

**THE NEW ZEALAND FAMILY AND
CHILD DEVELOPMENT**

**The 1968 lectures
delivered to the
Association for the Study of Childhood
Wellington, New Zealand**

New Zealand University Press

1969

Wilmington

The original fee

Wilmington

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF CHILDHOOD

some pencilling
\$10
N780c

Officers for 1968

PRESIDENT: D.J. Lundy
VICE-PRESIDENTS: J.J. Shallcrass, J.G. Nicholls
HON. SECRETARY: W.B. Elley
HON. TREASURER: P.C. Alve
ASST. TREASURER: Mrs. M. Giese
EDITOR-PUBLISHER: D.J. Lundy
COMMITTEE: Mrs E.M. Gabites, Mrs M.W.L. Logan, Mrs G.R. McDonald,
Mrs B.G. Paul, Mr H.C.D. Somerset, Mrs V. Walsh.

Previous publications of the Association

- 1956 : *Psychoanalysis and the Study of Personality.*
1957 : *Children in Primary School*
1958 : *Conformity and Individuality*
1959 : *Adults and Adolescents*
1960 : *Mental Health in Childhood*
1961/62 : *Children's Thinking*
1963 : *The Currie Report - A Critique*
1965 : *The Development of Conscience in Children*
1966 : *From Mind to Mind: How Children Learn the
Art of Communication*
1967 : *What do we really know about Child Development?*

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF ETHNOLOGY

1900

THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF ETHNOLOGY
WAS ORGANIZED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
AMERICAN ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY AT
WASHINGTON, D. C., ON DECEMBER 29, 1899.
THE FIRST MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION
WAS HELD AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
AMERICAN ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY AT
WASHINGTON, D. C., ON DECEMBER 29, 1899.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1899	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1900	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1901	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1902	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1903	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1904	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1905	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1906	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1907	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1908	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1909	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw
1910	Dr. Wm. H. Henshaw

THE
NEW ZEALAND FAMILY
AND
CHILD DEVELOPMENT

*The 1968 lectures
delivered to the
Association for the Study of Childhood
Wellington, New Zealand*

1969

NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITY PRESS
Price Milburn and Company Limited

1969
NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITY PRESS
Price Milburn and Company Limited
Post Office Box 2919 – Wellington
New Zealand

Set in 11 point Press Roman
on an IBM Selectra Composer
and printed by
John Milne Limited
Wellington

Published for the
Association for the Study of Childhood

Copies may be obtained from
any bookseller or from Mr P.C. Alve
52 Raroa Road, Kelburn
Wellington

CONTENTS

Foreword by <i>D.J. Lundy</i>	7
1. An introduction to the New Zealand Family by <i>J.R. McCreary</i>	11
2. The Family in New Zealand Fiction by <i>Joan Stevens</i>	21
3. The New Zealand Family and its House by <i>John Daish</i>	25
4. The Family and Personality Development by <i>R.J. Methven</i>	40
5. The Family and Intellectual Development by <i>P.J. Lawrence</i>	50
6. The Changing New Zealand Family by <i>M. Gilson</i>	65
7. Sibling Interaction by <i>H.S. Houston</i>	76

FOREWORD

These talks were presented to the Association for the Study of Childhood in 1968 under the title of 'The New Zealand Family'. There were seven talks in the series: some of which described the New Zealand family, some that showed how this family affected the lives of the children who grow up in it, and some which raised fundamental questions about the nature of this family. Because of this range in topics the title of the publication was changed to *The New Zealand Family and Child Development*. In this way the two aspects of description and influence were combined.

In the opening paper Professor McCreary takes up the challenge of defining the New Zealand family and, limiting himself to the European family, he raises several important issues. He suggests that as yet there is no evidence to show that we have one particular pattern and mentions the obvious differences which exist between different regions and different occupational groups. If over-stressed these differences sometimes prevent us from noticing more fundamental characteristics such as the fact that a high proportion of today's parents 'are at best first generation New Zealanders'. This introduces one of the recurring themes of the series. The New Zealand family, as an institution, has changed a great deal in the past, and is changing rapidly today.

The changes which occurred in the past were well developed by the second speaker, Professor Joan Stevens, in her survey of the family in our fiction. The picture of the family presented in each age was affected by two factors: the changing social pattern and also the gradual trend towards more realistic and intimate styles of writing. For this reason we find that many of the earlier writings give a very clear idea of the behaviour of the family and little analysis of the feelings involved.

The evidence so far indicates that the family has changed considerably but in the third paper John Daish suggests that while aspirations have changed, little thought has been given to the frame within which the family will live — its house. Our neat homes surrounded by lawns and low shrubs may be a way of establishing a

territory for our family. But have we developed the kind of house which allows us to give expression to the ideals for family living which we hold? Perhaps some of the difficulties experienced by parents arise from the use of traditional house forms which prevent parents from living as they really wish to live.

The family, as a social institution is a universal phenomenon and its influences are largely predictable within any society. For this reason the next group of articles seldom refer specifically to New Zealand. As Dr. Methven said in his study of personality development in the family, 'There is little I will say which will be limited to New Zealanders.' His case studies, drawn from his work in the Marinoto Clinic in Auckland, are of New Zealand children, but the nature and causes of these problems are similar to those found in any Western European civilisation.

If we look in this general way at the family it is possible to ask such questions as: What proportion of intellectual development occurs within the first five years of life? In what ways do environment and heredity interact during the child's time within the family? Both of these questions are asked and answered by Professor Philip Lawrence in relation to the intellectual development of children. His selection of headings for the second question includes an analysis of the importance of parental attitudes in the formation of interests, cognitive styles, the drive to achieve, and discussion of the influence of national culture. These are further elaborated in a series of thoughtful comments on the importance of socio-economic class, family atmosphere, family language patterns and family routines, such as 'table talk'.

All of these topics are of importance in understanding the influence of the family. But to discuss them fully within a New Zealand context we need to know much more about the styles of living employed in New Zealand families. How are the parental roles seen, and played, by New Zealanders? Who are the parents and what is a typical New Zealand family?

Miriam Gilson, reporting on a study undertaken in Wellington in July, 1967, describes the New Zealanders' attitudes to their roles as parents. We begin to see who the parents are and to recognise that some of the well-worn cliches about the nuclear family need careful study before use. As Mrs Gilson says, 'Anyone who regarded our

nuclear families as isolated units would understand little of our way of life.' The complex of relationships which supports the family are more widespread than some writers have assumed.

In the final paper Stewart Houston draws attention to the intricate network of relationships found within each family. While it is easy to work out by simple permutations the number of relationships within a family of any given size, the *significance* of a relationship between siblings, for instance, changes as the children grow older. Some relationships appear to be particularly important and Houston describes how in his research on 78 boys from two-child families, the brother or sister is sometimes the recipient of stronger feelings than either parent. His findings suggest quite marked shifts in affectional ties between 5 and 8 years of age. Does the increase in negative feelings in relationship between the 5 and 8 year old siblings result from the 8 year old's move into a new play group? One fact is clear from this survey. The boys perceived their siblings as very significant in their lives.

By limiting his study to boys from two-child families he was able to show the 'child's eye-view' of the family world. In so doing he highlights the importance of this area of study and our own ignorance of the large number of possible patterns which can be found. But the area surveyed is small and, as Houston points out, we need more research if we are to continue to increase our understanding of the importance of the family.

This was a most successful series of talks and the Association is very grateful to the speakers for allowing us to publish their manuscripts. We hope that in this form the talks will continue to provoke discussion as well as they did in 1968.

D.J. Lundy.
President.

WELLINGTON, MARCH, 1969.

PAPER I

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW ZEALAND FAMILY

J.R. McCreary

As the opening speaker in this series, I have assumed that my task is in part to clear the ground for those who follow me. I therefore wish to begin by examining the title of tonight's paper. I assume by the term 'New Zealand Family' is implied the New Zealand pakeha family and for the purposes of this discussion we are not concerned with the Maori people or their family life. I also assume that despite the existence of precise definitions, in using the word family we will mostly be thinking of the kin groups gathered together in households in New Zealand, our most common image probably is that of the nuclear family - mother, father, children. This seems to me an unnecessarily limiting view. We should be concerned rather with the extended family group, both extended within the framework of a single household to include grandparents and other relatives, and extended beyond the household to include the network of kin relations which seem to be part of the social milieu of most New Zealanders. We know very little of the way in which the extended network operates but I am sure that Mrs. Gilson in her paper later in this series will make some comments on this.

Our knowledge of the New Zealand family is extremely limited. We have some information from public statistics, a little from scientifically based research projects. We have a great many hypotheses or just plain guesses about the nature of the New Zealand family found in the works of our literary men and in the

J.R. McCREARY is Associate Professor in the Department of Social Administration and Sociology in the Victoria University of Wellington.

pseudo-scientific statements of some who have commented on our country. Much of the information is little more than a set of stereotypes and prejudices which have somehow found their way into the current usage. One area of information which is in some ways more extensive is knowledge of the New Zealand family in breakdown: the type of knowledge gained by our social workers, psychotherapists, counsellors, when they come into contact with the family in a crisis situation. There is indeed so much that we don't know that I feel my paper will be punctuated with question marks rather than exclamation marks or full stops. Indeed it is my intention to raise questions not answer them.

In a family survey conducted in Wellington last year, in which only married women living with husbands were interviewed, 74.22% of the subjects were born in New Zealand, 69.36% of their husbands, 54.76% of their mothers and 51.14% of their fathers. Such figures would tend to suggest that we're about to launch a year's discussion on families which contain a large proportion of people who are at best first generation New Zealanders. Many New Zealand families are made up of couples who come from different traditions, from different cultures, with different family patterns, with different concepts of the roles of husband, wife and parent, and that these are the couples from a variety of backgrounds meeting, mating, loving and fighting in our society, that we are going to consider as New Zealand families. In some ways it might be more appropriate to call this series 'The New Zealand Family in Genesis'.

Up to this point I have been using the term New Zealand family as if there is such an entity available for study. Can we generalise to the extent that we can speak of *the* New Zealand family? Are we sufficiently homogeneous as a society to say that such a single, identifiable form as the New Zealand family exists? It becomes a matter of doubt when we consider the variety of situations in which New Zealand families are to be found. There is the rural family, the urban family, the family of the north, the family of the south and some would even add, the family of the state housing area and the family of the non state housing area. There has been a good deal of discussion concerning the nature of class structure in New Zealand but we can, I think, assume that there are at least different occupational groupings and that these groupings also provide

differing milieus in which their children grow up. Comments of visiting social scientists do however give us some hope that there is a unit capable of description. I still remember the prominent anthropologist visiting New Zealand some years ago who said, with a ripe American accent, 'you are, of course, an encapsulated lower middle class society'.

Despite all I have said I intend now to go on talking as if there were a New Zealand family.

Viewed historically the New Zealand family had its origins when marriage began to be made in this country. The nature of a pioneer society is such that the major ingredients missing in starting family life is a wife. The early statistics demonstrate clearly in what desperate straits the men found themselves. Even as late as 1881, 55% of the population were men and in the age group between forty and fifty the figure rose to almost 65%. Even after the ravages of World War I, in 1926, 51% of the population were males and it is not until the 1945 census that women crept into the majority with 51%. The most recent figure is 50.09% male.

John Miller in *Early Victorian New Zealand* after quoting E.G. Wakefield as saying that the shortage of young women was 'the greatest evil of all', points out that 'in 1847 there were 528 bachelors in the Wellington settlement and 248 spinsters'. Any commodity in short supply is eagerly sought after and can command a high price. Young men of good family, according to the recorded tittle-tattle of early New Zealand, married beneath them. Miller quotes a letter from Mary Swainson (1841) in which she says, 'a very intelligent and well-informed man, and apparently possessing considerable capital (for this colony) is going to be married to Mr. Tollemache's housemaid, who also came out in the fore-castle of our ship! She seems a decent, respectable, young woman, but would never, even in her dreams, have aspired to such a match in England'. By 1854 the state of the market can be judged by another letter from Mary Swainson, herself married by this time, 'the mother of a woman I had for a month had a wooden leg, a son of 22 and six children, yet has just been married again!! No one need despair after that I think!'

It is interesting to speculate on the effect such a balance between the sexes has had on marriage relationship in our society. Have we a tradition that wives are to be cosseted and cared for? That the

woman's wishes and needs should supersede those of the men? Have women a more powerful place in the New Zealand family than they have in countries without a pioneering tradition? An anthropological analogy occurs to me from the Marquesas where when women were in short supply the chief ogre was believed to be a female one!

A pioneer society also makes markedly different demands on men and women in their everyday life. Roles are clearly demarcated but so too are areas of operation. The woman's domain is clearly the inside, extending perhaps to the flower garden and house cow, and the man's domain is the outside. The man's work is hard and dirty and the woman's work no less hard but concerned with keeping the dirtiness of the outside from penetrating into her domain. In the pioneer families I have met the women seemed to regard themselves as depositories of the civilisation, of the arts, etiquette, manners and morals, which stem from a better world they have never known. They seem to feel that these are under attack and the attackers are the men who do not appreciate these finer things of life.

If I am right in this impression, there is a socially inherent separation between men and women in our society and it is, therefore, not surprising that the two sexes do not mix readily socially and that relationships between them are uneasy.

Am I right in asserting that relationships between men and women, husbands and wives, mothers and fathers, are less satisfactory here than in other countries? As New Zealanders we have comments such as the following which we must examine if we are to come to terms with the nature of our families:

By American standards women in New Zealand give the impression of being somewhat hard, determined, and lacking in feminine charm and softness. They seem deadly serious most of the time, funless, unimaginative and apparently incapable of relaxing and enjoying leisure. Unlike American women who characteristically dominate their husbands through feminine wiles and subterfuge, despite frequent semi-humorous allegations regarding more direct control, New Zealand women dominate the home in a perfectly frank, open unsubtle and undisguised fashion. (Ausubel).

Along with the Spaniard, the New Zealander is probably the most conservative white man still living. He is rarely at ease in public with his

wife, whose new-found freedoms have not yet been clearly defined. He is most unsentimental (Michener).

Both these authors are suggesting that there is something defective in the relationship between men and women and at a deeper level also ask if New Zealanders, as individuals, have feelings about being masculine or being feminine which differentiate them from other people.

Such questions probably lead to more speculation than any others. I have heard it argued that there is a strong element of latent homosexuality in the New Zealand character. That this is evidenced by our preference of body contact sports, in particular rugby football, by the rough treatment meted out to homosexuals, from an examination of graffiti on lavatory walls, and, in general, by the strength of feelings produced by any public airing of the topic. General practitioners and marriage guidance counsellors would probably agree that a not uncommon presenting problem in a case of marital difficulty is frigidity in women and impotence in men. It is also not uncommon in marriage guidance to find sexual satisfaction regarded as a male prerogative, and almost a bargaining point between the couples with the husband as supplicant. I heard of a New Zealand gynaecologist, for instance, who asked a wife how often her husband¹ 'required' her.

Despite the famous Freudian precedent it is probably not wise to overstress arguments based on pathology, but if relationships between men and women are defective in comparison with other societies and this is reflected in marriage and has psychological concomitants in the individual's feeling of sex identity, then our basis of family life is not as harmonious as we would like to believe.

If New Zealand couples do not interact easily as men and women what are the areas in which they co-operate? Although wives do help their husbands in business (in Hawera, 1954, 27% of wives in the sample) the most obvious area of interaction is in the home. Professor L.B. Brown applied the 'Day at Home' questionnaire to a Wellington sample of school children in 1959. I do not intend to examine his findings in detail but merely to say that there are duties which emerge clearly as the responsibility of the wife or husband but in all of these there are some husbands helping wives or vice versa. A

comparison of the Wellington figures with an Adelaide sample would tend to suggest a marked similarity in family patterns in the two cities.

My main reason for mentioning Brown's study is to focus attention on the importance of elaborating and extending the scope of such research. The 'Day at Home' questionnaire is concerned not only with who does what in the home but also with who decides what is to be done. Our ignorance of patterns of decision and action in the home is very great indeed. We do not know who decides when to have children, or how many, or whether they should go to pre-school centres, or which school they should attend, or what secondary school course they should follow. We do not know who controls the family budget, who decides housekeeping allowances, or who decides to purchase a house and in which suburb. One could go on elaborating what we do not know about decisions in the New Zealand family and yet these are the areas in which husbands and wives are working out their relationships and the way in which they work them out has an important bearing on the strength and stability of our family life.

It can be argued that the house and section have come to play a dominant role in New Zealand family life. Ausubel in writing about the New Zealander at work says, 'The forty hour week and morning and afternoon tea are observed with scrupulous religiosity. Although it is considered perfectly acceptable to convert holidays and week-ends into veritable orgies of backbreaking labour in home gardens and sections'. In 1961 there were 633,707 dwellings in New Zealand, 29% of these were owned without mortgage and about 40% owned with mortgage. Think of 69% or 437,257 houses and sections each a potential do-it-yourself factory with a twenty hour working weekend! How much time and energy do New Zealand couples devote to house and section maintenance and improvement? How much time and energy have they left for each other or their children? Does each work at his own task or do they work together? Do they relate to each other through a common relationship to a thing? Is it safer this way?

Up to this point you will notice that children have barely been mentioned. I have done this deliberately because in examining the family the critical relationship seems to me to be that between

husband and wife. The way children are brought up and the sort of children they become will largely reflect the nature of their parents as individuals and the relationship between them.

Until 1911 we could find the number of children born to N.Z. women by reference to the Census. Today this figure is not available. In 1911 we know that families were large by modern standards, e.g. one married woman in four, over the age of 50, had given birth to 10 or more children. Occasionally, a figure of about 2.5 children is quoted as being the size of the average family but this refers only to *dependent* children at the time of a Census i.e. children under 16 years of age. We do know that N.Z. has one of the highest crude birthrates in what could be loosely called the western world, but this will not necessarily be related to family size. It is a reasonable guess that the median N.Z. mother gives birth to between two to four children in her lifetime. Although family units have grown smaller in the last hundred years there are proportionately more of them. To phrase this in a different way, more people are now trying parenthood and, for men at least, at a younger age.

It is interesting to observe the patterns of infant care in a pre-industrial society. Where patterns have been learned by the observation of parents and other villagers there is an ease and certainty in caring for infants that is not always present in a N.Z. mother. One wonders if the migrant nature of our society and the consequent separation of generations produced an uncertainty in child care which is reflected in the invention of the Plunket Society and the growth of organisations concerned with teaching anxious mothers how to care for their young. One could reasonably ask whether N.Z. mothers are more anxious and more uncertain than those of older European countries? Are we creating a generation of self-conscious parents? Is there an identifiable N.Z. pattern of infant and child care?

In previous sessions of the Association for the Study of Childhood there are, of course, a number of speakers who have argued that such a pattern does exist. One can recall Ausubel and Bourne, both of whom commented vigorously on the New Zealander's attitude towards authority and discipline in relating to their children. Bourne made a comment which, because it asserts a

common N.Z. pattern is worth repeating. After indicating that he had, of course, met the same emphasis on discipline in British fathers he writes:

I would not — emphatically I would not — expect him to be a school-teacher or a lawyer, nor would I associate him with a large car, an all-electric home, a son at university and a middle-class standard of living. Yet in New Zealand it's this sort of anomaly that one so often finds. To see it leads to uncovering a confusion in the New Zealand family's structure and standards of conduct — on the one hand, its economic aspirations and ideology are prosperously middle class, while on the other, the emotional relationships within it are the unreflective, unsubtle ones of an industrial working-class, inherited from the pioneers bred in the urban bleakness of 19th century England.

This is reminiscent of the comment made to me by the visiting American anthropologist. Are we then caught by the attitudes and values of a lower middle class society? Do these permeate our child rearing practices? One could develop from this a rather depressing hypothesis. Because of lower middle class pretensions, we want our own house and garden which must compete successfully with everybody else's house and garden. Without sufficient money to employ others to do this for us we must do it ourselves. Children then become an interruption in cleaning, polishing, painting, weeding, and must, therefore be kept in their place. Paradoxically, lower middle class values include vertical mobility in an open class society and therefore our hopes and aspirations centre on our children. We, therefore, encourage teachers to discipline them to succeed, and try to do what we are told at PTA meetings because they will then be better and more successful children. If this is so, parents would then feel two ways about their children, they would feel caught between the polarities of rejection and acceptance.

I must confess that having written this, my hypothesis seems both oversimplified and not particularly fruitful. I have, however, left it in the text purely as a springboard for discussion to try and suggest that we need to answer the question: Are N.Z. parents strongly ambivalent in their feelings towards their children? If the answer is yes, what are the roots of this ambivalence?

The most recent study I know of patterns of family life in N.Z. is

that undertaken by James and Jane Ritchie of Waikato University. I have access to a mimeographed report they call 'Some Preliminary Results' and would like to mention some of their findings briefly. The great majority of mothers said they enjoyed babies and 85% reported they were very responsive to crying babies, only one third of the sample made no attempt to breast feed although 84% did not continue feeding beyond four months. Thirty percent made no attempt to schedule feeding but 33% were very rigid in this regard. N.Z. mothers were more permissive in feeding schedules than an American sample where only 12% operated on demand feeding. While in one third of the cases, mothers made no restriction on the children at meal times, 38% did not allow children to leave the table if they wished, but almost 50% permitted children to interrupt parents at the table. Twenty two percent began toilet training before four months although toilet training was completed by 18 months in only 20% of cases; by two and a half 70% of the children were trained. Over one third considered it morally wrong for a child to run about naked in the house. Some 42% had very definite attitudes against masturbation and 32% were severely upset by social sex play. Aggression between children is the greatest source of difficulty. The N.Z. sample report a higher incidence than the American sample and are also less permissive of this behaviour - 46% say they will not tolerate it, American 4%. Although positive controls are used, only 1% of the N.Z. sample reports she has never spanked her child, 16% of the children are spanked every day by their mothers. To quote the Ritchies:

Methods of control are the key to the mother-child relationship and it is here that the New Zealand pattern is sharply defined. Control by smacking is its chief characteristic and for many mothers virtually the only control consistently employed. They have thrown away some of the most potent reward techniques; praise is thought to be inappropriate; tangible rewards are castigated as "bribery"; holding up other children as positive and negative models thought to be an anti-social technique; very few families use a credit-point reward system; over half think isolation of the child cruel (or find it impossible to achieve); half regard reasoning as a waste of time. What is left for them to use? Only punishment and threat of punishment. And it is Mum who punishes not Dad. If this is so then the implications for the child's maternal image are clear. The source of

greatest affection is also the source of greatest punishment. Mother is the object of complicated and ambivalent feelings. This may have implications also for the general relationships between men and women in New Zealand.

Here then is some objective evidence of the comments made by Ausubel and Bourne. Discipline is considered a major problem and the area in which a N.Z. sample is most clearly differentiated from an American. Why is this? Does this link up with any of the patterns of living we have previously discussed?

I would like to conclude by referring briefly to the extended N.Z. family. When subjects were asked in Hamilton to whom they would turn when faced with a problem of personal unhappiness in the family, the largest proportion (30%) said they would first turn to their relatives. Old age surveys show that although about 20% of the elderly are living alone, the great majority not living with their spouses are living with adult kin. These two slender pieces of evidence lead one to speculate on the web of interaction and mutual support supplied by the extended family. How far are kin relationships recognised in N.Z.? How strong are the bonds between kin? How can these be investigated to add to our understanding of the nature of the N.Z. family?

References

- Ausubel, David P. *The Fern and the Tiki*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1960.
- Bourne, Harold. 'Authority and the New Zealander', *The New Zealand Listener*, 4 October 1957, p. 4.
- Brown, L.B. 'The Day at Home in Wellington, New Zealand', *Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 189-206.
- Congalton, A.A. (ed.) *Hawera - A Social Survey*, Hawera Star Publishing Company, 1954.
- Miller, John. *Early Victorian New Zealand*. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Ritchie, James and Ritchie, Jane. 'Patterns of Child Care in New Zealand - some preliminary results', Hamilton: Waikato University, 1966, (mimeographed report).
- VandenBerg, Marjorie, McCreary, John, and Chapman, Murray. *A Social Survey of Hamilton*. Wellington: School of Social Science, Victoria University of Wellington, 1965.

PAPER 2

THE FAMILY IN NEW ZEALAND FICTION

Joan Stevens

This paper is a summary, by Professor Stevens, of her address to the Association.

Ever since New Zealand literature began, just over a hundred years ago, family life has been a topic of concern to our writers. Pressures within the family, and between the family and its community, have both persisted, and changed. Fiction provides us with a mirror in which we can see not only where we were in the past, in pioneer days, but which way we have been travelling since then. The changing roles of the father and the mother, alterations in attitudes to children and to adolescents, persistence of central human problems of learning and growth, all these can be found in stories. Before the psychology text books were circulating, writers were presenting the truths of family life and of childhood, in vividly dramatised forms. Perhaps the artist gets nearer to the truth than the academic investigator, because story telling is born of an emotional impulse, which gives access to the very heart of the experience.

One of our earliest novels is a family story, Mrs Aylmer's *Distant Homes, or The Graham Family in New Zealand*, (1862). Here is the ideal of colonial family life held by Victorian emigrants. The Grahams are middle class, Church of England, and comfortably off; they emigrate to Canterbury, grow roses, corn, potatoes, pigs, sheep, and cows; books came out with them, a piano is soon added. The daughters help in the house and Sunday School, the sons learn to be

JOAN STEVENS is Associate Professor of English in the Victoria University at Wellington.

gentlemen. The only break in the internal harmony is when brothers tease sisters, or when the youngest, a small boy, is slapped in anger by an exasperated sister.

One can compare the rosiness of this picture with that given by Katherine Mansfield in her sketch 'Sixpence', which explores the motives of the 'corporal-punishment mother', the tired father, and the reaction of the small boy to an undeserved whipping. The same incident, festering in some recess of memory, gives us Katherine Mansfield's story 'The Little Girl', where Kezia is also unjustly punished by an angry father.

Nothing as penetrating as this is found in our 19th century fiction. Most of it presents the family as a tightly bonded unit, wholehearted and outward facing in the pioneer endeavour. Fathers in pioneer stories are wise, strong, heroic when necessary, mothers are competent, cheerful, loving, and children grow up unhesitatingly in the parental pattern. It is all very satisfactory. An excellent example of this 'Ideal Family' is Blanche Baughan's 'An Active Family' (1912) which may be read in *New Zealand Short Stories*, first series, World's Classics. This is a pastoral idyll, in which even the cows co-operate, a vision of the Golden Age. It reminds us of Martin Tupper's colonising poem, 'New Zealand, A Song for the Antipodes':

Queen of the South! which the mighty Pacific
Claims for its Britain in ages to be,
Bright with fair visions and hopes beatific,
Glorious and happy thy future I see!
Thither the children of England are thronging,
There for true riches securely to search;
Not for thy gold, California, longing,
But for sweet home, with enough, and a church!

Cracks began to appear in this family portrait early in this century, even as Blanche Baughan was celebrating the old vision. Katherine Mansfield has already been noted. Jane Mander's *The Story of a New Zealand River* (1920) gives an angry picture of the tensions between husband, wife, and growing adolescent girl, Asia being the forerunner of many a daughter-rebel in later fiction. Jane Mander pleaded for truth and honesty in family relationships, and dealt a blow to various kinds of Victorian pretence.

One most rewarding reading programme is that offered by the

N.Z. stories of Katherine Mansfield, taken in the order of the development of the family she creates. It is the same family – basically her own – whatever name she uses. The stories concerned, in the order of family growth, are: 'The Little Girl', 'Prelude', 'The Doll's House', 'The Birthday', 'At the Bay', 'Sixpence', 'New Dresses', 'Sun and Moon'. Then time takes a jump, so that her imagined family is now in its teens. We have 'The Garden Party', 'Her First Ball', 'Taking the Veil', and 'The Wind Blows', in which last we see Katherine imagining herself and her brother taking the final step in their emancipation from home, by leaving New Zealand itself. Last of all comes 'An Ideal Family', in which, with a striking change of the point of view, we see the forgotten father of a 'successful' family. This is a story with implied criticism of material possession, class status, and the social whirl.

Other family stories can only be listed here; they include, of course, John Lee's *Children of the Poor*, Robin Hyde's *The Godwits Fly*, and the various studies of Frank Sargeson. Almost all his stories attack the institution of the family, seeing it as destructive and twisting to the personality. One can examine his ideas in such stories as 'An Affair of the Heart', 'City and Suburban' (to be found in *New Zealand Short Stories*, second series, World's Classics or the novel *When the Wind Blows*. Dan Davin's pictures of home life, though also offering us rebellion against it, are at least of a strong and valuable childhood experience, with perceptive treatment of the tensions between love and the need for independence.

To come to the present time, there is Janet Frame's *Owls Do Cry*, in which the home is happy and real, though tragedy hangs over it. Ian Cross's *The God Boy* is another classic, and on a lighter level, Norman Harvey's *Any Old Dollars, Mister?* More solid, with a documentary density, is Bill Pearson's *Coal Flat*, which is full of case history material.

Other novels can only be named; Maurice Shadbolt's *Among the Cinders*, Maurice Gee's *A Special Flower* (the adult family this time), and finally, Jean Watson's *Stand in the Rain*, a study of the 'family-that-was-not', i.e. of the detached and rootless state which is the logical finale of so many modern trends.

One final note; stories of the Maori people have quite a different emphasis, and would make a topic on their own, for which there is no time here.

References

Chapman, Robert, 'Fiction and the Social Pattern', *Landfall*, 25, March 1953.

McCormick, E.H. *New Zealand Literature: a survey*. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

The 'families' referred to in this paper will be found in these books: Isabella E. Aylmer, *Distant Homes*, or *The Graham Family in New Zealand*, 1862; Katherine Mansfield, *Collected Stories*, 1945; Blanche E. Baughan, *Brown Bread from a Colonial Oven*, 1912; Jane Mander, *The Story of a New Zealand River*, 1920; John Lee, *Children of the Poor*, 1934; Robin Hyde, *The Godwits Fly*, 1958; David Ballantyne, *The Cunninghams*, 1948; Dan Davin, *Roads from Home*, 1949; Dan Davin (ed.) *New Zealand Short Stories*, 1953; *Te Ao Hou*, 15, July 1956; Janet Frame, *Owls Do Cry*, 1957; Maurice Shadbolt, *The New Zealanders* 1959; Noel Hilliard, *Maori Girl*, 1960; Bill Pearson, *Coal Flat*, 1963; Norman Harvey, *Any Old Dollars, Mister?* 1964; Maurice Shadbolt, *Among the Cinders*, 1965; Maurice Gee, *A Special Flower* 1965; Jean Watson, *Stand in the Rain*, 1965; C.K. Stead (ed.), *New Zealand Short Stories*, second series, 1966.

PAPER 3

THE NEW ZEALAND FAMILY AND ITS HOUSE

John Daish

In the first talk of this series Professor McCreary pointed out the variety of situations in which the New Zealand family can be found. This observation is, also true of the New Zealand house. Differing times in which houses were built, differing places to build on, differing materials of which they were constructed, differing upkeep, alterations and improvements have brought a variety in which it would be difficult to identify many identical houses. Another kind of variety is in the picture a person holds of a house. You may have had the experience while travelling in a car with someone of seeing what you consider a particularly atrocious house, only to be interrupted in your thoughts by your companion pointing out the same house as a particularly pleasing example of domestic architecture. Perhaps architects experience this more than others. But this is the point isn't it, that we each have pictures about houses, built up from our family situation and background, our education, our present stage in life and so on? Psychologists, for instance, have clearly demonstrated that children under five learn colour differences more readily than shape differences, and prefer low luminosity (or low brightness) colours particularly in reds and blues in contrast to adults' preference for high luminosity colours. Because of this an Australian psychologist questions the habitual use of pastel colours for children's furnishings and equipment and suggests it may well reflect adult taste rather than the child's preference.¹ Each member of the family then sees his house differently. Professor Stevens too

JOHN DAISH is a Senior Architect in the Ministry of Works.

referred to this in the literature she reviewed. In Katherine Mansfield's story 'At the Bay' clearly Stanley had a different picture of his house from that of his womenfolk.

Given then that a large variety of houses exist and that we each hold pictures of houses peculiar to ourselves, there still must be a large number of pictures that we share in common – for we do, to some extent, communicate with each other. If I mention a bedroom, a fireplace, a front door, then to some extent we share a common picture. But seeing that these are word symbols for things having shape and colour, to describe them exactly it would be easier to draw them or even better, perhaps, show you a photograph. But even this wouldn't ensure coincidence in our pictures. For instance a fireplace with which you may associate the drudgery of cleaning out in the morning I may associate with the pleasant warmth of toasting crumpets. ² Thus our pictures or images as Kenneth Boulding calls them include both the physical object itself and the experience we associate with it. ³ This experience seems to be made up largely of previous behavioural situations which are modified and worked into a value system with our other images. For instance if equality of family members is a personal value held highly, then the behaviour of the family and the parts of the house relating to this value, such as the use by everyone of all rooms in the house, will feature prominently in the person's picture of the house.

It seems to me then, that if we are to describe the New Zealand house as it relates to the New Zealand family we must isolate those things contained in our images, i.e. the physical parts, the behaviour associated with these parts, and the personally held values modifying these. I would then like to introduce the little research I know of done on the New Zealander's house. To a large extent this will probably conform to your picture of it, but I hope there may be a few surprises.

During 1961, another student and I undertook to find out some facts about the New Zealand house and suburb for our undergraduate thesis. ⁴ This was under the direction of Professor Peter Middleton at the Auckland School of Architecture. Michael Austin looked at the house itself, how it was currently being designed and produced, while I looked at the pattern of house and garden in some typical Auckland suburbs. We found out, not

surprisingly, that most new builders houses (80%) and a significant proportion of architect designed houses (around 25%) conformed pretty much to an accepted norm, i.e. a detached, single storey house around 1000 sq. ft. in area (the architect's is somewhat larger – around 1400 sq. ft.), separated into two distinct zones of sleeping and living. The sleeping zone (bedrooms, bathroom and toilet) approaches 50% of the total area of the house, the living zone (living and dining spaces and kitchen) some 40%, and the remainder (passage and laundry) about 13%. Every room has at least one exterior wall with windows, except for the passage placed in the centre of the house.

We studied the suburb by means of some 700 photographs. These photographs of houses were taken mainly from the street and thus concentrate on those parts of the house seen by the public. The aim was to collect a representative sample of Auckland suburbs which could be analysed for discernible patterns – particularly regarding the age and socio-economic grade of the houses. We found that houses in newer suburbs have larger windows, the gardens have smaller scale vegetation, and the houses and gardens are neater, than in older suburbs. Thus large windows, small scale vegetation, and neat houses and gardens all tended to be related. Put round the other way there seems to be a close relation between small windows, large scale vegetation and untidy gardens. Also the house in the newer suburbs was more simple in form, the newer suburb had less diversity in house and garden types, and the houses were sited on sections more similar in size than in the older suburb. However, the complexity of house form or diverseness of house types seemed to be unrelated to neatness.

Probably to a large extent this general outline is close to your picture of the New Zealand house and suburb. Indeed how the parts of a house are put together and the pattern that is built up from individual houses and gardens seems to be generally known and accepted by New Zealanders.

How much, however, is this acceptance of the pattern of house and garden, habit? Does this apparent acceptance of the pattern reflect agreement about family behaviour? If so, do families who live in houses built in 1900, in new builders houses, and in architect designed houses, find that they behave differently from each other

and if so are these differences intended? Is there any conflict between the actual pattern of house and garden and our desired behaviour and values?

Three students from the School of Architecture for their thesis in 1963 attempted to find out something about what New Zealanders desired and actually did in their houses.⁵ Their research centered around a questionnaire presented to a representative sample of State Housing tenants in Auckland, and the results illuminate the difficulty of attempting this type of research, especially perhaps by architects who have little experience in these matters. But some knowledge was gained. Also recently, the Housing Division studied, quite intensively, 20 existing single unit State houses and the families living in them, using a loosely structured interview, and physical survey of house and garden. Using these findings, very incomplete as they are, let me suggest a few of the physical relationships we accept in our picture of a house, attempt to indicate the associated behaviour, and ask some questions regarding the fit between these physical relationships and family behaviour.

Perhaps one of the most basic sets of relationships concerns the detached house in its garden. Each house stands on its own site separated from the next site and from the street by defined boundaries. One of the things the students attempted to pin down was the use made of this space between houses. When asked about the upkeep of their gardens some 30% of tenants said it was a burden; for owners, of course, the percentage could well be lower. However, in a social survey of Hamilton⁶ during 1961 it was found that of those dissatisfied with a section of less than a quarter of an acre (around 1/3) most wanted a larger rather than a smaller area of land. Clearly then, the burden of upkeep is not too critical. It seems that generally, people will undergo the burden of its upkeep rather than forfeit the size of their section. The students also found that some 12% of tenants had no flower or vegetable garden at all, most had some flower and vegetable garden, while only 5% had an appreciable amount of flower or vegetable garden. The part of the site not in flower or vegetable garden was invariably lawn. Regarding activities undertaken outside, gardening featured prominently in replies, especially for couples, while children's play became increasingly mentioned as the principal use for large families (81% of

children between 3 and 4 years old play on their own section and another 7% on a friend's section). Frequently mentioned however, was that the garden was used for 'living'. What does this term mean? Certainly not eating – it seems that only 10% ever had a main meal, and only 30% ever had morning or afternoon tea outside. The Housing Division study too, shows that outside activities are almost wholly confined to gardening, children's play, and hanging out clothes. Would it however be used for 'living' if it were more private? The students found that around 80% of tenants hadn't a space outside they could call private, though when asked, some 60% said they would like such a space (another 12% gave no answer). The above findings seem to indicate that the garden is little used for 'living' in, although the expressed desire for a private space may indicate that people have a picture of the garden's potential living use. Perhaps relevant here is Austin's finding that while architects in 80% of cases provide some sort of outdoor area and attempt integration of outdoors and indoors, builders only provide such an area in 30–40% of cases and when they do it is usually labelled 'future'. Similarly, with connections between outdoors and indoors, architects generally provide 5–6 doors while builders provide only a front and back door and occasionally french doors from the lounge. Perhaps it is merely an economic factor that is acting here. Clearly however, in practice the space around the house is little used. What then is its importance, for as the students found out it was rarely neglected (10% of cases were neglected – my thesis corroborates this and suggests that in higher class housing, and presumably owned housing, even fewer are neglected)? The clarity of boundaries defined by fences, hedges shrubs and flower beds is suggestive. This barrier of fences and vegetation, especially in newer suburbs denotes, because of its height, a physical barrier rather than a visual one. I say denotes because clearly a wall, fence, or shrubs of two feet or so do not constitute a substantial physical obstacle. What people cannot do easily is to loiter or wander on to a section without clearly trespassing. I am suggesting then that this pattern of a detached house is to provide a territory around it which clearly belongs to the residents within, and which cannot without due warning and custom be violated; and as such, is to some extent analogous to the sense of territorial space exhibited by animals. ⁷ One of the principal

components of this territorial space (of the family space bubble if you like, for detached houses seem to be especially favoured by nuclear families⁸), is the removal from physical contact and physical proximity – of touching especially. For instance, we have extremely strict social rules about touching people, and this attitude even extends to objects like a car which we get off the road so that it will not be tampered with. It is interesting too, to watch children both contravening and learning these rules, such as when they paint the livingroom wall in their own chosen colours, or the terrible harshness with which they tell other children to 'get off our property'.

One major effect of the detached house pattern is that space available to a child in a suburb is severely restricted. Until the age of around four he has only his own house and garden to move around in freely. The street, his only access to other parts of the suburb is out of bounds for safety reasons, when he is by himself or with other children. How does this affect the child's actions and development? The students' thesis indicated that children play predominantly on their own sections, but they also found that ways through to neighbouring sections where they existed (in 20% of cases), were mostly between sections with young children. It seems probable that the evolving of such informal ways through to neighbouring sections indicates the restriction placed on children's movements by the use of the only formal access routes. Does such restriction affect how the child handles relationships later on? We know how important these early years are in a person's development and how it is in these years that children learn how to form relationships with others. The existing detached house and garden pattern seems to conflict with this.

Presumably after these early years this type of spatial proximity has decreasing importance in allowing the establishment of relationships with people. The teenager and adult often seem to maintain and develop friendships over the phone rather than face to face. Indeed meeting places where teenagers can loiter and watch others seem rather scarce in the existing suburb. For the adult however, the section boundaries seem to be psychologically significant rather than physically so. Having one's own territory on one hand implies freedom of action. Peter Middleton has suggested for instance, that the detached house in its own garden allows for a

certain independence from one's neighbour and ease in acquiring, disposing of, and altering one's house and garden.⁹ Having one's own territory however also implies its maintenance. David Ausubel, as Professor McCreary noted, saw the New Zealanders' weekends and holidays as 'veritable orgies of back breaking labour in home garden and section'.¹⁰ The Housing Division study however didn't confirm such an 'orgy' of work. Family outings and outside organisations seem to take up a significant proportion of the family's leisure time. Again, probably a study where people owned rather than rented houses would modify this study's observation. There seems then to be some contradiction apparent. While the pattern of detached house and garden may provide the aspects of freedom suggested by Peter Middleton, at the same time the neatness of house and garden noted in my study, suggests an awareness that the upkeep of one's house and garden is expected. This kind of neatness of house and garden, which occurs especially in newer suburbs, certainly suggests a consciousness of others' thoughts encroaching on one's territory. That privacy is not established suggests perhaps that this encroachment is not unwelcome, such display making possible the confirmation to oneself of one's own standing, or, as Peter Middleton suggests, it helps maintain self-respect.¹¹

Within the house, Austin observed two distinct zones – sleeping and living. He found that the sleeping zone comprises some 50% of the house. That such a large proportion of the house should relate to the 8 sleeping hours seems rather puzzling. There seem to be two possible approaches. Either the activity of sleeping and associated activities need this amount of space or there are other behaviours and values not at first apparent. The pattern of the sleeping zone is clearly its division with walls into 3 bedrooms (sometimes 2 or 4), bathroom and toilet, each accessible only through a central passage space. Why so many walls? Does the activity of sleep itself need isolation from noise, or isolation from others' physical and visual intrusion? What effect do these walls have on the children's and adults' behaviour and how do they affect family relationships?

Austin found that the parents' bedroom is almost invariably the largest bedroom and indeed it seems to be its size that identifies it as such. Also the parents' bedroom is generally the furthest bedroom from the living zone. The Housing Division study found that the

parents' bedroom contains furniture associated only with sleeping and dressing, typically a bed, a chest of drawers, and dressing table. Other bedrooms, if young children's, contain in addition toys, and on the walls scratches and crayon marks. Older children's rooms often contain, in addition, a small desk, bookcase, and chair, and on the walls usually posters and photographs. The students' research showed that as the children get older they use their bedrooms more for study (around 45% for those 12-15 years). The parents' bedroom then seems to centre around sleeping. A number of pointers however suggest a more complex picture. First, clearly the parents sleep separated from the children - even the baby's cot is in one of the other bedrooms. Second, the parents' bedroom is the largest and usually in a favoured position (in the houses at the turn of the century this was even more clear as the parents' bedroom shared the front of the house with the lounge). Third, is lovemaking. Although this is an important function of the room, even in the reasonably intensive interview of the Housing Division study no reference was made to it. Fourth, there is a distinct preference for 3 bedrooms (70% in Austin's sample). Peter Middleton suggests that to isolate 50% of the house for the eight unconscious hours of the day does not conform to economic pressure. How then can it be explained? Middleton suggests that an indication can be found in the prevailing taste for pastel colours, colours which go with emotional inhibition and control. He suggests respectability was a principal value.¹² Certainly the predominance of 3 bedrooms suggests that the division of sexes could well be significant. Clearly too, undressing and dressing goes on in the bedrooms, and in addition presumably love-making and intercourse in the parents' bedroom. Is it then that emotional inhibition and control is related to the exposure of bodies, sexual display and so on? Certainly I think such a case could be supported by some New Zealand writing such as Sargeson's 'City and Suburban'¹³ and 'I Saw in My Dream'.¹⁴ Does this however explain the larger parents' bedroom? I think partly it does. In older New Zealand suburban houses (and two-storey English suburban houses too) the front rooms were the parlour and parents' bedroom. These were the principal rooms, the ones that children treated with respect and only entered when permission was granted - certainly sex and undressed parents were not for children to see. The other part is that

this room is probably of special significance to the parents; it is their own room. It seems relevant that in a survey of personal values reported by the Australian psychologist mentioned earlier, ¹⁵ although equality of family members featured prominently, the child was not expected to have the freedom of the house. The psychologist links this with the desire for a separate lounge room and separate main bedroom – in effect the ‘front’ rooms of the older suburban house. Again I ask what effect does this very early separation of parent-child sleeping, and a little later separation of girl-boy sleeping have on children? Certainly for the parents I suspect it means many disturbed nights, and cold trips for the father to comfort a waking child, and in the early hours of the morning disturbed sleep of parents and children in the parents’ 4’ 6” wide bed.

Austin found the living zone occupies some 40% of the house. It includes living space; dining space and kitchen. If you include a sunroom, playroom or study (provided principally in architect designed houses) then the zone occupies some 50%. You may notice the description has gone from rooms in the sleeping zone to spaces in the living zone. There is usually no passage in the living zone and some walls that used to separate spaces have been wholly or partially excluded. Thus the relation of spaces is such that generally to reach a space other spaces must be passed through, a pattern that does not occur in the sleeping zone. Austin found no agreement for the position of the dining table. In some builders’ plans a space was provided off the living room, and in others, at one end of the kitchen. Like the builders, architects provided dining spaces, and in addition used a separate dining room, or provided space in a family room. The Housing Division study found that in the few cases where the dining space was large enough other furniture was present such as a sewing machine, easy chair or radiogram (the dining space is usually provided at one end of the kitchen). The interview too, indicated that this space was used for other activities besides dining, including wife’s relaxing, and child’s play during the day, and the table was used as a surface for working on in the evenings. The eating together of the whole family for the main meal was also stressed. In contrast, a number of respondents were impressed that since they had acquired a television set the living room was now used again. The other students’ thesis gives some indication of the use of the house by

visitors (though here probably we should be especially cautious about inferences to New Zealanders as a whole). Friends or relatives come for a main meal very occasionally (70% of cases had none to two visits in a month). Friends dropping in was somewhat more frequent (50% of cases had none to two visits in 2 weeks). Parties were rare (84% of cases had not had a party in 6 months). The going-out pattern in evenings varied, not surprisingly, with different members of the family; though 50% of parents had not been out together in the evening in the last 2 weeks, all of the children over 12 years old had been out at least once in the last 2 weeks.

The above findings suggest, I think, that the living space is used infrequently for entertaining either visitors or relatives (at least in this socio-economic group). This finding plus the few complaints about the size of the living space (as compared with the marked dissatisfaction with the dining space), suggests again, I think, that the living space is to some extent provided to maintain respectability. The finding of the other students, that this space was assessed as neat and well kept in 80% of cases, as well as Austin's findings that it is off this space that the street-facing french doors and future terrace are placed (at least for builders houses), seems to confirm this. In this respect the comment about television bringing the room into use again is interesting. Either this space has been provided partly because of habit, or people are to some extent ambivalent about providing space for self-esteem, thus the use of the room for television viewing now allows the space to remain respectable as well as to be utilized. In contrast the dining space doesn't have this respectable connotation, though, significantly perhaps, the separate dining room appears in architects' designs which presumably are generally provided for a higher socio-economic group. The frequency of the statement expressing preference for the family to eat together, as well as statements criticizing the dining space in apparently functional terms of getting around the table, suggests the table may well 'hold a symbolic significance concerning family unity. The Australian psychologist's research which showed that family centrism is a principal value seems relevant here. The kind of activities that go on in the dining space, as well as the expressed desire for a close audio-visual relation to the kitchen,¹⁶ seem to suggest a desire for the family to interact as a unit especially for such a potentially

symbolic activity as the main evening meal.

The two-zone pattern of sleeping and living has been apparent in the New Zealander's house since its beginning. The separation of zones has generally been as clear as the upstairs and downstairs of its English archetype.¹⁷ The separation of the zones has been achieved through using a passage both as circulation between zones and as an entry to the house. Connection between zones is only possible through this passage space. Austin found that this circulation space, including the laundry, contains some 14–14% of the house; it is regarded as minimal and is centrally placed, having no connection to the outside except an obscured glazed front door. The expression of the two zones on the outside of the house is also of interest. Until the State House era of the 1930's, the typical suburban bungalow had the main bedroom set back under a short length of verandah while the living room was thrust forward, finishing in a bay window. The expression of zones is still present in more recent suburban houses. My study showed that, although the verandah is no longer utilized and the form of the houses is generally more simple and less intricate, the majority of new houses have a large living room window facing the street. Often the living room is still thrust forward or emphasized by a wrought-iron edged concrete terrace – the bedroom windows in contrast remain smaller and unemphasized.

The Housing Division study noted the use by children of their bedrooms for play, study and place making activities, indicated by such items as toys, bookshelves, desks, and posters and photographs on the walls of their rooms. Also noted were such activities as bringing mother tea in bed in the mornings, parents supervising the bathing and dressing of children from the kitchen, and mother supervising the children's play while she is doing housework. Activities such as these, in that they are not confined to one zone, suggest that to some extent the clear physical separation of zones does not match the interconnection pattern of family activities. If the distinction of zones does not clearly match the family behaviour, what is its significance? I suggest that the use of the passage space as the entry to the house and as access to either zone, is a device which does not permit the family to be caught as it were 'off-guard' (I have of course already suggested somewhat the same function for the front garden of the house). Again the dominant position and larger

size of the living room window seems to be a device which communicates the family's image to other people. Thus the distinction of zones seems to maintain the family's self respect (and as the analysis of the sleeping zone showed, respectability between individual members of the family is maintained within this zone). Having at least tentatively established this, certain tendencies in recent suburban houses seem to suggest a change in the way of maintaining self respect. The sleeping zone in its apparent simplicity of purpose, coupled with the use of pastel shades, suggests a zone to which one can retire from others in the family, and, of more importance, from the responsibility of the larger world. At the same time however, the increase in exposure of the living zone in recent suburban houses through the use of both smaller scale vegetation and larger living room windows, seems to indicate an increased desire to make and maintain contact with the world at large, even if visually symbolic in nature rather than face to face. Could it be, as an observer of the American suburb has suggested, that people are showing in their houses, a reaction to an increase of stress in everyday life. ¹⁸ This stress is brought about by the increase in messages received by our senses from, for example, the written word, especially more complex media like television and simply a greater number and complexity of the actions accomplished in a day. In this context the comment that what happens in Auckland, the most 'urban' New Zealand city, the rest of New Zealand will shortly follow, is not irrelevant. Neither, perhaps, is the increasing number of holiday houses to which one can escape the pressures of 'normal' city life. I am suggesting then that the pattern of detached house surrounded by its garden, which in newer suburbs is increasingly more exposed, and the pattern of distinct zones, in which the living zone becomes increasingly more exposed, is indicative of a general ambivalence in reaction to the increasing stress of urban life. On the one hand the detached house and separated sleeping zone are devices to withdraw from this general urban stress, while on the other, the exposed garden and displayed living zone are devices to establish contact. It is interesting too I think, that the large windows and the small scale vegetation occur in the newer suburbs where young families predominate (compare with the relatively new suburb of Waikanae to which many older couples have retired). Could it be that

young couples establishing a family are more concerned, though remaining somewhat ambivalent in feeling, with establishing self-esteem and with displaying themselves and their possession, indeed with making contact rather than withdrawing from others? On the other hand, older couples in reacting to the increasing urban stress are concerned with withdrawing from others. Does either behaviour, in fact, maintain and nurture direct contact between people? If not, then to what extent is either behaviour a pathological reaction to the increasing stress of urban life? How can indeed the pattern of house and garden, while maintaining self respect, assist in nurturing direct contact between people, if this is desired? These questions to me seem worthy of study by others, besides architects.

Perhaps I should try to outline some conclusions. I would suggest that the almost universal pattern of detached house and garden, and the house divided equally into two distinct zones of sleeping and living has not significantly altered over the relatively short history of New Zealand's suburban development. Reyner Banham an English architectural critic, pointed out in a recent review of a book *Best Houses for the Year*, that the houses were fundamentally all the same, showing what he termed the similarity and moribundness in life styles of the middle class.¹⁹ Is this criticism relevant to the New Zealander's house? Do the basic similarities in the New Zealand house also indicate a basic similarity in life styles of New Zealanders? In suggesting that this could be so, we should be equally aware that this basic pattern I have described allows much detailed variety within it, furthermore differing behaviour, values, and meanings, could well be attached to each part of it. The little research conducted does, however, indicate that the existing physical pattern does not entirely match the actual or desired family behaviour and values. There is some conflict showing in parts of the pattern. In understanding the reasons for this conflict, between the physical pattern and family behaviour, such complex concepts as territoriality, respectability, and stress, in the context of family and urban life, need to be consciously dealt with. Habit too, by repeating what was built before and repeating our parents' behaviour is clearly a major factor that we should be equally aware of. In studying the New Zealand family and its house, the question of what comes first, the chicken or the egg – is it the house affecting the family's

behaviour or the family's behaviour affecting the house – cannot be entirely escaped. But it is in precisely this cycle of stimulus and response that change has to be effected. I have shown, I hope, that in the relationship between house and family, the pictures we hold about the use of a house and relationships within it, are vitally important. The importance of these pictures is that they have a very great impact on what we actually build. If we can free ourselves to talk about, and work on, our mental pictures concerning houses, then making these consciously known it becomes possible to make well thought out changes in our pictures, and hence in our houses themselves. Previously of course, we have relied on the long drawn out incremental changes in habit to correct any conflict between our houses and the way we use them. Innovations by architects, for example, have tended to be in existence some 20 years before they reach any general level of acceptance. It is not only the slowness of change that makes the reliance on habit so ineffectual but also that the changes that most easily come about tend to be the ones people are visually aware of, such as stylistic changes of redwood weatherboard stain, sloping ceilings, and colonial bay windows. Unfortunately these changes which are easily seen are not the ones which affect the relationships in the physical pattern and hence human relationships and behaviour. We do not any longer have to rely on these incremental changes in habit to get alterations in our surroundings; instead, we can work at our mental pictures of our surroundings, making changes where these are shown to be necessary. If we can do this, then perhaps we will be able to obtain houses and gardens that fit more closely the family living relationships that we desire.

References

1. C.P. Kenna, 'Housing and Personal Values' *Architecture in Australia*, September 1962.
2. Luminosity is a subjective measure of a surface's reflection of light. For instance, in trying to gain an understanding of people's pictures of objects, researchers have shown

photographs, slide series and so on, to respondents who are then asked to choose from a list of adjectives those which match their response to the display shown. See C. Osgood's work, or K. Craik 'Comprehension of the Everyday Physical Environment', *Journal of American Institute of Planners*, January 1968.

3. K. Boulding, *The Image - Knowledge in Life and Society*, University of Michigan, 1956.
4. M. Austin and J. Daish, 'House and Suburb', unpub. thesis for B. Arch., University of Auckland, 1962.
5. I. Bargiacchi, N. Corry and B. Halstead, 'Housing Research' unpub. report for B. Arch., University of Auckland, 1963.
6. M. Vandenberg, J. McCreary and M. Chapman, *A Social Survey of Hamilton*, School of Social Science, Victoria University of Wellington, 1965.
7. See for example E.T. Hall, *The Hidden Dimensions*, New York: Doubleday, 1966, part 3.
8. For example, in Porirua, an outlying suburban area of Wellington largely made up of single houses, 78% of households are nuclear families. By contrast, in Newtown, which is an inner city suburb of Wellington with a large proportion of flats, 38% are nuclear families.
9. P. Middleton, 'Planning Suburbia', *Comment*, September 1967.
10. D. Ausubel, *The Fern and The Tiki*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson 1960.
11. Middleton, op. cit.
12. P. Middleton, 'A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue of Auckland Suburban Houses', *Architectural Science Review*, Vol. 7, No. 1, March 1964.
13. F. Sargeson, 'City and Suburban', *Landfall*, March 1965.
14. F. Sargeson, *I Saw in My Dream*. London: John Lehmann, 1949.
15. Kenna, op. cit.
16. Any desire for separation of kitchen and dining space seemed to be concerned with the problem of cooking smells. These can be solved in purely technical terms.
17. Perhaps at times the distinction has been less clear as in the smaller suburban house at the turn of the century where the zones tended to be on opposite sides of the corridor, and in some early State House plans where a bedroom was placed between living room and kitchen.
18. C. Alexander, 'The City as a Mechanism for Human Contact', in W.R. Ewald Jr. (ed.) *Environment for Man: the Next Fifty Years*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967.
19. R. Banham, in a review in *The Listener*.

PAPER 4

THE FAMILY AND PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

R.J. Methven

I am a psychiatrist working with children and their families and this evening I would like to talk about the practical framework within which I work. Out of this I will try to develop my ideas of how personality develops, and, in particular, how the family affects this development.

Children and parents come to our clinic because they have problems. But whether it is child or parent who comes, we treat the family because the problems are usually only symptoms of Professor McCreary's 'families in crisis'. Their problems and their situations usually fit the commonly accepted patterns for English speaking people with which we are familiar. There is little I will say tonight which will be limited to New Zealanders only. Personality is built on the original relationship of the child to the mother.

Personality has been defined in many ways. Originally emphasis was placed on the outward showing, the mask. More recently the emphasis has been placed upon the way each individual establishes patterns of behaviour as he grows within his environment. As G.W. Allport said, 'personality is the dynamic organisation within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to the environment'.

This definition suggests three points that are particularly important:

The use of the words 'dynamic organisation' emphasises the point that personality is constantly changing. Even if we persist in behaving in the same

DR. R.J. METHVEN is Director of the Marinoto Clinic, Auckland.

way, increasing age causes others to place a different interpretation on our behaviour.

There is a continuing interaction between the physiological and the psychological events in the life of the individual which often makes it very difficult to find a simple answer to a human problem. Unfortunately many psychologists and doctors get an easy answer by focusing on either the mind or the body.

Each individual is constantly adjusting in his own way. He 'makes a unique adjustment' to his environment.

These three points need to be kept in mind as we look at the influence of the family on personality development. For this talk I am concentrating on the child's unique adjustment to the family and in this connection it is well to remember that while most children grow up in families, each family is different, changing with age and in part in response to the demands of the child himself.

One further point should be added. The child's personality is a developing one and there are particular times when a child is ready for a developmental task, and if the environment does not respond the organism may have deficits in its adaptive capacity.

Physical Development

The question of how much influence genetic structure has upon personality is a highly controversial one. While there is no doubt of the importance of inherited characteristics in general, the problem comes when we try to apportion responsibility for particular characteristics. There have of course been some outstanding researches often carried out on unusual or atypical characteristics. In this way we often gain illuminating insights into the behaviour of normal populations. But the practice of generalising from such results is a very doubtful one unless closely scrutinised.

Our doubts of the validity of much research is further reinforced when we note that different researches often reveal contradictory results. Following the extensive twin studies of Kallman and Slater it appeared reasonably conclusive that schizophrenia was largely genetically determined. Their results showed a concordance rate of 76-91% for monozygotic twins and 10-17% for dizygotic twins. Roughly speaking, this meant that if one twin of an identical pair had schizophrenia the other twin had 9 chances out of 10 of

developing it. In the case of fraternal twins who had a different genetic make-up but the same environment there were 2 out of 10 chances of developing the disorder. A genetic causation was generally accepted until Tienari's study of 16 schizophrenic patients, all of whom had been identical twins. This appears to have been a most superior study from a methodological point of view and it revealed no schizophrenia in any other twin. Perhaps it is not surprising that many investigators are now looking closely at the patterns of family interaction for the cause of this common disabling disorder.

Another interesting discovery from the field of genetics is the link between the karotype XYY, where males have an extra Y chromosome, and criminality. The presence of the extra Y gives a genetically super male and far more prisoners have this genetic pattern than probability would lead us to expect. In fact about 3% of the population in a maximum security unit will have an extra Y in comparison with under .2% in the normal population. The exact significance of this is not yet known, but it does suggest that with more detailed analysis of the genetic structure some important findings can be expected. My own view is that genes impose limits and possibilities that are acted on within the environment and the combination produces the facets of personality we observe.

The Period of Personal Attachment

There are many influences which operate on the child as he grows through pregnancy, birth and the first few weeks of life but I would like to focus attention on what I call, the period of attachment. This occurs around six months and is that time when the child recognises his mother as a person, is contented in her presence and distressed by her absence. When the mother figure, usually the natural mother, comes to mean something special to the child.

The links that are forged between mother and child, these instinctual bonds, are probably built up in the same way in human young as in other similar species. It is probable too that there is a particular time when the infant is ready to form the relationship with the mother figure. If at this time the environment does not respond appropriately, that is if a mothering figure does not appear, or the mother is not interested in the process, the attachment is not formed

and serious defects of personality can occur. To make this more clear I would like to describe a clinical example.

Recently a boy was brought to the clinic by his foster mother for treatment. The behaviour of a child in this new situation is often very revealing. Most children of his age, three and a half years, stay sensibly with their mothers but this lad came to me without a backward glance. His foster mother with whom he had been living for six months told me the following things:

1. She knew that he would go to me without difficulty. He would go with anyone, attaching himself in quite indiscriminate fashion to people walking by and following them home.
2. His speech was immature and babyish. He appeared to put little effort into talking, as if he had no need to communicate.
3. He had no idea of when to go to the toilet. Not because he had any objection to going. In fact he was developing the idea of what you did when you got there. It was as if the idea had never been built into him.
4. Attempts at punishment such as smacking evoked smiles instead of tears.

It is not really clear what happened to this child during the first two and a half years of his life. His mother is said to have been retarded and quiet and there is some evidence to suggest that she was psychotic. But it appears that the child was almost completely deprived of mothering and stimulation. He was left alone for long periods and managed by different people.

At times when various aspects of his personality were ready to develop, such as the capacity to make loving relationships, the need to communicate and accede to the demands of the environment, no mother appeared. For most children the mother is there and learning proceeds, as the child takes in aspects of the mother's behaviour through the processes of introjection and identification.

At this point, perhaps, I should stress that the relationship between a child and his mother is a reciprocal one. There has to be fit between the parents and the child. Sometimes the baby's inherited rhythms and activity patterns do not fit in with those of the parent. In such cases a particular child may be very difficult for the mother to deal with.

The Control of Aggression

The child interprets incidents in his interaction with his mother in the context of his present relationship with her and of his previous experiences. And here lies one of the central problems in the education of people in the bringing up of their children.

If a certain method is prescribed by authority, be it doctors, teachers, the Plunket Society or Parents Centres as the right way to bring up a child it is perceived by the parent in relationship to their own experiences and applied according to their own personality. We have of course realised the crucial variable is the intuitive understanding a mother develops in relation to the needs and feelings of her own child and the child's perception of these - in other words the communication between them.

Smacking is a good example - I was interested to see Professor McCreary's quotation from the Ritchie study in Waikato suggesting 15% of parents smack their children each day. Discipline and smacking seem to be very closely connected here. The intent of smacking I would assume is to convey disapproval over some action of the child. To learn to tolerate frustration is as necessary for the development of the child's personality as it is necessary for the comfort of the surrounding adults. But it must be meaningful. It must convey a message from a person for whom the child feels affection. In other words smacking of the child I have referred to earlier, the deprived child, just means pain. He will avoid the situation if it is likely to happen again but it does not give that sense of inner discomfort, that feeling of what is right and what is wrong.

We are all concerned about the problem of the control of aggression and that is why cruelty to children is such a popular topic. Here is an extreme example of a family problem in smacking.

Billie was a two year old when I first saw him. Nine months before, he had been in hospital with a broken leg and legs do not break themselves. Six months before, the Plunket Nurse had reported to Child Welfare that his bottom was the bluest she had ever seen and subsequently there were several similar reports. Father said he smacked him because he was naughty. He also said that Billie had upset him by turning away from him when he returned from a period overseas a year before.

Father is a rather immature, rigid man. He was an only child himself and probably was over-indulged as a child. He complained that Billie messed up his things, his records, and his stamps. Mother was the eldest child of a family in which the father was an alcoholic who frequently beat the mother and the children. She married when she was seventeen. She abhorred the idea of smacking but did not know how to set limits on Billie's behaviour.

Billie was an active toddler who had two worlds to live in. One where he had to be quiet and careful and not touch. Another where he could do anything. This of course is difficult for him and will markedly affect the growth of his personality.

Moving outside the Family

Now let us look at the growth of the child's capacity to cope with becoming independent, to make relationships with people outside the family, and to participate in the learning experiences of school.

At five years social custom prescribes that children start school. It is only at six that school becomes compulsory but most families in New Zealand expect their children to start at five. The vast majority of children are ready at this time, after having been allowed and encouraged before school age to mix with other families, to attend play centre and kindergarten, to learn to cope with this enriching experience. They are becoming more independent, able to get on with people outside the family and ready to take part in the learning experiences of the school. Some children, about 20% in a recent study, show symptoms such as crying, complaining of various aches and pains, and bed wetting, when they start school. A smaller proportion find the situation more difficult and find getting to school a continuing difficulty. Some eventually refuse altogether. The latter are often called school refusers or school phobic children.

Characteristically, when you enquire, you will find mother has always been anxious about this particular child. Perhaps there were special difficulties when she was pregnant or perhaps this is an only child. Mother and child have always been close, the child fearing to leave the mother and the mother fearing to leave the child. The other component that emerges clearly is a great deal of hostility between them. I have met several mothers lately who seem to say about their child, 'I can't bear it without him but I would like to murder him.'

Within the family the situation is the same. Mother is usually closely tied to her mother, 'I hate her but I must live with her.' Father, of course, is in this too and you get a picture of a family angry with each other but not daring to leave each other.

Somehow of course the child has to be helped to cope with this and be helped to become involved in other relationships where the destructive components will not be so overpowering. This particular sort of family neurosis is typical of the neurotic family interaction which permeates some family groups.

Adolescence

Continuing our theme of critical stages we find that adolescence provides rapid growth in all fields of development and because of this, for many, a second chance. Definitions of this period are often rather vague: 'The period in an individual's life between the onset of puberty and the attainment of adult maturity in the psychosocial as well as the psychological sense'. Unfortunately we cannot state a time when maturity has been reached. While the law says twenty-one years some have reached maturity before this time while most of us know of some people who remain adolescents through their whole lives. Personally, I find Freud's idea of maturity, expressed in a letter to Einstein, most helpful. 'Maturity is the capacity to love and to work.'

The most striking changes occurring in adolescence are the physical changes. The changes in relative size and shape force the child to find new ways of coping within the family and society. The endocrine changes also lead to the mature growth of the sex organs, a development welcomed by most children. In this interest they are usually encouraged by parents and exploited by commercial interests, as those of you who saw the television documentary on the 'Pre Bra Set' will appreciate.

During this time there are many new adjustments to be made, and the following set of developmental tasks, taken from Erikson, is helpful in understanding this age.

1. Modification of Parental Images.

Through the processes of introjection and identification aspects of the mother and the father have become incorporated into the child's personality and form strong structural elements in it. The

young child's security is based on the all-knowing, all-powerful mother and father figures they know. In adolescence these unconsciously formed attitudes are subjected to scrutiny as reality shows that, no matter what father and mother say, these attitudes do not fit the facts. For many adolescents this is difficult and unfortunately many parents make it doubly difficult by trying to defend their omnipotent position. As Anna Freud has said, 'there are few situations in life which are more difficult to cope with than an adolescent son or daughter during the attempt to liberate themselves.'

In trying to achieve this task adolescents select from fairly common patterns. Some attempt to replace fathers and mothers with other leaders equally omniscient and onnipotent. This need of youth to find a leader and to follow him blindly explains much of the mass or group behaviour with which we are familiar. Some on the other hand replace mother and father by the group of peers - the gang. And many of course, take both courses.

For parents there is at least one consolation at this time. The attachments at this time seldom last long. In fact this concern with the self and the rapid changes in allegiance cause one of the most serious of the psychiatrist's problems in dealing with this age. As psychotherapy is based on a developing relationship it is often very difficult to work with patients who are so intensely focussed on the self that they are unable to form attachments for new objects.

2. Social Morality

The young person has the task of internalising agreed-upon meetable standards. It is a time of fluctuating behaviour, between renunciation and indulgence, as the internal state is disturbed by the rising demands of sex and aggression.

3. Identification with Sex Role

All adolescents need to learn to accept the sex role for which they are fitted. But for many it is years before the task is satisfactorily achieved. Many girls, for instance, pass through a tomboy stage before settling down.

One girl who came to the clinic was finding it particularly difficult to achieve a solution. She said that she could only feel

comfortable when she was with boys as a boy. She was dressed in jeans and a shirt and had her hair cut. This behaviour alternated with periods of sexual promiscuity for which she said she had no memory. This is an extreme example of a not uncommon pattern.

For many parents who have been particularly close to their children this time is often very trying as children seem to find it necessary to break up the closeness in an attempt to ward off the feelings of love which the child cannot accept because of the sexual element involved. This angry, aggressive behaviour is often quite startling to the adult, but again, it does not usually last for long. It has been well described by Berne as the game of 'Uproar' in his book *Games People Play*.

4. *Work Identity*

Society is becoming more complicated every year and occupations more specialised. Training is more intensive and begins earlier so that choices, often irrevocable choices, have to be made early in life. These work choices determine to a large extent our position in society. For many adolescents the choice is very difficult. Disturbed or distressed in other ways they select a way out, a job, which does not interest or challenge them, just to escape from situations they find intolerable; and then find that they have not even the anchor of an interesting activity to provide a base on which to build a stable personality.

I would like to sum up by referring to the four aspects of adolescence I have mentioned. Each is a task the adolescent must face, and in doing so, he often shows the face of revolt as he tries to dissociate himself from childish ways and become recognised as an adult. Is this revolt necessary? Anna Freud would say yes, and regard the uneventful course in adolescence as pathological. Is its intensity predictable? The answer is probably yes, given enough knowledge of the adolescent personality. Personality development is a complex process continuing throughout our lives. But our family experiences are the most crucial in shaping that personality and determining the sort of people we are.

References

- Ackerman, N. *Psychodynamics of Family Life*. New York : Basic Books, 1958.
- Berne, E. *Games People Play*. London : Andre Deutsch, 1964.
- Caplan, G. *Principles of Preventive Psychiatry*. London : Tavistock Publications, 1964.
- Freud, A. 'Adolescence', *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 13, 1958, p. 255.
- Freud, A. *Normality and Pathology in Childhood*. London : Hogarth Press, 1962.

THE FAMILY AND INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT

P.J. Lawrence

Compared with such topics as personality and social development in children, the topic of intellectual development within the family setting has received very little attention. This is understandable, for on the one hand intellectual development has been conceived of as largely a hereditary matter and therefore uninfluenced by family life, while on the other hand scholastic achievement has been thought of as the responsibility of the school rather than of the home. If the role of the family is to be discussed, then there are two fundamental questions which must be asked before the subject is opened up any further. First, while it is generally recognized that the family has a proportionately greater influence than any other agency during the pre-school years, is it the case that an appreciable amount of intellectual development occurs during these years? Secondly, if we are to explore the effect of the family environment on intellectual development can we draw upon any general principles of environmental-hereditary interaction? As a contribution to answering the first question we can turn to a recent study by Bloom and for the answer to the second we can gain much from Piaget's analysis of intelligence.

Intellectual Growth in the Early Years

In his book *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*, Bloom (1964) brings together a number of longitudinal studies of child development completed between the 1920s and the 1950s. Many of

P.J. LAWRENCE is Professor of Education in the University of Canterbury.

them are of about ten years' duration, although some cover the life span up to early adulthood. By studying the patterns of correlations of test scores at each age with test scores of the same characteristics at maturity he is able to estimate the absolute amount of total development which has been reached at particular age levels. For example, the correlations of measures of intelligence rise from about .45 at year one (i.e., with intelligence as measured at 17 years) to .7 at year four, .9 by year eight, and .96 at year thirteen. This correlational trend can be converted into proportions of final development (by using a statistic based on the 'overlap hypothesis') so that the following picture emerges: By the end of the first year, 20 per cent of mature development has been achieved; by age four, 50 per cent; by age eight, 80 per cent; and by age thirteen, 92 per cent (note that 'mature', in these longitudinal studies is taken as age seventeen). In other words, between conception and age four, 50 per cent of total intellectual growth is accounted for; between the ages of four and eight another 30 per cent is added; and during the period eight to seventeen years, the final 20 per cent. Although Bloom's analysis is in many respects a crude approach to a complex problem (and an approach which is open to criticism), nevertheless it points to an important implication: namely, that as a substantial part of intellectual growth is completed during the first five years of life, then environmental influences during this period are of crucial significance. Thus, in answer to the first question posed above it can be said that the family, as the major environmental influence in the pre-school years, has a substantial role to play in the shaping and stimulation of the child's intellectual development.

Interaction of Environment and Organism

It is here that Piaget's work is of such great value. Any pattern of behaviour is the result of two processes, assimilation and accommodation; the former accounts for the increasing range of stimuli to which the organism can respond, and the latter for the increasing range and flexibility of responses available to the organism. These processes cannot operate without the 'nutriment' provided by the environment, in fact the idea of the environment as nourishment for the mind — that which the mind feeds upon for its

development — is very helpful in the attempt to visualize the process of intellectual growth.

Patterns of behaviour are, in the first instance, patterns of actions performed by the child, but within the first two years these actions take on a symbolic nature in that the child learns to work with **representations** of actions. The use of image and symbol marks the breakaway from dependence on the constraints of time and space which limit sensori-motor activities. But the same need for 'nourishment' prevails whether the nutriment be concrete or representational. There are two important points about the formation of these patterns of behaviour (concrete or representational) which must be stressed. In the first place, there is a cycle of equilibrium — disequilibrium which marks the formation and elaboration of new patterns of intellectual activity (a cyclic progress emphasized by both Gesell and Piaget). This ebb and flow of activity depends upon the stimulation which results from environmental challenge, surprise, or inconsistency, and the subsequent efforts of the individual to assimilate and accommodate these stimuli. Naturally, such stimuli must be within the context of the child's experience and capacity, and it is one of the marks of a sensitive parent that he is able to judge the level of, and the appropriate occasion for, stimulation of this type. The second point about the development of new behaviour patterns is that their consolidation usually calls for considerable repetition. But repetition of a new skill is usually pleasurable, and that is why Piaget refers to the satisfaction of such repetition as 'function pleasure'. This is especially the case in the young child, but its power should never be underestimated even with older children and mature adults; to take an example of current interest, the mastery of computer programming techniques provides a strong stimulus for the exercise of the new found skill — as many a research worker will know.

Interaction and Intellectual Growth

We are now in a position to put 'Bloom' and 'Piaget' together, as it were, and to specify more precisely what is happening to the child in the family environment. Within the family the child's rapidly growing intellectual capacity is nourished by the constant challenge

of new stimuli (or environmental events). He moves to higher and higher levels of functioning and extends the range, complexity, and mobility of his patterns of intellectual functioning by assimilating events and accommodating to them. He can do this through constant repetition in the varied situations occurring repeatedly in family life. Note the three characteristics of these patterns: range, complexity, and mobility. Range will increase through responses to a **wide variety** of stimulus classes, but range by itself is not enough. Complexity will depend upon the **richness of possible relationships** among stimuli; yet even range and complexity provide no guarantee of active involvement with the environment – there must be mobility as well. Mobility will develop from **freedom to experiment** with a variety of stimuli and new relationships, and all three characteristics are likely to increase in value if there is encouragement to respond, and pleasure in functioning. Mobility, in particular, and the freedom to experiment which is its major facilitating condition, is closely dependent upon a feeling of security and trust. Erikson's (1963) stages of trust, autonomy, initiative, and achievement although formulated to describe stages of personality development can be translated into cognitive terms as representing the conditions under which the succeeding stages of cognitive growth will emerge.

What has been said so far supports a generalisation about the importance of a rich environment, namely that it should not be 'flat', but challenging that it should not be anxiety provoking, but ensuring trust and the conditions for autonomy of action; that it should not be passively registered but actively explored. In passing, it is worth pointing out that these conditions were described and illustrated most vividly by Susan Isaacs many years ago in her book *The Intellectual Development of Young Children* (1930).

The Family Environment

What aspects of the environment provided by the family are in some way related to the child's intellectual abilities and achievements? This question takes us to the heart of the matter, and can be answered quite generally by saying that it is not so much the environmental objects themselves as the **attitudes of parents towards their environment and that of their child**. Parents are mediators

between the child and his environment – especially in the first four or five years of life, but also in many ways right throughout the child and adolescent years. This means that the child is learning from his parents how the environment is to be approached and perceived. For example, the child may learn, through many specific family experiences, that:

- the environment is to be explored, and it gives satisfaction to do so

- the environment is orderly; questions can be asked of it and answers can be found by patient search

- the environment is full of interesting things – of surprising and perplexing things – which are not magical or arbitrary but for which reasons can be sought

- the environment is something to be wondered at and held in awe

- the social environment is friendly and supportive; it is safe to approach people and ask questions or talk about new experiences

On the other hand, a child may be learning the converse of these fundamental attitudes, for example:

- the environment is to be feared; it can cause hurt, discomfort, and punishment

- the environment is to be accepted and no questions asked of it

- the environment is unreliable and unpredictable; its changes are not rational

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that Rousseau, in 1762, gave many examples in his *Emile* of the formation of these general attitudes through the experiences of the child in his first twelve years.

This type of learning may be direct, but it is more likely to be indirect, and often incidental. The power of identification is such that the child incorporates the characteristic parental responses to events through an endless number of small family episodes; it is as though the child is being exposed to a succession of 'models of

behaviour' which neither parent nor child is conscious of experiencing as a series of learning situations. The way a parent handles such a small experience as the finding of a spider or peculiar insect while gardening creates a model which demonstrates an attitude to biological phenomena. Susan Isaacs pointed out that many mothers, with their squeamishness for the less pleasant natural phenomena, may easily extinguish the young child's curiosity in the natural world. The power of parental models in cognitive development is probably no less than that of parent influences upon personality development; it is just that we know much more about the unfortunate effect of poor parental models upon a child's social and emotional development than the effect of such deprivation upon intellectual development.

The role of parental models raises an interesting question concerning culturally determined sex differences in parental attitudes towards, and expectations of, children's capacities and achievements – especially the more subtle aspects of cognition. For example, if a father sees the male role as one of manliness and practical achievement, is he likely to mediate a perception of beauty, aesthetic appreciation, and sensitivity to design in his sons? If a mother sees her role as traditionally feminine, is she likely to mediate a sensitivity to order, pattern, and cause and effect in her daughters (and young sons)? These questions about the way parents see their roles could extend to such apparently trivial things as decisions about who has the responsibility to be concerned with the child's educational progress at school, or who should check up on homework, or who should attend the local P.T.A. meetings. But, in reality, these are not trivial things because they convey something to children about what is expected of them, or what it is important for a girl or a boy to achieve. This is especially significant for boys, because in so many homes the mother carries the major responsibility for educational decisions and this is reinforced by the usual practice of having female teachers for the first years of schooling. It is only to be expected, therefore, that a boy may learn to believe that learning, study, and 'things of the mind' are feminine rather than masculine characteristics. We cannot tell what long-term influence this might have on his intellectual development – especially if it is reinforced by national stereotypes of the characteristics of the 'typical New

Zealand male'. It can be seen then that one of the indirect but significant ways in which parents may influence the general intellectual development of their children is through their own perceptions of their roles in society. There must be many households in which the mother hopes to make a scholar of her son, while the father hopes to 'make a man' of him!

Family Environment and Achievement

As well as the more subtle intellectual traits or ways of responding to, and involving oneself with, the environment there is the much more tangible outcome which we refer to broadly as academic or scholastic achievement. We need to distinguish between **actual** achievement as measured by performance, and the **need** to achieve which represents the motivation to perform well. The building up of this need has been intensively studied by McClelland who, among others is a pioneer in this field. He writes: (1953)

Clearly the expectations are built out of universal experiences with problem solving – with learning to walk, talk, hunt, or read, write, sew, perform chores, and so forth. The expectations also involve standards of excellence with respect to such tasks.

This is where the parents play a very important part: what is their perception of the standards of excellence appropriate or desirable in the common experiences of the child? What is their reaction to the child's reaching or failing to reach the standards of excellence they expect or demand?

This whole field of study is relatively new and the research student finds a complexity of interacting factors which makes it very difficult to generalize. This is why some of the conclusions of achievement studies appear to be contradictory; for example, in some studies a democratic, nurturing family environment is positively related to achievement, while in others a demanding or rejecting background has led to striving for achievement (as a compensation?). Again, both docile, conforming and assertive, independent backgrounds have been found to be positively related to 'need achievement' as well as actual achievement. But such general

research conclusions can be misleading; for example a family background of high level of expectation and reward for conformity may result in high achievement in formal schoolwork but at the cost of **flexibility, experimentation, and creativity**. Yet we do need to make some tentative generalizations as a guide to practice, and a general statement which summarizes the present position would be approximately as follows:

In the light of what we know about learning and motivation, we would expect that achievement and a healthy motive to achieve would be related to a group of family characteristics: acceptance and warm interest in the child coupled with a concern for his ultimate achievement, expressed in making him aware of the standards of excellence expected of him, and rewards for reaching or approaching these standards rather than punishments for falling below them. The corollaries of acceptance and warm interest in the child would be parental attributes of encouragement, help, patience, and the sharing of the joys of success.

One study, in which an attempt was made to measure those aspects of the home which were considered most relevant to the development of general intelligence, is worth noting because of the similarity of the overall picture it presents to the achievement data just described. In this study by Wolf (1964) the best relations (with the development of intelligence) were found for the scales dealing with:

... the parent's intellectual expectations for the child, the amount of information that the mother had about the child's intellectual development, the opportunities provided for enlarging the child's vocabulary, the extent to which the parents created situations for learning in the home, and the extent of assistance given in learning situations related to school and non-school activities.

Some Broad Features of the Family Environment

(1) National culture:

National culture is hard to specify, especially when it is judged through child-rearing practices. Because of the wide individual

differences within any culture there is some danger in referring to typical culture attitudes and practices in family life and child-rearing. We may contrast Japanese family patterns with those in New Zealand, or typical American and English patterns, but these are gross contrasts which are difficult to test because of the lack of specific survey data – even in a small population such as New Zealand's. Yet this important influence or pressure upon the family must be kept in mind, not only because it makes us more aware of the sort of 'model' we mediate through our membership of New Zealand society, but also because it reminds us that our particular customs and beliefs in child rearing are very much more a matter of convention than we normally think. In some traditional Chinese families, for example in Malaysia, there is a convention which is accepted by parents and children alike that scholastic achievement is honourable, that to strive for academic honours is a mark of one's maturity, and that hard work to achieve such an aspiration is taken for granted. While this may be an idealized picture it does point to a powerful way in which a national culture may influence attitudes and expectations in the family. It is interesting to wonder in what ways the 'intellectual' environment of New Zealand could change – as experienced by the young – if the economic position deteriorated markedly and jobs became much more competitive. Economic pressures probably have a more direct relationship to level of achievement than has been conceived – as many a married student who cannot afford to fail knows!

(2) Socio-economic class:

The middle class has often been described as that part of the community which is particularly concerned with the achievement of its children. It is not clear how relevant this is, as a broad generalization, in New Zealand; but it is probably safe enough to say that there are many families in which the value of education and academic achievement is stressed because of its social status implications. By the same token there will be families where the school seems to stand for white-collar privileges and where all the paraphernalia of learning (especially reading) are seen as hardly necessary for the child who will become a tradesman. Although

generalizations based on socio-economic status groupings are of doubtful validity when translated from American or British to New Zealand conditions, there is no doubt that whenever children come from an underprivileged or 'disadvantaged' group there is likely to be a diminution of the type of environmental stimulation which is necessary for optimum intellectual development. It is of importance to note, in this connection, that these depriving conditions need to be recognized and countered as early as possible, hence the emphasis (for example in the Headstart programmes) on the need for pre-school centres.

(3) Family atmosphere as 'open' or 'closed':

An 'open' family atmosphere is one in which the family is open to new experiences — meeting new people, going to new places, welcoming the child's friends, letting the spontaneous family decision or impulse occasionally override family routine. A 'closed' family, like some of the rigid children's institutions characteristic of the earlier decades of this century, may result in 'stimulus deprivation' with the consequent deterioration in language skills and problem-solving capacity. In a closed family, the child's activities and interests are subordinated to a rigid set of rules: it is as if the parents decide beforehand to organize the child's exposure to the environment, and to 'pre-set' the child's experience. Perhaps the simplest way to visualize such a family is to think of the child as one who has learned to scan each new experience with a set of anxious questions: 'will this be all right; will my parents allow this; will they approve or will I get into trouble if I do this?'

This 'open-closed' dimension of family life is of course a very general concept, but there is some ground for believing that the 'open' family atmosphere is likely to foster characteristics such as:

- individuals who are more creative in their thinking
- a flexibility of approach to and manipulation of experiences
- individuals who are able to take intellectual risks and who are not afraid to go 'out on a limb' in exploring their environment
- individuals who are more 'field-independent', that is, whose cognitive style is not bound or constricted by the particular context in which they experience the environment.

This last characteristic is one which has been related not only to 'cognitive style' but to personality and perception, and acts as a reminder that we cannot in reality separate the intellectual and the social-emotional aspects of individual development and family atmosphere; the two aspects are interdependent.

(4) General intellectual atmosphere of the family:

Although it is difficult to obtain reliable measures of general intellectual atmosphere, there are at least some categories of information which point to important aspects of family functioning which should be kept in mind when estimating the influence of the family. In the first place, the number and types of books in the home; attitude to, and the use of books by the members of the family; the child's first experiences with printed matter in the home; the time spent in reading to the child. Then there is another broad category of functioning which can be summed up as: interest in the child's questions, encouragement to ask questions, amount of time spent in answering them, quality and appropriateness of the answers given. A third category can be described in general terms as the decision making process in the home: giving reasons for requests or demands; involving the child in discussion leading to decisions; giving the child the opportunity to make appropriate decisions and to experience the consequences of such decisions. Reaction to the child's striving or achievements represents a fourth category; it is probably illustrated most clearly in the extent to which there is encouragement or disparagement of the child's new skills or initiative. Lastly, there is the child's perception of parental interest in books, words, talking, listening, observing, solving problems, exploring, and so on. It can be seen from even such a rough listing of categories that if we are to understand more fully the ways in which the family can influence general intellectual development, then we need to reduce some of the apparent 'intangibles'. This should not prove unduly difficult for social scientists interested in family structure and functioning.

(5) The use of language in the family:

The work of Bernstein (1961) on different socio-economically based language styles is now widely known. He has identified two patterns or codes of language usage - elaborated and restricted (or 'formal' and 'public'). In the elaborated usage, language is seen as an objective instrument for precise communication and the exploration and elaboration of experience. In the restricted usage, language is merely a poorly formulated extension of one's own experiences; as such, it has little meaning outside of the situation in which it is used. Just as elaborated language is closer to the 'objectivity' of the conventional printed word, so restricted language is closer to the 'subjectivity' of exclamation and gesture. It seems clear that the particular pattern of language usage to which a child is exposed will have a considerable influence upon his own use of this highly flexible instrument of communication and thought. Language is, after all, the most powerful tool for the expression of, and to some extent the shaping of one's intellectual experiences. Hence the obvious significance of language models in the home, and the importance of careful attention to and awareness of the child's use of language. It is not possible to spell out here the implications of this crucial role of language in the home because it influences almost every aspect of family living. But as an example, and to end this paper, it might be instructive - and interesting - to discuss the role of one particular type of language usage within the family routine: namely, family table talk.

(6) Family routines and rituals - especially 'table talk':

A family has a particular type of organization which gradually takes shape and is expressed through rules, restrictions, rituals, and expectations as to the roles each member may adopt. What we really need to know is something about the effects of a well-ordered versus a disorganized family on subtle aspects of the child's intellectual functioning. But at least we can take account of the fact that the carrying into action of a particular family organization is always emotionally tinged (or in some cases emotionally laden). As the child experiences this active organization he is learning in an intimate and

effective way something about human behaviour – about adult expectations, attitudes, and practices. Is the family bound rigidly by its own organizations? Can it adapt flexibly when something unforeseen happens? Is it a rational or an unpredictable organization? These are the types of questions which the child is unknowingly answering for himself through his varied family experiences. One particular aspect of family routines illustrates the point very clearly – family table talk.

The family meal is a central part of family life; in many homes it is accompanied by a religious act, the saying of grace; and in the Christian church a family meal (Holy Communion) is symbolic of the fellowship of the partakers. Bossard (1966) describes the significance of the meal very vividly: 'The family meal, in short, represents the family in action, focused upon a common interest and a task so absorbing as to let it operate off-guard in other important aspects.' It is this 'off-guard' characteristic which provides the condition for a great deal of incidental learning on the part of the children present. The very repetitiveness and intensity of this everyday routine make it an effective learning situation, rich in models and reinforcements.

Bossard studied transcripts of meals of 82 families and was able to place families in categories; for example there is the type of family in which the meal is regarded as an unavoidable process of refuelling: 'Over and over, as one studies these transcripts, there arises the picture of a number of half-snarling dogs clearing out a trough.' But it is the communicative aspect of the family meal which is of importance in forming attitudes and influencing modes of thinking about a wide variety of topics. To quote Bossard again:

The dining room is like a crossroads through which flows the news of the world as the respective members of the family see it and experience it... The family meal serves constantly as an evaluating conference... individual views are expressed, modified, and reconciled often as a family judgment, choice, decision, or attitude emerges.

There are certain obvious educative functions in family meal talk, and these functions are all the more important because it is the one occasion, in most homes, when every member is present and has a part. Increase of vocabulary and word usage is one obvious function, and the sheer pressure of time and number of potential speakers

means that comments need to be pertinent and reasonably clearly expressed ('Faculty and quickness of expression may constitute the price of admittance to the conversation.' Bossard). Then there is the introduction of new topics or information, probably information about people, in the main, but including 'bits of information' which direct attention to some aspect of the child's environment or give him a chance to express in words what he has noticed (e.g., 'Did you notice that the Smith's are putting up a new fence?').

But there are more subtle aspects which, cumulatively, must be powerful forces: attitudes to the nature, the function, and the satisfactions to be gained from discussion itself; experiences of argument and the attitudes and techniques which arise from the need to persuade or prove or justify; attitudes to those who stand for the values of intellectual achievement, of 'learning' (e.g., parental evaluation of teachers). Overall, it can be said that the child is learning to evaluate the relative acceptability and desirability of many types of achievement and aspiration, and to identify himself with these evaluations.

As can be seen, the significance of family table talk is a very plausible topic for speculation, but unfortunately it is hard to rise above a common-sense level of interpretation in the absence of properly controlled studies. In due course, however, a new psychological instrument will doubtless be produced to explore this fascinating but elusive area of the social environment; perhaps it will be entitled, 'Index of Table Talk Intellectuality'! In the meantime we may enjoy our table talk, but keep an eye on what and how we are communicating. But we need not go to the extreme of one family described by Bossard: the father introduced a topic for discussion, the family discussed it during the meal, and then at the end of the meal he gave a summary of the trend of the discussion. There is no summary of what has been discussed in this paper — but perhaps this will emerge over 'supper talk'.

References

- Bernstein, B. (1961) 'Social Structure, Language and Learning', *Educational Research*, 3,3.
Bloom, B.S. (1964) *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*. New York: Wiley.
Bossard, J.H.S. and Boll, E.S. (1966, 4th ed.) *The Sociology of Child Development*. New York: Harper.

- Erikson, E.H. (1965) *Childhood and Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- McClelland, D. C. and others. (1953) *The Achievement Motive*. New York: Appleton-Century. For a good review of some recent research see J.W. Atkinson, (1965) 'The Mainsprings of Achievement-Orientated Activity', ch. 2 of *Learning and the Educational Process*, edited by J.D. Krumboltz. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Wolf, R.M. (1964) Unpublished doctoral thesis referred to in Bloom (1964) and in 'Parental Influence on Cognitive Development in Early Childhood: a Review' by N.E. Freeberg and D.T. Payne. *Child Development*, 38, 1, 1967.

THE CHANGING NEW ZEALAND FAMILY STRUCTURE

Miriam Gilson

There are many approaches to the study of the family but most could be classified under one of three broad headings:

1. The place of the family in society.
2. The family as a group of interacting members.
3. The family and its effect on individual development.

My approach to the study of the family does not fit neatly under any of these headings. Essentially I am trying to discover the main outline of changes in the N.Z. family during the 20th century, to provide a framework within which more intensive studies of particular aspects can be placed. These may be aspects of any of the three categories in the classification that I have suggested. Before describing some of my findings to date, I would like to explain certain assumptions underlying this sort of research. The family is regarded as an open system, sensitive and responsive to changes in the wider society, changes which can alter the structure of the family in the sense of affecting its numbers, the timing of the various stages in its life cycle, and its scope or whether the nuclear family or a modified extended family is the real working group in our society. Further assumptions are that changes in the wider society, directly, as well as the changes they have produced in family structure lead to behavioural changes within the family such as in methods of childrearing and types of interaction between husband and wife, for

MIRIAM GILSON is a Lecturer in the Department of Social Administration and Sociology, in the Victoria University of Wellington.

example. They also lead to changes in the participation of the family in society, both as group and individuals. This, of course, makes for further social change. In other words, there is an ongoing process of reflexive change. By examining changes in one part of this process we should get some idea of contributing factors and so, what further changes are likely to occur. The part of the process on which I have chosen to base my explorations, is change in family structure.

An outline of some of the structural changes in the N.Z. family can be pieced together from census data and other official statistics. From the beginning of the century there have been almost consistent trends to more marriage and younger marriage; in 1901, 71% of the adult women were or had been married; by 1966 this proportion had risen to about 90% so that increasing proportions of the population are having and taking the chance to become parents. Within marriage, parental ages at the various stages of the family life-cycle have altered very markedly. Earlier marriage and longer life have led to a considerable lengthening of the average marriage period; smaller numbers of children in family, again together with earlier marriage, has meant earlier completion of child-bearing and younger parents; the period when husband and wife are likely to be living together without children has been very greatly extended. These changes have certainly influenced life within and outside the family circle. Frequently they have merely reinforced the effect of other social changes. An example of this is the apparently greater emphasis on the desirability of husband-wife companionship in modern marriage. The need for companionship is intensified by the fact that husband and wife are now likely to spend nearly half their married life together without children in the home and it is also intensified, in many cases, by more frequent change of residence which removes families geographically from established friendships and activities. This increases dependence on each other for security and companionship, at least until new associations are formed. The possibility of greater companionship has increased with the rise in the status of women which has led, amongst other things, to a better matching of the education of the sexes and to more overlapping in the roles of husband and wife. So they are likely to have more interests in common and to be better able to share them.

Another indication from the changed timing of the family cycle

is, of course, the much earlier age at which a mother is likely to complete the period of full-time child care, leaving her with the possibility of developing her interests outside the household. As this trend to earlier completion of child-bearing has coincided in New Zealand with an increasing demand for female labour not able to be met by the shrinking proportion of single women, it was almost inevitable that more and more married women, including mothers, would take jobs outside the home. The rise in the proportion of married women in paid employment has been fairly rapid; 3.7% of the married women of all ages were working in 1936, 19.9% in 1966. This is a development which could have and probably has had a profound effect on many aspects of family life, including standard of living, organization and activities of the household, family relationships and interaction patterns and child development. Although I do not intend to discuss the sketchy evidence we have on these sorts of changes in New Zealand, I would like a little later to make some assessment of the comparative importance a mother places on her home and work roles, using data from an interview survey conducted in Wellington in July, 1967, by the Department of Social Science, Victoria University.

It is to this survey that I would now like to turn. I suggested earlier that the picture of changes in family structure obtainable from official statistics was far from complete. It shows that people are tending to marry at younger ages but not whether there are variations in the pattern according to people's social characteristics, for example, education, occupation or religious denomination. It tells us little about family size or spacing of children and nothing about the social characteristics of marriage partners or the structure and functions of kinship networks. The survey was designed to help fill in these gaps in our knowledge. Unfortunately, we had to confine ourselves to a sample of Wellington families although a wider sample would have been preferable. Within Wellington, the sampling framework was selected by choosing six census-subdivisions with varying levels of socio-economic status and fertility and a random sample of one house in five was drawn in each of these subdivisions and an interview requested from the wife in each of these houses where there was an unbroken family. The 36 student interviewers finally obtained 942 usable schedules from European wives living

with husbands. I shall describe some of our findings from the starting point of the family life cycle, the formation of a marriage and the first question is 'who marries whom'?

Marriage Partners

A predominant myth in our society is that choice of marriage partner is based almost solely on 'falling in love'. Romantic love is idealized and it is regarded as somewhat shameful to marry for more materialistic reasons. However, in practice, there are many other considerations involved in the choice. There is a marked tendency towards homogamy or marriage between like people. As Robert Winch, an American family sociologist, points out this does not mean marriage between people of the same personality type, in fact a person is likely to choose a marriage partner whose need pattern is complementary to, rather than similar to, his own. It means, rather, that a marriage partner is chosen on the basis of like attitudes and interests which result from a common background, racial, religious, socio-economic, for example. I was interested to see how far this was true of our sample and whether there had been any change over the last 40 years in the tendency towards homogamy. Taking type of occupation as an index of socio-economic status, we cross-classified the occupational group of the wife's father by that of her husband and found a fairly high association for those who married in the period 1917 - 1967. The contingency coefficient was 0.48 in a test where the upper limit of the coefficient could reach 0.94. A complete correlation would be almost impossible because of the continued changes in the distribution of occupations in New Zealand. For instance, the proportion of unskilled labourers has been steadily decreasing, and the proportion of professional and managerial workers steadily rising.

Using a classification of occupations as follows:

1. Professional and Managerial
2. Minor Business and Professional
3. Clerical and Sales
4. Skilled Manual
5. Semi and Unskilled Manual

an index of dissimilarity was calculated on the difference in the

occupational distributions of husbands of women with fathers in each of the occupational groups. The greatest differences were found between the choices of daughters from the Professional-Managerial and Semi and Unskilled Labourer groups. In this case 67.5% of the daughters of either the top or bottom category of fathers would have had to select a marriage partner from a different occupational group from the one she actually married into, to produce the same occupational distribution of husbands. The second greatest difference, 53.5%, was found between the choices of daughters of Professional-Managerial and Skilled Labourer fathers and the closest association was found between Clerical and Sales and Skilled Manual, a difference of 12.0%. Indexes of dissimilarity between the occupational distributions of the husbands of women with fathers in other pairs of occupational groups are as follows:

Professional Managerial – Clerical and Sales	49.9%
Minor Business and Professional – Unskilled Manual	43.0%
Professional & Managerial –	
Minor Business & Professional	38.5%
Skilled Manual – Unskilled Manual	24.0%
Clerical and Sales – Unskilled Manual	22.0%
Minor Business & Professional – Clerical & Sales	21.0%
Minor Business & Professional – Skilled Manual	19.0%

As family behaviour and attitudes, including child-rearing practices, aspirations for children, types of activities, sex attitudes and practices, tend to differ amongst occupational strata, it is important in a study of the family to discover whether marriage along class lines is becoming more or less common. If the tendency to marry within an occupational stratum is becoming more marked, class differences in family life may crystallize and even widen. Alternatively, if there is an increasing amount of marriage across occupational strata, a more homogeneous pattern may be developing. To test whether the proportion of homogamous marriages was changing, the degree of association between the occupational groupings of husband and father-in-law was calculated for each of the 4 ten-year periods between 1927 and 1967 and practically no change was found in the strength of the tendency to marry within the same occupational strata. The correlations varied between 0.48 and 0.51 which gives no basis for suspecting either a widening or lessening of

the social differences between strata.

Turning to an examination of the religious denomination of wife by that of her husband, using the broad classification of Protestant and Roman Catholic, an even higher degree of association was found than in the occupational comparison: 91% of the wives who were Protestant had Protestant husbands, 6% had Roman Catholic husbands and 3% had husbands who claimed no religious affiliation; 65% of wives who were Catholic had Catholic husbands, 29% had protestant husbands and 6%, husbands without religious affiliation. It is apparent that a greater proportion of Catholics marry outside their religious denomination, when only these two broad groups are considered, and this can be partly explained by the fact that New Zealand is predominantly Protestant, the Roman Catholic percentage varying around 16 for several past censuses. This means that there are many more Protestants than Catholics from whom to choose a marriage partner. Calculations on different marriage periods, this time by 5-year groups, showed that mixed marriages were more common at some times than others but there was no consistent trend found to more or less Protestant-Catholic intermarriage.

Age at Marriage

In the total sample, the survey showed the trends to younger marriage as indicated by a study of official statistics. The average age at first marriages was 24.5 years for women married between August 1937 and July 1947, 23.5 years for those married between 1947 and 1957 and 22.5 years for the most recent 10 year marriage group.

The clearest differential by social strata was the later average age at marriage of more highly educated and vocationally trained women. Considering all the women in our sample, classified by their occupational group before marriage, the following averages were calculated.

<i>Occupational Group</i>	<i>Average age at 1st Marriage - Years</i>
Professional & Managerial	25.3
Minor Business & Professional	24.4
Clerical A (Definite training)	23.4
Clerical B (Little training)	23.0
Skilled Manual	23.9
Semi and Unskilled Manual	22.8

An examination of the averages in each of the 4 ten year periods between 1927 - 67 suggested that there was a later average marriage age for the more highly educated in each period. In fact there was no evidence of a lessening of the differential.

Because the *Growth of American Family* studies, through interviews in 1955 and again in 1960 found that Roman Catholic women had married an average of a year later than Protestant, our survey data was analysed to see whether this difference had occurred in Wellington. However, the average age at marriage of Catholics and Protestants was found to be almost identical and the one interesting difference noted was that no very young Catholic brides were found. In the 1962 - 67 marriage period, for example, over 7% of the Protestants had married before the age of 18½ years, while the youngest Catholic bride was 19 years old.

Fertility

Information was asked on the number of children the women had borne and, if they intended to have more children, how many they intended to have altogether. The success of the *Growth of American Family* studies in obtaining an accurate assessment of future births, encourages some confidence in the data we collected. However, they are unlikely to be entirely accurate, particularly for the most recent marriage group, 1962 - 67. The most obvious source of error here is the over-small proportion, 1.6%, who expected to have no children. Using the figures just as a guide line, then, it appears that average achieved or expected family size has changed little for the marriages contracted over the last 20 years, and is larger than that common in the marriages of 1932 - 47.

<i>Marriage Period</i> <i>August to July</i>	<i>Average number of children</i> <i>achieved or expected</i>
1962 - 67	2.9
1957 - 62	2.9
1952 - 57	2.9
1947 - 52	3.0
1942 - 47	2.4
1937 - 42	2.6
1932 - 37	2.5

Opinions of the number of children which constitutes the ideal family size for the average N.Z. couple appear to have crystallized at some number between 2 and 4 children, nearly 90% of the sample giving an ideal number in this range.

These findings do not support the fairly widely expressed view that the size of our families is going to decline rapidly with the general use of the contraceptive pill.

Whether socio-economic status was measured by occupational grouping of husband or premarital occupation of wife, there was very little difference in the average number of children borne or expected by wives in the various socio-economic strata. There was a slight tendency for Professional - Managerial and Semi and Unskilled Labourer husbands to have somewhat larger averages than those in the middle occupational groupings and a stronger tendency for those with professional premarital occupations amongst the most recently married wives to expect a larger number of children than those in other occupational categories. In other words, the survey findings did not support the view that people of higher socio-economic status are restricting family size more drastically than those of poorer status.

A differential was found in the average number of children borne or expected by Roman Catholic and Protestants. However, in no 10 year marriage period did this amount to more than an average of one child a family and it was usually less. Catholic wives did not just happen to have a larger number of children, they also considered a slightly larger number preferable (average 3.6) than Protestant wives (average 3.1)

Kinship

A popular theme in commentaries on the family in industrial societies has been the decline of the extended family. The nuclear family (parents and children) are said to have become a relatively isolated unit separated from kin both geographically and socially. To investigate how true this was in New Zealand, one section in our interview schedule was devoted to questions about relationships with kin outside the immediate household.

First we asked where the family's nearest relatives lived and discovered that 27% had relatives living in the same suburb, 54% had

relatives in other parts of Wellington, 3% could pay relatives a day visit, 2% an overnight visit and 7% had relatives in other parts of New Zealand and 7% had none in this country. This did not appear like drastic geographic isolation from relatives but it did not tell us whether there was social isolation. However we had asked about the place of residence of the relatives or group of relatives seen most frequently. In terms of this definition, 18% had relatives living in the same suburb, 55% in other parts of Wellington, 5% could pay a day visit, 3% an overnight visit and the relatives seen most frequently by 13% of the sample saw these relatives at least once a day, 42% at least once a week, 24% at least once a month, 16% several times a year and 5% once a year or less. In summary, nearly three-quarters of the relatives whom the interviewees saw most frequently were living in Wellington and nearly half the sample saw this particular group of relatives at least once a week. When it is considered that telephone calls would have added considerably to the frequency of communication, it is apparent, not only that many have relatives living close by, but that they keep in regular contact with them.

The relatives most frequently seen were parents and parents-in-law, 40%, subject's or husband's brothers or sisters, 30%, and sons or daughters, 14%. Cousins, aunts, uncles and other more distant relatives received few preferences and usually when lineal relatives or siblings were living further away.

Having established that there was a significant amount of contact with kin in New Zealand, the next question was what sort of contact, what were the reasons for seeing relatives? Respondents were asked whether they or any member of their immediate household had, within the last 2 years, had relatives to stay or had stayed with them; whether they had attended a major celebration, such as a wedding, of a relative outside the household; whether they had attended a gathering of relatives at Christmas or some other occasion. Of those with relatives in New Zealand, 81% had done the first, 65% the second and 77%, the third. Nearly half the sample had done all three. The reasons for these gatherings are undoubtedly complex but social satisfaction must certainly be included.

Many families also give help to relatives and/or receive help from them; 22% said that they had given financial help, within the last two years, 17%, that they had received it; 60% said that they had given

services (labour or goods), 46% that they had received them. It is interesting to note that more claimed to have given than received and also that money was exchanged more rarely than services. There may have been more financial help given when there was a less comprehensive scheme of social benefits in New Zealand. Far more families than had recently received help, expected it from relatives if they really needed it; 51% of those with young children would ask a relative rather than someone else to look after them in time of crisis; 55% would ask relatives for temporary accommodation if their house was burnt down.

It was difficult to get information on whether families are relying less on their relatives than formerly but a query about who looked after the subject's family at the time of her most recent confinement, provided a slight indication. Only the women who had more than one child were asked this question. The following table distributes the answers in ten-year marriage periods.

<i>Persons who looked after family</i>	Arrangements for the care of the family when the mother has a child				<i>Total no. cases</i>	
	1952-62	1942-52	1932-42	1922-32	1912-67	1912-67
	%	%	%	%	%	
<i>Husband</i>	14.2	23.7	12.9	22.0	17.7	107
<i>Subject's or husband's Parents</i>	34.7	32.3	40.2	44.0	35.7	216
<i>Subject's or husband's Siblings</i>	10.5	9.7	12.9	10.2	10.9	66
<i>Any other relative</i>	2.1	3.2	3.8	1.7	2.8	17
<i>Combination of people including one or more relatives</i>	18.4	12.4	9.8	6.8	12.9	78
<i>Friend</i>	9.5	4.8	10.6	6.8	8.4	51
<i>Paid Help</i>	10.5	14.0	9.8	8.5	11.6	70
<i>Total no. of cases</i>	190	186	132	59		605

Note: The years are not calendar years but run from August to July.

This table shows two main tendencies, a slight decrease in the proportion of parents looking after their daughter's or daughter-in-law's families at time of childbirth and an increase in the percentage of families being cared for by a combination of people including relatives. It is quite apparent that relatives are relied on extensively during the period of childbirth, 80% of the wives in the total sample having their families cared for by some relative outside the immediate household, or the husband.

The indications from this survey were that effective relationships with kin outside the immediate family were still strong in New Zealand. Anyone who regarded our nuclear families as isolated units would understand little of our way of life.

In this talk I have told you of some of the findings of our survey of Wellington families. They show that family structure is changing and this is in response to changes in the wider society. I have touched only briefly on behavioural changes. These have certainly occurred but in some areas they are not as extensive as much current commentary would appear to indicate.

SIBLING INTERACTION.

H. S. Houston.

There are three categories of interaction which map the configuration of relationships within the nuclear family; (1) the parent-parent relationship; (ii) parent-child relationships; (iii) child-child relationships. But, in the literature and research of family study, there are two curious deficiencies. One is a conceptual limitation imposed on the term 'interaction,' the other is a denial of the network of associations which exist, so obviously, in the contemporary family.

In the first case, interaction is frequently interpreted as a unidirectional parent-affects-child phenomenon. In the second, it is assumed that the family is composed of discrete 1:1 subsystems, each independent, each impenetrable to any persons or influences beyond it. Freudian thought afforded dignified patronage to the first deficiency, for Freud himself laid heavy emphasis on the father-mother-child social system. Sibling interaction, when Freud considered it at all, was discussed mainly in terms of rivalry and jealousy. Concerning the second deficiency, many theorists have stressed the parent-affects-child paradigm and have, in large part, ignored the fact that relationships are interactional, not unidirectional.

This unidirectional, parent-affects-child model has dominated the major theoretical explanations in child rearing and child development. In them all, it is invariably an adult — usually a parent — who,

H.S. HOUSTON is Senior Lecturer in Education at Massey University.

from a position of power, nurturance or mediation (i.e. of biological or social rewards) serves as the primary model or socializing agent. Thus child behaviour, within these contexts, is assumed to be a consequence of the action or actions of one or both parents.

And the deficiency persists in spite of the fact that Schachter, almost a decade ago, admirably made the point that the child can influence the parent:

... baby, pin pricks baby, baby is scared, screams - mother hears, screams, rushes to baby, investigates, removes pin, kisses sore spot, caresses, fondles, soothes.

The main concern of research into the child's relationships with others in his family has centred upon the mother-child dyad. Presumably, the reason underlying the voluminous data on mothers and children is the mother-centred emphasis on child-rearing; father-child relationships, by contrast, are only occasionally viewed as significant or even relevant. Camichael (1954) did not list 'father' in his index; Bowlby well known for his work on maternal deprivation and for the invention of that precious commodity, TLC, wrote (1952) that he (the father) was 'of no direct importance to the young child, but of indirect support as an emotional support of the mother.' Still more recently, Miller and Swanson (1958), in a study of six hundred children, accorded only an incidental significance to the father-child relationship.

Overall, there is a paucity of studies addressed to fathers and their children. Nash (1965) for example, found only seven adequate studies addressed to father-child relationships in the twenty years since 1945. Yet it must be conceded that studies bearing directly upon delinquency and sexual aberration have uncovered a mine of valuable information. But while the aetiology of disordered adolescent and adult behaviour attests to the dire consequences of faulty father-child relationships, awareness of this has percolated all too slowly into the mainstream of discussions on social and educational problems in this country.

PERSPECTIVES AND PROBLEMS IN FAMILY RESEARCH

With its rich store of interactions and activities, the family provides a

rich potential for empirical study. In the relatively short history which family research has enjoyed, attention has primarily been directed to three broad areas: (a) external relationships with other societal institutions; (b) a limited range of internal relationships; (c) changes in structure and function.

No one discipline could presume to incorporate so broad a range of phenomena, so family research has advanced on a series of fronts from within such disciplines as sociology, psychology, psychiatry, anthropology, history, law and education. As a consequence, a problem in communication arises. In itself however the problem is not new for J.B. Watson, speaking particularly of psychology as far back as 1913, remarked: 'there is no guarantee that we all mean the same thing when we use the terms now current in psychology.'

But as specialisms within the various social disciplines proliferate, the problem is much more acute in the present. As an illustration of this problem of communication, Mandler and Kessen (1964) have pointed out that the psychoanalyst, well-schooled in clinical techniques, sees a world full of libidinal cathexes which his laboratory-trained colleagues may neither see nor concede to exist.¹

Bearing this limitation in mind, an assumption can be drawn - that a discipline or even a methodology within a discipline, communicates through the use of a specific linguistic idiom.

In the literature of parent-child interaction a further problem, suggesting the need for caution in the interpretation of research findings is evident. This relates to the substantial body of research in which mothers report what they 'generally do' or anamnestically, what they 'used to do' in rearing their children. Yarrow (1963) has not only pointed out that techniques of this kind lead to the 'possibility of a selective and distorted quality in mothers' reports' but also that sharp discrepancies occur when such self-report data are placed alongside data derived from the responses, such as those of fathers or children, addressed to the same situations. To illustrate: Kohn and Carroll (1960), in their study of parental responsibilities in 80 families, reported a 61 per cent agreement between fathers and mothers, a 48 per cent agreement between mothers and 10-year-old children and 51 per cent agreement between fathers and the same children. Thus as Yarrow tersely notes, 'the picture of faith is

shaken...'

This example serves to illustrate the point that not only may language communities within a discipline be particularistic, but that the phenomenology of the child may be distinctly different from the phenomenology of the parent or parents. This leads to a second assumption — that whatever is derived from a particular approach or research strategy may afford a partial view or 'a metaphor for reality' (Sutton-Smith).

Although the family is the most basic of our institutions, an extraordinary paradox under which we labour is the manner in which 'family' as an organizing concept has, in some of our literature, been misconstrued or misrepresented. In one text, for example, an entire chapter devoted to family influences makes no mention of inter-action² between members; another dealing with symbiotic family relationships opens with the words that 'the parent-child relationship provides the mould in which all other experience is cast'; in others, there is no mention of fathers and only passing reference to siblings. In sum, there is little regard for relationships beyond the 'vertical' relationships between parents and children. Whilst it can only be presumed that the network of family associations has been abandoned because of its complexity, it must, at the same time, be pointed out that studies of the less complex 'horizontal' relationships which exist between child and child are equally conspicuous by their absence.

So while it is abundantly clear that siblings do affect one another, rigorous studies of sibling relationships and sibling effects are singularly few. In sociology and social psychology for example, the role of siblings has been considered 'chiefly in the light of "displacement" and rivalry'. (Bossard and Boll, 1960). Several reasons can be adduced for this limited perspective. First, difficulties in studying sibling interaction longitudinally, by age, and in diverse environmental situations; second, diversionary demands upon the time and energies of potential research scholars; third, the relative inaccessibility of sibling groups³; fourth, difficulties involved in controlling for such structural characteristics as sex of child, order of birth of child, sex of sibling, age differences between siblings and family size; fifth, conceptual limitations imposed by preoccupation with the father-mother-child triad.

Sibling position, on the other hand, has long been recognized as a

determinant of family and social status: 'to the first-born according to his birthright, to the youngest according to youth. (Genesis 43:33). And, even to the present day, the grace-and-favour benefits of primogeniture are promoted in subtle and manifold ways.

Not unexpectedly, therefore, there has been, over a period of time, an abundance of research on the psychological and social consequences of birth-order. As early as 1874, Francis Galton recorded there was a preponderance of first-born men holding positions of eminence in science; some fifty years later, Terman(1925) confirmed this assertion by reporting that scientific pursuits which demanded a high degree of intelligence were overweighted with first-borns. Adler (1927), too, stressed the advantages of being first-born:

The oldest child is usually the one whom one accredits with enough power and common sense to be the helper or foreman of his parents. It is not surprising that such individuals are markedly conservative.

And again from Adler:

The attitude of the second born is similar to the envy of the poorer classes. There is a dominant note of being slighted, neglected in it. (1929)

But the opposite view, from equally reputable sources, stressed the advantages of being last-born.⁴ In the same year as Adler adumbrated this precursor of the status-envy hypothesis, Otto Rank (1929) wrote:

It must always be the youngest who appears as the hero...his superiority consists in the fact that (in having access to the mother) he is like the father, with whom he alone is able to identify himself.

Freud (1938) also believed that advantages accrue to the later born. After indicating that the first-born may either experience 'profound embitterment' at his displacement by a second child or adopt his younger sibling as a love object, he concluded by saying:

A child's position in the sequence of brothers and sisters is of very great significance for the course of his later life.

Perhaps, as Harris (1964) speculates, these views reflect little more than the early experiences of the writers themselves – Adler the fourth-born child, Freud the first-born son.

Such early reports as these, although stamped with the authority of Adler, Rank and Freud, were not the consequences of systematic empirical research. But from the thirties onward, studies of birth-order proliferated. A bewildering, diverse array of phenomena was examined: academic achievement, delinquency, political attitudes, emotional stability, stuttering, atheism, school failure and neuroticism to name but a few. A great many of these early studies did little more than take the first-born/after-born distinction into account. Equivocal results were reported, due, it has been held, to the operational naivete which had been employed (Krout, 1939). So looking at birth-order primarily in terms of biogenetic variables was singularly unproductive. In all this early research, no allowances had been made for family size, sex of subject, sex of sibling and age-spaces between siblings. Prior to the forties, findings conflicted one with the other and, as a result, birth-order research languished for a decade or more.

From the fifties onward, interest quickened. In 1950, Sears made the point that 'ordinal position was an ecological variable, not a psychological one', and suggested that it would be fruitful to turn back to the exact circumstances of a child's rearing and 'to the immediate stimulatory forces acting upon him'. The point has been well taken in some subsequent studies. Since the fifties, in studies where there has been partial or total control for structural characteristics, there has been a gratifying increase in the consistency of results.

Many studies have been directed to ordinal position effects. First-borns, in scattered research findings have been shown to be conforming, conventional, anxious, adult-oriented and dominant (Sears, 1950; Lasko, 1954; Koch, 1955; McArthur, 1956; Schachter, 1959). Second-borns, on the other hand, have been shown to be peer-oriented, placid and not studious (McArthur, 1956).

But, as has been pointed out, classification by birth order alone takes little account of the complexities which sex differences in subjects and their siblings produce. Recent research (Schoonover, 1959; Hodges and Balow, 1961; Rosenberg and Sutton-Smith, 1964;

Bayley, 1965; Stroup and Hunter, 1965) has indicated that birth order without regard for other family status variables may 'conceal more differences than are actually revealed'. (Rosenberg and Sutton-Smith, 1964).

Two sets of studies have thrown considerable light on the effects of sibling position.

1. *The Koch Studies*

In an outstanding series of studies (Koch, 1954; 1955a; 1966b; 1956; 1960), in which 384 normal white five- and six-year-old children from small, intact, urban, middle-class families were studied, the structural characteristics, sex of child, sex of sibling, ordinal position and age-spacing were all controlled. In all, 16 subgroups of 24 children were considered. The variables of child's sex, ordinal position, and sibling's sex, were shown to influence socialization. Some of Koch's findings deserve mention:

Girls with brothers tend to be more ambitious and aggressive and do better on tests of intellectual ability than girls with sisters; girls with older brothers have more tomboyish traits than girls with older sisters; and boys with older sisters are less daring than boys with older brothers. (1956)

Second-born males with an older sister are more sissyish than first-born males with either a younger sister or a younger brother; siblings with brothers are more competitive, ambitious, enthusiastic and less wavering in decisions than siblings with sisters; and boys with an older sister as compared with boys with a younger sister are less jealous, less exhibitionistic and less inclined to take leadership. (1955)

The effects of age-spacing are clearly shown in this quotation:

With spacings up to four years, second-born boys with sisters are more sissyish than first-born boys with sisters; this relationship between first and second-born children is reversed when the siblings differ in age by more than four years. (1956)

2. *The Bowling Green Studies*⁵

In this series (Rosenberg and Sutton-Smith, 1964a; 1964b; 1968;

Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg, 1965; 1966; Sutton-Smith, Roberts and Rosenberg, 1964; Sutton-Smith, Rosenberg and Houston, 1968), interview and inventory techniques have confirmed that unique relational realities exist between siblings. In the main, these studies have been concerned with parent and sibling effects in small (i.e. one-child, two-child, three-child) families. Subjects with opposite-sex siblings have shown more opposite-sex traits and have interacted more with opposite-sex classmates.

Girls with brothers, irrespective of ordinality, became more masculine than girls with sisters. The power and prestige of the masculine role, it is argued, compels the girl to model masculine behaviour, continuously available and best represented by her brother. Femininity in boys, on the other hand, depended on the number of sisters available to a greater degree than did the number of brothers available in the case of the girl. Whereas a boy with one sister registered more feminine traits and interacted more with girls in the classroom setting, the boy with two sisters exaggerated his masculinity and did not interact as frequently with girls in school.

It is difficult, however, to do justice to so wide and complex a range of studies within the compass of one paper.⁶ Yet from the little that has been presented, it is patently clear that structural characteristics demand careful attention if research into intra-familial relationships is to be diligently pursued in the future.

THE NEW ZEALAND CASE

If research time and expenditure are valid criteria by which to judge a nation's interests, then New Zealand must be taken to be singularly uninterested in its children. It appears that a tacit assumption within which we operate is that all that was eternally necessary was accomplished as a result of social welfare legislation enacted some thirty years ago.

In the main, studies about New Zealand children fall into three categories: (a) school-classroom-subject studies; (b) 'shoe-string' studies conducted by part-time researchers; (c) Maori studies. It may be argued, of course, that these categories cover New Zealand's most pressing needs adequately enough. But this range of research, by any country's standards, is singularly narrow. By comparison with other

countries, knowledge of the growth and development of New Zealand children in New Zealand settings is more limited than that for many countries, which, with paternalistic condescension, we still choose to label 'underdeveloped'. We have gained too little since Stroobant (1958) remarked:

We all have opinions and impressions of how children are brought up in this country, but it is doubtful if these are much more than rather personal and limited observations drawn from a relatively small range of cases.

The recent work of Brown (1959), Landreth (1963) and the Ritchies (1966) is thus of considerable importance, not merely because their findings have found recognition beyond New Zealand, but because they have been derived specifically from the New Zealand environment.

SIBLING RELATIONSHIPS

In an attempt to provide an insight into patterns of intrafamilial relationship existing in New Zealand, beginning has been made in a study of children's perceptions of affectional feelings. This present study is predicated upon two assumptions: that the 'child's eye' view of his world provides as viable a metaphor for reality as do reports of relationships deriving from parents or impartial, trained observers; and that the test situation, where a modification of the 'Family Relations Test' (Bene and Anthony, 1957b) was used, is essentially a game for the child. This approach avoids the difficulties of experiment within the psychological laboratory and permits the child to retain the realities of relationships within his own family, in a non-threatening, 'neutral' setting.

The Family Relations Test

In the Test Manual for the original form of the test, a hypothetical distribution of a child's emotional involvement with his family was presented. The conversion of the distribution from histogram to numerical form provides the following percentages: Mother 42%;

Father 30%; Sibling 24%; Self 6%. Unfortunately, the distribution, 'drawn from purely theoretical considerations' (Bene and Anthony, 1957b), takes no account of structural characteristics.

If the hypothetical distribution is tenable, then the mother-son relationship should continue to be the most salient in the lives of children within the ages for which the test is designed. If, on the other hand, these ties are demonstrably weaker than hypothesised, then relationships with other persons — particularly the father (Parsons and Bales, 1964) — should begin to assume much more significance once the oedipal situation is resolved.

The study to be described, involving children of two ages, may serve to test the validity of the hypothesised involvement of the child, as he himself perceives it, with other members of his family.

The Present Study

Subjects were 78 boys from two-child families selected from eleven schools in Palmerston North; all were no more than six years older or younger than their siblings. Forty were aged 5-6 (Mean Age 67 months S.D. 9.01), thirty eight aged 7-8 (Mean Age 95 months S.D. 4.89). Of the 5-6-year-olds, six had older brothers (MM_2), twelve older sisters (FM_2), twelve younger brothers (M_1M), ten younger sisters (M_1F). Of the 7-8-year-olds, ten had older brothers (MM_2), ten older sisters (FM_2), seven younger brothers (M_1M), eleven younger sisters (M_1F).⁷ All parents agreed to their sons' participation.

Each boy was known to the examiner before the test was administered. In every case, the test was conducted in a small room in his own school with no third person present.

The boy's perception of his intrafamily relationships was assessed with an adapted version of the Test of Family Relationships (Bene and Anthony, 1957b). The present test consisted of 40 items (see Appendix): 10 of positive outgoing feelings from the child to his family, 10 negative outgoing, 10 positive incoming, 10 negative incoming. Each item was printed on a card read to the child and given to him. First, however, from an array of 20 line-drawn figures (four men, four women, five boys, five girls, a toddler and a baby), the child selected figures representing himself and his family. An

extra box, Mr. Nobody, was added by the examiner. The items read to the child in random order were 'posted' in the slotted box (i.e., the 'postbox') behind each of the family figures he had chosen.

Table I gives a comparison between the hypothetical distribution, as originally postulated, and the perceived relationships for the two age-groups as reported by the children themselves. Percentages are derived from the total (i.e. 40) responses for each family member.

TABLE I.

*Hypothetical and perceived affectional relationships
in two-child families.*

	HYPOTHETICAL DISTRIBUTION (Bene and An- thony, Ages Not Stated)	5-6 YEAR OLDS				7-8 YEAR OLDS			
		MM ₂	FM ₂	M ₁ M	M ₁ F	MM ₂	FM ₂	M ₁ M	M ₁ F
NOBODY	Not Included	11.0%	12%	14%	9%	18%	19%	10%	6%
SELF	6%	8.5%	9%	8%	7%	3%	8%	9%	5%
FATHER	30%	17.5%	22%	22%	27%	20%	28%	25%	26%
MOTHER	42%	22%	23%	22%	22%	21%	24%	23%	23%
SIBLING	24%	41%	34%	34%	35%	38%	21%	33%	40%

The table shows considerable differences between the hypothetical distribution and the perceived feelings as actually reported. For every ordinal position at age 5-6 and all except boys with older sisters at age 7-8, siblings are reported as more important in their total affectional feelings than mothers and fathers. (Affectional feelings here include both positive and negative feelings.)

But total relationships, it can be argued, deny the realities of particular situations and reveal nothing of the qualitative range of relationships which exist in interactional situations. The four sections of the present test, however, can be utilised to reveal something of the qualitative differences which, as Bene and Anthony (1957) put it, are part of the 'psychic reality' of the child's world.

Table 2 summarises the four categories of feelings by age and ordinal position. The lower-corner letters indicate the relative rankings for fathers and mothers. Thus, for the 5-6-year-olds with older brothers, the sibling was equal with mother and given more positive outgoing responses than father. Throughout the Table where $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$ is shown, the rank-order is Sibling, Father, Mother; where $\begin{matrix} <Mo \\ <Fa \end{matrix}$ the rank-order is Mother, Father, Sibling.

TABLE 2.

Mean percentages of affectional relationships in two-child families by age and ordinal position.

ORDINAL POSITION BOYS WITH:	Age 5-6				Age 7-8			
	Affectional Feelings				Affectional Feelings			
	+ Out	+ In	- Out	- In	+ Out	+ In	- Out	- In
Older Brothers (MM ₂)	30 $\begin{matrix} =Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	38 $\begin{matrix} <Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	65 $\begin{matrix} >Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	56 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	18 $\begin{matrix} <Mo \\ <Fa \end{matrix}$	19 $\begin{matrix} <Mo \\ <Fa \end{matrix}$	58 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	48 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$
Older Sisters (FM ₂)	30 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	34 $\begin{matrix} >Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	36 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	31 $\begin{matrix} >Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	19 $\begin{matrix} <Fa \\ <Mo \end{matrix}$	16 $\begin{matrix} <Mo \\ <Fa \end{matrix}$	38 $\begin{matrix} >Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	30 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$
Younger Brothers (M ₁ M)	21 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	40 $\begin{matrix} >Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	36 $\begin{matrix} >Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	31 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	25 $\begin{matrix} <Mo \\ <Fa \end{matrix}$	32 $\begin{matrix} =Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	44 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	34 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$
Younger Sisters (M ₁ F)	21 $\begin{matrix} <Fa \\ <Mo \end{matrix}$	26 $\begin{matrix} <Fa \\ <Mo \end{matrix}$	57 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	39 $\begin{matrix} >Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$	23 $\begin{matrix} <Fa \\ <Mo \end{matrix}$	35 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	61 $\begin{matrix} >Fa \\ >Mo \end{matrix}$	35 $\begin{matrix} >Mo \\ >Fa \end{matrix}$

Older siblings, MM₂ and FM₂, were the main sibling recipients of positive outgoing feelings at 5-6 (note also mothers for the MM₂ group) and younger siblings, M₁M and M₁F, at 7-8. Like-sex siblings, MM₂ and M₁M, were perceived as giving the greater positive incoming feelings at 5-6, younger siblings, M₁M and M₁F, at 7-8. Mutually warm links were strongest with older siblings, M₁F and M₁M, at 7-8.

For negative feelings, older brothers and younger sisters, the major recipients of negative outgoing feelings, were perceived as spoiling fun and being too fussy, being a nuisance etc. more than any other family member by both age groups. Older brothers, MM₂, were perceived as directing most negative feelings (e.g., hitting, teasing, scolding) towards the subjects. For every ordinal position (both ages) siblings were reported to be greater recipients and donors of negative affections than fathers and mothers.

In the four ordinal positions, differences are seen to occur. At 5-6, the boy with the older brother (MM₂) perceived his sibling relationships as equally positive to those with his mother, and less negative than those with his father and mother. By 7-8, however, the older brother was replaced by both parents as the major figure possessing such positive-feeling characteristics as kind heartedness, jolliness and helpfulness. Furthermore, the older brother, rated as inferior to mother and father as the chief donor of warm feelings, easily outdistanced them as giver and receiver of negative feelings.

To the 5-6 year-old, the older sister was more significant in every category than each parent, but by 7-8 only in negative relationships, both incoming and outgoing, did she figure prominently.

Relationships with younger brothers at 5-6 were reported as stronger in every category than those with mothers and fathers. At 7-8 they were significantly greater only in negative incoming and outgoing feelings.

Younger sisters were rated more salient than parents in negative give-and-take relationships at both 5-6 and 7-8. They were the only siblings rated lower than parents for positive incoming and outgoing feelings at 5-6, but at 7-8 they were perceived as providing greater positive incoming feelings than both parents. The 'sex war', so aptly described by Shields (1966), appears to begin not in the adult world of competition and business, but within the intimacy of the family circle. As these boys reported, their younger sisters were most important to them in situations in which hostility and animosity was displayed.

Conclusion

Caution is demanded in the interpretation of the foregoing data.

Although the sample ($n = 78$) was drawn from all intact two-child families in which siblings were no more than six years apart, it was composed solely of boys. One clear fact emerges, however: the boys in this study perceived their siblings as surprisingly significant. The study, it must be emphasised, was merely exploratory and focussed only upon familial interaction for a one-sex group limited to one size of family and only four types of sibling constellation. An approach such as this, with its many limitations, can provide only a tentative and fractional view of parent-child and child-child relationships. What is still needed in this field are fuller analyses of configurational patterns within families. If we are concerned with the family and its various members, families of different race and socioeconomic status as well as families of different size and sex composition deserve fuller attention. It remains to be seen whether our resources and energies are sufficient to provide the answers to some of the questions raised by Professor McCreary in his opening paper of this series.

APPENDIX

Items in Adaptation of the Family Relations Test

Positive Outgoing Feelings

1. This person is always very nice.
2. This person is nice to play with.
3. This person is kind-hearted.
4. This person is jolly.
5. This person often helps the others.
6. This person is lots of fun.
7. This person deserves a present.
8. I love this person very much.
9. I would like to keep this person always near me.
10. I would like to sit on this person's knee.

Positive Incoming Feelings

11. This person likes to play with me.
12. This person is very kind to me.
13. This person makes me feel very happy.
14. This person likes to help me.

15. This person thinks I am a nice boy.
16. This person smiles at me.
17. This person often wants to be with me.
18. This person always listens to what I say.
19. This person likes me very much.
20. This person likes to give me things.

Negative Outgoing Feelings.

21. This person spoils other people's fun.
22. This person is bad-tempered.
23. This person is not very patient.
24. This person is sometimes too fussy.
25. This person sometimes makes me feel very angry.
26. This person sometimes grumbles too much.
27. Sometimes I don't like this person.
28. Sometimes I hate this person.
29. Sometimes I would like to spank/smack/hit this person.
30. This person is a nuisance.

Negative Incoming Feelings

31. This person hits me.
32. This person teases me.
33. This person scolds me (tells me off).
34. This person won't play with me when I feel like it.
35. This person won't help me when I am in trouble.
36. This person is too busy to have time for me.
37. This person is always complaining about me.
38. This person makes me feel sad.
39. This person gets cross with me.
40. This person makes me feel foolish.

NOTES

1. Bertrand Russell(1932) wryly commented: 'One may say broadly that all animals that have been carefully observed have behaved so as to confirm the philosophy in which the observer believed before his observations began. Nay more, they have displayed the national characteristics of the observer. Animals studied by Americans rush about frantically with an incredible display of bustle and pep and at last achieve the desired result by chance. Animals observed by Germans sit still and think and at last evolve the solution out of inner consciousness.'

2. Almost twenty years ago, Kephard (1950) indicated that sociologists had neglected quantitative analysis in intragroup research.

The formula $R = \frac{n^2 - n}{2}$ may be used to determine the number of 1:1 relationships.

The number of potential relationships, however, are determined by the formula

$$PR = \frac{3n - 2n + 1}{2}$$

where R = the number of relationships, PR = the number of potential relationships, and n = number in family.

3. Hoffman and Lippitt (1965) advance this as the greatest problem in the study of sibling composition.
4. Brian Sutton-Smith has pointed out to me that in Grimm's fairy tales, in stories with other-than-only children, the latter-born were more often favoured more than any of the others.
5. Conducted principally at Bowling Green State University, Ohio.
6. A full account will appear in B. Sutton-Smith and B.G. Rosenberg, *The Sibling*. (Holt, Rinehart, in press).
7. This notation states sex and position referent. The number following the subject indicates his position. Thus in MM₂ the subject is a second-born male and has an older brother; in M₁F the subject is a first-born male with a younger sister.

References

- Adler, A. (1927) *Understanding Human Nature*. (Greenberg).
- Bayley, N. (1965) 'Comparison of mental and motor test scores for ages 1-15 months by sex, birth order, race, geographic location and education of parents', *Child Development*, 36, 379-411.
- Bene, E. and Anthony E.J. (1957) 'A technique for the objective assessment of the child's family relationships', *Journal of Mental Science*, 541-555.
- Bene, E. and Anthony, E.J. (1957b) *Manual for the Family Relations Test*. (National Foundation for Educational Research).
- Bossard, J.H.S. and Boll, E.S. (1960) *The Sociology of Child Development*, (Harper).
- Bowlby, J. (1952) *Child Care and the Growth of Love*. (Penguin).
- Brown, L.B. (1959) 'The Day at Home in Wellington, New Zealand', *Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 189-206.
- Carmichael, L. (1942) *Manual of Child Psychology*. (Wiley).
- Clarke, P.A. (1968) *Child-Adolescent Psychology*. (Merrill).
- Freud, S. (1938) *A General Introduction to Psycho-Analysis*. (Garden City).

- Garrison, K.C., Kingston, A.J., Bernard, J.W. (1967) *The Psychology of Childhood*, (Scribners).
- Harris, I.D. (1964) *The Promised Seed - A Comparative Study of Eminent First-and Later-Born Sons*. (Free Press of Glencoe).
- Hodges, A. and Balow, B. (1961) 'Learning disability in relation to family constellation', *Journal of Educational Research*, 55, 41-42.
- Hoffman, L.W. and Lippitt, R. (1960) 'The measurement of family life variables', in P.H. Mussen (ed.) *Handbook of Research Methods in Child Development*. (Wiley).
- Irish, D.P. (1964) 'Sibling interaction: a neglected aspect in family life research', *Social Forces*, 42, 279-288.
- Kephart, W.M. (1950) 'A quantitative analysis of intragroup relationships', *American Journal of Sociology*, 544-529.
- Koch, H. (1954) 'The relationship of primary mental abilities in five- and six-year-olds to sex of child and characteristics of his sibling', *Child Development*, 25, 209-223.
- Koch, H. (1955a) 'Some personality correlates of sex, sibling position and sex of sibling among five- and six-year-old children', *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 52, 3 - 50.
- Koch, H. (1955b) 'The relation of certain family constellation characteristics and the attitudes of children toward adults', *Child Development*, 26, 13-40.
- Koch, H. (1956) 'Attitudes of young children toward their peers as related to certain characteristics of their siblings', *Psychological Monographs*, 70, 19, 1-41.
- Koch, H. (1960) 'The relation of certain formal attributes of siblings to attitudes held toward each other and toward their parents', *Monograph of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 25, 4, 5-124.
- Kohn, M.L. and Carroll, E.E. (1960) 'Social class and the allocation of parental responsibilities', *Sociometry*, 23, 372-392.
- Krout, M.L. (1939) 'Typical behaviour patterns in twenty-six ordinal positions', *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 55, 3-30.
- Landreth, C. (1963) 'Four-year-olds notions about sex-appropriateness of parental care and companionship activities', *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 9, 3, 175-182.
- Lasko, J.K. (1954) 'Parent behaviour towards first and second children', *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 49, 96-137.
- McArthur, C. (1965) 'Personalities of first and second children', *Psychiatry*, 19, 47-54.
- Mandler, G. and Kessen, W. (1964) *The Language of Psychology*. (Wiley).

- Miller, D.R. and Swanson, G.E. (1958). *The Changing American Parent*. (Wiley).
- Nash, J. (1965) 'The father in contemporary culture and current psychological literature', *Child Development*, 36, 1, 262-297.
- Parsons, T. and Bales, R.F. (1964) *Family, Socialization and Inter-action Processes*. (Routledge, Kegan Paul).
- Rank, O. (1929) *The Trauma of Birth*. (Harcourt, Brace).
- Ritchie, J. and J. (1966) 'Patterns of child rearing in New Zealand - some preliminary results'. (mimeographed).
- Rosenberg, B.G. and Sutton-Smith, B. (1964a) 'Ordinal position and sex-role identification', *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 70, 297-328.
- Rosenberg, B.G. and Sutton-Smith, B. (1964b) 'The relationships of ordinal position and sibling sex status to cognitive abilities', *Psychology: a study of a Science*, 1, 81-82.
- Rosenberg, B.G. and Sutton-Smith, B. (1966) 'Family interaction and sex role identification', *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 3, 355-356.
- Rosenberg, B.G. and Sutton-Smith, B. (1968) 'Family interaction affects on masculinity-femininity', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8,2,117-120.
- Russell, B.(1932)*Marriage and Morals*. (Allen and Unwin).
- Schachter, S. (1959) *The Psychology of Affiliation* (Stanford, U.P.).
- Schoonover, S. (1959) 'The relationship of intelligence and achievement of birth order, sex of sibling and age interval', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 50,143-146.
- Sears, R.R. (1950) 'Ordinal position in the family as a psychological variable', *American Sociological Review*, 15, 397-401.
- Shields, R. (1966) 'The sex war'. *The Observer*, February 27th, March 6th.
- Stroobant, R.S. (1958) 'Current methods of child control', *Conformity and Individuality*. (Association for the Study of Childhood, Wellington).
- Stroup, A. and Hunter, K. (1965) 'Sibling position in the family and personality of offspring', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 27, 65-68.
- Sutton-Smith, B. and Rosenberg, B.G. (1965) 'Age changes in the effects of ordinal position on sex-role identification', *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 61-73.
- Sutton-Smith B. and Rosenberg, B.G. (1966) 'The dramatic sibling', *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 22, 993-994.

- Sutton-Smith, B. and Rosenberg, B.G. (in press) *The Sibling*. (Holt, Rinehart).
- Sutton-Smith, B., Roberts, J.M., and Rosenberg, B.G. (1964) 'Sibling associations and role involvement', *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 10, 1, 25-38.
- Sutton-Smith, B., Rosenberg, B.G., and Houston, H.S. (1968) 'Sibling perception of family models'. Paper presented to Eastern Psychological Association, Washington.
- Terman, L. et.al. (1925) *Genetic Studies of Genius*. (Stanford, U.P.)
- Yarrow, M.R. (1963) 'Problems of methods in parent-child research', *Child Development* 34, 215-226.



