create boundaries or manage linkages.

Accordingly, in this chapter I shall examine how my respondents negotiated this boundary between public and private and the extent to which they have reproduced it. I demonstrate some of the ways that conventional assumptions about the division of the realm of public and private, and by extension, work and non-work, do not apply to rural clergy. First, I consider how clergy face difficulties in construing the home as private space, both because of the location of

offices in the home environment and because of the intrusive presence of the phone. Second, I consider the extent to which wives, husbands and children are embedded in the work world of clergy, rather than separate from it. Finally, I look at some of the strategies clergy use to "work at" making space for family and private time. This includes the way that spouses monitor the limits of work, the way children are used as an "excuse" to limit work, and the need to "escape" the pastoral charge to ensure time off. In each of these areas I consider how managing linkages between the spheres has varying impacts on women and men. More broadly I argue that clergy's attempts to separate the two does not necessarily imply a reproduction of the masculine character of the profession. Indeed, the extent to which they succeed at separation may represent an act of resistance to the traditional ways in which ministry has commandeered the private realm, and an important step towards valuing both professional and domestic work.

SEPARATING HOME AND WORK: MANSES, OFFICES, AND PRIVATE SPACE

Traditionally clergy have lived in manses which were church property rather than privately owned homes. Furthermore, the minister's office was frequently located in the manse rather than in the church. Such a design reflected aspects of both ideology and economy. Having one's office in one's home suited the notion that the minister should always be available and that there could be no separation of

religious vocation from the rest of life. In addition, it was more economical to situate the office in the manse which would have to be heated anyway than in the church which might not otherwise be in use during the week. The result of this arrangement was that the manse was not a private home but a semi-public building. The minister's office was also the office for all church business, and it was not uncommon for the manse to be the site for meetings and, as one of my informants pointed out, even baptisms or weddings (M2:227). Although housing arrangements for many clergy have changed in recent years, with a trend towards paying ministers a housing allowance rather than providing a manse, many still live with the consequences of these historic arrangements. Among the clergy I interviewed, thirty lived in manses (fifteen women and fifteen men); this included three women who lived in the manse part-time and commuted to a second private residence on their day off. In addition, six lived in their own homes or private rental accommodation on the charge, and four commuted from their own homes off of the charge.

The historic legacy of manses being sites of professional work meant that those respondents who lived on the pastoral charge and who worked out of home offices had few problems legitimating this as "real work". In defining what is work, it seems that clergy are less constrained by the physical location of an activity, and its relative publicness or privateness in or out of the home, than are those in many

other occupations. For example, in discussing the work of home-based consultants and teleworkers, both Christensen (1988:162) and Mirchandani, (1999:102-104) have suggested that when professional work is done in the home it is suspect as "real" work. The only group among my respondents who did have difficulty in legitimating time at home as work-time were those clergy who lived off the charge, and worked partly from a home office. For example:

> ...I could spend 14 hours in front of the computer and they would think that I was writing personal letters. You know? I just don't think they have any understanding. But if my car were in a drive way in that community, or if my car were in front of the church then they could say I was working. (F14:258)

> ...I have to remind people that there are times when they may expect me to be here [in the church office] but I'm actually at home at the computer doing church work. And they can get me at my home number because I do the church bulletin on my computer at home.... So I, you know, remind them that--that because I'm not here doesn't mean that I'm not working. That I--my computer's at home and that's where I do a lot of the work. (M38:376)

Both of these individuals commuted to work from off the charge, and neither had access to a computer in the church office. While they themselves had no difficulty in defining time spent in their home offices as work, they did have a harder time legitimating it to their congregations than if they were present on the pastoral charge. This fits with the accounts of other informants who both lived and worked on the pastoral charge but who had difficulty in convincing their congregations that time spent off the charge at meetings of wider church courts was a part of their paid work. Thus

defining work became a more of a problem for clergy if it was performed outside the pastoral community; if work was done within the territory of the pastoral charge, even if it was in the home, its legitimacy was less likely to be doubted.

The most common working arrangement for respondents was to have an office in their homes, whether that was the manse or a privately owned home. Twenty-four individuals (thirteen women and eleven men) had office space only in their homes. In contrast, ten informants (including four women) had office space only in the church, while six (including three women) maintained offices in both[1]. These arrangements were not always by choice; some individuals had no other option but to work out of their homes since no suitable space was available in the church building. Among the group who had offices in both places the tendency was to do worship and sermon preparation from home, and sometimes correspondence, while using the church office for counselling and meeting with parishioners. In part, this was because they often worked on their own personal computers which they preferred to keep at home (many churches lacked such equipment). More importantly, it also reflected my respondents' concern for the intrusion of outsiders into family or private space. Many individuals who only had offices in their homes also tried to avoid meeting

---

[1]   Of the thirty individuals who lived in manses, twenty-one had their offices located in the manse. Ten of these were women. Four respondents had offices in both the church and the manse and five had office space located only in the church.

parishioners there for the same reasons. For example, one man refused to meet parishioners in the office in the manse, taking them to the church if they needed to talk:

> ...the family needs a home and a house that's sort of their own. And I'd feel terrible about tracking people through the living room, and up to the office and that sort of thing, when--when the kids have got friends over or when there's television on and people are just trying to relax in their housecoats or whatever. (M15:146)

Among married individuals (including those with and without children) eight men and eight women mentioned concern over how working in the home affected family members. However, this represents almost two-thirds of the thirteen married women but less than half of the eighteen married men. Not surprisingly, women seemed to be more concerned about the impact of their physical working arrangements on others in their personal lives than were men. For some this concern led them to move the church office out of the manse, with varying reactions from parishioners. For example, two women refused to use the existing office space in the manse and had insisted that renovations be done to relocate the office in the church or to construct a separate entrance for the office in order to allow their families more privacy. The evidence in my data of women's greater concern for the impact of working arrangements on their families echoes studies that suggest that women are more likely than men to be the ones who attend to issues concerned with balancing employment and family life (Daune-Richard, 1988, Seron and Ferris, 1995, Wajcman, 1998). In this case, the work of articulation (Daune-Richard, 1988:262)

is concerned with creating space for both family and employment as well as coordinating the demands of each. In contrast to the women, men were more likely to talk about the need for a separation of home and work from the perspective of their own psychological well-being and their need for some relief from the obligations of work.[2]

The protection of a private space separate from work was a concern for single people as well, and particularly women. One woman illustrated this when she talked about the tension between having the pastoral charge office in the manse and her need for a "safe space" where "you're free to be yourself and not--not meet all the expectations that come with your role as a professional" (F12:120, 124). Other single women pointed to the concern over their personal safety in counselling situations (F7:100; F13:323; F14:319-321; F19:304); it was more comfortable for them to have a public place to meet men for counselling.[3]

For rural clergy, often it seemed more problematic to define home as a private space, free from professional work, than it was for them to legitimate professional activity performed in the home as real work. Although many of my

---

[2] Some men were exceptions to this pattern, such as the one (M15) cited at the end of the previous paragraph.

[3] While empty church buildings were also somewhat problematic in regards to women feeling safe while meeting someone for counselling, at the church it was easier to arrange to meet while there was something else going on, or to make sure that someone else was in the building at the same time (F7:100; F14:320).

respondents did not find the congregation overly intrusive, they also usually acknowledged that the battle to separate home and work had been fought by their predecessors, thus still drawing attention to the unusually problematic nature of this divide. However, a quarter of my respondents still struggled with this issue. Some talked about the importance of working to establish clear boundaries when one first arrived on the charge; one had to be "adamant" (F7:100) or "very firm" (M39:191) about fixing these boundaries, and attempts at separating home and work spaces was seen as a "radical departure from tradition" (M2:219) which "surprised" congregations   (F16:229,306).   Furthermore,   sometimes congregational members were not pleased when they were not invited into the manse (M35:306), and such strategies could lead to the minister being seen as "cold" (M39:191). In addition, respondents who lived in manses had to negotiate access to the manse with the church committee which was responsible for its maintenance.[4] Individuals in this situation, faced the uncomfortable situation of knowing that others had keys to their home and, in the worst cases, sometimes entered unannounced (F13:323; F29:164; F37:170;

---

[4] Within the United Church system, the manse is legally the property of the wider church, as opposed to the congregation or the minister. Congregations, on behalf of the higher courts of the church, are responsible for the maintenance of the building and usually have committees set up to fulfil this purpose. Thus, like a landlord, congregations retain a right of access to the building for this purpose, but they may be more or less intrusive in terms of how they exercise this prerogative.

M39:191).

That the home was not in question as a site of professional work is surprising since it seems to go against the conventional norm of "real work" being located in the public domain. Yet at the same time, my data also show how the home was redefined as a "public" place due to the manse's historical and continuing negation as a site for family or personal needs alone, to the exclusion of paid work. This characteristic of clergy life, while unconventional, nevertheless hinges on the historical experience of male clergy who did not have to worry about whether the house was clean or the children out of sight in order to do their work. In short, even though this arrangement muddles the notion of the public-private divide as it is typically discussed, it still reinforces an image of the worker as "a man whose work is his life and whose wife takes care of everything else" (Acker 1992:257) and rests on a particular gendered division of labour. It creates a peculiar clergy-masculinized mode, somewhat at odds with broader cultural trends. Inasmuch as my informants were able to move professional work out of the home and establish a space for family and personal life, they were resisting this clergy-masculinized mode by challenging the way in which clergy work was historically organized with its divorce from the responsibilities of family or private life.

One aspect of working out of one's home which is surprisingly absent from the accounts given by both female and

male respondents is the need to do housework to maintain a presentable home environment for receiving parishioners. While several women mentioned how they fitted housework in around professional demands, only a very few of them linked the need to do housework with the need to do professional work in their homes. Furthermore, none of the men made this link. For example, a single woman commented:

> I don't know a single woman in ministry...who can keep up with her dishes. (Both laugh.) And I talked to a lot of single women in ministry about housework. And the expectation that, I mean, if you're a woman--I mean in rural communities there's definitely an expectation that you--you keep up the yard and the garden and the house and, you know, do canning and do--. You know, bake a pie for, you know, the whatever supper, at the same time as you're doing ministry. And, quite frankly, I can't do it. I've discovered, I cannot do all those things. And so, if people come into my house, they walk past a sink full of dirty dishes, sometimes. Or piles that I--you know, that kind of stuff.... That's part of the insecurity with people meeting in my house. Because there's all--because there's extra roles that I have to perform that I'm not performing. (F12:116-117)

The gendered expectation that they do housework well meant that women who had no choice about working in their homes also had no way of escaping or diminishing the extent to which their evaluation as women might overshadow their evaluation as ministers. That only three women mentioned the way that housework became an unwelcome extension of their professional work was surprising given that twelve women had offices only in their homes and that all women were at risk of facing this threat of being seen in other than professional terms. The silence of these women on this topic might be explained by the presence of hired household help. Although I did not

directly ask my respondents if they employed cleaners, only one respondent stated that she did, while three others clearly talked about doing their own housework. However, various comments made by my informants suggest that this was unlikely to be an option for many; one respondent expressed concerns about finding someone unconnected to the congregation (F5:242), and others suggested that hiring domestic help was not seen as a socially acceptable solution within their communities (F12:117; F32:213). These respondents, taken together with the ones who did note how housework became an extension of their job, still only account for seven out of the twelve women who worked entirely from home offices. That men were silent on this matter is less surprising since research shows how housework remains primarily women's responsibility even when they are working for pay (Demo and Acock, 1993; Statistics Canada, 1994). Furthermore, doing professional work within the home did not challenge men's status as professional workers. The location of the home as a work site for ministers became problematic for women in a way that it did not for men because of women's cultural association with the domestic sphere.

BEING ON CALL: THE INTRUSIVE PHONE

The obligation to be available for people meant that clergy were always "on call". Regardless of how much one tried to avoid using one's home for work, the fact remained

that for all of my respondents the phone meant frequent intrusions into their private space and time. This was true even for those who lived in private homes rather than manses, and who lived off the charge as well as on it. It was likely the most irksome aspect of ministry for my respondents:

> And I guess if I had any complaints--and I don't have many--but I feel other professions such as a doctor who will occasionally get a weekend off or evenings off. And someone else is on call for that physician so he can be away. And ministry is not--you're always on call, unless you're away on a course with another clergy filling in for you or on vacation. So when I get home at night the phone can ring, or, for example, this morning, it rang at 7:15 this morning--um, Sunday evenings--any time--supper time. (F30:191)

It is worth noting that this respondent lived in her own home, off the charge, and faced such interruptions even though she actually lived outside the fishbowl of small town life. The phone meant that it was extremely difficult to define when one was <u>not</u> working.

Within rural areas, the problem of being on call may not be unique to clergy. One woman suggested that her position was no different from that of the school secretary who might receive phone calls at home on the weekend from parents because their child had forgotten some needed item at school (F10:176). This same woman also pointed out that local tradespeople such as plumbers might also be "on call" at odd hours. The only thing which may be unique for clergy is the frequency of the calls during hours which would be outside of regular working hours for most other workers.

For more than half my informants, the only phone for

church business was the phone which was in their homes.[5] In other cases, while there could be a phone in the church, it was primarily clergy's home number which was used for church business. For example, while I was contacting individuals for interviews it was common to phone a church number only to get a recorded message that provided the home phone number for the minister. Even for those individuals who maintained an office outside of their home, the phone meant that work could not be entirely separated from the home environment. The fact that only a handful of my respondents had secretarial support meant that there was no one else to field phone calls or take messages. Most individuals did this themselves with the help of an answering machine and sometimes their families.

Because one could not be sure when the phone would ring, work was difficult to control. Some clergy tried to set limits around when people should call, but only with limited success. To some extent, rural communities imposed some of their own limits due to the nature of farm work; since farm chores meant many people started their working day very early, phone calls were less likely late in the evening as compared to urban ministry, but more likely early in the morning. It was not uncommon for the phone to ring at meal times, because of the assumption that the minister would most likely be at home at that time. Thus suppertime, which for most other

---

[5] In a few cases this was true even when the minister lived in a private home rather than the manse.

people could be assumed to be family time, often was interrupted by professional work. This was most difficult for my female respondents with young children who might be involved with meal preparation or feeding young children. Phone interruptions came from other ministers as well as from parishioners. One individual complained that colleagues were perhaps worse offenders than his congregation for calling on his day off or late at night, when he assumed his work had finished.

My respondents employed various strategies to balance being on call with private or family time, with varying degrees of success. No one was entirely successful in completely blocking the intrusiveness of the phone, and thus entirely creating a time and space that was free from professional work. Although many individuals mentioned having answering machines, they also drew attention to the limited way this protected their time and space:

> ...I have an answering machine, but you're very reluctant, or at least, I'm very reluctant...to let the tape pick up calls. Unless I'm in the bathtub or something like that. Simply because people have this-- although people are getting more used to answering machines, they still--there are a lot of older people who don't want to talk to the answering machine. (F7:122)

> ...people haven't always learned about answering machines, and using them. But, um--because I have an answering machine at--at the church in my office. So they'll phone at home and--and so that sort of takes you away from whatever you're doing at home. (M24:156)

Both their own reluctance to let the machine take the call, and the congregation's reluctance to leave messages meant that

answering machines helped in only a minimal way to protect their time off. A few did let the machine take the call, and then screened the calls at various points during their day off, making decisions about whether any calls had to be returned immediately. A few others had a separate line installed for personal calls, with an unlisted number. Both a male and a female respondent spoke about how they let their spouses answer the phone and screen calls when they had time off. Despite these strategies, clergy had great difficulty in limiting the accessibility which the phone facilitated. Technology did more to confound the balance between professional and domestic obligations than it did to enhance it.

THE UNPRIVATE FAMILY: INCORPORATING SPOUSES AND CHILDREN

For rural clergy, negotiating the boundary between public and private is far more complex than simply making decisions about whether or not to use their home as a work space. Professional work cannot be differentiated so easily from the private sphere because of the involvement of ministers' spouses and children in church groups and events. Janet Finch identified the "two person career"--the incorporation of wives unpaid work as an extension of their husband's career--as a facet of clergy work in her 1983 book, Married to the Job. However, in that book she only examined the contribution of wives work to their husband's careers. This section extends

the consideration of the two person career by comparing the role of husbands and wives in relation to the work of clergy. I also consider the way children are a presence in the domain of professional work.

Wives

The list of wives' involvements in the life of the congregation is extensive. For example, the eighteen married male informants talked about their wives being involved in the church choir or giving other leadership in worship, teaching Sunday school or leading youth groups, serving on church committees or being involved in other community groups, being part of the United Church Women[6], and baking for, or entertaining groups of parishioners. Among these, there were six men whose wives had taken on a major leadership role within the congregation such as choir director, head of the Sunday School or committee chairperson. The only wives who were not involved in some way were those who did not live on their husband's pastoral charge. However, even among these three women, one attended church regularly with her husband and all had been involved in some regular way on previous pastoral charges.

---

[6] The United Church Women, or "UCW" as it is commonly referred to, is an organized denomination-wide women's group, with units in most congregations. The UCW meets regularly for Bible study, fellowship, to organize fund-raising and charitable events, and to perform "auxiliary" functions for the congregation, in the same way a women's auxiliary might for a hospital.

Significantly, six male respondents also talked about the work their wives did in nurturing relationships, whether through visiting or more generally being attentive to people's feelings. For example, one male respondent stated,

> We do ministry together. Because [my wife's] a wonderful organizer...[and] she's also very in tune at times about people, maybe saying something or there's an underlying remark that she'll catch or I won't. (M25:200)

In most cases, the men I spoke with gave their wives credit for how this informal work extended their ministry. In one case, however, one older respondent more fully appropriated his wife's work into his own:

> My wife is very good at mingling with people and chatting with people and entertaining people and--. And I can bring anybody into my house and make them feel comfortable. (M34:155)

While he acknowledges the sociability work (Daniels, 1985) of hostessing which is performed by his wife, there is an implication that it is his effort which makes people feel comfortable. More common, however, were statements from men who acknowledged their wives contributions, such as "[my wife] is half my ministry" (M31:155) and "I score big points with the congregation when they see [my wife] involved" (M35:238).

Male respondents described various levels of congregational expectations for their wives involvement, which made it more or less easy for wives themselves to define their relationship to their husband's work. These ranged from claiming that the congregation had absolutely no expectations (M33:262, M20:223; M23:267) to the story one informant told of

how his wife had automatically been slated for various leadership positions within the church's women's group, prior to their move to the pastoral charge (M2:302-310). In general, however, their accounts seem to suggest that congregational expectations are lessening to some extent with regard to wives' involvement. This was especially true if the previous minister had been a woman; if wives had full-time or part-time paid employment; and where congregations were comprised of younger members who were more likely to be in dual earner households themselves.

My male respondents also spoke of the various ways their wives responded to these expectations. While wives of several older respondents opted into the conventional role, many of the other wives did not. For example, six men told stories of how their wives consciously fought against the stereotype by not becoming involved in congregational women's groups. However, this did not preclude them from being involved in other ways, such as with committees or in choirs. One male respondent stated that part of his wife's strategy to resist congregational expectations was to very quickly become involved in things which were of her choosing:

> because of that, I think the expectations are sort of gone. Maybe they'd like her to join this group or that group but--but someone else on that committee will say, "well she's already doing this and this and this, so let's just leave it at that!" (M15:269)

What is interesting is how a rhetoric of choice about wives' involvement surfaces in at least half of the accounts

offered by male respondents who were married. Emphasizing how one's wife has "participated on her own terms" (M33:269) is a way of stressing how stereotypes have been resisted. A rhetoric of "choice" also appears to differentiate wives' work in the congregation from the professional work of their husbands, which, as I have already demonstrated, is frequently defined in terms of obligation. But when one examines these descriptions closely even where the wife's involvement is described as "her choice" there seems to be little question that the wife will be involved in one way or another. In other words, choice rarely extends to non-participation. By focusing on the choice that their wives exercise rather than on the obligation to participate, these men's descriptions obscure the way the wives' volunteer work extends their own professional work. One man was more forthright in his evaluation that minister's spouses "have to be part of it in order for it to really work, I think. Otherwise, I think it must be very difficult either for the couple or the community" (M25:87).

Husbands

The involvement of husbands varied more than did that of wives. Ten of the thirteen married women had husbands who were involved to some extent, including two women whose husbands commuted to the pastoral charge for the weekends[7].

---

[7] The other commuting husband was not very involved.

Husbands were involved with church maintenance, setting up for activities or tasks which required heavy lifting, participating in regular committees or groups such as the choir or teaching Sunday school, attending Sunday worship and in one exceptional case, doing secretarial work for the wife and occasionally volunteering food for pot-luck meals. While some of these tasks reflect masculinized volunteer work--for example, building maintenance tasks or heavy lifting--not all of them do. In fact, some activities are of the same type which minister's wives have traditionally taken on, such as singing in the choir or teaching Sunday School. Only three women of the thirteen women who were married spoke of their husbands being involved minimally or not at all in congregational life. However these included two husbands who lived on the pastoral charge.

The involvement of husbands differed in some very significant ways from that of wives. As I have just noted, husbands did not necessarily become involved even if they lived on the charge; this is in stark contrast to the wives of male respondents who were always involved if they were on the charge. The attentiveness to building relationships and to others' emotions which figured in men's accounts of their wives involvement did not figure in female respondents' descriptions of the roles their husbands performed. And perhaps most significantly, husbands tended to participate in ways which were more ad hoc and required less long-term

commitment than wives. This last difference was partly due to the lower expectations that congregations had of husbands' involvement. This comes out in one woman's response when she was asked whether there were expectations about her husband's involvement:

> "Not in the same way as there is for female spouses. I think they are very appreciative when he helps but it's not the same type of, uh--like he doesn't have to be president of the UCW, chairperson of the Bible study, and things like that. ...[M]aybe the expectations are a little different. It's great when he helps out with the--the building or the electrical. He'll be called when the fuse blows--things like that. (F6:235)

Notably congregations did not expect husbands to take on specific leadership roles--such as choir leader or chairperson of the Bible study--which have typically been assigned to minister's wives. This freedom from set expectations and long term volunteer commitments shows in descriptions such as "he's sort of an ad hoc available young guy" (F19:244) and there are no clear expectations "beyond just being" (F17:190). Husbands appeared to have far more real choice about their involvements than that which was attributed to wives.

These data suggest that wives of clergy are more intensely involved with their spouses' professional work than are husbands. In reference to defining work, this means in practice that it may be more difficult for my male informants than my female ones to disconnect professional work from family relationships, even if many men contrast their wives' volunteer work with the obligation of their professional work through a rhetoric of choice. At the same time--and not

surprisingly--male clergy seem more likely than female clergy to benefit from the adjunct work of spouses, particularly the work of processing emotions and nurturing relationships which wives appear more likely to do than husbands. The way in which spouses are embedded in their professional lives means that the family as a private unit is not a reality for either women or men. However, spousal involvement extends professional ministry to different degrees for female and male clergy.

Children

Children, as well as spouses, were part of the work worlds of most of the married clergy I interviewed. At the level of involvements, children attended Sunday School and helped with other church activities. Two individuals even mentioned how their adult children helped to lead worship when they visited, though this was by no means the norm. Several of my respondents pointed out how their children faced congregational expectations for their involvement as did wives. Such expectations might include regular attendance at Sunday School as well as exemplary behaviour in other social settings and at school. The pressure of ministry, in this regard, is "something the whole family carries at times" (M24:174). All of this highlights the way that family life is intertwined with work in rural ministry. Documenting the involvement and expectations of minister's families has been

done by other researchers (Marciano, 1990). However, in considering how work is defined, this evidence helps to make the point that differentiating work from non-work in terms of establishing boundaries between public and private lives is more difficult for rural clergy than it is for many other jobs, even professional ones.

More significant than their participation in particular activities, is the presence of children in a general way at church events. Congregations expect that family members will participate in church and community activities, such as attending worship services or potluck suppers. However, this expectation exists without the clear recognition that clergy are also professionally "at work" in such situations. Clergy of both sexes talked about how it was difficult to listen and be attentive to parishioners when children were present. The lack of fit between congregational expectations, the demands of the professional role, and the realities of childcare come through most strongly in the words of respondents who were mothers:

> I mean when we have a pot-luck lunch, the rest of you may be hanging around visiting, but if so-and-so happens to get into a conversation with me about her aunt who's just been diagnosed with cancer, um, it's not helpful to me if my five year old's yanking at my arm because she wants another drink of Koolaid! (F10:185)

> And people say, "oh yes, bring the children," but they don't really mean children. (Laughing.) Dolls would be okay, but not real children. (F1:103)

Women's strong articulation of this lack of fit between their definition of work and their congregations' definition, and

what it meant in terms of coordinating their roles as clergy and parents, is not surprising since studies show that women, more than men, still tend to be the primary care-givers in the family (Demo and Acock, 1993; Statistics Canada, 1994).

Given the demands of both professional ministry and domestic responsibilities, it is not surprising that only five women in my sample had children in their care at the time of the interview. This is in stark contrast with the twelve men who had children at home.[8] In addition, there were four men who had grown children, but who had practised ministry while their children were growing up whereas none of the remaining women had a history of combining the two roles. Most of the remaining women were either single, widowed or divorced, or had waited to enter ministry until their children were grown. These data suggest, once again, that combining the two sets of demands seems to be less of a burden for men than for women.

WORKING AT FAMILY TIME

For many of my respondents, defining professional work became an important issue in terms of ensuring some balance between professional and domestic responsibilities. Time for family and even for personal relaxation could become lost, given the ambiguous nature of the work of ministry. Several respondents stated that it was more important to define when

---

[8] In addition, two of the women but none of the men were responsible for caring for elderly parents.

they were working for their families than for themselves. One woman who was recently married stated, "For myself the ambiguity is alright but when it starts to affect someone else's needs and life then it feels like it needs to be much clearer" (F19:232).

Respondents clearly associated the term "work" with professional duties. When asked, "what does your work involve", people invariably described their professional responsibilities and not their domestic obligations. Not surprisingly, clergy's understanding of that question reflected cultural norms about the notion of "work" as referring to paid employment. However, when individuals went on to describe how their professional life affects their personal life, approximately one third of the married respondents (five women and six men) used language, images, and strategies associated with paid work to describe how they ensured a balance between their professional and private lives. For example, people spoke of "scheduling in" family time, of literally making appointments for family in their agendas, of "working at" and being "disciplined" about making time for family, and of "managing" the commitments of ministry and of being a spouse and parent. In this sense, this group of respondents is similar to the corporate workers examined by Hochschild (1997:45-52). For the workers she studied, family time took on "an industrial tone" (45) and quality time became "like an office appointment" (50). The language of work

pervaded the comments of both her respondents and mine. In addition, several other individuals in my sample described the ways they organized family time around work, even though they did not use this language. While ministry provided some flexibility in terms of work hours which allowed for taking family members to doctor's appointments or attending school events, the sometimes erratic schedule and high demands associated with work did not guarantee regular time with family. Thus, although my respondents did not initially name it as such, the impression that one is left with is that creating time for family life _is_ "work" for many of these individuals. The remainder of this section examines some of the strategies that clergy used to limit professional work and make time for family.

Monitoring the boundaries of work

Working at family time means that family members got incorporated at another level into the work of rural clergy. They were sometimes called upon to help establish and enforce boundaries around professional work, in order that "time off" might be retained for family matters. Seven of my respondents--three women and four men--described how they relied on their husbands or wives to help them establish boundaries around their work. Respondents also spoke of spouses monitoring phone calls so they would not have to deal with parishioners and drawing attention to when work

threatened to encroach upon family time or time off. For example, one male clergy explained that his wife reminded him that he was working even at times when he might also be enjoying himself by saying, "that's WORK--because I can't be with you, we can't do something together" (M21:278). Another female respondent, described how her spouse, before they were married, would have to "talk her off the charge" by convincing her that she did have time for a day off to come and visit him, and that professional obligations could wait until she came back (F19:186). Relying on one's spouse to monitor the boundaries of one's work was yet another way in which the boundary between public and private was blurred; spouses were drawn into an "adjunct control role" (Grant and Tancred, 1992), although in this case it is less directly concerned with socializing clients to the correct behaviour (as this term was originally defined) than it is with controlling client access to the professional/spouse. One female respondent whose husband was also an ordained minister suggested that when one did not have a spouse outside the profession to do this, that professional work could easily take over, placing family and marital relationships in jeopardy (F1:114-126).

Single clergy, in contrast, did not have a spouse or other family members to help them set limits on professional work. Four of the seven single women I interviewed (though neither of the two single men) mentioned this factor when

discussing the problem of drawing boundaries around their paid work. While these women recognized that not having a spouse or children saved them some work domestically, they also were aware that "if you have children and spouse, uh, or a partner, you are pulled out of [work] because they have other interests and they have other demands" (F7:336). The sentiments of these single clergy are in keeping with the observation made by Carroll et. al. (1983:191) that single clergywomen lack the "legitimate excuse of a husband or children to use in keeping over-demanding parishioners at bay."

Children: an acceptable limit on work?

The presence of children also helped to put a limit on work. Although clergy were expected to be available at all times to their congregations, they were also expected to be exemplary parents. These two expectations contradict each other. Being always available to the congregation means that one cannot always be available to one's family; as mentioned earlier, respondents pointed out how this was the case in terms of their children's presence at congregational events. In the past, the ideal of "good minister and perfect parent" was accomplished largely through the work of wives in raising children and managing family life. This is another example of the particular clergy-masculinized model, which I mentioned earlier in this chapter. Here, the idealized worker is not divorced from family roles, but labour is organized in such a

way that the worker <u>is</u> free from the concrete demands of family responsibilities. The parental role is visible, but the supportive work of wives is not. Although this still may be the case, my respondents' accounts suggest that it may also be changing. Whereas ministry may combine poorly with childcare at community events, some ministers stated that the presence of children helped them justify taking time away from their professional duties, and that congregations were supportive of this. Both women and men gave examples of how this occurred. For example:

> I know when our--our oldest daughter was born--like she really helped us to keep the balance. Because when we were both in ministry as a couple, like it was really easy for all of our time to be spent, um, focused on our pastoral charge work. ... But when she was born, uh, she has needs and so she--she called us <u>away</u> from the pastoral charge...we really welcomed that. And she was quite a delight, and people knew--they wanted us to be good parents...so time spent with her was quite legitimate in their eyes. (F8:179)

> I find the community making excuses for me all the time, in terms of my ministry, because they're very aware, unlike my predecessors who tended to take off because they had opportunity, I'm around a lot more. And because I have 4 children, and--and commitments, you, know, socially and athletically and scholastically that, um-- it's changed their perception of the minister. (M20:115)

Inasmuch as clergy are able to take the old ideal of "good minister <u>and</u> perfect parent"--which depended, to a large extent, on the invisible work of wives to maintain--and use it as a justification to limit their professional work, balance it with family time, and make the work of parenting visible, they are resisting what I have referred to as the clergy-masculinized model.

Nevertheless, the norm that professional work should come before family still persists. It is evident in the respondent's statement above that recognizing the need to pay attention to family somehow implies a less than legitimate demand on his time and thus necessitates the congregation making "excuses" for him. Other respondents, who had congregations which were supportive of family time, made similar statements. The priority of professional work is also evident in the practices of women and men whom I interviewed who found it difficult to give their families sufficient time because they felt that the work role precluded this as a possibility, quite apart from any clear congregational expectations that they do so.

The persistence of the masculinist norm that family is necessarily secondary to paid work is also suggested by comments from a few respondents which point to differing expectations for women and men in regards to childcare. These respondents stated that it was easier for female rather than male clergy to justify taking time for childcare. These comments come from clergy couples where both spouses were attempting to balance professional demands with domestic responsibilities. One man expressed frustration that his time looking after his children was spoken of as "baby-sitting," and therefore something remarkable, while his wife's time with them was not questioned (M24:216). In contrast one woman was aware that it was easier for her than her husband to justify

leaving a meeting in order to return to look after children:

> ... I'm expected to say things like "I have to leave now,
> I've got to go home and meet the kids from the bus." And
> that's okay, that's fine; nobody--in fact, I get respect
> for that...and they say that's what a mother should do.
> But if my husband says that--well, you know, he's hen-
> pecked and it's a sign of weakness and he shouldn't have
> to do that..." (F1:291)

Furthermore, two women stated that they explicitly limited evening meetings or decided not to attend certain meetings in order to have more evening time with young children. They were clear with their congregations about their reasons for doing so and their congregations supported their decisions. Their experience contrasts sharply with one male clergy who was criticized by his congregation for trying to limit visiting in the evenings in order to have more time with his family. In practical terms, these differing norms may make it somewhat easier for women place some limits on professional work. But, at the same time, they also reflect the supposition that women are different kinds of workers than men, and that the family is more naturally their domain than a man's. As a different type of worker, women are placed in jeopardy of being seen as less professional than men (Hochschild, 1997:85-102; Sheppard, 1992:164).

Time off: escaping work

> ...[T]he concept of a "day off" to me is really funny.
> I mean, people are all--people are saying, oh, you know,
> "you need to make sure you take your day off." The fact
> is, I CANNOT take a day off. Even if I don't do anything
> work-related...even if I spend the whole day...watching
> television which, you know, you couldn't say is part of

my job...I don't feel like I have a day off. Because--
because I am <u>here</u>. You know, the phone rings or the
door--I mean people come, or--or I still have to be ON.
(F12:167)

This quote points out some of the dilemmas clergy face in establishing a day off, and by extension the difficulties inherent in defining their work. First, establishing time apart for leisure or domestic pursuits is difficult because of the ambiguity of their work and the reality of being on call. The expectation that clergy should always be available means that it is sometimes difficult to train congregations to respect this limit. As the respondent says, "the phone rings" or "people come". Secondly, "escaping" the pastoral charge--a word used by many of my respondents--may be the only way to ensure that one is free of work obligations. Thirdly, the necessity of working weekends and many holidays makes it difficult to plan time with family or friends. Although this is not mentioned in the quote above, I expand on this latter point below.

Because of the way in which work is embedded in community life, often turning leisure situations into occasions for work (see chapter 4), three-quarters of the respondents (sixteen women and fifteen men) interviewed spoke of how it was necessary to "escape" the pastoral charge to really feel they had time off. The strength of this word to describe the process of getting away from work and the frequency with which it was used both point to the ubiquity of work and the difficulty which rural ministers had in making

time and space which was free from professional obligations. Rural clergy had to face the combined difficulty of having to be available to respond to emergencies and the difficulty of being able to "train" (F32:153) the congregation to respect a defined "day off":

> The phone tends to ring as much on Monday as any other day. I take seriously the idea that this is my day off-- if I really took that seriously, then I would resent the phone ringing. (M35:193)

> You're never off. You can't--you never can say, um, well, Friday, I will go into a show--Friday can be a funeral. Or somebody can be in a--or end up in an emergency. ... I've never found it possible to take "a day off". I've never ever seen that I could take a Monday off or a Saturday off. I--I catch as catch can. (F28:118)

The difficulty of taking time off while remaining on the pastoral charge is illustrated by the comments of the following male informant who describes both his own mixed reactions and those of clergy colleagues to his family's decision to not leave home during his summer holiday:

> ...I didn't realize how radical a thing we had done last summer until I told some of my colleagues, and they sort of went, "You DID?! And you SURVIVED?!!" (Interviewer laughs.) But I thought it was really a valuable thing for us to do. Um. There were moments of anguish--sort of like, "oh, shit, I should really be doing something." You know--"I should go and visit the family [after a death]." But I just decided that there are times when-- ...where you just have to say, "I'm sorry." (M20:121)

Despite being guaranteed a day off in United Church regulations (F28:118), in addition to annual holiday time, in practice the notion of "time off" was not a given for clergy. Unlike many other occupations, clergy had to "work at" defining this "external boundary" (Ronco and Peattie, 1988:

714) around their professional lives. It could only be ensured by leaving the pastoral charge, or refusing to answer the phone, or to check one's phone messages.

Trying to coordinate one's day off with the schedules of family members and friends was often difficult. This was particularly true for clergy who are married to spouses who work outside the home and those who have children. One may take Monday off, because Sunday is a work day but it is a day when others are working or at school. Taking Saturday off was problematic for my respondents because the pressures of preparing for Sunday often interfered with family commitments, and Saturday was the most common day for weddings to be scheduled. Work demands on the weekends were especially difficult for individuals who were in commuting relationships and saw their spouse only on the weekend.

One woman who was part of a clergy couple with young children had negotiated a creative solution to this dilemma of having family time on the weekends. The couple had arranged to have a certain number of "no-excuse Sundays" throughout the year (F8:83-87). These were Sundays when they did not have to account for why they were taking a break, and the charge paid for a replacement preacher. These also served to compensate the clergy couple for the "over-time" which the charge could not remunerate at a regular salary scale.

Having grown children or being single also posed problems in organizing one's time off in relation to others. For

women, having grown children still presented them with the dilemma of reconciling having to work on weekends and many holidays with trying to create family time. One woman explains the dilemma:

> Like, my family come Easter, my family come Thanksgiving, my family—but I WORK. And those are my HIGH intensity WORK times. So the whole time that they're here, they're the ones—they get the meals, they do this and that, and I'm working. And if I should want to visit them during the week, well, they're at work. ...[T]hose kinds of things...are a bit difficult. (F28:124)

Finally, single clergy reported the difficulty of missing family gatherings because they could not visit relatives on weekends (F29:129), and of organizing dates in romantic relationships because of their divergent schedules (F29:140; M39:118).

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have demonstrated that the literature which argues that the masculine model of work is reproduced through a separation of work and home, and public and private, is not so easily applied to ministry. Instead to better understand the work of clergy, I have suggested that one must conceptualize a particular clergy-masculinized model of work, which reflects specific historical traditions linking work and family. In the case of clergy, a traditional style of work does not depend on a clear separation of work and family— particularly not in terms of physical locale—but rather on the family's very direct incorporation into the domain of

professional work. The masculinity of this profession rests more precisely on the negation of home and family as a private domain clear of the obligations of professional work. It is this relationship between the two which has led writers to characterize the church as a "greedy institution" (Marciano, 1990; see also Coser, 1974) which still turns ministry into a "two person career" (Finch, 1983). However, at the same time, the organization of professional ministry rests on the assumption that someone else will attend to the needs of the family and the organization of the home. Separation occurs at the level of responsibilities rather than locations. Given this, I would argue that, unlike many other occupations, the ways in which clergy create boundaries and maintain private space and time for family and personal life often represent a step away from the clergy-masculinized model of work rather than reproducing conventional masculinized work norms. By making social space for domestic responsibilities, and limiting their accessibility, they make the work in this domain visible.

Within this occupation, the lack of boundaries between public and private disadvantages women more than men. Professional demands occur simultaneously with the demands of childcare and family life--the phone rings while supper is cooking, one's child wants Koolaid when one is trying to listen pastorally--and since women are the ones more likely to be attending to the domestic needs, they are likely to be more

burdened than their male counterparts. Furthermore, husbands are not as systematically incorporated into the work worlds of their clergy wives as wives tend to be incorporated into the work of their clergy husbands. Thus female clergy lack some of the benefits of the two person career which may accrue to men in the same profession. Finally, while women may benefit from the congregational assumption that it is their responsibility to stop work and make time for family--making it easier for them to establish limits on their availability--they also are at risk of being seen as less professional because of their links to the domestic realm. Female clergy may be held to higher standards than a male clergy in terms of housework, with this "feminine" obligation over-shadowing their work as professionals and adding to the stress of having an office in their home. For women in this occupation, separating public and private may help them manage the demands of their various roles by limiting the intrusions of professional work into family time and space. Furthermore, such a separation may help women avoid some of the situations that serve to confound their professional identity with their femaleness.

Chapter 8

CONCLUSION

In this concluding chapter, I will first summarize my findings as responses to my initial research questions. I then move on to comment on how the insights of this research might be relevant to other occupations, and finally to considering what contributions this study makes to the broader project of reconceptualizing work.

ANSWERING MY RESEARCH QUESTIONS

How does work come to be defined, and particularly professional work?

In this research, I have asked how work comes to be defined. I have intentionally chosen a situation where the line between work and non-work seems ambiguous in the hope that the processes of definition will be that much more obvious. Thus I have chosen to study professional work, because of its poor fit with conventional parameters of work, and the work of a particularly anomalous group, rural clergy. But this study is about neither the professions, as institutions within society, nor about the practice of religion. It is about "work", as a socially constructed category, and the social relationships, especially gender relations, which mould it.

Institutionally, the United Church defines pastoral care

as the third, in a triad of duties--"word, sacrament, and pastoral care"--for which ordained clergy are responsible. However, the respondents in this study stressed that even though it was named third in this triad, pastoral care was a priority in their work--both in its own right and for how it facilitates other components of their work, such as those related to "word" (Biblical preaching and teaching) and "sacrament" (ritual leadership). Within pastoral care, my informants included work related to nurturing relationships, building up a sense of community, and attending to the emotions of others. In other words, the professional work of rural clergy focuses, in part, on kinds of activity which are culturally associated with the feminine. At first glance, then, their professional work is defined in a fashion which appears anomalous to the way that the sphere of work is theorized in the standard sociological literature--that is, by marginalizing women's work. Defined in this manner, their work also appears anomalous from the perspective of the feminist critique of this literature which casts professional work as quintessentially masculine in its constitution. In short, the work of clergy is ambiguous in both senses in terms of its content.

The work of rural clergy is also ambiguous in terms of its location and activity. Respondents situated an important part of their work in situations which did not seem to be work-like from a conventional perspective. They saw

themselves "at work" in situations which for others would be leisure, socializing or volunteer activities. Furthermore, they performed important parts of their work in private homes, either their own or those of others--that is in the sphere which is conventionally linked with non-work. And sometimes, because of the intimacy of the rural setting where they and their families lived, they themselves had a difficult time differentiating when they were and were not "at work" professionally. The ambiguity of their work in terms of both its physical and social location raises questions about how to theorize paid work which occurs in the private domain, unpaid work in the public (or as I have called it, the communal domain) and the point at which professional identity merges with private life.

I have illustrated how obligation, flexible notions of work-time, context, and visibility were markers which helped rural clergy decide when they were working--or, more precisely, when they had been at work, since in many cases the decision could not be made in advance. These markers helped respondents make work visible for themselves in many contexts, both ambiguous and unambiguous; for example, when clergy were involved in situations which appeared to be volunteer activity or socializing; when clergy were engaged in the work of nurturing relationships; and when clergy were providing more formalized professional services such as doing funerals, counselling, or visiting the sick. In other words, these

markers were able to delineate work in a wider range of activities than normally would be included by conventional parameters of pay, time, place, or activity.

These markers bring the emotional component of work into focus for clergy. Thus, they represent an approach to defining work which diverges in a significant way from a masculine work norm. In this case, emotional labour is neither women's work, nor relegated to the private sphere. But obligation, as a definitional element of work, implies that work can happen at any time; thus, this conceptualization assumes a worker who can be free from the demands of family to respond to the demands of clientele. Furthermore, the flexible approaches to defining work-time that attempt to either balance or circumscribe the demands of ambiguous work do not take into account that clergy may have families who do not share the same flexible schedules and that not all blocks of time are equally substitutable from the families' perspective. These various techniques of time management ignore the work of articulation which must be done to coordinate the two spheres (Daune-Richard, 1988)--work for which women continue to be primarily responsible. Thus, defining work in regard to either of these markers--flexible time or obligation--rests on a masculinist notion of the worker as free from the demands of the domestic sphere (Acker 1992: 257).

How do women and men construct and negotiate the boundaries around their professional work?

Work--even professional work--is not defined in a vacuum. While rural ministers control the day-to-day content and organization of their work, they nevertheless must account for some of their actions to church committees and take community opinion into account. Professional autonomy in defining what counts as work is tempered by the expectations and perceptions of one's clientele. The image of the autonomous professional hinges on the assumption of a worker free from upwards accountability in a formal hierarchy. But my data illustrate that professional work is also defined within a broader web of relationships, including those working below or beside professionals, and those inside and outside formal institutional hierarchies.

Thus, I have shown how the markers outlined above, even though they helped to define work for clergy, were problematic when clergy had to account for their work to others. For example, because ambiguity was a resource which facilitated the work of building relationships, to explicitly define "being friendly" as an obligation, and therefore work, undercut what clergy were trying to accomplish. Furthermore, community opinion about what constituted "real work" and what a minister should do, did not always match those of clergy. Definitions of work were negotiated and applied within this context.

Both the women and men in my sample focused on the importance of relational and emotional work in ministry; my study reveals few gender differences in how this work was conceptualized or performed within the community. In this regard, my research counters claims by other authors that female clergy place greater emphasis on relationships than their male colleagues, or are inherently less hierarchical than men (see for example, Daly, 1973; Nason-Clark, 1987; Wallace, 1992a,b; Weidman, 1981). However, by saying that both women and men stressed the importance of relational concerns, I am implying that both defined part of the content of their work in terms which are culturally associated with the feminine.

But this feminine aspect of ministry is mediated by several culturally masculine characteristics. Women and men equally define "being friendly" as part of the professional task and differentiate it from being friends at a personal level; a particular style of professional distance defined work despite the focus on nurturing relationships.   In addition, I have demonstrated that this inclusion of relational work as a professional duty ultimately rests on a broader organization of labour that reflects male experience, both in terms of a professional who is free from domestic concerns, and in terms of a separation of emotional and material care-giving that does not usually occur in women's work. Thus, in several ways, both women and men also appeared

to reproduce significant facets of a model of work which are culturally masculine.

How do the challenges in this process differ by gender?

The way the work of clergy is defined by its focus on nurturing relationships, its embeddedness in community life, and its lack of public-private delineation, has differing repercussions for women and men. First, many respondents, though not all, asserted that female clergy were better nurturers than their male colleagues. In other words, women were more adept at a kind of work which had been defined as central to the profession. However, this did not guarantee a higher status for women clergy serving in rural parishes; in fact, my respondents suggested that the opposite was true-- that men were accorded greater respect in the professional role because they fit the masculine image of what a minister should look like. Women were seen as better nurturers, but not because they were better professionals; instead their skill in this area was linked with gendered conceptualizations of the caregiver role.

Second, the location of the professional work of clergy in the same social domain as that of volunteers placed female clergy in a tricky situation. Like other women of the community, many of them were asked to prepare food stuffs as contributions towards congregational events. This presented female clergy with the dilemma of how to maintain their

professional persona in this context, and not become, as Nason-Clark has suggested, the "minister's wife" in addition to being the minister (1987:335). A few agreed to undertake such work; they justified this by labelling such activity as part of their ministry, thereby supporting and affirming the work of women in the community. But a larger number refused these requests or expressed relief that such requests had already been defined as inappropriate by a female predecessor. While the response of this latter group was a practical response to time demands, and may be conceptualized as resistance to "sex role spillover" (Nieva and Gutek, 1981:60), it also has the unfortunate effect of replicating a masculine model of work where emotional and material labour are separated. Men were not placed in a similarly awkward position; they were neither as likely to be asked for such a domestic type of contribution, nor would such a request jeopardize their professional status by associating them with a domestic role. For female clergy, it was difficult to define themselves as professional, relative to volunteers, without simultaneously defining their work in a masculine way.

Third, the traditional organization of clergy life confounds delineations of work based on a public-private dichotomization. While this created a certain amount of stress for both female and male clergy and their families, this was particularly difficult for women. On pastoral charges where the church office was still in the manse, and

where the principal phone for the pastoral charge was still the manse phone, clergy worked at protecting private space and time for family and themselves. Women were somewhat more likely than men to express concern over how these arrangements affected their family members. Phone calls at mealtimes were difficult for women who may be engaged in food preparation and attending to children. Having an offices in their home meant that some women felt that housework was "added on" to their professional duties. In short, working at home did not make things easier for women in their professional role, a point already made by other researchers (Christensen, 1988; Mirchandani, 1999).

Furthermore, the traditional involvements of family in the life of the congregation--in other words, in the sphere of work--had differing implications for women and men. Women in my study spoke more than men about the difficulties of performing pastorally at a community event if their children were present; this is understandable since women still are more likely to carry the larger responsibility for childcare. Even women with grown children were more likely than their male contemporaries to stress the difficulties of maintaining time for family; again, this is not surprising given women's role as the creators of group life within the domestic sphere (DeVault, 1991). Finally, husbands of female clergy were less likely than wives of male clergy to be involved in the congregation, and less likely to be as involved in organized,

on-going ways. While fewer congregational expectations of clergy husbands and less intense involvement on the part of husbands meant that it was easier for women to differentiate professional and private life, it also meant that my female respondents benefitted less than their male colleagues from the kinds of adjunct work typically performed by wives and outlined by Finch (1983).

The traditional ways in which the public-private boundary has been blurred for clergy has created extra work for wives in the domestic sphere and located their work as an extension and support for the work of professional men (Finch, 1983). Lacking "wives" to perform this extra work, women who are presently in the profession may be better served by creating clearer boundaries between work and family in order to manage the demands of each. For example, moving their office out of their home allowed some of my female informants to avoid the issue of whether housework was done when they met with parishioners. Creating boundaries helped to protect family space and time from the intrusions of professional work. In the case of rural clergy, dividing public from private in these terms is a step towards undoing the clergy-masculinized model of work.

THE RELEVANCE OF THIS RESEARCH FOR STUDYING OTHER OCCUPATIONS

In the course of the interviews my respondents compared themselves to a number of other occupations in the rural

context. These included farmers, doctors, lawyers, public health nurses, undertakers, plumbers, and school secretaries. They identified a number of similarities between themselves and these other occupations, when it came to the issue of defining work. Like farmers, plumbers, public health nurses and even school secretaries, it was difficult for clergy to draw boundaries around work in terms of scheduled time; one had to work when the need was there, and one could not control when demands for one's services might arise. Like doctors and lawyers, visibility in the community was important to minister's work, reflecting an expectation of the community. Furthermore, these other professionals may be called upon for their insights in situations which were not in the domain of their professional expertise as occurred for rural clergy. Like farmers, clergy could not wholly separate their professional work from their domestic life. In fact, this characteristic was more than a similarity; it affected the whole of rural culture and shaped how rural respondents organized their lives, and how their work was evaluated. By clergy's own accounts, their work was not necessarily unique in some of its significant characteristics.

In a rural context, regardless of one's occupation, one also was known within the context of one's other relationships as parent, spouse, family member, community volunteer, etcetera. Being known in this way gave one greater flexibility in how one organized one's employment

responsibilities in relation to one's domestic or community responsibilities. Ruralness made work more ambiguous and harder to control, but it also allowed for a flexibility that was not present to the same extent in urban settings. For the purposes of conceptualizing work, the observations of rural clergy about the resemblances between their work and the work of others suggests that some of our theorizing reflects an urban bias. And while gender, rather than geography, has been the primary focus in my discussion of the way work is defined, it is worth noting that our concepts of work must be tested against other cultural variables as well. Generalizing further, if conventional conceptualizations of work are inadequate when confronted with the empirical realities of gender and of locale, how might they also be inadequate on an international scale when talking about work? Tancred (1995: 13) also suggests this may be something which needs to be taken into consideration as we re-think definitions of work.

When I have talked about this research with other academics, heads frequently nod in recognition when I describe the "ambiguous" situations in which clergy locate their work, and the challenges presented by doing part of their work in the home.[1] Clearly, the issue of defining work is not unique to the clergy, nor to individuals in rural settings. Quite

---

[1] I also had to consider the issue of the extent to which I divided academic work time and space from other areas of my life in the course of writing this dissertation. How did I know when I was "at work" and when I was not, and how did I explain that to others?

apart from the theoretical concerns of sociology, it is an issue that people in different occupations must deal with in their everyday lives. Just a brief list which illustrates the range of cases where the definition of work is important might include Seron and Ferris (1995) on lawyers, Ronco and Peattie (1988) on artists, and Freidson (1990) on volunteers. The inadequacies of conceptualizations of work based on a male model of work certainly apply to a wider group than my particular subjects.

It is worthwhile considering how the issues which arise in this dissertation apply, in particular, to other helping professions. Davies (1996) has suggested that professional work is gendered through the <u>apparent exclusion</u> of certain culturally feminine features, such as work concerning emotions, and also how professional work rests on the <u>inclusion</u> of feminine by "delegating" the emotional domain to others in adjunct occupations. I have illustrated how the work of ministers does not follow this pattern. Instead, the emotional and relational aspects are retained as a central concern of the work, but many of the material aspects which are required for carrying out this work--including the material inputs to sociability, such as preparing the food for a potluck meal, or fixing a cup of tea to provide hospitality during a visit--are left to volunteers and to private individuals to provide. These observations suggests some important questions for further research: when emotional

labour becomes professionalized, to what extent does "caring for" (the instrumental and tangible tasks of caring) and "caring about" (the affective dimensions) become separated, and who is left to perform the material labour which complements the process of "caring about"? To what extent do helping professions, which retain a concern with the emotional and the relational, nevertheless represent a masculinized model of work through this process of separation and delegation?

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS RESEARCH TO RECONCEPTUALIZING WORK
Broadening and redefining the category of work

In chapter two, I outlined how the feminist critique of work has broadened the category of work by challenging parameters suggested by a "male work norm" (Kobayashi et al., 1994:xv). In addition, I drew attention to the important concern expressed by writers such as Glucksmann (1995) over how this process of broadening threatens to undermine the usefulness of work as a conceptual category. Glucksmann (1995) and Karlsson (1995) have both been particularly critical of the way in which discussions of emotional labour and other kinds of invisible work turn everything into "work" (see for example, Daniels, 1987).

I would argue that the work of rural clergy presents an instance where work is defined broadly, yet it is not without

limits in its conceptualization. While the focus on the work of nurturing relationships, including emotional labour, means clergy find themselves "at work" in a broad range of contexts, they nevertheless are relatively clear in delineating what work is. In particular, they define work in reference to their sense of <u>obligation</u> to respond to the needs of individuals, and in the way various activities allow them to be <u>visible</u> in the community and available to people. While the components of "<u>context</u>" and "<u>time</u>" as I have described them in chapter five reveal an understanding of work which is not fixed absolutely in time or place, these markers nevertheless suggest that clergy are able to decide, to a significant extent, when they are and are not at work as professionals. The present research is significant, therefore, in that it outlines a set of alternative markers to delineate the category of work for sociological study.

The accounts of rural clergy suggest a conceptualization of work which is well-suited to specifying emotional labour as work, and differentiating it from non-work. It is an area for further investigation to see how well some of markers suggested in this research may also be applicable across different types of work. Just considering this question briefly, I would suggest that the wages or salary in paid employment may be conceived as the reification of obligation, while, alternatively, in the household the daily work of preparing food for the family may be conceived of as an

obligation imposed on women by the sexual division of labour, and therefore, work. In pursuing the latter example, when food preparation extends to elaborate gourmet meals, this may reasonably be argued to extend the activity beyond the parameters of obligation, and therefore turn the same activity into non-work, or a hobby. In short, it would be worthwhile thinking through how some of these markers could be applied to both the productive and reproductive realm, and to the terrain of "women's work" (Daune-Richard, 1988) that bridges the two.

New terms for describing work

In reviewing existing attempts to re-think work, in chapter two, I suggested that they point to a need to move away from purely market terms to analyze productive work--both conceptually and at the level of language. I argued that a shift to terms like "necessity" in defining work (see Armstrong and Armstrong, 1990) may be more useful than re-defining terms that have links to economic models, even if this re-definition is as sophisticated as in the case of the work of Glucksmann (1990) who suggests the term "social economy", or England and Farkas (1986:73-101) who extend economic terms like "opportunity cost" to the domestic realm, or Seccombe (1974) and those who followed him in the domestic labour debate. By replicating terms associated with the market sphere, these re-definitions of work limit our thinking. The way in which clergy have stressed that work is

defined by "obligation" links it with "necessity" and provides a definition of work which comes out of the shadow of work as conventionally defined.

I would also argue that using the term "obligation" to define work goes one step further than using the term "necessity". "Obligation" frames the concept of work in relational terms; we usually speak of having an obligation to someone or something other than ourselves. While the term "necessity" highlights a lack of choice in performing an activity, it does not have the same relational connotations as "obligation"; what is necessary may be so only for our own survival. By emphasizing that something becomes work when it is done to meet the demands or needs of others, or the demands of society at large, in addition to highlighting the lack of choice in meeting those demands, the term "obligation" is especially useful in describing work which is often performed by women. Much of women's work is performed to meet the needs of family members or to live up to social expectations surrounding feminine roles.

Moving away from dualistic understandings

I have reviewed the ways that conventional understandings of work rely on dichotomous conceptualizations of work and non-work and how the feminist literature argues that these serve to gender work. In the present research, I have shown how these dichotomies, and the processes of gendering which

they support, occur for clergy, but in a way that the literature does not anticipate. These dichotomies do not always reinforce each other in expected ways. The emotional is not marginalized in clergy's professional work or relegated to the private domain. Paid work is sometimes done within the home, and unpaid work occurs in the public, or as I have called it, the <u>communal sphere</u>. Clearly, the case of the clergy calls for a more complex description of the social world than is facilitated by a dualistic understanding. Furthermore, the specific form of masculinization that characterizes clergy work comes into focus most clearly only when one considers all components of clergy experience—professional, familial, and personal—taken as a whole.

Glucksmann's concept of the total social organization of labour (1990) represents the most sophisticated attempt to move beyond the dualisms that tend to define work (i.e. work/leisure, paid/unpaid, production/consumption, public/private). In chapter 2, I outlined how Wright (1995) and Daune-Richard (1988) tried to theorize kinds of activity which fall between the cracks in dualistic descriptions, and discussed the work of several writers who have tried to move beyond the public-private dichotomy by focusing on a third social sphere or an intermediate zone in the social world (Hansen, 1987, Parkin, 1989, 1993; Stacey and Davies, 1983). By proposing the term "communal" to designate a third sphere of social life, I am arguing for a better conceptual niche in

which to place much of the kinds of activity in which clergy are engaged, and also a better explanation of the relation of their work relative to that of volunteers. While volunteer work in the community might be conceived as public activity, the strong links between the notion of public activity and paid work, especially in discussions of how work is gendered, problematize this conceptualization. And although the work of rural clergy is paid, much goes on in situations and activities which we do not associate with the public sphere. In highlighting the relationship of clergy's professional work to volunteer activity within the communal sphere, I demonstrate the need to re-think work in a way that moves beyond dichotomies.

Presently, feminist theory has inadequately theorized work which is done neither inside the home, nor in the workplace, such as volunteer work. For example, Glucksmann's study does not specify how such activity fits into her total social organization of labour. In my research, I have begun the task of explicating how this sphere of work is and is not gendered in its relationship to domestic and paid activity. More research is required to draw out all the implications of conceptualizing the social world as three domains, and how this helps to broaden our understanding of work.

Locating gender in the sphere of work

A multitude of writers assert that the way work is

organized reflects masculine experience and negates the feminine. Masculine assumptions are built into the gendered substructure of organizational dynamics (Acker, 1990, 1992, 1998), work definitions are shaped by cultural codes of masculinity and femininity (Davies, 1996, in press; Stivers, 1993), and professional boundaries are defined in such a way as to make women's practice invisible (Adams and Tancred, in press). These dynamics serve to exclude that which we associate with the feminine from our conceptualizations of "real work". All of these writers also argue that definitions of paid and professional work need to include how these kinds of work ultimately depend on, and therefore include in their conceptualization, work conventionally done by women, whether through delegating it to a adjunct "women's" occupation (as in the case of doctors and nurses) or marginalizing such work to the domestic sphere. Thus it is not just the work of a single occupational group which we must analyze but how work is defined and organized within a larger division of labour which is structured in important ways by relations of gender.

My principal argument has been that the work of the rural clergy includes components which we culturally associate with the feminine, and that these must be accounted for if we are to understand how this work is defined.[2] However, for rural

---

[2]   Stivers (1993:54-55) has made a similar argument in her account of how the work of those in public administration is defined. Stivers points out how public administrators have an "obligation to be responsive" to the public, and operate with a "norm of service"; she argues that these aspects

clergy, it is not the case that these feminine components are delegated to others within a formal division of labour or to women in the domestic sphere. The work of clergy cannot be described as a masculinized profession, in the sense that Davies (1996), for example, delineates. However, the way these feminine components are realized in the organization of work <u>do depend</u> to a large extent on masculinized divisions of labour—such as the assumption that the worker is unhampered by domestic obligations; that the emotional and the material may be separated; and that relationships with clients may be circumscribed by notions of professional distance. Women as well as men may define their work in such a way as to reproduce these gendered relations. Thus, to be accurate in my portrayal of the work of ministry, I argue that ministry reflects a specific style of masculinity, regardless of who does the job. This clergy-masculinized model of work incorporates and "professionalizes" some activities and characteristics which we associate with the feminine, but does so by relying on the practical work of women who continue to facilitate this.

While my research demonstrates the usefulness of a gender relations approach for making sense of work, it also argues that careful attention should be paid to how specific

---

resemble culturally feminine characteristics. However, public administrators repress this femininity and assert the masculinity of their occupation by emphasizing their role as professionals and as objective, scientific, anonymous experts.

occupational cases are structured by gendered notions of work. The case of rural clergy demonstrates that it is dangerous to assume a single version of masculinity to explain the gendering of work. Connell has drawn attention to the importance of exploring hegemonic <u>and</u> subordinated masculinities (1987, 1995), and I have shown why this is necessary in discussing work.

CONCLUSION

The case of rural clergy reveals the complex way in which work comes to be defined when it is embedded in community life, and demonstrates that broadened definitions of work do not necessarily imply that work cannot be distinguished from non-work. While "work" must be clearly defined in order to be useful as a sociological category, I have argued that a more complex conceptualization is required than those delineated by dualistic understandings of the social world.

Furthermore, this research illustrates the need to pay careful attention to the specific forms of masculinity and femininity which gender work and to the various levels at which gender shapes experience. The norms which shape clergy work reflect a masculinized experience specific to the context of the profession, and these norms differ in some significant ways from a more hegemonic masculinity. Both women and men reproduce this particular clergy-masculinized model; there is little evidence that women and men in rural ministry include

different elements in their definitions of work. However, it is also clear that my respondents are differentially affected by gendered expectations, especially in regard to managing the interface of their professional and non-professional roles. The result is that clergy work is, indeed, a contrasting experience for women and men.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX: CODING CATEGORIES

BASE DATA
1 Sex   1) female 2) male
2 Age   1) 34 or less 2) 35-44 3) 45-54 4) 55+
3 Hours worked   1) full-time 2) part-time
4 Years of experience
   1) 5 or less 2) 6-10 3) 11-15 4) 16-20 5) 20+
5 Marital status
   1) single (includes divorced or widowed)
   2) married - spouse present i) full-time ii) part-time
6 Caregiver role
   1) no children
   2) children - ages i) 0-5   ii) 6-16   iii) 16 +
   5) eldercare
7 Housing
   1) manse 2) own home-on charge
   3) own home-off charge 4) manse plus own home

AREAS OF AMBIGUITY
1 Sites of work
   1) church/home 2) on the street 3) phone 4) off-charge
2 Relationships and Roles
   1) friends 2) contacts with larger community
   3) colleagues & rural professionals
3 Activities/Events (other than routine duties)
   1) special events (congregational or community)
   2) leisure activities (i.e. with parishioners)
   3) visiting
   4) volunteering
   5) gendered tasks (ex. baking pies, handyman tasks)
   6) relating (emotional work, "being there", etc.)
   7) being on call

NOT WORKING
1 Time off (private leisure, without parishioners)
2 Escaping (getting away, getting out of the role)

NEGOTIATING AMBIGUOUS AREAS
1 Setting boundaries (use of home)
2 Capitalizing on ambiguity (intentional use of ambiguity)
3 Managing time (setting day off, blocking time, saving time)
4 Accounting for work (to others or to oneself)
5 Controlling work (in ways other than listed above--
   ex. setting priorities, working more efficiently)
6 Being the minister/being yourself
7 Work and family/personal life
   1) Integrating work and family (decisions to incorporate
   family/domestic work and how; using family to set limits)
   2) Balancing family with work (different than #8.1,
   including decisions to separate work and family)

CODING CATEGORIES (continued)

MARKERS OF WORK - "definitions" of work used by respondents
1 Context - specific activities are not necessarily always
      seen as work, but may feel like work when they occur in
      relation to each other
2 Clergy role - due to the clergy role, work is ubiquitous
3 Obligation - having to attend to needs of others; having
      no choice about doing something
4 Nurturing - emotional labour and building relationships
5 Visibility

CONTEXT OF WORK
1 Congregational expectations/perceptions
2 Previous paid work (including skills, comparisons to)
3 Unpaid/life experience (as parent, volunteer)
4 Spouse's work
5 Age/ageism

GENDER - ways in respondents felt that gender influenced work

OTHER
1 Consequences of work (ex: evidence of doing a good job)
2 Pay
3 Commuting
4 Sexuality

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, A.
   1988   <u>The System of the Professions</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Acker, J.
   1990   "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." <u>Gender and Society</u>, 4(2):139-158.

   1992   "Gendering Organizational Theory" Pp. 248-260 in A. J. Mills and P. Tancred (eds.), <u>Gendering Organizational Analysis</u>. Newbury Park: Sage.

   1998   "The Future of 'Gender and Organizations': Connections and Boundaries." <u>Gender, Work, and Organization</u>, 5(4): 195-205.

Adams, A. and Tancred, P.
 In press "<u>Designing Women</u>": <u>Gender and the Architectural Profession</u>. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Alvesson, M. and Due Billing, Y.
   1997   <u>Understanding Gender and Organizations</u>. London: Sage Publications. Pp. 209-229.

Armstrong, P. and Armstrong, H.
   1990   <u>Theorizing Women's Work</u>. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Aronson, J. and Neysmith, S.M.
   1996   " 'You're not just in there to do the work': Depersonalizing policies and the exploitation of home care workers' labour." <u>Gender and Society</u>, 10:56-77.

Barksdale, V.
   1981   "Small Church--Big Family." Pp. 33-48 in J. Weidman (ed.), <u>Women Ministers: How Women are Redefining Traditional Roles</u>. San Francisco: Harpur & Row Publishers.

Becker, H.
   1971   "The Nature of a Profession." Pp. 87-101 in <u>Sociological Work</u>. Transition Books: New Brunswick, N.J.

Beechey, V.
   1988   "Rethinking the Definition of Work." Pp. 45-62 in J. Jenson, E. Hagan, and C. Reddy (eds.), <u>The Feminization of the Labour Force</u>. Oxford: Polity Press.

Bell, D.P.
    1981   "Bearing the Good News." Pp. 107-122 in J. Weidman
            (ed.), Women Ministers: How Women are Redefining
            Traditional Roles.   San Francisco: Harpur & Row
            Publishers.

Bibby, R.
    1993   Unknown Gods: the ongoing story of religion in
            Canada.   Toronto: Stoddart.

Canada
    1961   Census of Canada, Vol. 3, Part 1, Table 6: "Labour
            Force 15 years of age and over, by occupations and
            sex, for Canada, the provinces and territories,
            1961."

    1991   Census of Canada, The Nation Series: Occupation.
            Catalogue 93-327.   Table 1: "Labour Force 15 years
            and Over by Detailed Occupation (Based on the 1980
            Standard Occupational Classification) and Sex,
            Showing Counts and 1991 Percentage Distribution for
            Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1986 and 1991 --
            20% Sample Data."

Carroll, J.W.
    1992   "Towards   2000:   Some   Futures   for   Religious
            Leadership." Review of Religious Research 33(4):
            289-304.

Carroll, J. W., Hargrove, B. and Lummis, A.
    1983   Women of the Cloth. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Chambers, D.
    1986   "The Constraints of Work and Domestic Schedules on
            Women's Leisure."   Leisure Studies 5(3):309-325.

Charlton, J.
    1987   "Women in Seminary: A Review of Current Social
            Science Research."   Review of Religious Research
            28(4):305-318.

Christ, C. and Plaskow, J.
    1979   Womanspirit Rising: A Feminist Reader in Religion.
            New York: Harpur & Row.

Christensen, K.
    1988   Women and Home-Based Work: The Unspoken Contract.
            New York: Henry Holt and Co.

Connell, R.W.
1987   Gender and Power. Oxford: Polity.

1995   Maculinities. Oxford: Polity.

Coser, L.
1974   Greedy Institutions. New York: The Free Press.

Crompton, R.
1987   "Gender, Status, and Professionalism." Sociology 21:413-28.

Dalley, G.
1988   Ideologies of Caring: Rethinking Community and Collectivism. London: Macmillan.

Daly, K.
1996   Families and Time: Keeping Pace in a Hurried Culture. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Daly, M.
1973   Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation. Boston: Beacon Press.

Daniels, A. K.
1985   "Good Times and Good Works: the place of sociability in the work of women volunteers." Social Problems 32(4): 363-374.

1987   "Invisible Work." Social Problems 34(5): 403-415.

Daune-Richard, A.
1988   "Gender Relations and Female Labour: A Consideration of Sociological Categories." Pp. 260-275 in J. Jenson, E. Hagan, and C. Reddy (eds.), The Feminization of the Labour Force. Oxford: Polity Press.

Davies, C.
1996   "The Sociology of Professions and the Profession of Gender." Sociology 30(4): 661-673.

In press "The Masculinity of Organizational Life" in S. Baker and A. Van Doorne-Husker (eds.), Women and Public Policy: the shifting boundaries between the public and the private. London: Ashgate.

Deem, R.
    1982   "Women, Leisure and Inequality." Leisure Studies
            1:29-46.

    1986   All Work and No Play? The Sociology of Women and
            Leisure. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Demo, D. and Acock A.
    1993   "Family diversity and the division of domestic
            labour." Family Relations, 42:323-331.

DeVault, M.
    1990   "Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint:
            Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis,"
            Social Problems, 37(1):701-721.

    1991   Feeding the Family. Chicago: University of Chicago
            Press.

Donovan, M. S.
    1988   Women Priests in the Episcopal Church. Cincinnati:
            Forward Movement Publications.

England, P. and Farkas, G.
    1986   Households, Employment and Gender. New York:
            Aldine de Gruyter.

Finch, J.
    1983   Married to the Job. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Fineman, S.
    1993   "Organizations as emotional arenas." Pp. 7-35 in
            S. Fineman (ed.), Emotion in Organizations.
            London: Sage.

Freidson, E.
    1990   "Labors of Love in Theory and Practice: A
            Prospectus." Pp. 149-161 in K. Erickson and S.
            Vallas (eds.), The Nature of Work. New Haven and
            London: Yale University Press.

Gannon, T.M.
    1981   "Friendship Patterns of American Catholic Clergy."
            Research in the Interweave of Social Roles 2:197-
            217.

Ghorayshi, P.
    1989   "The indispensible nature of wives' work for the
            farm enterprise." Canadian Review of Sociology and
            Anthropology. 26(4): 401-25.

Giles, W. and Arat-Koç, S.
    1994   "Introduction." Pp. 1-12 in W. Giles and S. Arat-
            Koç (eds.), <u>Maid in the Market: Women's Paid
            Domestic Labour</u>. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing

Gilligan, C.
    1987   "Remapping Development: The Power of Divergent
            Data." Pp. 77-94 in C. Farnham (ed.), <u>The Impact
            of Feminist Research in the Academy</u>.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A.
    1967   <u>The discovery of grounded theory</u>. Chicago: Aldine.

Glucksmann, M.A.
    1990   <u>Women Assemble: Women Workers and the New
            Industries in Inter-War Britain.</u>   London:
            Routeledge.

    1995   "Why 'Work'? Gender and the 'Total Social
            Organization of Labour.'" <u>Gender, Work, and
            Organization</u> 2(2):63-75.

Gordon, J. and Neal, R.
    1997   "Voluntary Non-Profit Organizations: A New
            Research Agenda." <u>Society/Société</u> 21(1):15-19.

Graham, H.
    1983   "Caring: A Labour of Love," In J.Finch and D.
            Groves (eds.), <u>A Labour of Love: Women, Work and
            Caring</u>. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Grant, J. and Tancred, P.
    1992   "A Feminist Perspective on State Bureaucracy." Pp.
            112-128 in A. J. Mills and P. Tancred (eds.),
            <u>Gendering Organizational Analysis</u>. Newbury Park:
            Sage.

Green, E., Hebron, S., and Woodward, D.
    1990   <u>Women's Leisure, What Leisure</u>. Houndmills and
            London: McMillan Education Ltd.

Gregory, S.
    1982   "Women among others: another view." <u>Leisure
            Studies</u> 1:47-52.

Gutek, B.A.
    1989   "Sexuality in the Workplace: Key issues in social
            research and organizational practice." Pp. 56-70
            in J. Hearn, D.L. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, and
            G. Burrell (eds.), <u>The Sexuality of Organization</u>.
            London: Sage.

Hansen, K.
  1987   "Feminist Conceptions of Public and Private: A Critical Analysis." <u>Berkeley Journal of Sociology</u> 32:105-128.

Harding, S.
  1987   "Introduction: Is There a Feminist Method?" Pp. 1-14 in Harding, S. (ed.), <u>Feminism and Methodology</u>. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Henderson, K.
  1990   "An oral life history perspective on the containers in which American farm women experienced leisure." <u>Leisure Studies</u> 9:121-133.

Hochschild, A.
  1972   "The Role of the Ambassador's Wife." Pp. 453-480 in C. Bryant (ed.), <u>The Social Dimensions of Work</u>. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

  1983   <u>The Managed Heart</u>. Berkeley: University of California Press.

  1997   <u>The Time Bind</u>. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Howe, E. M.
  1982   <u>Women and Church Leadership</u>. Grand Rapids: The Zondevan Corporation.

Hunter, J. and Sargeant, K.
  1993   "Religion, Women, and the Transformation of Public Culture." <u>Social Research</u>, 60(3):545-570.

Imray, L. and Middleton, A.
  1983   "Public and Private: Making the Boundaries." Pp. 12-27 in E. Garminikow, D. Morgan, J. Purvis, and D. Taylorson (eds.), <u>The Public and the Private</u>. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

James, N.
  1989   "Skill and work in the emotional regulation of feeling." <u>Sociological Review</u> 37(1):15-42.

  1992   "Care = organization + physical labour + emotional labour." <u>Sociology of Health and Illness</u> 14(4):488-509.

Karlsson, Jan
  1995   "The Concept of Work on the Rack: Critique and Suggestions." <u>Research in the Sociology of Work</u>, 5:1-14.

Kasteler, J., R. Kane, D. Olsen, and C Thetford
1976   "Issues Underlying Prevalence of 'Doctor-Shopping'
        Behavior." Journal of Health and Social Behavior,
        17: 328-339.

Kern, J.
1972   "A Doctor in the House." Pp. 436-452 in Bryan, C.
        (ed.) The Social Dimensions of Work. Englewood
        Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Kirchemeyer, C.
1993   "Nonwork to Work Spillover: A More Balanced View
        of the Experiences of Coping of Professional Women
        and Men." Sex Roles 28(9/10):531-552.

Kleinman, S.
1984a   Equal Before God: Seminarians as Humanistic
        Professionals. Chicago: The University of Chicago
        Press.

1984b   "Women in Seminary: Dilemmas of Professional
        Socialization." Sociology of Education 57:210-
        219.

Kobayashi, A., Peake L., Benenson, H., and Pickles, K.
1994   "Placing Women and Work." Pp. xi-xiv in Kobayashi,
        A. (ed.) Women, Work, and Place. Montreal: McGill-
        Queens Press.

Lehman, E.C.
1987   "Research on Lay Church Members Attitudes Towards
        Women Clergy: An Assessment." Review of Religious
        Research 28(4):319-329.

1993a   Gender and Work: The Case of the Clergy. Albany:
        State University of New York Press.

1993b   "Gender and Ministry Style: Things Not What They
        Seem." Sociology of Religion, 54(1):1-11.

Leicht, K. T. and Fennell, M. L.
1997   "The Changing Organizational Context of
        Professional Work." The Annual Review of
        Sociology, 23:215-31.

Marciano T.D.
1990   "Corporate Church, Ministry, and Ministerial
        Family: Embedded Employment and Measures of
        Success." Marriage and Family Review, 15(3-4):171-
        193.

Margolis, D.
1979   "The Invisible Hands: Sex Roles and the Division of Labor in Two Political Parties."   <u>Social Problems</u>, 26(3):314-324.

Mason, J.
1996   <u>Qualitative Researching</u>.   London: Sage.

McConnell, J.
1994   "Women's Voices: Stories shared by women in ministry with the United Church of Canada." Unpublished report: United Church of Canada, Division of Ministry, Personnel, and Education.

1995   Personal communication.

Mellow, M.
1993a   "Defining Work and Leisure: Challenges Arising from Women's Experience."   Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, Ottawa.

1993b   "Framing the Invisible: Patients' Perceptions of Nursing Work." Master's Thesis. Montreal: McGill University, Department of Sociology.

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A. M.
1994   <u>Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook</u> (second edition).   Newbury Park: Sage.

Mills. A. and Tancred, P. (eds.)
1992   <u>Gendering Organizational Analyis</u>.   London: Sage.

Mirchandani, K.
1996   "Living in the Office: Professional Telework and Its Critical Reflection of the Public-Private Dichotomy. Ph.D. dissertation. Montreal: McGill University, Department of Sociology.

1998   "Protecting the Boundary: Teleworker Insights on the Expansive Concept of Work."   <u>Gender and Society</u>, 12(2):168-187.

1999   "Legitimizing Work: Telework and the Gendered Reification of the Work-Nonwork Dichotomy."   <u>The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology</u>, 36(1):87-107.

Nason-Clark, N.
1987   "Are Women Changing the Image of Ministry?   A Comparison of British and American Realities." <u>Review of Religious Research</u> 28 (4): 330-340.

Nieva, V.F. and Gutek, B.A.

Nieva, V.F. and Gutek, B.A.
  1981   Women and Work: A Psychological Perspective. New York: Praeger.

Park, P.
  1981   "Women and Liturgy." Pp. 77-88 in J. Weidman (ed.), Women Ministers: How Women are Redefining Traditional Roles. San Francisco: Harpur & Row Publishers.

Parker, S.
  1983   Leisure and Work. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Parkin, W.
  1989   "Private Experiences in the Public Domain: Sexuality and Residential Care Organizations." Pp. 110-124 in J. Hearn, D.L. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, G. Burrell (eds.), The Sexuality of Organization. London: Sage Publications

  1993   "The Public and the Private: Gender, Sexuality and Emotion." Pp. 167-189 in S. Fineman (ed.) Emotion in Organizations. London: Sage Publications.

Patton, M.Q.
  1990   Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods (second edition). Newbury Park: Sage.

Pierce, J.
  1995   Gender Trials. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reinharz, S.
  1992   Feminist Methods in Social Research. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rinehart, J.W.
  1975   The Tyranny of Work: Alienation and the Labour Process (second edition). Toronto: Harcourt-Brace Javanovich.

Robb, C. (ed.)
  1985   Making Connections: Essays in Feminist Social Ethics. Boston: Beacon Press.

Rojek, C.
  1985   Capitalism and Leisure Theory. London and New York: Tavistock Publications.

Ronco, W. and Peattie, L.
  1988   "Making Work: a Perspective from Social Science." Pp. 709-721 in R.E. Pahl (ed.), On Work. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Ronco, W. and Peattie, L.
    1988   "Making Work: a Perspective from Social Science."
            Pp. 709-721 in R.E. Pahl (ed.), On Work. Oxford:
            Basil Blackwell.

Ross, S.
    1991   As for Me and My House. Toronto: McClelland &
            Stewart.

Ruether, R. and McLaughlin, E. (eds.)
    1979   Women of the Spirit: Female Leadership in the
            Jewish and Christian Traditions. New York: Simon
            and Schuster.

Scott, J.
    1986   "Gender: A   Useful   Category   of   Historical
            Analysis." American Historical Review 91:1053-75.

Seccombe, Wally
    1974   "The Housewife and Her Labour under Capitalism."
            New Left Review, 83:3-24.

Seron, C. and Ferris, K.
    1995   "Negotiating Professionalism: The Gendered Social
            Capital of Flexible Time." Work and Occupations
            22(1):22-47.

Sheppard, D.
    1992   "Women's Managers' Perceptions of Gender and
            Organizational Life." Pp. 151-166 in A. Mills and
            P.   Tancred   (eds.),   Gendering   Organizational
            Practice. Newbury Park: Sage.

Simon, R. and Nadell, P.
    1995   "In the Same Voice or Is It Different?: Gender and
            the Clergy." Sociology of Religion 56(1):63-70.

Simon, R., Scalon, A., and Nadell, P.
    1993   "Rabbis and Ministers: Women of the Book and the
            Cloth." Sociology of Religion 54(1):115-122.

Smith, D. E.
    1987   The   Everyday   World   as   Problematic.   Toronto:
            University of Toronto Press.

Stacey, M. and Davies, C.
    1983   Division of Labour in Health Care: Final Report to
            the S.S.R.C. Conventry: University of Warwick.

Statistics Canada
    1994   <u>Women   in   the   Labour   Force: 1994   edition</u>.
            Catalogue   number   75-507E.   Ottawa: Supply   and
            Services.

    1997   <u>Caring   Canadians,   Involved   Canadian: Highlights
            from   the   1997   National   Survey   of   Giving,
            Volunteering   and   Participating</u>.   Catalogue   number
            71-542-XPE.   Ottawa: Minister   of   Supply   and
            Services.

Stelling, J.
    1994   "Staff nurses' perceptions of nursing: issues in a
            woman's occupation."   Pp. 609-626 in B.S. Bolaria
            and H.D. Dickinson (eds.), <u>Health, Illness and
            Health Care in Canada</u> (second edition).   Toronto:
            Harcourt Brace & Company.

Steward, M.S., Steward, D.S. and Dary, J.A.
    1983   "Women Who Choose a Man's Career: A Study of Women
            in Ministry."   <u>Psychology of Women Quarterly</u>,
            8(2):166-173.

Stivers, C.
    1993   <u>Gender Images in Public Administration</u>.   Newbury
            Park: Sage.

Stoltenberg, J.
    1990   <u>Refusing to Be a Man: Essays on Sex and Justice</u>.
            Portland: Breitenbush Books.

Tancred, P.
    1995   "Women's Work: A Challenge to the Sociology of
            Work." <u>Gender, Work and Organization</u> 2(1): 11-20.

Thompson, P.
    1983   <u>The Nature of Work</u>.   London: McMillan Press.

Thompson, S. M.
    1990   "Thank   the   Ladies   for   the   Plates":   The
            Incorporation   of   Women   into   Sport."   <u>Leisure
            Studies</u> 9(2):135-143.

Tronto, J.
    1989   "Women and Caring: What Can Feminists Learn About
            Morality from Caring."   In A. Jaggar and S. Bordo,
            (eds.) <u>Gender/Body/Knowledge</u>. New Brunswick, N.J.:
            Rutgers University Press.

United Church of Canada
   1996   The United Church of Canada Yearbook and Directory.
             Toronto: United Church Publishing House.

   1998   The Manual.   Toronto: United Church Publishing
             House.

Wadel, C.
   1979   "The Hidden Work of Everyday Life." Pp. 365-84 in
             S. Wallman (ed.), Social Anthropology of Work. New
             York: Academic Press.

Wajcman, Judy
   1996   "The domestic basis for the managerial career."
             The Sociological Review, 44(4):609-629.

   1998   Managing Like a Man. University Park, P.A.:   The
             Pennsylvania State University Press.

Wallace, R. A.
   1992a   They Call Her Pastor: A New Role for Catholic
             Women.   Albany: State University of New York
             Press.

   1992b   "The Social Construction of a New Leadership Role:
             Catholic Women Pastors."   Sociology of Religion
             54(1):31-42.

Watson, T.
   1980   Sociology,   Work,   and   Industry.   New   York:
             Routledge, Kegan and Paul, Ltd.

Wearing, B. and Wearing, S.
   1988   "'All in a Day's Leisure':   gender and the concept
             of leisure." Leisure Studies 7:111-123.

Weidman, J. (ed.)
   1981   Women   Ministers: How   Women   are   Redefining
             Traditional Roles.   San Francisco: Harpur & Row
             Publishers.

Whyte, W.H. Jr.
   1962   "The Wives of Management." Pp. 548-555 in S. Nosow
             and W.H. Form, (eds.), Man, Work and Society. New
             York: Basic Books.

Wilson, S.J.
   1996   Women,   Families,   and   Work   (fourth   edition).
             Toronto: McGraw, Hill, Ryerson Limited.

Witz, A.
1990   "Patriarchy and Professions: The Gendered Politics of Occupational Closure." Sociology 24(4):675-690.

Wright, M.M.
1995   "I never did any fieldwork, but I milked an awful lot of cows!" Using Rural Women's Experience to Reconceptualize Models of Work. Gender and Society. 9: 216-235.

Yanay, N. and Shahar, G.
1998   "Professional Feelings as Emotional Labour." Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 27(3):346-373.