

DECISION-MAKING IN WORKING CLASS
ENGLISH AND CANADIAN FAMILIES

by

Marion P. Crawford

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research, in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology,
McGill University,
Montreal

July 1962

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
I THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	3
Traditional Sex roles	4
Evidence of change	7
Factor of the working mother	14
II DEFINITION OF TERMS AND METHODOLOGY	21
III SOME DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CANADIAN FAMILIES	35
Socio-geographical description	36
Differences in Family Decision-making	41
Differences in Family characteristics	45
IV FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKING AND NON WORKING WIVES	51
V FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND SYNERGATICITY.. .. .	62
VI DISTRIBUTION OF POWER	72
Power, Nationality and working	73
Power, Nationality and Syneraticity	79
Power and Religion	82
VII SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	84
APPENDICES	
A Schedule administered to the Exeter sample	88

APPENDICES

B	Schedule administered to the Canadian sample	..	92
C	Text of letter to Exeter respondents	95
D	Text of letter to Montreal respondents	96
E	The sample	97
F	Occupations of husbands	99
G	Occupations of working wives	100
H	Decision-making in English and Canadian Families		101

BIBLIOGRAPHY	103
--------------	---------	-----

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was begun in Exeter, England, in October, 1960, under a University Postgraduate Scholarship. I intended to submit a thesis to Exeter on the data collected from 400 Exeter families. However, in December, 1960, I found that I was coming to Canada under a Rotary Foundation Fellowship. The opportunity therefore to undertake a comparative study of decision-making in the English and Canadian family ^{was} presented and I took advantage of it.

I wish to acknowledge the help and support of the following:-

Exeter University and Rotary International for financial support without which neither part of the study would have been possible,

Dr. M. Hewitt and Dr. F. Oliver of Exeter University for their indispensable guidance and interest in setting up the project, in the fieldwork and in the analysis,

Dr. W. Westley, the thesis supervisor, without whose help this thesis would never have been written,

Finally, the 400 English and 100 Canadian families who took me into their homes and answered my questions so willingly.

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

This is a study of one effect of the paid employment of the mother on one aspect of family relationships. It is intended to discover whether the mother's paid employment has any effect on decision-making in the home. (It is suggested that perhaps the working mother makes more decisions in the home and arrives at these more independently of her husband than her non-working counterpart.)

This study was begun in England, where until very recently there had been very little empirical work done on the family in sociological terms. The family seemed to be an area about which sociologists were content either to write historical accounts or to study its "breakdown" in terms of divorce statistics. There was no study of the dynamics of family life.

Elisabeth Bott¹ broke this convention with her study of familial roles and social networks but she based her work on only 20 families. Young and Wilmott² traced the change in family life when working class families moved from a London slum to a suburban housing estate, but they based their findings on forty-five married couples. There was no large scale empirical study specifically devoted to the dynamics of decision-making in the family.

This subject had, however, been studied in Australia³ and in the States⁴ where it was found that the patriarchal or husband-dominated family

¹Elisabeth Bott, Family and Social Network, London; Tavistock Publications Ltd., 1957.

²Michael Young and Peter Wilmott, Family and Kinship in East London, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1957.

³P.G.Herbst, in Social Structure and Personality in a City, ed. by O.A. Oeser and S.B.Hammond, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1954.

⁴Robert O. Blood and Donald M. Wolfe, Husbands and Wives: Dynamics of Married Living, Illinois; The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.

was giving way to an equalitarian or democratic type of family. It is popularly supposed that the English family is husband-dominated and so the present study sought to determine whether the English family was following these world-wide trends or whether it was adhering to its somewhat Victorian ideal.

The work of Professor Zweig¹ suggested a more specific problem. This was that the working mother would be likely to feel more independent and competent than the nonworking mother. Therefore the hypothesis formulated for the purposes of this study became:- a working mother has more power in the home in terms of decision-making than a nonworking mother.

There were two main reasons why it was considered worthwhile to make a comparison of the English and Canadian family in these terms. First, in Canada as in England, there has been very little empirical work done on a large scale. Secondly, the proportion of working to nonworking mothers in Canada is much lower than it is in England, which suggested that the two societies were at different stages in the growth of the phenomenon of the working mother.

Chapter I describes traditional sex roles and reviews the evidence that these are changing. The possibility that working mothers may be a factor contributing to this change is discussed. Chapter II defines the meanings of the terms used in the study and describes the methodology. Chapter III traces general differences in the family in England and Canada. Chapter IV compares families of working mothers with families of nonworking mothers. Chapter V describes factors affecting the amount of sharing in decision-making. Chapter VI discusses the distribution of power.

¹F. Zweig, Women's Life and Labour, London; Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1952.

CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Traditional Sex Roles

One of the ways in which sociologists have studied the family is by analysing the roles associated with the social positions of fathers and mothers or husbands and wives. It has been observed that these roles are changing in modern society and it has been suggested that the paid employment of the wife may accelerate this change. It is proposed, therefore, first, to examine the traditional roles of husband and wife; secondly, to examine the evidence on which theories of change have been based; and, thirdly, to examine previous studies which have also suggested that the working wife may be a causal factor in the changing role structure.

Sociologists have discussed the origins of the role of husband and wife in biological terms. Zelditch describes them as the instrumental and expressive roles¹.

The instrumental role belongs to the husband/father.

"It involves, first, a manipulation of the external environment and consequently a good deal of physical mobility. The concentration of the mother on the child precludes a primacy of her attention in this direction although she always performs some instrumental tasks. In addition to the managerial aspects of the role, there are certain discipline and control functions of the father role."

The mother, on the other hand, is

"The focus of gratification in a diffuse sense, a source of security and comfort . . . Thus because of her special initial relation to the child, 'mother' is the more likely expressive focus of the system as a whole²."

¹Morris Zelditch, Jr., "Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family: a comparative study", in A Modern Introduction to the Family, ed. Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960. Ch.11.

²ibid., 334.

"The American male, by definition, must provide for his family. He is responsible for the support of his wife and children. His primary area of performance is the occupational role in which his status fundamentally inheres; and his primary function in the family is to supply an income, to be the breadwinner. There is simply something wrong with the American adult male who doesn't have a job. American women, on the other hand, tend to hold jobs before they are married and to quit when 'the day' comes; or to continue in jobs of a lower status than their husbands. And not only is the mother the focus of emotional support for the American middle class child, but much more exclusively so than in most societies . . . The cult of the warm, giving 'mom' stands in contrast to the 'capable', competent, 'go-getting' male . . . The father is supposed to remain the primary executive member. The image of the 'hen-pecked' husband makes sense only on this premise. His 'commands' are validated on the basis of 'good judgment' rather than general obedience due to a person in authority¹."

This is a theoretical description of the traditional roles of husband and wife. Western culture has for centuries accepted this pattern and based its sanctions of familial behaviour on it. Moreover, it has been demonstrated empirically that these are the roles which people in the positions of husband and wife accept. In 1959, Hurwitz drew up a Marital Roles Inventory, based on the opinions of 104 American middle class married couples². The behaviour of these couples can be taken as representative of Western society, as groups lower in the social scale take the middle class as their reference group. Hurwitz found that the following tasks were designated as the husband's:- earning a living and supporting the family, doing jobs around the house, serving as a model of men to his children and doing his wife's jobs around the house if help is needed.

¹ibid., 336.

²F. Hurwitz, "Components of Marital Roles" in Sociology and Social Research, XVI, 1960-61, pp. 301-309.

The wife's tasks are being a homemaker, caring for the children's everyday needs, serving as a model of women to the children and helping to earn the living when necessary. Both husband and wife are responsible for helping the children grow, representing and advancing the family in the community, helping to manage the family income and finance, being a companion to and sexual partner for each other, and practising the family religion.

Thus the traditional role of the husband/father in our society is that of breadwinner and chief executive; the traditional role of the wife/mother is that of homemaker and child carer and chief expressive leader. This has led to a situation in which the husband is the chief spokesman and decision-maker because if he is bringing home the family's income for the wife to spend, he has a right to say what should be done with it. As Blood and Wolfe put it,

"That partner is most powerful who is the instrumental leader, who gets those things done which most urgently need doing if the family is to survive. Such a leader is not only economically productive himself but functions as the organiser and administrator¹ of other family members in the task of economic production¹."

They trace the continuing dominance of the husband and submission of the wife through hunting, agricultural and industrial societies. In the latter phase,

"The man became the sole source of support for his dependents. And since the wife was one of these dependents, her position continued subordinate as before²."

This meant that, until the beginning of this century at least, the man was regarded as the head of the household and, in both middle and working class families, his word was law. It was taken for granted that a good

¹Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 16.

²Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 17.

husband should be a strong, energetic personality who left the care of the home and the nurture of the children to his "weak" obedient wife.

Evidence of Change

This traditional view of the roles of the sexes in marriage has been challenged. One of the first to do this was Margaret Mead. The social behaviour which she observed in the islands of New Guinea caused her to revise her Western-oriented ideas on the roles of husband and wife¹. She found that different social systems had different role behaviour ~~was~~ expected of the wife.

"The Arapesh regard both men and women as inherently gentle, responsive, cooperative, able and willing to subordinate self to the needs of those who are younger or weaker and to derive a major satisfaction from doing so. . . Those who suffer most among the Arapesh, who find the whole social system the least congenial and intelligible are the violent, aggressive men and the violent, aggressive women. This will at once be seen to contrast with our own society in which it is the mild, unaggressive man who goes to the wall and the aggressive, violent woman who is looked upon with disapproval and approbrium²."

In a second social system, the sexes played identical roles. Mundugumor men and women were expected to be proud, harsh and violent and the tenderer sentiments were felt to be as inappropriate in one sex and in the other. In a third social system, the Tchambuli, on the other hand, it was the women who had the real position of power in the society. They remained a solid group upon whom the men depended for support, for food and for affection and their attitude towards the men was one of kindly tolerance and appreciation.

¹Margaret Mead, Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1935.

²ibid., 145

Mead concludes that

"If these temperamental attitudes which we have traditionally regarded as feminine, such as passivity, responsiveness and a willingness to cherish children, can so easily be set up as the masculine pattern in one tribe, and in another be outlawed for the majority of women as well as for the majority of men, we no longer have any basis for regarding such aspects of behaviour as sex-linked. And this conclusion becomes even stronger when we consider the actual reversal in Tchambuli of the position of dominance of the two sexes in spite of the existence of formal patriarchal institutions¹."

Mead may have read into the situation rather more than was warranted; however, she did raise the theory that the traditional roles of husbands and wives in our society are not the ones necessarily determined by our biological nature but by other factors, for example, economic expediency.

In this century we have seen the growth of a change in these traditional patterns of behaviour. Since this study is concerned chiefly with working class families, it is useful to see how Young and Willmott describe the change in the English working class household, based on the reports of social investigators like Helen Bosanquet at the turn of the century.

"The husband too often took for himself what he should have spent on his family. (He) was not only mean with money. He was callous in sex as often as not forcing a trial of unwanted pregnancies upon his unwilling mate. He was harsh to his children. He was violent when drunk, which was often²."

"Being a prisoner to child-bearing, the wife could not easily mend her finances for herself by going out to work. She lived in the dread that even the little support her husband afforded her might be withdrawn by his unemployment, by his premature death or by his desertion. . . . His wife did indeed belong to the downtrodden sex.

¹ibid., 145.

²Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 4.

"Even though we may think the accounts overdrawn, and distrust the representativeness of the families they describe, we cannot ignore the historical evidence, all the more so since the notion still survives that the working class man is a sort of absentee husband, sharing with his wife neither responsibility nor affection, partner only of the bed. Such a view is in the tradition of research into working class family life.¹"

However, in their research Bethnal Green, Young and Willmott found that great changes had taken place. For instance,

"The man's earnings may still be his affair, but when it comes to the spending of the money, his part of the wages as well as hers, husband and wife share the responsibility.²"

Again

"Whatever happened in the past, the younger husband of today does not consider that the children belong exclusively to his wife's world, or that he can abandon them to her. . . . while he takes his comfort in the male atmosphere of the pub³. . . . The old style of working class family life is fast disappearing. The husband and wife portrayed by previous social investigations is no longer true to life. In place of the old comes a new kind of companionship between man and woman reflecting the rise in status of the young wife and children which is one of the great transformations of our time. There is now a nearer approach to equality between the sexes and, though each has a peculiar role, its boundaries are no longer so rigidly defined nor is it performed without consultation. The grand assumption made by Church and State (but thrown into doubt by earlier surveys) can be reestablished⁴."

¹Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 5.

²Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 12.

³Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 6.

⁴Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 15.

Another sociologist found the same situation in North-East England as well as in London. Professor Zweig, after talking to over 100 women, concluded that

"It is a commonplace to say that our present age is an age of transition and the statement itself conveys but little. But the transition is very marked if the role and status of women in society is considered. It looks as if a new balance will be struck between the sexes and the traditional sex barriers and fences brought down. The promotion of women becomes one of the basic characteristics of our age. Her aspirations towards greater equality, independence and freedom are being fulfilled to an ever greater extent¹."

In Canada also it has been suggested that the family is changing from patriarchy to democracy². In Crestwood Heights, a middle class suburb of Toronto, although many families with a strong patriarchal bias still persist,

". . . the Victorian father, patriarchal head of the family and owner of wife and progeny, is as frowned upon as the over-dominant, nagging mother. Severe discipline, a primary differentium of the authoritarian father, is defined and disapproved of as the expectation of instant obedience, modelled on the military pattern. The good father should not leave complete or almost complete responsibility for the child's upbringing to the mother (even though he provides for the child's material needs) no matter how pressing are his business of professional duties . . .

"The ideal Crestwood family is therefore greatly different from the ideal family of previous decades. If we might use an analogy, the Crestwood family now seems a little like a country which, having operated under an authoritarian form of government, has suddenly switched to a democratic

¹Zweig, op. cit., 153.

²John R. Seeley, Alexander R. Sim and Elizabeth Loosley, "Family and Socialisation in an Upper-Class Community" in Canadian Society, ed. by Bernard B. Blishen et al., Toronto; The MacMillan Company of Canada 1961. Part III, Ch. 5.

"form, without too much preparation for the change . . . The father, it is true, still holds the economic power but he is now culturally enjoined from exercising it in despotic ways. A central problem of the family now appears to be the allocation of power among its members so that each may participate, not in the earning of the family income, but in the emotional and social life of the family unit¹."

The authors explain, however, that in this particular model class of community the status of the father, theoretically at least, is still that of head of the family.

"Even though the patriarchal powers once associated with his role are largely dissipated, the father still stands as the symbolic head of the family. Under the new dispensation he is expected to share his authority among all members of the family in varying degrees and, indeed, because of his frequent absence, his power to deal with situations and with persons within the family largely pass to the woman. But even more difficult, the man is, at the same time, now required to 'participate' in the whole child-rearing process and sometimes in the actual household routine as well . . . The father now seems to have more responsibility within the home but without commensurate authority²."

The changes described here were not studied in empirical terms - these were the informal impressions of the interviewers. However, other studies have shown in statistical terms that the father who gives all the orders and makes all the decisions is a phenomenon of the past. These other studies were carried out in Melbourne and Detroit.

Perhaps the first important study in this field was the work of Herbst in Melbourne, Australia³. He was trying to measure dominance or authority in terms of decision-making. His methods will be discussed more fully below, but briefly he administered a questionnaire to a group of school children. Thirty-three items of family activities were listed and the children were

¹ibid., 124.

²ibid., 125

³Herbst, op. cit.

asked who made the decisions on the activities, who actually did them and how much disagreement there was. Alternative answers included each member of the immediate family, other relatives and friends. He looked at family activities in terms of field structures and distinguished six areas of family activity, - wife's household, common household, husband's household, child care, economic affairs and social affairs. The results showed that:-

"On the average, one-third of all activities are engaged in together, and that the total activity field of the wife is about twice as large as that of the husband¹."

On terms of decision-making, the wife is the dominant partner; the husband makes 19.8% of all decisions, both together make 29.8% and the wife makes 50.4%. He concludes:-

"The percentage of wife's decisions is seen to be considerably larger than that of the husband's decisions. By itself, this fact would not prove that families in the sample tend to be wife-dominant since the percentages are to some extent a function of the selection of items. It is, however, reinforced by earlier findings about tension distribution among interaction patterns, especially the finding that higher tension occurs when the husband is dominant than when the wife is dominant. A later analysis of the data in terms of the number of regions in which the husband and wife respectively were the source of authority, shows more conclusively that for the city sample the wife is² generally the major source of authority in the home²."

Thus we see that the modern Australian urban family is very much more likely to be wife-dominated or equalitarian than husband-dominated. The same situation has been found in the States. Blood and Wolfe interviewed 730 wives in metropolitan Detroit between 1955 and 1959 in order to ascertain "what factors determine how husbands and wives interact³". They listed

¹Herbst, op. cit., 149.

²Herbst, op. cit., 163.

³Blood and Wolfe, op. cit.

eight family decisions and asked who made them. The results showed that

"When viewed against the relatively small margin of husband-winning over wife-winning cases (in argument) Detroit marriages have clearly moved a long way from nineteenth century patriarchalism¹."

Moreover, Blood and Wolfe then examined various segments of the population which they assumed would be likely to be patriarchal, i.e., those segments less exposed to urban, industrial and educational influences. But they report:-

"We have looked in five directions for evidence that patriarchal subcultures still linger in contemporary American society - without success. Neither the farm families, nor immigrants from other countries, nor Catholic families nor the older generation, nor poorly educated families adhere to a patriarchal way of life. In some cases, they are no different from the families which were expected to be more 'modern' in their decision-making. In other cases they are significantly less matriarchal than those which were supposed to be most 'emancipated' from the bonds of tradition.

"Under these circumstances the weight of evidence suggests that the patriarchal family is dead. This does not mean there is no such thing as an American family in which the husband makes most of the decisions. Nor does it mean that no groups of American families can be found in which the husbands exercise power. What it does mean is that wherever husbands exercise power today it is not because they and their wives subscribe to a patriarchal belief system which says that it is only right and proper to have this kind of marriage.²"

We have now seen that in Australia and in the States there has been found empirical evidence for the change from patriarchal to equalitarian and matriarchal families, and in England and Canada informal evidence has supported this theory. The question must now be asked, "What factors determine the authority pattern of the modern family?" Blood and Wolfe have attempted to answer this question. According to them, since the patriarchal family was

¹Blood and Wolfe, op. cit.,

²Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 28.

not found in any particular subculture, the location of authority in the family is not determined by ideological factors. Rather they say it is based on more practical factors. They claim that

"The balance of power in particular families and in whole categories of families is determined by the comparative resourcefulness of the two partners and by the life circumstances within which they live . . . It is no longer possible to assume that just because a man is a man he is the boss . . . Rather he must prove his right to power, or win power by virtue of his own skills and accomplishments in competition with his wife¹."

In other words, power in the modern family is not wielded by the competent sex but by the competent marriage partner.

The Factor of the Working Mother

This study is seeking to determine whether one of the factors which make a contribution to competence and therefore to the relative authority of a marriage partner is the paid employment of the wife. The hypothesis was first presented to the writer by Professor Zweig². He informally interviewed 119 women, 92 of whom were working outside the home and 27 of whom were fulltime housewives, in order chiefly to discover their attitudes towards working wives and to investigate the possible effect on industry. In the course of this study which was conducted in London and the industrial north of England, he raised the question of the relative status of working and nonworking women in their homes. He states that

"The social status of a woman at home is not the same as that of a woman worker. A woman standing firmly on the ground . . . looking fearlessly into her husband's eye with the recognition of her full contribution is a being wholly different from the 'professional' wife, who takes her

¹Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 29.

²Zweig, op. cit.

"master's wish for a command and her master's voice for ultimate wisdom¹."

One of his respondents said, "A wife who goes out to work belongs more often to the domineering type but she acquires also a higher status in the family by virtue of her independence". Zweig continues on this theme, "She can earn her own living, and stand on her own feet. She can feel independent and have a security altogether different from a housewife. She can bargain with men on equal terms²."

Since other studies have shown that the status of women in general in their families appears to be higher in our society now than it was fifty years ago, one is led to wonder whether the working wife will not have an even higher status than the nonworking wife. This is a relevant problem for our society since in Britain and North America the number of working wives is increasing. In Britain full employment of men does not seem to fill the need for more paid workers since 82% of single women are employed. Any increase in the labour force must therefore come from the ranks of the married women. Myrdal and Klein note that in 1931, only 10% of married women were paid workers, whereas in 1951, 26% were, and in 1956 they found that "every fourth married women in Britain has a job outside her home"³. In Canada, in 1951, one in ten were working⁴, but if the rate of increase approaches that of Britain, it can be estimated that in 1962 about one in seven are working.

¹Zweig, op. cit., 153.

²Zweig, op. cit., 15.

³Alva Myrdal and Viola Klein, Women's Two Roles; Home and Work, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956. 54.

⁴Department of Labour, Survey of Married Women Working for Pay in Eight Canadian Cities, Cat. No. L38-258, Ottawa; the Department of Labour, 1958.

There appear to be two main reasons for the possibility that working wives have more power than nonworking wives. One reason is that, as Zweig noted, working women contribute to the family income. This may enable them to demand the right to be consulted on decisions affecting the spending of the income. Helping to make decisions about this may increase a wife's self-confidence and sense of responsibility and she may also make decisions in other areas of family life either at her own demands or at her husband's suggestions. Moreover, making a contribution to the family income, the wife may feel independent from her husband; she does not have to go to him for every small thing she needs. She may realise that she can earn her own living even if he walks out on her so she does not have to be perpetually pleasing him and avoiding his displeasure. She can be a free agent and does not have to consider his reactions to everything she does. What is more, her husband may realise that she is now more than a wife and mother; she is also an economic asset. If he offends her, he may lose a convenient source of income besides an emotional partner. Thus he may be more ready to listen to her opinions and demands and to accede to them. In this way she may participate more in family decisions and will have more authority, knowledge and self-confidence to bring to bear on family discussions.

Another reason for raising this possibility is that the working wife may become a different kind of personality in the home. Members of a family sometimes think that a nonworking wife has nothing else to do but look after their needs. In their eyes she can organise her time entirely to suit the fulfillment of these needs and she is permanently in the home. It is possible that the family, and particularly the husband, will come to take her presence and willing service for granted. She may therefore find herself in the position of a household servant who is not consulted on decisions, who is merely asked to carry out decisions made by her husband. The working wife,

on the other hand, spends most of her time outside the home. She has commitments outside which involve herself and not the family. She has a time schedule of her own to obey. Thus she has possibly more pressing things to do than look after her family and see to their every need. There is not therefore so much likelihood that her willing service will be taken for granted. She may be a person in the home to be consulted and considered rather than just used.

It is suggested that for either of these reasons, the working wife may make, or help to make, more decisions in the home than the nonworking wife. This study was begun in England before the publication of the results of two studies which were concerned with this problem. One of these was part of the research carried out in Detroit by Blood and Wolfe, whose reasons for investigating this were identical to those just described. They considered that

"The pay cheque of the working wife is a contribution to the family which would be expected to give her a greater interest in financial decisions - and greater respect from her husband. The participation of the wife in the outside world through her job gives her contacts with fellow workers which lessen her dependence on her husband for emotional support and increase the knowledge and skill which she brings to decision-making..

"Such factors have produced a new generation of wives who are more resourceful and competent than their grandmothers. They are no longer content to sit ¹ quietly by while their husbands make the decisions'."

Their results showed that "working wives have substantially more power on the average than the nonworking wives at all status levels²".

¹Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 18.

²Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 41.

Table 1 shows that the husband's power, which the authors calculated in statistical terms from the responses to the eight questions on decision-making, decreases as the length of the wife's work participation since marriage increases. Thus the employment of the wife does alter the power structure of the family.

TABLE 1. - Length of wife's work participation
by husband's power¹

	Wife's work participation in years				
	0	Under 1	1 - 4	5 - 9	10+
Husband's mean power	5.80	5.65	4.97	4.66	4.29
Total no. of cases	154	85	183	70	55

With data from the same research project organised by the University of Michigan, Blood and Hamblin, assuming that relative power varies with the control over flow of resources into the family, tested the following hypotheses:-

"On the average working wives change towards equalitarian authority expectations more than do housewives². On the average husbands of working wives change towards equalitarian authority expectations more than do husbands of housewives."

Both these hypotheses were validated, although the second one was not statistically significant. The authors then turned to the actual power structure in the families. They argued that if control over the resources does determine power in the family, working wives should have a larger percentage of adopted suggestions than housewives. Working wives did in fact have a greater percentage of adopted suggestions than housewives but the difference was not significant. However, the working wives in this sample

¹Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 41.

²Robert O. Blood Jr., and Robert L. Hamblin, "Effects of the Wife's Employment on the Family Power Structure", Social Forces, XXXVI, 1957-58, pp. 347-352.

had not been working for more than six years. It may be that significant differences would occur between housewives and working wives who had been working for a longer period.

Thus these previous studies have found that there is a relationship between familial roles in terms of power and the employment of the wife, which is not connected to ideology but which is based on the competence of both partners. However, Hoffman, in a research project at Michigan, suggested that this result may have been found simply because the proper controls were not imposed¹. He asked the question, "Does the mother's employment to have such an effect?" Before he controlled his sample for a Male Dominance Ideology, and a Traditional Sex Ideology, he too found a relationship, but after controlling, this disappeared.

"The results . . . suggest that women's employment does not affect family power structure directly but only in interaction with preexisting ideologies and personalities of the actors. It seems that power relationships like the division of labour are either too deeply intertwined with psychological needs to respond readily to an outside stimulus or that mother's employment is too weak a stimulus. The several recent attempts to show the presence or absence of a relationship between mother employment and the husband-wife power, therefore, seem to be oversimplifications of what should be studied as a complex and multivariate phenomenon²."

In the face of these two conflicting reports, it was decided to continue with the present study. Differences in methods from other work will be discussed below. It should be noted here that a fairly large sample was used and the ratings of power were based on a longer list of decisions than those used by Blood and Wolfe or Hoffman.

¹Lois Wladis Hoffman, "Effects of the Employment of Mothers on Parental Power Relations and Division of Household Tasks" in Marriage and Family Living, XXII, February 1960, pp. 27-35.

²ibid., 34.

Another reason for continuing was that the only studies on the family in Canada so far have been concerned with small segments of the population, e.g., the Doukhobors, etc., and have not been constructed empirically; thus a large scale empirical study of decision-making in the family in one of Canada's largest cities may be welcomed. In England, too, there have been very few studies of the dynamics of family life and these few have again been large scale empirical projects. In neither country has there been much work of the working mother and her effects on the family. Finally a comparative study of the family in England and Canada has not before been attempted and this may be useful while the two countries are at different stages in the growth of the phenomenon of the working mother.

CHAPTER II

DEFINITION OF TERMS AND METHODOLOGY

DEFINITION OF TERMS AND METHODOLOGY

It will be observed that many of the reports of family life used different terms in discussing the relationship between husband and wife in decision-making. It is necessary now to define what has been meant by the terms dominance, authority and power and to indicate which meanings are relevant for this study.

When Herbst reported that most Australian urban families are wife-dominated, he meant that in the majority of these families the wife made most of the decisions and either she or her husband carried them out together or the husband himself carried them out. Herbst found this result by using the following method.¹ He made a list of 33 family activities based on three time sequences - getting up in the morning, at work during the day and at home in the evening. These activities he divided into six areas - wife's household, common household, husband's household, child care, economic affairs and social affairs. About each activity he asked three questions - who decided about it, who actually did it and how much disagreement there was. He administered this questionnaire to a group of 128 schoolchildren aged between 10 and 12. Alternative answers included members of the immediate family, other relatives and friends. From this he derived three continua. The Action continuum ranged from "husband does", through "both do" to "wife does". The Decision continuum ranged from "husband decided", through "both decided" to "wife decided". The tension continuum or index ranged from "no disagreement" to "some disagreement" or "much disagreement".

From the Action and Decision continua, he was able to distinguish nine types of husband-wife relationship.

¹Herbst, op. cit.,

TABLE 2.- Herbst's Typology of Husband-Wife Relationship¹

Ha, Hd	Ba, Hd	Wa, Hd
Ha, Bd	Ba, Bd	Wa, Bd
Ha, Wd	Ba, Wd	Wa, Wd

a - Act

d - decide

H - Husband

B - Both

W - Wife

From this typology, four basic patterns of interaction can be obtained. The Autonomic pattern occurs where the husband acts and decides on some matters and the wife acts and decides on other matters - Ha, Hd and Wa, Wd. The Husband-Dominant pattern occurs where the husband decides and either the wife and husband act together or the wife acts alone - Ba, Hd and Wa, Hd. The Wife-Dominant pattern has been described above. The Syncratic pattern occurs where both decide and both act - Ba, Bd. Thus Herbst based his typology on decision and action and these four types are mutually exclusive.

Blood and Wolfe, on the other hand, were concerned simply with decision-making.² They selected eight questions on which most families have to make decisions, and asked who finally made each one. Possible answers were "husband always", "husband more than wife", "husband and wife exactly the same", "wife more than husband", "wife always".

The total scores for the eight questions were then converted into a 10-point scale, reflecting the amount of influence exerted by the husband. The middle group of equalitarian marriages were further differentiated according

¹Herbst, op. cit.,

²Blood and Wolfe, op. cit.,

to whether they made most of their decisions together or whether they assigned equal numbers of separate decisions to both partners. The former type, following Herbst, was called syncratic and the latter autonomic. Thus they too had four main types - Husband-Dominant, Syncratic, Autonomic and Wife-Dominant.

Blood and Wolfe refer to power rather than authority because of the way in which they define these terms. Power is "the potential ability of one partner to influence the other's behaviour"¹. Authority is "legitimate power, i.e., power held by one partner because both partners feel it is proper for him to do so".² Their method of collecting data does not give them any guidance as to how "proper" the respondents feel their way of decision-making is. Thus they use the term power. For the same reason, in the present study we shall also use the term power rather than authority. It will mean the ability of one partner to decide on family matters in a way which binds the other partner. For instance we will assume that when the respondent states that her husband made such and such a decision, she did not challenge it or act against it once it was finally made.

There are two other terms used in this study which need explanation. These are autonomy and syncraticity. The way in which families were classified as autonomous or syncratic is described below; here we will merely say that a syncratic couple is one where the husband and wife make most family decisions together. An autonomous couple is one in which the husband and wife make most decisions separately. Thus a syncratic family can be thought of as a highly-sharing family, an autonomous family as a low-sharing family.

A description will now be made of the way in which the data in this study were gathered. The number of decisions made by husband and wife

¹Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 99

²Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., 102

respectively had to be ascertained. This could only be done by a formal interview based on a standard set of questions, for the following reason. The subject of the relative power of husband and wife could be a sensitive one for respondents and the information derived could be highly coloured by a respondent's personality and awareness of the subject. An informal or unstructured interview was not, therefore, considered a suitable instrument per se. Thus the instrument chosen was a formal or structured interview. Answers to questions were coded beforehand in order that the results might be combined into statistical aggregates.

Thus the first requirement met was reliability. As Moser says:-

"The aim all the time is to maximise reliability, i.e., the extent to which repeated measurements (interviews) made on the same material (respondents) by the same measuring instrument (interviewer) would get the same results. Without doubt formal interviewing succeeds in achieving higher reliability than informal techniques.

Reliability, however, is not everything. The other side of the picture is the validity of a response, i.e., its closeness to the truth which one is trying to ascertain. When the survey subject is complex or emotional, it may be that the greater flexibility of an informal approach succeeds better than set questions in getting to the heart of the respondent's opinion¹."

It was considered that power in the family was indeed both emotional and complex and when the 400 English interviews had been completed, it was recognized that the results may not be altogether valid. It is probably not possible to derive a true picture of the balance of power in a home in half-an-hour of questioning along standardised lines. Again the choice of activities on which to measure authority might lead to a distortion although the questions covered a wide area of family life (see schedule in

¹ C.A. Moser, Survey Methods in Social Investigation, London; William Heinemann Ltd., 1958. 204.

Appendix A). For the Canadian survey, therefore, it was decided to add a short informal interview at the end of the structured interview which it was hoped would either support the statistical results or give a truer picture of the balance of power.

By the time the whole survey was completed, the interviewer had come to the conclusion that this delicate and often latent or unrecognised phenomenon could not be gauged successfully by any interview technique. Probably it could be done if the researcher lived with a family for a considerable length of time or if psychological methods were used but certainly information about which partner decided on various family matters, as far as respondents were willing or able to remember, is only a superficial measure of the distribution of power in the family. However, this was a sociological study and not a psychological one. Sociological methods had to be adapted to the problem and used as efficiently as possible. Future researchers in this field may find a more successful method.

The Schedule

The present schedule was based on that used by Herbst in Melbourne, in that questions on activities in the same four areas of family life were asked, although there were important differences¹. During the pilot study in Exeter it was found that respondents were unable to distinguish between the person who decided on an activity and the person who carried it out. Also they either could not or would not say how much agreement there was over a given activity. Thus the questions on activities, the answers to which were used to rate the families for the distribution of power, were confined to asking who decided.

¹Herbst, op. cit.,

The two schedules used in Exeter and Montreal will be found in the Appendix and differed from each other only slightly. The following description refers therefore to both except where noted. It was composed of two parts, one of which was designed to elicit certain information about the family and the other to be used as a basis for rating it for power. The first part covered the occupation, income and status at work of the husband, the number of children and their ages and sexes, the age of the mother at the present time and at marriage and the number of years married, the location of and amount of contact with both grandmothers, the items of household expenditure for which the wife was responsible, and particulars about the wife's job, where relevant. The Canadian respondents were also asked how much education each partner had received, where they both were born and whether the wife thought that her mother or her father was the most dominant person in her childhood home. The English respondents were also asked whether the husband did night work.

These questions were asked as it was felt that they might have a significant relationship with the balance of power in the family. The other part of the schedule consisted of questions about decision-making in the family, designed to find out which partner made decisions about various activities. The subjects were taken from the Australian questionnaire and covered the following areas of family life - household affairs, child care, economic affairs and social affairs, but the number of questions were fewer. In the English survey 22 questions and in the Canadian 21 questions were asked. Possible answers were "husband decides", "both decide" or "wife decides", e.g., one question was, "Who decides on the amount of the children's pocket money?" Respondents could either answer "my husband", "both of us", or "myself".

The Canadian respondents were also given a short informal interview at the end of the standard questions. This was designed to find out if indeed there were any matters over which partners disagreed. If there were, what sort of subjects were they and how were the disagreements resolved. Did the wife give in to the husband, or vice versa? Was any punishment involved and what form did it take? Did the respondent think that her family's procedures were different from those of her friends' families? If so, in what way, etc.

Scoring System

It was not possible to follow Herbst's method of scoring answers because the answers to the questions were different. At first, therefore, a simple scatter was used, i.e., if the husband made the most decisions, the family was designated as husband-dominated or patriarchal, etc. However, this presented some difficulty as a family with a score of, for instance, 8 for the Wife, 7 for the Husband and 6 for Both could hardly be designated as wife-dominated or matriarchal. To remove this difficulty, we used the matriarchy and syncreticity scales developed by W. A. Westley. To compute the matriarchy scale, the number of questions answered is totalled for each family and the scores of Husband, Wife and Both are calculated as percentages of this number. For example, a family with a score of 7 decisions made by the Wife, 11 decisions made by Husband and Wife together, and 2 made by the Husband became Wife - 35, Both - 55, and Husband - 10. Since the husband and wife contributed equally to those decisions said to be made by both, this number is split and half is added to the scores of Husband and Wife. The wife's total score is then the basis for the matriarchy-patriarchy scale. In the example quoted above, the wife's total score

would become 62, i.e., 35 plus half of 55. A 1-40 score indicates a patriarchal family, i.e., the wife made less than 40% of the decisions. A 41-60 score indicated an equalitarian family, i.e., 41-60% of the decisions were made by both husband and wife. A 61-100 score indicates a matriarchal family, i.e., the wife made 61% or more of the decisions.

For the autonomy-synchraticity scale, the percentage score for Both is used. It is assumed that the percentage of decisions made by Both is an indicator of the amount of sharing or synchraticity in the family, while the remaining decisions which must be made by the husband or the wife constitute the percentage for the degree of autonomy. A 1-40 score indicates an autonomous family, i.e., 40% or less of the decisions were made by the two partners working separately. A 41-60 score indicated a "mixed" family, i.e., 41-60% decisions were made either separately or together. A score of 61-100 indicated a synchratic family, i.e., over 61% of the decisions were made by husband and wife working together. The family quoted above was therefore classed as matriarchal and mixed.

Thus each family could be rated on two scales and there would be altogether 9 categories into which the families could be divided - matriarchal autonomous, matriarchal mixed, matriarchal synchratic, equalitarian autonomous, equalitarian mixed, equalitarian synchratic, patriarchal autonomous, patriarchal mixed and patriarchal synchratic. The results will show that one or two of these categories accounted for many families, some accounted for a few families and some were not relevant.

Pilot Studies

A small pilot study of 19 interviews was carried out in Exeter in order to test the schedule. The main result of this survey, as noted above,

was to drop the distinction between deciding and doing and also to omit questions on the amount of disagreements over each activity. Otherwise the questions seemed to present no difficulty to respondents. The wording was not changed very much and one or two questions were added, e.g., did in fact parents have a choice of schools to which to send their children.

In Montreal a small pilot study of interviews was carried out in the survey area in order to ensure that the schedule would adapt to Canadian families. This was a small number but the questionnaire in only slightly different form was administered 400 times in Exeter so that its efficiency was fairly predictable. For the same reason it was felt unnecessary to get equal numbers of working and nonworking wives; the first available subjects were interviewed. There were very few changes in the final schedule, e.g., the question on choice of schools was dropped as these parents had no choice in the matter.

The Sample

For the purposes of this thesis, a family was defined as a married couple living together with at least one child of 16 years or under. A group of this kind could fill the positions and play the roles with which the hypothesis was concerned. Although the power of the husband and wife was being studied, the presence of children added more scope to the schedule and a measure of power based on a family including children was thought to have a wider significance than one based merely on a married couple. Therefore, although these women are referred to in the text as wives, it should be remembered that they are in fact mothers.

The English sample was a random drawn from Kelly's Street Directory for Exeter in 1960. Other sources such as the family allowance list, school lists or polling lists were for various reasons eliminated. The Street Directory arranges streets in alphabetical order and then the names of house occupiers in numerical order. It was thought at the time that 400 families would be the minimum number which could yield significant results. Of the 400 families, 200 were to be families in which the wife did not go out to work (nonworking) and 200 were to be families in which the wife did go out to work (working), the nonworkers to function as a control group. Myrdal and Klein, writing in 1956, had put the national ratio at two nonworking wives to every one working wife¹. Although this present survey was dealing with mothers rather than with wives, their estimate was taken as a guide, and it was decided that out of all eligible families, all with a working mother and every alternate one with a nonworking mother should be interviewed.

It was calculated that a sample of 1,000 families could yield the required number so a sample of every twenty-fifth name was taken from the Street Directory. Altogether, however, just under 2,000 families were drawn and visited (see Appendix C). It will be noted that this method was that of quasi random sampling in that once the sampling fraction had been decided upon, i.e., every twenty-fifth name, then the random selection of the starting point determined the whole sample. This method was justified by the fact that the feature by which the Street Directory was arranged, i.e., streets in alphabetical order, was not related to the subject of the survey.

A duplicated letter on University stationery was sent to each respondent a few days before the interview, stating a reason for the survey and asking

¹Myrdal and Klein, op. cit.,

that the respondent would cooperate.

Thus this sample covered the whole city of Exeter and was as representative as it possibly could be. The Canadian sample was not representative of the whole city of Montreal, however. The interviewer did not speak French so the sample had to be limited to an English speaking area. Eventually, an elementary Protestant school was contacted in a working class, predominantly English speaking area and the principal made available the names and addresses of parents. It had been decided that 100 families was as many as could be interviewed in the time available and so 50 families where the mother did not go out to work and 50 where she did had to be found. Finally, a sample of 200 families was drawn from the school lists (see Appendix C for method) and a letter, again on University stationery, was sent (see Appendix B for copies of both these letters).

It will be noted that this sample is composed of Protestant, English speaking families where there are children at least five years old. Thus it is not as representative of Montreal as the English sample was of Exeter, but this was the only possible way to obtain a reasonably large sample in a short time.

Matching

As it was intended to carry out a comparative study in the subject, some method had to be found to select 100 English families which could be matched to the Canadian sample. It was decided that socio-economic class was probably the most useful basis for matching. The Exeter sample had included people from the professional to the unskilled classes, whereas the Canadian was composed predominantly of skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers, with a few semi-professionals. Thus the same type of

family had to be selected from the English sample. It was discovered that income groups were not comparable as there was some difficulty in translating pounds into dollars in a meaningful way in terms of social status. Eventually the Hollingshead and Redlich scale of occupations was used.¹ The Canadian sample was divided into the five lower groups on this scale and then families were drawn from the English sample which corresponded in these categories to the Canadian families. As far as possible the actual occupations were matched.

Response

Response in both Exeter and Montreal was good. The number of those who refused to be interviewed as a percentage of those who cooperated was 4% in Exeter and 5% in Montreal. In both places respondents appeared to be quite accustomed to people knocking on the door and asking them fairly personal questions; presumably the social services and some sales representatives now require this sort of information. Several asked what the survey was trying to discover. In Exeter, where there was no informal interview at the end and where the question of the balance of power was never explicit, they were told that the interviewer was trying to find out whether family life was "dying out" - it was inferred that some people claimed that it was. In Montreal they were told that the interviewer was trying to find out how families organised themselves and how they allocated jobs, etc. Nearly all the Canadian respondents seemed quite willing to talk during the

¹August B. Hollingshead and Frederick C. Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness, New York; John Wiley and Sons Inc. Publishers, 1958.

unstructured part of the interview - some of them had definite views on the question of dominant husbands and wives and of the balance of power in general, others had never thought of it before the interview, but none seemed offended by the questions or the subject itself.

CHAPTER III

SOME DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CANADIAN FAMILIES

SOME DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CANADIAN FAMILIES

This study was designed to test the hypothesis that a mother who goes out to work will have more authority in the home in terms of decision-making than a mother who does not go out to work. If this were so, it was also intended to show whether the relationship differed among English and Canadian families. However, the schedule covered many other facets of family life and a comparison of the data gathered from the Canadian and English families shows various other differences between them.

The first part of this chapter will consist of a socio-geographical description of the areas in which the surveys took place, based on the researcher's observations. The second part will be an account of the differences in family life based on statistical evidence.

Socio-Geographical Description

The city of Exeter, in the South West of England, has a population of roughly 80,000, about which comparatively very little is known sociologically. It is a sprawling, provincial, Cathedral city, but it is not typical of such cities in England in that there are few similar centres of population nearby, unlike the Midland and Northern cities. Bristol, Taunton and Plymouth are at least 30 miles away and do not have much influence on Exeter. The latter is thus a focus for a wide rural area of Devon and is a place from which patterns of modern social behaviour are filtered through to the conservative farming communities of the West country.

It houses many first-generation city-dwellers, who left their families in the country and came to the city in search of jobs or more amenities, and also many retired people, some of whom came down specifically to retire in Exeter and some of whom have lived there all their lives. It is notable that a third of the families in this sample had lived in their present houses for less than three years and 60% for less than ten years. The reason for this high rate of mobility seems to be the large number of couples who started their married life in the home of one of the parents and it mostly reflects movement in Exeter itself. There are many post-war council housing estates, mainly in the outer areas of the city, which seem to have been exceptionally well planned and organised physically to make good use of the natural environment of the countryside. As many as 57% of this sample lived in council houses or flats. There does not seem to be very much private building going on; the character of a large proportion of private houses, even those of professional middle class people, is Victorian or earlier and reminds one that Exeter is of historical rather than of economic importance.

Most people living on the council estates had to take a bus to reach any shops. These areas are literally housing estates, the only other buildings being churches or schools. Exeter is mainly a centre for transport and distribution with a few light industries in small factories on the outskirts. However, since this sample has been matched with the Canadian on the basis of the husband's occupation, most of the husbands like the Canadians worked on the railway, in retail trade, in light engineering or technical jobs, in clerical work or in building. The average wage was between £10 and £15 a week. 28% of the wives did domestic work, 14% were in retail trade and 12% had clerical jobs (see tables in Appendix D).

Although older residents have their associations and clubs, etc., there is not a great deal of social life among the inhabitants of the new estates. They seem to live rather isolated lives in their own family circle around the television set and there were many complaints of the unfriendliness of neighbours and a sense of loneliness, although only 3% actually admitted having no friends at all. The majority of couples shared their friends with each other. Very few people seemed to be particularly friendly with their neighbours or to belong to a close-knit network. This impression agrees with Young and Willmott's account of the Greenleigh estate outside London.¹ It seems that when people are uprooted from their old communities and are moved into new houses on new roads in new communities, they find themselves isolated and anonymous, with the familiar people and places far away. The people on Exeter's housing estates are in a similar position to the Bethnal Greeners who were moved to Greenleigh in that they also came from older areas in the city where they had grown up or from small agricultural communities in the countryside around Exeter.

Most amusements seemed to be of the kind where people are isolated participants. In this sample, 30% spent some of their leisure time in pubs, 26% in theatres or at concerts, 22% in the cinema and 26% in walking. 21% did not go out at all for any kind of entertainment. 22% did not visit friends or relations at all although only 5% did not actually invite friends or relations to their house. The 12% who went to clubs and meetings seemed to be those who went to meetings of the parent-teacher association, although this was not specifically asked.

¹Young and Willmott, op. cit.,

Montreal presents some contrasts. It has a population of nearly 2 million, 67% of whom are French speaking. Among the rest are people of many different nationalities, mostly of European or Asiatic origin, each national group claiming different areas of the city. Montreal is highly industrialised and expanding rapidly. Like Exeter, it is the only large city for quite a wide area of agricultural country.

The area in which the survey was undertaken was predominantly an English speaking one, although there were a number of French people. The living quarters were either bungalows or duplexes, the latter mostly built within the last 30 years. Probably none of these families lived more than five minutes' walk from the shops and the main thoroughfare of the district offered sizable shops of all descriptions plus the usual supermarkets. It was a flat, treeless area and of course only bungalow occupiers had anything resembling a garden. A feature of the duplexes was their narrow, winding, outside staircases, and many of the respondents lived on the first or second floors.

Rail transport, manufacturing and construction accounted for 48% of the occupations of the husbands with retail trade and clerical work well represented. Incomes averaged between \$2,000 and \$4,000 annually. Of wives who worked, 46% did clerical work, 18% did domestic work and 12% worked in retail trade. 70% of respondents' husbands had been born in some part of metropolitan Montreal. Of the rest 22% were born in Canada. The 8 husbands who were not born in Canada mostly came from the United Kingdom. 68% of the wives were born in Montreal and 15% in Canada, and again the remaining 17% usually came from the United Kingdom. The area was not perhaps typical of Montreal as a whole in terms of moving population; only 37% of this sample had moved within the last three years.

There did not seem to be much neighbourhood or community life except that which revolved around religious institutions, i.e., most clubs seemed to be church clubs although this was not specifically asked of respondents. Leisure time was mostly taken up with the cinema (38%), sports (34%), walks (42%) and above all drives (70%), for most of these families had their own cars and, judging from odd comments, a good number had summer cottages. As many as 24% went to clubs and meetings of one kind or another so that although most amusement in Montreal as well as in Exeter was of the kind where people are isolated participants, yet 24% is a fairly high proportion in an area which does not give the impression of being closely-knit. Only 5% did not visit friends or relations and 12% did not go out at all for any kind of entertainment compared to 21% of the English families.

Thus from a somewhat superficial look at these samples, it seems that the Canadian participate in outside social activities more than the English. The English respondents seemed to be inclined to spend a great deal of time at home. This may be because television is still very popular in England and not regarded quite so much as a necessity as it seems to be in Canada. (4% of the English respondents did not have a television set; 1% of the Canadian did not.) Another factor is that all the occupiers of housing estate houses and flats had their own gardens, and gardening in England is almost a national institution, so that there was more entertainment in and around the home in Exeter than in Montreal. Also, the sizes of the houses in both places were roughly similar but Montreal families had more children than the Exeter families. Thus the Montreal bungalows and duplexes which only have had one living room (and this on the same floor as the bedrooms) were liable to become crowded in the evenings and at weekends; this may send people out of the house. In England there was only one living room and

a large kitchen but the bedrooms, at least in the houses, were upstairs which probably meant that there was more room to escape without going out of the house.

Differences in Family Decision-Making

An attempt has been made to determine for each nationality the normal areas of responsibility of husband and wife in the family. Answers to each of the 22 questions or decision-making were computed for each group.

On most decisions in the home, Canadians and English agree about which partner is responsible. In both countries, both partners together decide on when they will move house. Both decide together when the television should be switched off and both take responsibility for the children's manners. Both decide together whether or not they can afford a holiday, how much they can afford to spend on this and also where they will go. Both decide on all social affairs - when they will go out to visit friends and relations, where to go for entertainment and when they will entertain guests. Herbst also found that the responsibility for social affairs was shared by both partners¹.

Again, in both countries, the wife decides who is going to do the dishes and decides when the children should go to bed. The Australian wife was also responsible for these things as was the American. She also buys her own clothes, decides whether or not she will go out to work and how she will spend her wages if she does. Husbands in both countries are responsible for the garden or house decoration as were the Australian and American husbands.

The high proportion of items for which both partners are responsible may seem surprising. However, the respondents gave the impression that they considered that this was the right and proper way in which to run family affairs. The English respondents were not given an informal interview at

¹Herbst, op. cit.

the end of the structured one, but many of them made comments like, "Well, you have to do things together, it's the only way to get along, isn't it?". Perhaps the jokes about domineering wives and brow-beating husbands have come to be associated with working class culture and so any self-respecting couple wants to show that they do not subscribe to this way of life, that they are enlightened and democratic in their family organisation. The English respondents were not informed of the true object of the survey, but many of them repeated throughout the interview, "We always do everything together" or "It's a 50/50 proposition here". Thus it is not so surprising that the results should reflect this ideology.

The Canadians, on the other hand, were encouraged at the end of the formal interview to talk about their views on dominance in the family and to say whether they thought that husbands and wives should have their own spheres of responsibility or whether they should "do everything together". In answer to the question, "Who do you think should be the boss in the home?" most respondents said that there should be no boss, although 30% said they thought that the husband should be the head of the household. In answer to the question, "Do you think that husbands and wives should have their own jobs or that they should do everything together?" 15% said that they thought a wife should look after the children and the home and a husband should look after the money. 11% seemed to think that a mixture was the best way. This usually meant that the wife should look after the money and that they both should take responsibility for the children. Many of the respondents seemed to feel that they differed from most people over this. One woman who favoured shared responsibility for everything said, "I suppose the majority of people think that a mother should look after the children and

the husband after the money". Another went so far as to say, "We have friends who think we are odd. The majority of people are opposite to what we are. Either one is the boss or the wife's job is the housework. But if I can help my husband, or if he can help me, we do."

A stereotype emerges of a family in which the great majority of decisions are made by husband and wife together. However, husbands and wives still carry out tasks unilaterally for which they are traditionally responsible, i.e., the husband does the heavy work and the wife looks after the house and children. As Blood and Wolfe say, "The husband specialises in heavy and technical tasks, the wife in functions correlated with her role in life as child bearer and child rearer¹".

On the other items than those mentioned above, there are differences between nationalities. These are slight in most cases (see Appendix E). In England, as in Australia, the amount of the children's pocket money is a shared decision to a greater extent than in Canada where it is the wife who usually makes this decision. In England, most couples share the decision on when to buy a large item of furniture; in Canada, it is usually the husband who decides on this. In England, the question of what furniture to buy is more often the wife's decision than it is in Canada where it is usually both partners'. In England it is more often the husband who decides how much the couple will save than in Canada where it is decided by the wife alone or by both partners together. The greatest difference concerns the decision on the amount of housekeeping money. In England it is predominantly the husband who makes this decision; in Canada it is predominantly the wife.

¹Blood and Wolfe, op.cit., 32.

The items on which there are differences are all of an economic nature. Thus we may say that whereas the responsibility of each partner in other areas of family life is similar in each country, and thus to a certain extent generally accepted, the responsibility of each partner in economic affairs is uncertain and differs between the two societies. The English wife has more influence than the Canadian over what furniture to buy and when to buy it and the Canadian has more influence over the children's pocket money, the amount the couples should save and the amount of housekeeping money she receives.

Although, as has been noted above, people in both societies seem to favour the democratic way of family organization, yet it is perhaps traditional in English society, at any rate among the working class, for the husband to deal with economic affairs. It has been found by other investigators, e.g., Zweig¹, Young and Willmott², that even today the working class wife often does not know how much her husband actually earns; she only knows how much he gives her. The difference between the two societies on the decision about the amount of housekeeping money the wife will get is the only one that is statistically significant, as Table 3 shows.

TABLE 3.- Who makes the decision on the amount of housekeeping money in the English and Canadian family

Nationality	Persons Deciding			N
	Husband	Both	Wife	
English	30	12	8	50
Canadian	13	11	27	50
N	42	23	35	100
$\chi^2 = 18.08$ Significant above .01%				

¹Zweig, op. cit.

²Young and Willmott, op. cit.

It can be seen that in Canada, it is predominantly the wife, in England predominantly the husband, who decides on this. Other results show that even when the English wife is the dominant partner, the husband is almost equally as likely to decide on this as his wife. Even when the wife is working, the English husband will still decide this in 60% of the cases. Thus this must be a well-established norm in English family life. In Canadian families, the husband has slightly more influence over this when his wife does not go out to work than when she does, but it is predominantly the wife who decides how much housekeeping money she shall have in Canada.

Differences in Family Characteristics

There were also some other differences between the family in Canada and in England. One of these was the size of the modern family, as Table 4 shows.

TABLE 4.- Size of family by nationality

Nationality	Number of Children			N
	1	2	3+	
Canadian	20	41	39	100
English	46	18	36	100
N	66	59	75	200

$$\chi^2_2 = 19.32, \text{ Significant above } .001\%$$

Nearly half of the English families have only one child whereas only 20% of the Canadians do. The position is reversed for families with 2 children. There is not a great deal of difference among families with 3 or more children although the Canadians are slightly more numerous here.

Thus on the whole Canadians tend to have larger families than the English. These Canadian families were all Protestant, so religious affiliation cannot account for the difference. It may perhaps be explained by the influence of the European immigrant's large family; although these families were English-speaking, it is possible that over the years the norm has become general for all Canadians or for all Montrealers. It may also be a hangover from the pioneer days when large families were essential. It may also be that Canadians can afford to have more children.

Secondly, the age of the mother at marriage differs, as can be seen in Table 5.

TABLE 5.- Age of mother at marriage by nationality

Nationality	22 or under	23 or over	
Canadian	65	35	100
English	50	50	100
N	115	85	200

$$\chi^2 = 4.60, \text{ Significant above } .05\%$$

65% of the Canadian wives were married when they were 22 or under. The English are not very many fewer but the difference may be explained by the great emphasis laid in North America on 'dating', marriage and romantic love from a very early age among all strata of the population. A girl is judged to be abnormal if she is not dating regularly by the age of 14. This may have the straightforward effect of inducing girls to get married earlier. In England half of the wives marry at the age of 22 or under; there are probably more controls on the situation - people do not approve so wholeheartedly of early marriages in England. Perhaps also it is easier for a young couple to find somewhere to live in Canada than it is

in England and there may be more emphasis in England on saving for a few years before marriage than in Canada. We have seen that Canadians have larger families than the English; these two factors are probably related. Either Canadians get married earlier in order to have more children or they have more children because they have been married longer.

Thirdly, the hours of the wives at work are different as is shown in Table 6. It should be remembered that in each sample half of the wives worked and half did not - these are not the actual percentages in each country who work.

TABLE 6.- The number of hours wives work by nationality

	HOURS OF WORK			
Nationality	6 Hours a day or more	5 Hours a day or less		N
Canadian	70	30	100	50
English	46	54	100	50
N	66	34		100

$$\chi^2 = 5.90, \text{ Significant above } .02\%$$

70% of the Canadian working wives work full time, i.e., at least 6 hours a day and of these 44% work 5 days a week. This may be explained by the fact that there is perhaps a different concept about wives' work in Canada. It may be a career or a long term project to a greater extent than it is in England where it seems easier to find jobs taking only a few hours a week and where the mother is not necessarily interested in going out to work for a long time.

However, probably a better explanation is in terms of the jobs these women do (see table in app. -D) 46% of the Canadians work in some sort of clerical capacity, presumably because there are greater opportunities for clerical training in schools in Canada than there are in England. Clerical jobs usually demand a full day's and a full week's work and as in clerical jobs

wives are competing with single girls, they have to accept these conditions if they want the job.

In England, on the other hand, 28% of the wives do domestic work of some kind or another. This seems to be in schools, offices or homes and is the kind of job which takes a couple of hours a day. This is probably ideal for a mother as she can be at home when the rest of the family are and in Exeter it was probably easy for them to find these jobs near their own homes. 14% are shop assistants and 12% do clerical work - these jobs demand full time usually, although there seem to be more parttime jobs available in shops in England than there are in Canada. The ability to do clerical work is not as common in England as it is in Canada, which may explain why so comparatively few do it. When these wives went to school, it was not taught as it is now and it needed an extra six months of specialised secretarial training. It is also significant that there are no nurses among the Canadians, this is a much more highly trained job in Canada than in England.

There seems to be a greater variety of jobs for wives to choose from in England than in Canada. Presumably this is because the phenomenon of wives working is not as well established in Canada as it is in England and so some industries and professions have not yet opened their doors to wives. For instance until a few years ago, teachers in Quebec had to give up their jobs on marriage.

Finally, there is a difference in the number of items of household expenditure for which wives take responsibility, as Table 7 shows.

TABLE 7.- Responsibility for household expenditure by nationality

Items of Household Expenditure				
Nationality	1	2	3	N
Canadian	28	13	59	100
English	11	13	76	100
N	39	26	135	200

- 1 - Food only
- 2 - Food and Clothes
- 3 - Everything

$$\chi^2_2 = 9.56, \text{ Significant above } .01\%$$

More English wives take responsibility for all items of household expenditure than Canadian wives. These items include food, clothes, rent, heating, light and water.

One explanation may be that most bills in England like rent etc., are payable weekly so wives pay it, whereas in Canada the couple sit down together every month and work out their commitments.

This finding seems paradoxical when we remember that more Canadian than English wives decide themselves how much housekeeping money they are going to get from their husbands. One explanation may be that husbands in Canada are responsible for big items needing payment by cheque, etc., so that although the Canadian wife stipulates how much she needs, this money is spent only on smaller items like food, clothes and household sundries. In this case the difference between the number of women in Canada and England who decide how much money they need is not so significant, as the English wife is likely to be responsible for all items of household expenditure, large or small, and so the husband will have more say in how much she will get.

We have found that Canadian wives make slightly more decisions in the economic area of family life than English wives. Over the other areas,

however, there is little difference between nationalities.

We have also found that Canadians tend to have larger families and that Canadian women tend to marry at an earlier age than the English. If these findings were interdependent, we should expect to find that mothers with more than 2 children married earlier than those with fewer children. But Table 8 shows that however many children a couple have, roughly 60% of the Canadian wives married before they were 23.

TABLE 8. - Percentage distribution of number of children by age of mother at marriage among Canadians.

Age of mother at marriage	No. of Children			N
	1	2	3+	
22 or under	60	66	64	64
23 or over	40	34	36	36
	100	100	100	
N	20	41	39	100

Not significant

Thus it seems that Canadians get married earlier than the English for reasons other than those connected with the number of children and that they have larger families irrespective of the age of the mother at marriage.

Canadian working wives tend to work full time more often than English working wives. English wives tend to take responsibility for more items of household expenditure than the Canadian wives. There is not, therefore, a great deal of difference between family life in the two countries.

CHAPTER IV

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKING AND NONWORKING WIVES

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKING AND NONWORKING WIVES

In the course of gathering data with which to discuss the effect of the wife's employment on family relationships, data were also gathered on the differences between families of working and nonworking wives. These differences concern the occupational status of the husband, the number of children, the balance of power in the wife's family of orientation, the age of the youngest child and the use of the housekeeping money. These will be discussed in this chapter. Wherever possible, comparisons will be made with the findings of other studies, but previous data gathered on working wives were not specifically related to some of these characteristics. Moreover, factors on which other studies have found a significant difference between working and nonworking wives were not found to be significant in this study. For instance, the Canadian Department of Labour Report found that the age of the mother, the education of the wife and her birthplace were different for working and nonworking wives.¹

Occupational status of the husband

Families were rated on the Hollingshead and Redlich scale of occupational status but only the last five categories were relevant since this was a lower class sample.² These were:- 1. Administrator of large concern, owner of small independent business, or semi-professional, 2. Owner of little business, clerical or sales worker or technical, 3. Skilled worker, 4. Semi-skilled worker, 5. Unskilled worker.

One would expect to find that working wives come from low income families as 62% said that they worked for money. We should expect to find therefore that wives in categories 1 and 2 are less likely to work than those in 3, 4 and 5.

¹Department of Labour Survey, op. cit.

²Hollingshead and Redlich, op. cit.

As Table 9 shows, there is in fact tendency for wives in the two higher income groups to stay at home

TABLE 9.- Distribution of working and nonworking wives according to occupation status

Occupational Status				
	112	3	4	5
Non-working	55	35	72	39
Working	45	65	28	61
	100	100	100	100
N	14	54	36	36

$$\chi^2_2 = 12.42 \text{ Significant above, } .01\%$$

On the whole, wives in the lower income groups tend to go out to work rather than to stay at home. Those in the semi-skilled group however mostly stay at home. It is possible that this group takes the middle class as their reference group and so do not go out to work or it may be that by chance these wives have more or younger children than the average wife, which keeps them at home. However, apart from this category, we do find that wives in lower income groups go out to work more frequently than wives in higher income groups.

Number of children

There is a significant relationship between working and the number of children as Table 10 shows.

TABLE 10.- Percentage of working and nonworking wives according to size of family

	Size of Family	
	1 child	2 or more
Nonworking	35	57
Working	65	43
	100	100
N	66	134

$$\chi^2_2 = 9.04 \quad \text{Significant above } .01\%$$

57% of the mothers who have more than one child stay at home. It sometimes occurred to the interviewer that a mother may have more children because she does not go out to work. So many of the nonworking mothers do not go out to work "on principle" that having more children may be a method of compensation for having to stay in and a rationalisation of their position. A more rational explanation, however, would be that she does not go out to work because she has more children. It is obvious that there is far less for the mother to do at home if there is only one child and it is less trouble to leave only one child with a friend or relation and cheaper to have it looked after by someone else. Of the mothers with only one child, 65% go out to work. If this child is at school, there is very little to keep the mother at home all day since housework is done quickly these days with labour saving devices. Many of the respondents said that they went out to work because they were bored as well as for financial reasons.

This tendency does not differ markedly between the Canadians and the English as Table 11 shows.

TABLE 11.- Percentage of working and nonworking wives according to size of family in England and Canada

	ENGLISH		CANADIAN	
	1 child	2 or more	1 child	2 or more
Nonworking	39	60	25	56
working	61	40	75	44
	100	100	100	100
N	4	54	20	80

$$x^2_2 = 4.04 \text{ Significant } .05\% \quad x^2_2 = 6.26 \text{ Significant above } .02\%$$

Of those with only one child, most of the English and most of the Canadians are working, whereas of those with more than one child, a slight majority in each society stay at home. Thus we see that in both countries, mothers with more than one child tend to be housewives and those with only one child tend to go out to work. Since we shall see below that it is those with older children who go out to work, it is reasonable to expect that most of these children are also older children. In fact only 13% of them are under 5 years of age.

Age of the youngest child

There is a significant relationship between the age of the youngest child and working, as Table 12 shows.

TABLE 12.- Percentage of working and nonworking wives according to the age of the youngest child

	Age of Youngest Child		
	0-2	3-5	6+
Nonworking	78	53	38
Working	22	47	62
	100	100	100
N	43	36	120

$$x^2_2 = 20.60 \text{ Significant above } .001\%$$

Of those wives who have children under 2 years old, 78% are housewives. This is to be expected since an infant requires a great deal of its mother's attention. Of those wives who have children of 6 years or older, 62% go out to work. Thus wives tend to wait until their children are at elementary school before they go out to work. When the sample is controlled for nationality, it can be seen in Table 13 that this tendency is more pronounced among the English than among the Canadians.

TABLE 13.- Percentage of working and nonworking wives according to the age of the youngest child in England

	Age of the Youngest Child					
	ENGLISH			CANADIAN		
	0-2	3-5	6+	0-2	3-5	6+
Nonworking	73	71	36	86	37	40
Working	27	27	64	14	63	60
	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	44	34	122	42	38	118

$$\chi^2_2 = 12.16 \text{ Significant above } .01\% \quad \chi^2_2 = 13.70 \text{ Significant above } .01\%$$

The difference between working mothers in both societies with children between the ages of 3 and 5 may be explained by the lack of nurseries for small children in England and the apparent number of them in Canada, although we have no data on this (7.5% of the children of respondents in the Department of Labour Survey spent the day at nurseries). Thus until their children are of school age before going to work and in England mothers have to wait as there are fewer nursery schools.

For those with very young children who do go out to work it is difficult to find an explanation. Zweig asked:-

"Do mothers with dependent children, especially with babies or infants to out to work because they are compelled under the whip of want, or of their own volition, because they like doing it, or because they want to make some extras?" ¹

52% of the total number of respondents who worked said that they went out for financial reasons only; this probably accounts for the comparative few in this sample who went out with young children.

Use of the Housekeeping money

Over the whole sample, there is no significant relationship between working and the use of the housekeeping money. When the sample is controlled for nationality, however, we see that there is a relationship in both countries, as Table 14 shows.

TABLE 14.- Percentage distribution of working and nonworking according to the use of the housekeeping money

	Use of Housekeeping money						N	
	ENGLISH			CANADIAN				
	1	2	3	1	2	3		
Nonworking	8	22	70	40	4	56	100	100
Working	14	4	82	20	20	60	100	100

1 = food

2 = food and clothes

3 = everything

$\chi^2_2 = 7.54$ Significant above .05%

$\chi^2_2 = 9.36$ Significant above .02%

Among Canadians only a few more workers than nonworkers take more responsibility but this trend is very much more obvious among the English where 82% of the workers as against 70% of the nonworkers take responsibility for all household items. This is a similar result to

1. Zweig, op. cit., 20

to that found by Zweig who says:

"I am not quite sure whether women in industry will not be more frequently chancellor of the Exchequer than women staying at home. This may be so as it is in my cross section....first because women workers have gained greater experience and versatility than women staying at home: secondly, because they have greater self-confidence in asking for a husband's wage packet, if that is necessary." 1

We know that Canadian workers are more matriachal than the English workers (see Chapter VI), so it is not because she is more dominant that the English working wife takes responsibility. This suggests that it is part of the duties of a wife in England to cope with the bills and payment of other items besides food and clothes whereas in Canada men participate in this task

Balance of power in the wife's family of orientation

Data on the balance of power of the wife's parents were gathered because it was thought that it might have an effect on the balance of power in the respondent's family. It was only asked for the Canadian respondents. The data are based on the wife's answer to two questions. The first one was: "Did your mother boss your father often, sometimes or never?" and the second one, sometime later in the schedule, was: "Did your father boss your mother often, sometimes or never?". There are two methods of interpreting the data. The first method is as follows. If the respondent said that both parents were equally dominant, e.g. the father bossed the mother often and the mother bossed the father often, they were scored as equalitarian. If the mother bossed the father more often than the father did the mother they were scored matriachal and vice versa. The method of interpreting

1 Zweig, op. cit., 48

the data produced the results shown in Table 15.

TABLE 15:- Percentage distribution of balance of power of wife's parents among workers and nonworkers

	Balance of power of wife's parents		
	Matriarchal	Equalitarian	Patriarchal
Nonworking	39	69	48
Working	61	31	52
	100	100	100
N	23	32	25

$$\chi^2 = 5.20 \text{ Significant above .01\%}$$

Of the wives from matriarchal families, 61% work, whereas of the wives from equalitarian families 69% do not work. There is then a marked association between matriarchal families and working. One explanation for this may be in terms of role image. It was found that there is no relationship between the balance of power in the wife's family of orientation and the balance of power in the family of procreation. For instance, matriarchs in one generation do not necessarily produce matriarchs in the second generation. Thus the wife is rejecting the role image presented to her by her mother in terms of power. Similarly the wife who had a dominant mother may be rejecting the role of housewife by going out to work; only 39% of these wives stay at home. Those wives with equalitarian parents, on the other hand, may accept the role of housewife presented to them by their mothers - 69% of them are housewives. In some manner which can only be explained by further research, matriarchs may present a negative role image to their daughters, whereas mothers who have equal power with their husbands may present a positive image.

The second method of interpreting the data is to consider that answers of "often" or "sometimes" indicate some degree of dominance and that where either of these two occur together in one family, that family is classed as a "conflict" family. Where neither partner bossed the other the family is classed as equalitarian and where the mother bossed the father often or sometimes and he never bossed her, the family is classed as matriarchal, and vice versa. The result of this interpretation is shown in Table 16.

TABLE 16.- Balance of power of wife's parents among workers and nonworkers (percentage distribution)

PARENTS WORKING				
Balance of Power	Nonworking	Working	N	
Matriarchal	41	59	100	22
Patriarchal	51	49	100	23
Equalitarian	62	38	100	29
Conflict	22	78	100	9

Not significant

Although this table is not statistically significant, it can be seen that the working wives tend to come from families where the mother was dominant or where there was conflict between the parents. Although there are few cases of the latter, 78% of them are workers' families. This seems to show that women who are brought up in homes where the wife asserts herself against her husband tend to work. It may be that they, like their mothers, believe that a wife should be able to defend herself and that in order to avoid constant conflict as a means of asserting herself, she goes to work and gains her independence and prestige in that way. However, since the table is not significant, we can merely note the potential association between conflict and working and we cannot draw

any valid conclusions. Nevertheless, both tables clearly show that where the mother was dominant, the wife is likely to go out to work.

This is the only significant factor on which there is a difference between working and nonworking wives which it is possible to assume has a casual relationship. We are not saying here that this is the only reason for which a wife will go out to work; obviously there are more important reasons such as economic but it is suggested that the balance of power in the wife's family of orientation could be a contributory factor.

Working wives thus have two characteristics which one would expect them to have. They come from lower income groups and they have older children. However, it is suggested that the two other characteristics relate to the hypothesis with which this study is concerned. This is that working wives will be more dominant in the home than nonworking wives. We have seen that working wives pay for more items of household expenditure than nonworking wives. This presumably means that they have more authority to deal with bills and family financial matters than nonworkers have. Secondly, most workers come from families where their mothers were dominant. Thus there is a relationship between working and the concept of a wife being a figure of authority in the home.

We shall discover below that in fact it is only Canadian workers who are significantly more dominant in the home than nonworkers. This does not invalidate these conclusions since there is less significant relationship between the use of the housekeeping money and working among English families, and it is only Canadian families about which we have any data on power in the wife's family of orientation.

CHAPTER V

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND SYNCRATICITY

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND SYNCRATICITY

Decision making has two dimensions. One of these is the question of which partner makes the decisions. The other is the way in which decisions are made. Other social investigators, e.g., Bott, have shown that decisions can either be made by husband and wife working together or by the husband or the wife separately¹. It was thought that the amount of sharing or syncraticity may be affected by the wife's employment. There was no significant relationship here but the amount of sharing was associated significantly with other family characteristics. These are discussed in this chapter.

It will be remembered that the questions which asked who made the decisions in various areas of family life could be answered in three ways. The respondent, who was always the wife, could either state that she made the decision, that her husband made it or that they both made it together. Some families did not answer every question, so the scores for the Wife, Husband or Both in a particular family were calculated as percentages of the total number of questions answered by that family. Thus the percentage score for Both indicates the proportion of decisions which both husband and wife made together. On the basis of this score, a scale was constructed whereby a family with a score of 40 or under was classed as autonomous and a family with a score of 40 - 60 was classed as mixed and a family with a score of 60 or over was classed as syncratic. Thus this score does reflect the amount of sharing between husbands and wives and it is interesting that other family characteristics should be significantly related to this. These characteristics are the number of years married, and the location of and amount of contact with the wife's mother.

¹ Bott, op.cit.

Number of years married

The respondents were asked the date of their marriage as it was thought that this might have a significant effect on the balance of power in some way. It did not in fact have an effect on this but on the way in which couples made their decision.

Table 17 indicates that those married over 15 years tend to be less syncratic than those married for a shorter period.

TABLE 17.- Percentage distribution of syncraticity according to length of marriage

	AMOUNT OF SHARING			
	Autonomous	Mixed	Syncratic	
15 years or over	36	50	14	100
14 years or under	30	40	30	100

$$\chi^2_2 = 8.18 \quad \text{Significant above } .05\%$$

30% of the families married under 14 years are syncratic as against 14% of those married longer. The age of the mother has no effect on the distribution of sharing so that this is an independent relationship between the numbers of years married and sharing. The findings of Blood and Wolfe support this.¹ If we assume that children come fairly soon after marriage what they say is relevant.

"When children first come to young people, the responsibilities increase, and at first (the wife) is quite dependent on her husband for help and for emotional support. However, the husband cannot usually be present in the home during much of the day and the wife must satisfy her needs and those of her children..... without the resources he might contribute. She must develop resources of her own and cope with the exigencies of child care and development".²

1 Blood and Wolfe, op. cit.

2 Blood and Wolfe, op. cit., p.113

Thus in the first years of marriage, the wife and husband make most decisions together.

The explanation offered, therefore, is that the pattern of living and areas of authority become stabilised over the years and couples do not find it necessary to consult with each other after 15 years of living together as after only a short time. They tend to divide decisions between them and to become autonomous in their family organisation as the marriage progresses.

Location of the wife's mother

Respondents were asked where the grandmothers lived as it was thought that this may have a significant effect on family relationships. One might suppose that if the wife's mother lived near there was a possibility that the wife would be the dominant partner because she would be supported by her mother over decisions. A similar situation would be expected if the husband's mother lived near, i.e., one would expect that the husband would be dominant. However, data refute this; there is no relationship between the balance of power and the location of the wife's mother.

Similarly, it was thought that the location of the grandmothers might affect the way in which couples make their decisions. Other studies have shown that a couple are likely to be syncretic when the mothers live away as they only have each other for emotional and material support; when they live near, they are likely to be autonomous as each has other people to guide them and help them. This situation was found by Bott¹. She found that if people were members of a close-knit network and particularly if the wife's mother lived near, they would have an autonomous or segregated role relationship in the home. As she explains:

"Because old relationships can be continued after marriage, both husband and wife can satisfy some

1 Bott, op.cit.,

personal needs outside the marriage so that their emotional investment in the conjugal relationship need not be as intense as it is in other types of family. The wife particularly can get outside help with domestic tasks and with child care. A rigid division of labour between husband and wife is therefore possible. The segregation in external relationship can be carried over to activities within the family. But although external people may help the elementary family, close-knit networks may also interfere with her relationship with her husband." ¹

She describes one family with a segregated role relationship where the wife's mother lived nearby.

"In Mrs. Newbolt's case, the relationship between herself and her mother was very close. Her mother lived nearby in the same local area, and Mrs. Newbolt visited her nearly every day, taking her children with her. She and her mother and her mother's sisters also visited Mrs. Newbolt's maternal grandmother. These women and their children formed an important group, helping one another in household tasks and child care, and providing aid in crises..... Mrs. Newbolt's female relatives provided some of the domestic help and emotional support that the wives of other research families expected to get from their husbands..... There was considerable segregation between Mr. and Mrs. Newbolt in their external relationships. In effect Mrs. Newbolt had her network and Mr. Newbolt had his..... There was a similar segregation in the way they carried out their internal domestic tasks. They believed there should be a clear cut division of labour between them and that all husbands and wives in their social circle organised their households in a similar way. In the day to day running of the household he had his jobs and she hers".²

On the other hand, she found that people who were members of a loose-knit network had a joint or syncratic role relationship.

"In facing the external world, they draw on each other for their strongest emotional investment is made where there is continuity. Hence their high standards of conjugal compatibility, their stress on shared interests, on joint organisation, on equality between husband and wife. They must get along well together, they must help one another in carrying out familiar tasks for there is no sure external source of material and emotional help."³

1 Bott, op.cit., 94

2 Bott, op.cit., 69

3 Bott, op.cit., 95

This same situation was found by Young and Willmott on the housing estate at Greenleigh. Perhaps the greatest change in the life of these couples on the housing estate was their separation from relatives, particularly their mothers. Young and Willmott imply that this draws the couple closer to each other.

"There is the possibility even inside their own little home of making good some of the loss of social life. Husband and wife are together and a closer partnership here can make a closer isolation bearable. He is now the one who leads the active life of society, not only on the job but sometimes too on his round of relatives after work is done.... She is more dependent on him for news and for the financial sacrifice which will sustain their domestic economy. If now that he does not have to share her with so many others he plays well his roles of messenger, earner and companion, the strains of the new life are not without compensation".¹

Thus previous investigators have found that when the mother lives near, husband and wife tend to make decisions separately. In the present study, the only significant relationship was between the location of the wife's mother and the way in which couples make their decisions, but the findings seem to contradict those of Bott and Young. Table 18 shows that those families where the wife's mother is dead or living out of town tend to be autonomous and those where she lives in town or nearer tend to be syncratic.

TABLE 18:- Percentage distribution of syncraticity according to location of wife's mother

	AMOUNT OF SHARING			N	
	Autonomous	Mixed	Syncratic		
Dead or out of town	43	45	12	100	107
In same street, in same town	23	46	31	100	93

$$\chi^2_2 = 13.33 \quad \text{Significant above } - .01\%$$

1 Young and Willmott, op.cit., 120

43% of those families with the wife's mother dead or living out of town are autonomous as compared with 23% of those with her living near. 12% of those with her living away are syncratic as against 31% with her living near.

A possible explanation is that if the wife's mother is near at hand, the husband may fear that she will interfere with their family decisions. Thus he may insist on a voice in decision rather than letting his wife, make them, possibly influenced by her mother. When she is not there to interfere, i.e., when she is living out of town or is dead, he may relax and need not take such an active part in decision making. He may be sure that even if the wife is making the decisions without him she is at least making them without being influenced by her mother. If this were so, we should expect to find that although location of the wife's mother does not have a significant effect on power, the couple tend to be equalitarian when the wife's mother is near and the wife should become slightly more dominant when her mother is away, as her husband relaxes his vigilance. Table 19 shows that this is so.

TABLE 19.- Percentage distribution of power according to location of wife's mother

LOCATION OF WIFE'S MOTHER	DISTRIBUTION OF POWER			N
	Matriarchal	Equalitarian	Patriarchal	
Away or dead	36	56	8	100 107
Near	27	67	6	100 93

Not significant

This relationship is maintained when the sample is controlled for nationality, so that both the English and Canadian samples refute Bott's findings. It is possible that the families in neither of these samples

were members of such close-knit networks as Bott's families. However, in both these samples, only roughly one third had moved house in the last three years, the remainder had moved before that; thus they were not transients. Moreover, this finding is based on 200 families rather than on 20; it appears, therefore, to be rather more valid. The explanation offered above appears to be the only feasible one, particularly when the original sample of 400 English families shows a similar trend. Table 20 demonstrates this.

TABLE 20 Distribution of syncraticity among 400 English families according to location of wife's mother

Location of wife's mother	DISTRIBUTION OF SYNCRATICITY			N
	Autonomous	Mixed	Syncratic	
Away or Dead	76	90	36	202
Near	59	99	40	198

Not significant

Contact with wife's mother

It will be seen that the findings in connection with this factor support the explanation offered above. Contact here refers to a meeting of the wife's mother with any member of the respondent's family.

This has a significant effect on the distribution of syncraticity over the whole sample, in that those families which see the wife's mother often (i.e., once a week or more) tend to be more syncratic than autonomous, and those who see her seldom (i.e. once a month or less) tend to be more autonomous than syncratic, as Table 21 shows.

TABLE 21.- Percentage distribution of syncraticity according to the amount of contact with the wife's mother

Amount of Contact with wife's mother	AMOUNT OF SHARING			N
	Autonomous	Mixed	Syncratic	
Often	21	48	31	100 81
Seldom	41	41	18	100 54

$\chi^2 = 7.09$ Significant above .05%

A possible explanation for this relationship is consistent with that offered above in connection with the location of the wife's mother. There it was suggested that the couple will be syncretic when she is living near because the husband will insist on a voice in decisions in order to counteract any influence the mother may have on his wife. If it is so, we should expect that the more contact the family has with the wife's mother, more likely they are to be syncretic, as presumably mothers living near are more frequently contacted than mothers living away. Table 20 shows that this is in fact so.

Thus it seems valid to state that if the wife's mother lives near, and contact is frequent, the couple will be syncretic and equalitarian, whereas when she lives further away and contact is made seldom, they will tend to be autonomous and equalitarian. This struggle between the husband and mother-in-law is evidently not merely a situation dreamed up for music hall jokes; Willmott and Young found it flourishing in Bethnal Green in 1957 and respondents there seemed to take it seriously¹.

"In Bethnal Green, the great triangle of adult life is Mum-wife-husband. It is clear that the mutual adjustment of the husband to his wife's family and particularly to his mother-in-law is a crucial matter. If husband and mother-in-law do not get on, the marriage will be stormy, the wife pulled this way and that by competing loyalties."²

Again

"Although, in these families, the husband seeks through 'mother-in-law avoidance' to reduce the conflict between himself and his wife's mother, he may avoid conflict in the extended family only to aggravate it in his family marriage.. The wife is determined to keep in close touch with her mother. The husband resents Mum's power but, though he can avoid her direct influence, he cannot avoid the indirect effects of his wife's refusal to follow his example. He can keep away from his mother-in-law, but, unless his wife keeps away from her too, the triangle may still be in tension."³

¹Young and Willmott, op.cit.

²Young and Willmott, op.cit., 46

³Young and Willmott, op.cit., 50

There is no reason to suppose that the respondents in the present survey differ in this respect from the Bethnal Green sample.

We have found that those couples who have been married for over 15 years tend to make decisions separately, i.e., as the marriage progresses, the number of shared decisions decreases. We have also found that those couples who have little contact with the grandmother tend to share decisions seldom (The number of years married was cross-tabulated with the amount of contact with the grandmother and it was found that they were independent of each other; thus these are separate findings).

Bott did not find that the length of the marriage had any effect on the amount of sharing but as we have seen she found that couples who live closer to the maternal grandmother tend to be autonomous.¹ It may be a subject of future research to discover which of these two findings is valid.

¹ Bott, op.cit.

CHAPTER VI
DISTRIBUTION OF POWER

DISTRIBUTION OF POWER

The central problem of this study is the effect of the paid employment of the wife on the dynamics of decision making in the family. This will now be discussed in terms of English and Canadian families. Moreover, since there is no overall difference between the two countries in the amount of sharing and decision making, it is proposed to examine whether there is any difference in this when the samples are controlled for distribution power. Finally, there will be a discussion of the effect on the distribution of power of religious denomination.

The first part of this chapter, therefore, will compare the distribution of power in England and Canada among workers and nonworkers and the second part will discuss differences in the amount of sharing in the two countries in the matriarchal, patriarchal and equalitarian groups and the third part will discuss the effect of religious denomination.

Power, Nationality and Working

It will be remembered that the questions which asked who made the decisions in various areas of family life could be answered in three ways. The respondent, who was always the wife, could either state that she made the decision, that her husband made it or that they both made it together. Some families did not answer every question so the scores for the Wife Husband or Both in a particular family were calculated as percentages of the total number of questions answered by that family. It was assumed that the score for both could be divided evenly between husband and wife and added to their scores to give their total amount of participation. Then a scale based on the percentage score of the wife was constructed, whereby a score of 1 - 40 designated a family as patriarchal, i.e., the wife made only 40% or less of the decisions, a score of 41-60 designated a family as equalitarian and a

score of 61 - 100 designated it as matriarchal.

When the whole sample is examined for the distribution of power, the results shown in Table 22 agree with the findings of Herbst¹ and Blood and Wolfe.

TABLE 22.- Distribution of Power by Nationality

Nationality	DISTRIBUTION OF POWER			N
	Matriarchal	Patriarchal	Equalitarian	
English	21	7	72	100
Canadian	45	8	47	100
TOTAL	66	15	119	200

$$\chi^2_2 = 14.04 \quad \text{Significant above } .05\%$$

Most or 58 of the families are equalitarian; of the remaining 41.5%, 33% of the families are matriarchal and only 7.5% of the families are patriarchal. Herbst found that 11.5% of his families were husband dominated and 26.7% were wife dominated; this means that 61.8% were equalitarian, although he called these either autonomic or syncretic. Blood and Wolfe found that among Detroit families, 46% were equalitarian, 22% were husband dominated and 22% were wife dominated. On the basis of these findings, they declare that "the weight of evidence suggests that the patriarchal family is dead".

If Blood and Wolfe can assert this on the strength of their findings the present findings certainly show that the patriarchal family is very unusual, not only in the States and Australia but also in England and Canada. They also show that the equalitarian or democratic type of family is the most usual. This supports the impression gained by the interviewer that most people believed that this was the right and proper way to run a family. Many of the English respondents said during the interview that they thought that doing things together was the best way to organise a family. "You have to do things together to get along, haven't

1 Herbst, op.cit. 2 Blood and Wolfe, op.cit.

you?" was a frequent remark, although a count was not kept of such remarks. The Canadians, however, were asked how they thought decisions should be made in the informal interview, and it was found that 62% of them said they thought that couples should "do everything together". Thus this ideology is supported by the statistical result.

It seems fruitless to discuss these findings at any deeper level until they are controlled for nationality, when it can be seen whether there are differences between English and Canadian or whether both nationalities contribute equally to this overall distribution.

It is one of the most significant findings of this study that over twice as many Canadians as English are matriarchal, and that very many more English are equalitarian. This seems curious when respondents of both nationalities were equally as vehement about the necessity and convenience of husband and wife doing things together; Canadians did not give the impression of favouring matriarchy. It cannot be a function of the schedule as the questions which were scored for dominance were identical for both countries. It remains, therefore, an empirical fact that the Canadian wife is far more likely to be the dominant partner in her marriage than the English wife. The Canadian couple, on the other hand are far less likely than the English couple to have an equal amount of power. Thus the Canadians tend to be more matriarchal than the English.

Table 23 shows the distribution of power among workers and nonworkers in each country.

It can be seen that among the Canadians the workers account for 62% of the matriarchs. One explanation of the relationship between working and matriarchy may be that working may increase the wife's

TABLE 23.- Distribution of power between families of working and nonworking wives in Canada and England

	Distribution of Power			N
	Matriarchal	Equalitarian	Patriarchal	
Non-Working	17	26	7	50
Working	28	21	1	50
N	45	47	8	100

$$\chi^2_2 = 7.72 \text{ Significant above } .05\%$$

CANADIAN

	DISTRIBUTION OF POWER			N
	Matriarchal	Equalitarian	Patriarchal	
Non Working	12	33	5	50
Working	9	39	2	50
N	21	72	7	100

Not Significant

ENGLISH

economic power and independence, it may give her independent ideas or it may increase her importance in the eyes of her family. Yet if working did affect power in any of these ways, it presumably would be true in both Canada and England. The above table shows that this is not so; as we have seen among Canadian matriarchs the majority are working and among English matriarchs the majority are nonworking

We have thus found an association between working and matriarchy in Canada. The question now is whether working makes a woman matriarchal or whether naturally dominant women go out to work. It may be that some women are matriarchs before they go out to work. The existence of 17 Canadian nonworking matriarch and 12 English non working matriarchs confirms this.

However, we have to account for the 28 Canadian and 9 English working matriarchs. If we assume that the 17 Canadian nonworkers are matriarchs before they go out to work, i.e. that they are matriarchal by personality, then, one can also assume that 17 of the 28 Canadian working matriarchs are matriarchal by personality and that the 9 English working matriarchs are matriarchal by personality. That leaves 11 Canadian working matriarchs to be accounted for. Since their matriarchy is presumably not caused by personality, it must be a result of their working. Are there any features of these Canadian workers which differ from English workers? One obvious difference is in the type of job.

44% of the Canadian working wives are clerical workers as compared with 12% of the English working wives. It may be that clerical workers have more education and hold more responsibility in their work than others, and so they may be more likely to dominate in their homes. If this difference in the number of clerical workers were the reason for the difference in the distribution of power, we should expect to find that among the working matriarchs there is a disproportionately large number of clerical workers. However, only 53% of the working matriarchs are clerical workers. This does not seem a disproportionately large number.

However, another difference between English and Canadian working wives is in the relative occupational status of the husband and wife. It may be that wives whose occupations are of a higher status than their husbands are likely to dominate in their homes through a sense of superiority. The occupations of husbands and wives were rated on the Hollingshead and Redlich scale of occupational status. It was assumed that husbands and wives would accept this general classification of occupations. Even if a wife were not any more competent than her husband, if she had a white collar job and her husband had a blue collar job, this would lead them both to assume

that she was more competent than he. Presumably then they would tacitly agree that she was the person to make most of the decisions. If this were the case, we should expect to find, first, an association between wives' higher occupational status and matriarchy, and, secondly, more wives with a higher status than their husbands in Canada than in England.

First, then, we should find that among those who have jobs of a higher status than their husbands a disproportionately large number are matriarchs. Among Canadian workers as a whole 56% are matriarchs. Among those Canadians with jobs of a higher status than their husbands, 84% are matriarchs. Table 24 shows the distribution among Canadian and English families.

TABLE 24.- Wives' relative occupational status by percentage distribution of power in Canada and England

STATUS	DOMINANCE				STATUS	DOMINANCE			
	Mat.	Equal.	Patr.	N		Mat.	Equal.	Patr.	N
Wives' higher	84	16	0	13	Wives' higher	50	50	0	2
Same	40	55	5	22	Same	21	70	9	23
Wives' Lower	53	47	0	15	Wives' Lower	11	84	5	25
N				50	N				50
$\chi^2_{\frac{2}{4}} = 10.13$ Significant above .05 %					Not significant				
CANADIAN					ENGLISH				

It can be seen that there is an association between the relative occupation status of husbands and wives in Canada. Since in Canada 26% of working wives hold jobs of a higher status than their husbands' as compared with only 4% in England, it is not surprising that among workers there should be more matriarchs in Canada than there are in England. Moreover, out of the 13 Canadian wives with a higher occupational status than their husbands exactly 11 are matriarchal; this presumably accounts

for the 11 extra Canadian working matriarchs.

Thus we conclude that there are two factors by which working is associated with matriarchy. Either the woman is a dominant personality before she works, or the fact that she has a higher occupational status than her husband tends to make her the dominant partner in the home.

NATIONALITY: Power and Syncraticity

As we have seen above, both samples were also rated on a scale ranging from autonomy to syncraticity. Briefly, an autonomous family is one in which 60% or more of the decisions are made by either the husband or wife separately, a syncratic family is one in which 60% or more of the decisions are made by husband and wife together, and a mixed family is one in which 40% to 6% of the decisions are made either separately or together.

Both samples were examined to see whether there was any relationship between who made the decisions and how they were made. There was no relationship. We have also seen that there is no relationship between nationality and syncraticity. However, the sample is controlled for power then there is a relationship between nationality and syncraticity.

In Canada, matriarchy tends to be associated with syncraticity, whereas in England matriarchy is associated with autonomy. TABLE 25 shows that most of the matriarchal families are predominantly autonomous in England and mixed in Canada.

TABLE 25.- Distribution of syncraticity among matriarchal families by nationality

	SYNCRATICITY		
	Autonomy	Mixed	Syncraticity
Canada	12	25	8
England	14	4	3
N	26	29	11

$$\chi^2_2 = 10.26 \quad \text{Significant above .01\%}$$

If we assume that mixed families do some sharing, then we can say that Canadian matriarchal families share more than English matriarchal families.

In order to find an explanation for the high proportion of syncratic or sharing families among Canadian matriarchal families, it is advisable to look at the workers in this group for two reasons. One is that families of workers make up 62% of the Canadian matriarchs. The second is that among Canadian matriarchs, workers tend to share more decisions than nonworkers as Table 26 shows.

TABLE 26.- Percentage Distribution of Syncraticity between Workers and nonworkers among Canadian Matriarchs

	Amount of Syncraticity				N
	Anomonus	Mixed	Syncratic		
Nonworking	52	42	6	100	17
Working	11	64	25	100	28
	12	25	8		45

$$\chi^2_2 = 8.44 \quad \text{Significant above .02\%}$$

Workers thus show this relationship between matriarchy and syncraticity to a greater extent than the nonworkers and workers form the majority of the matriarchs. We will discuss this relationship therefore in terms of the workers. There are two possible explanations for the fact that matriarchs tend to share decisions with their husband. One is that working matriarchs force their husbands to help in what are possibly disagreeable household tasks. The second is that they permit the husbands to share more of the decisions than nonworkers. In the first case, we would expect to find that workers in Canadian matriarchal families tend to share more of the decisions in the area of household affairs than nonworkers. But this is not true. A careful study of the responses to each question shows that the increases in sharing are scattered over all areas of family life. Therefore we assume that the second hypothesis is more likely,

although unfortunately, we have no evidence to prove it.

It is that wives who work may be more energetic and aggressive than nonworking wives. If this were the case then we could assume that the working wife can fulfil her needs to dominate in her job so that when she comes home she is more willing to share decisions with her husband. Nonworking matriarchs, on the hand, can only work out their aggressions in the home and so they monopolise decision making. If this hypothesis were true it would account for the fact that Canadian matriarchs share more decisions in the home.

When the sample is controlled for the distribution of power, there is a second relationship between nationality and syncraticity. Among equalitarian or patriarchal families, Canadians tend to be autonomous and the English tend to be syncratic, as Table 27 shows.

TABLE 27.- Distribution of syncraticity by nationality among equalitarian and patriarchal families

Nation- ality	Distribution of syncraticity				Nation- ality	Distribution of Syn.			
	Anonymous	Mixed	Syncratic	N		Anonymous	Mixed	Syn.	N
Canada	21	16	10	47	Canada	6	2	0	8
England	12	38	23	73	England	1	6	0	7
N	33	54	33	120	N	7	8	0	15

EQUALITARIAN

$$\chi^2_2 = 11.45 \text{ Significant above } .01\%$$

PATRIARCHAL

$$\chi^2_2 = 5.54 \text{ Significant above } .02\%$$

As we have seen, both samples show that the respondents seem to be equally emphatic that sharing decisions or doing things together was the best way to organise a family. Why then should Canadian husbands and wives be more independent than the English when making decisions, when in both groups husbands and wives have the same amount of authority as each other?

One explanation might be that English equalitarian or patriarchal families

are autonomous because they have the characteristics of families which are autonomous, e.g. s order marriages and little contact with the wife's mother. However, none of these factors had a significant relationship with the distribution of power so that it is not possible to state that equalitarian or patriarchal families showed these characteristics to a greater extent than matriarchal families.

Probably it is impossible without further research to give a valid reason for this relationship. All we can say with certainty is that when the English wife has no more authority than her husband, the couple will share decisions; when the Canadian wife has no more authority than her husband, they will make decisions separately,

Power and Religion

The only other factor which had a significant relationship with the distribution of power was religious denomination. Table 28 shows that Anglicans are more likely to be patriarchs than non-Anglican.

TABLE 28.- Percentage Distribution of power according to religious denomination

	Distribution of Power				N
	Matriarchal	Equalitarian	Patriarchal		
Anglican	28	63	9	100	130
Non-Anglican	44	51	5	100	70

$$\chi^2_2 = 9.85 \quad \text{Significant above .01\%}$$

It is possible that Anglicans are socially conservative and so are still predominantly patriarchal. It is also possible that working class Anglicans take the middle class as their reference group as Anglicanism is sometimes thought of as a middle class denomination and the middle class are largely patriarchal.

Non-Anglicans, on the other hand, largely made up in this sample of nonconformists, tend perhaps to be more liberally-minded and therefore are more frequently accept new patterns of behaviour such as matriarchy.

Since this factor is the only other one besides working which has a significant effect on the distribution of power, it may be considered to have more importance than it is given here. However, the level of significance was low and as Blood and Wolfe, say, "Sociologists have traditionally viewed church membership as a conventional matter unlikely to signify much about the persons involved".¹ Thus we merely note that possible Anglicans are more patriarchal than others.

1 Blood and Wolfe, op.cit. 39

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study tested the hypothesis that working wives have more power in the home than nonworking wives. The data were drawn from a comparative study of 100 English and 100 Canadian families, matched as to occupational status.

Among the English families there was no relationship between whether the wives worked and the degree to which they dominated their families. Among the Canadians, the dominance of wives in the family was positively associated with working. The proportion of Canadian working wives who hold jobs of a higher status than their husbands was greater than the proportion of English wives, and we found that matriarchy was associated with higher occupational status. It may be that working is associated with matriarchy in Canada because more working wives in Canada have jobs of higher status than their husbands.

In England, on the other hand, very few of the workers had a higher occupational status than their husbands and half of them had jobs of lower status than their husbands. Thus English working wives are no more dominant than nonworking wives. This suggests that there is no independent relationship between working and power. Blood and Wolfe suggested that the intervening factor between working and matriarchy was the amount of money the wife brought into the home.¹ Hoffman suggested that the intervening factor was the wife's ideology on sex roles.² It is suggested here that the relative occupational status of the working wives may be the intervening factor and that wives are likely to hold jobs of a higher status than their husbands, they are more likely to be dominant in their homes.

¹Blood and Wolfe, op.cit.

²Hoffman, op.cit.

There were some significant results other than those concerning the hypothesis. One of these was that the patriarchal family is very unusual in both countries. This conclusion had been reached by other investigators but the present statistics lend weight to the theory that the modern family is very different from the family of a generation or two ago in that the modern family is not ruled by a husband and father whose word is law; it is rather a companionate type of marriage and if one partner is dominant it is usually the wife rather than the husband. It should be remembered however, that these families are all working class families.

Another significant result was that the Canadian family is very much more likely to be matriarchal than the English family. This perhaps was to be expected; there seems to be a popular conception of the North American mother as an eminently capable, domineering woman. What is surprising, however, is the large number of equalitarian families in England which are traditionally patriarchal. This may be caused by the large number of respondents who came from an agricultural community.

In both England and Canada, in most families decisions tend to be of two types, i.e., decisions made by husband and wife working separately and decisions made by husband and wife working together. In other words, there is no preference for decisions made together or for decisions made separately. However, there is a tendency for couples to make most decisions together when they have been married for a short time only. It has been suggested that couples newly married may tend to consult each other more than older married couples. It was also found that husbands and wives who live closer to the maternal grandmother tend to share decisions to a greater degree than those who live far from the grandmother. Possibly these husbands tend to insist on a voice in family decisions to counteract the influence of their wives' mothers.

One of the other main results was that among matriarchal families Canadians couples tend to share decisions whereas English couples tend to make decisions separately. Also among equalitarian and patriarchal couples, Canadians tend to make decisions separately and the English tend to share. It is suggested that further research needs to be carried out on these findings before any valid explanation can be attempted.

Finally, there were some general differences between the English and Canadian families. The English tend to have fewer children than the Canadians. The Canadian women tend to marry earlier than the English women. Possibly there is more emphasis on dating and marriage in Canada. More Canadian working wives tend to work full time than English working wives. This is possibly because of the nature of their employment. More English wives take responsibility for all items of household expenditure than Canadian wives.

As we mentioned above, the subject of power relationships in the family is a delicate one. It is difficult to be sure that answers to questions on various family decisions, gathered in half an hour's interview with a respondent who may quite easily give a distorted picture though no fault of her own, give a valid and reliable index of the power structure in a family. The writer, after interviewing 500 families in this way, considers that a more informal, perhaps anthropological method is necessary; it may be more useful to make frequent and informal visits to families and to observe the reality of decision making. This would involve tremendous resources and organisation if a large enough sample were to be used but the results would surely justify this. Meanwhile, it is hoped that this study has contributed to our knowledge and ideas about power in the modern family and has suggested lines on which further research may be carried out.

APPENDIX A - Schedule administered to Exeter sample

Children

1. Have you any children under 16? Yes, no.
2. How many children have you got?
3. What are their ages and sexes? Boys Girls

Work

4. Do you do any work other than housework? Yes, No.
5. Is it paid or voluntary work? Paid, Voluntary
6. Do you go out to do it? yes, no.

Grandparents

7. Is your mother still alive? No - 1, in this house - 2, in this street,
- 3, in Exeter - 4, elsewhere - 5.
8. How often do any of you see her? Husband, Wife, Child. Once a day - 1, once
a week - 2, once a month - 3, once a year - 4, never - 5.
9. Is your husband's mother still alive? Same as for no.7
10. How often do any of you see her? Same as for no.8

Age of mother

11. In which year were you born?
12. Is this your only marriage? Yes, No.
13. If not how many times have you been married before.
14. In which year were you married.

Husband's Occupation and Income

15. What is your husband's occupation?
16. Does he have any responsibility over other workers. Yes, No.
17. Does he ever do night work? Never - A. sometimes - B, always - C.
18. Is he paid by wage - W, salary - S, Fees - F, Commission - C, other - O
19. (If a wage) is it £10 or under - 1, over £10 - £15 - 2, over £15 - £20 - 3,
over £20 - £30 - 4, over £30 - 5.

20. (If a salary) is it £40 or under - 1, over £40 to £65 - 2, over £65 to £90 - 3, over £90 to £130 - 4, over £130 - 5.
21. (If by any other means) Is your income £500 or under, p.a. - 1, over £500 to £750 - 2, over £750 to £1000 - 3, over £1000 to £1500 - 4, £1500 or over - 5.

Household Affairs

22. Have you moved house since you were married, Yes No.
23. How long have you been in this house.
24. (If moved) Why did you move the last time. H's job - 1, housing - 2, health - 3, children - 4, W's job - 5, other - 6
25. (If not moved) have you ever thought of moving? Yes, No.
26. (If yes) why did you not move. Same as for 24.
27. (If no) why have you never thought of moving? Same as for 24.
28. Who decides when the television or radio is switched off in the evening? H. B. W.
29. Who directs the work in the garden? H, B, W.
30. Who decides who washes up after evening meal? H, B, W,

Child Control

31. What religious denomination are you, your husband, your children. W, H. C.
None - 1, Cof E. - 2, R.C. - 2, Methodist - 4, Bapt. - 5, Congreg. - 6,
Scient. - 7, Quaker - 8, Jeh.Wit. - 9, Plym. Breth. - 10, other - 11.
32. Did you have any choice as to which school your eldest child went to? Yes, No.
33. (If yes) Who decided which school your eldest child went to? H, W, B,
34. Who sees to the children's manners and general behaviour? H, B, W.
35. Who decides on the amount of their pocket money? H, B, W.
36. Who sees that the children get to bed on time? H, B, W.

Economic affairs

37. Have you recently bought anything big for the house, Yes, No. what.
38. (If yes) Who decided exactly when you bought it. H, B. W.
39. Who decided that you bought that particular thing. H. B. W.
40. Before you last holiday together, was there any question of whether you had a holiday or not? Yes, no.

59. Who decided that you did not, that you stopped? H, B, W.
60. For what reasons did you stop, did you decide not to. c ildren - 1, home - 2, health - 3, income - 4, unemployed - 5, other - 6.

To mothers who do go out to work

61. What work do you do?
62. Have you worked all the time since your marriage except when you had the children? Yes, No.
63. (If no) How long have you been working since the last time you started?
64. Was there any discussion between you and your working before you started this last time? Yes, no.
65. Who decided that you should go back to work? H^u, B, W.
66. For what reasons did you (start again to) work) income - 1, boredom/company - 2, interest - 3, other - 4.
67. Is your wage under £5 - 1, £5 to £7 10s. - 2, £7 10s to £10 - 3, £10 - £15 - 4, over £15 - 5.
68. Who decides what you do with your wages. H, B, W.
69. How many days a week do you work?
70. What time do you leave home and return?

APPENDIX B - Schedule administered to Canadian sample

SCHEDULE

1. Have you moved house since you were married. Yes, No.
2. How long have you been in this house.
3. Who decided that you would move the last time you moved. H, B, W.
4. Who decides when the television or radio is switched off. H, B, W.
5. Who directs the work in the garden/house decoration. H, B, W.
6. Who decides who washes up after the evening meal. H, B, W.
7. What religious denomination are you. None, R.C., Angl., Meth., Bapt.,
Congreg., United., Unit., JW., Jewish, GO, Luth., other
8. Who sees to the children's manners and general behaviour. H, B, W.
9. Who decides on the amount of their pocket money. H, B, W.
10. Who sees that the children get to bed on time. H, B, W.
11. Have you recently bought anything big for the house. Yes, No.
12. Who decided exactly when you bought it. H, B, W.
13. Who decided that you bought that particular thing. H, B, W.
14. Before your last holiday together, was there any question of whether you
could afford one or not. Yes, No.
15. Who decided what you did. H, B, W.
16. Who decided how much you could afford to spend. H, B, W.
17. Do you ever buy any large item of clothing for yourself without your husband
seeing it first. Always, sometimes, never.
18. Who decides how much you can afford to save. H, B, W.
19. Who decided where you went on your last holiday together. H, B, W.
20. When you go out together for any kind of entertainment, who decides where
you go. H, B, W.
21. When you go out together to visit friends or relations in Montreal, who
decides when you go. H, B, W.

22. Where do you generally go. Cinema, theatre, concert, sports, club, meetings, walks, drives , other.
23. When you have friends or relations here, who decides when they come. H. B. W.
24. Do you both have your own particular friends or just mutual ones. O. M.
25. Do you have both sorts of friends here. Yes, No.
26. Has your housekeeping money changed much in the last 3 years. Yes, No.
27. Why has it (not) changed. H's wages, cost of living, children, W's wages, other.
28. Who decides how much housekeeping money you get. H.B.W.
29. What do you buy with the money which your husband gives you. Food, rent, children's clothes, small, large, wife's clothes, small, large, water tax, heating, insurance, other.
30. How many children of 16 and under have you.
31. What are their ages and sexes.. Boys Girls
32. Do you do any work other than housework. Yes, No.
33. Is it paid or voluntary P. V.
34. Do you go out to do it. Yes, No.
35. If you think back to your home when you were a child, would you say that your mother bossed your father often, sometimes, never.
36. (To mothers who do not go out to work) Who decided that you do not go out to work. H, B, W.
37. (To mothers who do go out to work) What work do you do.
38. Was there any discussion between you about your working before you started. Y, N.
39. Who decided that you should go out to work. H. B. W.
40. For what reasons did you decide to go out to work.
41. Do you earn under \$2,000, between \$2,000 and \$4,000, between \$4,000 and \$6,000 over \$6,000.
42. Who decides how you spend your wages. H. B. W.

43. How many years have you been working
44. How many days a week do you work
45. What time do you leave the house and return
46. Is your mother still alive. No, in this house, in this street, in Montreal, other.
47. How often do any of you see her. At least once a day, more than once a week, at least once a week, at least once a month, at least once a year, less often.
48. Is your husband's mother still alive. No, in this house, in this street, in Montreal, elsewhere.
49. How often do any of you see her. At least once a day, more than once a week, at least once a week, at least once a month, at least once a year, less often.
50. In which year were you born.
51. In which year were you married
52. If you think back to your own home again when you were a child, would you say your father bossed your mother, often, sometimes, never.
53. How many years at school did you have.
54. How many years at school did your husband have.
55. Where were you born.
56. Where was your husband born.
57. What is your husband's occupation
58. Thinking of his job, does anyone work under him. Yes, No,
59. If yes, does anyone work under those people. Yes, No.
60. Does he work under anyone. Yes, No.
61. If yes, does anyone work over his boss. Yes, No.
62. Is your husband paid by a wage or salary or other means. W. S. O.
63. Does he earn under \$ a year, between \$2,000 and \$4,000, between \$4,000 and \$6,000 or over \$6,000

APPENDIX C - Text of letter to Exeter respondents

University of Exeter

Queen's Building

Queen's Drive,

Exeter

Dear

I am writing to you to ask if you could possibly help me. I am doing some research, connected with the University, on family life in Exeter, and I wonder whether you would please be so kind as to co-operate by answering a few questions for me. I obtained your name and address from the Street Directory. The information will be entirely confidential and your name will not be mentioned.

I will not take up a great deal of your time, but I would be very grateful if you could help me in this way, I will be coming to see you within the next few days.

Yours faithfully,

APPENDIX D - Text of letter to Montreal respondents

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Dear

I am writing to ask if you could possibly help me.

I am studying sociology at McGill University and am doing some research on the modern family. I have just come from England where I carried out a survey with four hundred families in Exeter, in Devonshire, and I thought that, while I was over here, it would be interesting to carry out a similar survey in Montreal, to see what differences there are in family life between Canada and England.

Mr. D'Aeth of Connaught School very kindly gave me your name and address as I especially interested in families where there are children. All that it involves is a few questions about various tasks in the house, etc., and will not take up more than half-an-hour. The information will be entirely confidential and your name will not be mentioned. I would be very grateful if you would be kind enough to help me in this way. I will be calling to see you during the next few days.

Yours faithfully,

MC:lt

APPENDIX E - The Sample

It will be found in the text that 1000 families were thought to be sufficient number which would yield the requisite 600 eligible families. Taking the population of Exeter to be roughly 80,000 it was calculated that there might be 20,000 - 30,000 families.

Thus it was calculated that if every 25th name and address were taken from the Street Directory, there would result about 1,000 households. It will be noted that this method was that of quasi random sampling in that once the sampling fraction had been decided upon, i.e. every 25th name, then the random selection of the starting point determined the whole sample. This method was justified by the fact that the feature by which the street directory was arranged, i.e. streets in alphabetical order, was not related to the subject of the survey.

The sample was started at the random number of 24. Streets which were business centres were omitted and altogether 924 names were drawn. Some street were rather long and to avoid too many interviews in the same street, the sample was sampled and every 10th name was taken from 924. This was done 9 times until the whole list was exhausted, each sample starting at a different random number. This meant that in each of these smaller lists, there were only 2 or 3 names from one street.

Each smaller list was then divided into about 16 areas in Exeter and each area was completed before the next was begun. This meant that each area was visited roughly once in every 3 weeks and ensured a reasonable distribution of respondents over the city.

A duplicated letter on University notepaper was sent to each respondent, a few days before the interview, stating a reason for the survey and asking that the respondent would co-operate.

The first 924 names yielded about 200 interviews so that another sample was taken from the street directory of every 25th name replacing the first sample and starting at the random of 11. The same procedure was followed. This second sample yielded about 160 interviews so a third sample was taken starting at the random number of 5 and this was not exhausted when 400 interviews were completed.

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Interviewed.....	400 20
alternate workers(non).....	200 10
nonworkers in last sample...	84 4
no family.....	424 21
no children under 16.....	391 20
no children.....	423 21
house empty or demolished...	55 2.75
refusals	17 1
other.....	3 0.5
	<u>1997</u>	<u>100</u>

The Canadian sample was drawn from the lists of an elementary Protestant school. To obtain the nonworking sample, every 10th name from each grade list was taken in alphabetical order until 100 names had been drawn. This would allow for families who could not or would not co-operate. Then the principal collected the names of all those children whose mothers went out to work and this yielded 100 families also.

As the area was composed of fairly long streets, the procedure was a little different from that followed in Exeter in that all the addresses in one street were visited in one day and the streets chosen were scattered all over the area. A letter was also sent to respondents beforehand. (See Appendix C)

It will be noted that this sample is composed of Protestant English-speaking families where there are children at least 5 years old. Thus it is not as representative of Montreal as the English sample was Exeter but this was the only feasible way to draw a reasonably large sample in a short time.

APPENDIX F - Occupations of husbands

<u>England</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Canada</u>	<u>N</u>
Railway.....	16	Railway.....	18
Sales.....	14	Manufacture.....	17
Engineering.....	14	Construction.....	13
Clerical.....	13	Sales.....	11
Building.....	12	Clerical.....	11
Manufacture.....	8	Engineering.....	8
Printing.....	3	Transport	5
Transport.....	3	Printing.....	4
Public Transport.....	2	Catering	2
Catering.....	2	Others.....	11
Labouring	2	Boat Oiler	
Milkmen.....	2	Time Study	100
Others.....	11	Interior decorator	
Services	100	Insurance agent	
Watchmaker		Unemployed	
Newspaper manager		Milkman	
Social worker		Chauffeur	
Unemployed		Accountant	
Cleaner		Traffic Supervisor	
Estate Agent			
Leather worker			
Quantity surveyor			
Confectioner			
Road sweeper			

APPENDIX 9 - Occupations of working wives

<u>England</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Canada</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Cleaning.....	14	28	Clerical.....	23	46
Sales.....	7	14	Cleaning.....	9	18
Clerical.....	6	12	Sales.....	6	12
Nursing.....	4	8	Manufacture.....	3	6
Canteenworker.....	4	8	Catering.....	2	4
Telephonist.....	3	6	Demonstratint...	2	4
School meals.....	2	4	Others:.....	5	10
Others.....	10	20	Printing		
Adding machine operator			Shopping Sercie		
Cashier			Social work		
Old people's help			Babysitting		
Confectioner			Janitor		
Hospital Maid					
Hotel worker					
Cook					
Framer, optician					
Circular distributor					
Teacher					
Presser					

APPENDIX H - Decision making in English and
Canadian families

<u>Decision</u>	<u>England</u>			<u>Canada</u>		
	<u>H</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>W</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>W</u>
<u>Household</u>						
When to move	7	42	1	6	36	6
When to turn off T.V.	9	38	4	11	27	2
Care of the garden	32	8	9	21	9	15
Who does the dishes	5	17	27	2	8	45
<u>Child Control</u>						
Which religious denomination	3	41	6	3	40	7
Which school	2	25	2			
Correction of manners	4	35	11	2	32	17
How much pocket money	12	17	17	13	11	18
Enforcement of bed time	8	18	24	4	14	31
<u>Economic</u>						
When to buy furniture	10	14	12	13	10	4
What furniture	4	15	15	7	11	9
Whether to have a holiday	2	10	1	6	18	2
How much to spend on holiday.. .. .	20	22	6	12	23	7
Buying wife's clothing	15	3	31	17	4	29
How much to save	19	17	12	11	17	17
<u>Social</u>						
Where to go on holiday	4	37	5	10	32	2
When to visit friends	5	22	12	6	29	12
Where to go out when out	5	29	6	10	29	6
When to entertain at home	0	33	15	2	32	16

Housekeeping Money

How much housekeeping money	..	30	12	8	12	11	27
-----------------------------	----	----	----	---	----	----	----

Wife's Work

Whether she works or not	..	5	17	28	15	14	22
--------------------------	----	---	----	----	----	----	----

How she spends her wages	..	1	10	40	0	18	32
--------------------------	----	---	----	----	---	----	----

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Robert O. Blood, Jr., and Robert L. Hamblin, "Effects of the Wife's Employment on the Family Power structure", Social Forces XXXVI, 1957-58, pp. 347 - 352.
- Robert O. Blood, Jr., and Donald M. Wolfe, Husbands and Wives: Dynamics of Married Living, Illinois; The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.
- Elizabeth Bott, Family and Social Structure, London; Tavistock Publications Ltd., 1957
- Department of Labour, Survey of Married Women Working for Pay in Eight Canadian Cities, Cat.No. L38-258, Ottawa; the Department of Labour, 1958
- P. G. Herbst, "Family Living and Region Pathways" in Social Structure and Personality in a city, ed. O. A. Ceser and S. B. Hammon, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1954. Chaps. X, XI, XII
- August Hollingshead and Frederick C. Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness, New York; John Wiley and Sons, Inc., Publishers, 1958
- Lois Wladis Hoffman, "Effects of the Employment of Mothers on Parental Power Relations and Division of Household Tasks", in Marriage and Family Living, XXII, February 1960, pp.27-35
- L. Hurwitz, "Components of Marital Roles" in Sociology and Social Research, XVI 1960-1, pp. 301-309
- Margaret Mead, Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1935.
- C. A. Moser, Survey Methods in Social Investigation, London; William Heinemann Ltd., 1958
- Alva Myrdal and Viola Klein, Woman's Two Roles: Home and Work, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956

John R. Seeley, R. Alexander Sim and Elizabeth Loosley, "Family and Socialisation in an Upper-Class Community" in Canadian Society, ed. by Bernard R. Flishen et. al., Toronto; The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1961, Part III, Ch.5.

Donald M. Wolfe, "Power and Authority in the Family" in Studies in Social Power, ed. by Dorwin Cartwright, Ann Arbor; The University of Michigan Press, 1959. Ch.7.

Michael Young and Peter Willmott, Family and Kinship in East London, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. 1957

Morris Zelditch, Jr., "The Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family; a comparative study" in A Modern Introduction to the Family, ed. by Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel, Illinois; The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960. Ch.11.

F. Zweig, Women's Life and Labour, London; Victor Gollancz Ltd. 1952