

*That Was a Woman's Satisfaction: The Significance of Life History for Woman-Centred Research*¹

Gail Grant

(This paper is a revised version of a paper presented at the 1991 Learned Societies Conference at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.)

Women's lives have constituted a subtext even within historical studies of the family. Indeed, analyses of wife abuse have treated woman as "The Other"—the object of her abuser, the victim, the dropper-of-charges. Increasingly, we recognize, validate and interpret their experiences by allowing them—as narrators, as subjects—to limn the details of their lives as women. This is the distinctive feature of feminist methodology.

A life history is both a subjective interpretation of one's personal biography and a commentary on the context in which that biography was lived. Text and context are inextricably meshed within the "webs of significance" (Geertz 1973) that define and contain lives. Women's lives, in particular, have been bound about by, contained within, man-made rules and expectations and needs. Further, biographies of women, the famous and infamous, while penned by both women and men, often have been forced into the male "quest" framework (Heilbrun 1988); in general, the homely details of women's experienced lives have been the stuff only of the occasional anthropological study (e.g., Luxton 1980).

As a contribution to this lacuna in our knowledge, the life histories of fifteen elderly women were transcribed in an effort to document the conceptual models of proper womanhood that informed their activities and relationships. This study had a dual focus: an examination of how these women represented themselves *qua* women and an understanding of marital relationships during the second quarter of this century. Wife abuse was a focal concern: I was explicitly interested in their awareness of abuse among their peers as they conjured the past through the prism of the present.

Karl Mannheim (1952) contended that, while "measured time" defines biological cohorts, "experienced time" defines sociological generations. Cooley (1902) noted that "self and society are twinborn"; Mannheim concurred, observing that mentation and sociohistorical location cannot be separated. In short,

one conceptualizes oneself as a particular kind of self depending upon when and where that self was formed. This knowledge is "old hat" for human scientists today, of course; however, it is essential to keep it in mind as we examine the lives of women, particularly women whose lives were constrained by limited choices, for the text of their lives was determined by this context of limited choice.

The Women

The fifteen women that were interviewed ranged in age from seventy-seven to eighty-seven years.² All of the women were Canadian by birth; their parents were either Canadian or British immigrants. Eight of the informants would be ranked as working-class to lower middle-class,³ the other seven were located in the middle to upper middle-class.⁴ No divorces had occurred within this cohort, but three of the women had married a second time after being widowed and, at the time of the study, eight of the women were widows. Four of the informants were second wives: three husbands had been widowed, one had been divorced. Two of the women had married late in life (in their forties) after being self-supporting; there were no children born to these unions. The remaining thirteen informants had given birth to thirty-eight children (mean: three offspring); however, their actual families reflected the prevailing norm of a few (two) large families, the remainder producing three or fewer offspring. Moreover, these women's working lives were also typical of the era, both occupationally and temporally. The informants are described below:

Amy: 83 years, 3 children
widowed (married 43 years)
husband: small business owner (corner grocery)
worked with husband throughout marriage
urban

Constance: 84 years, 2 children (plus 2 step-children)
widowed (married 35 years)
husband: university professor
secretary until marriage
urban

Dorothy: 77 years, no children
widowed (married 26 years)
husband: sales, horsebreeder
secretary until marriage
urban

Edna: 77 years, 4 children
widowed (married 43 years)
husband: military (non-commissioned)
telephone operator until motherhood;
part-time work after children in school
rural (small village)

Ellen: 78 years, 1 child
married 56 years
husband: accountant
secretary until marriage
urban

Emily: 81 years, 6 children
widowed (married 47 years)
husband: skilled labourer
bookkeeper until marriage
urban

Joan:⁵ 85 years, 3 children
married, 58 years
husband: salesman
factory worker until marriage (then "laid off")
urban

Judith:⁶ 87 years, 3 children
widowed, 2 marriages (20 years, 24 years)
husbands: warehouse foreman, small business owner
secretary until first marriage; small home business during first widowhood
urban

Madge: 87 years, 2 children
married 65 years
husband: barber
worked as hairdresser throughout marriage
rural (small village)

Mary: 80 years, 3 children
married 54 years
husband: clergyman
nursed until marriage; part-time nursing for brief periods during marriage
succession of small towns/villages

Nancy: 86 years, no children
widowed (married 17 years)
husband: engineer
taught school until marriage; taught during husband's illness
urban

Nell: 86 years, 1 child
widowed (married 42 years)
husband: executive
taught until marriage
urban

Ruth: 78 years, 3 children
married 52 years
husband: accountant
taught throughout marriage
urban

Susan:⁷ 85 years, 5 children (1 deceased)
2 marriages (40 years, 18 years)
husbands: farmer, retired salesman
did not work out
rural

Violet: 83 years, 2 children
2 marriages (7 years, 44 years)
husbands: skilled labourer, salesman
did not work out
urban

This was the first cohort of women expected to work prior to marriage (Vipond 1977) and twelve of my informants had been involved in waged labour before and/or during (four part-time or sporadically, three full-time) their married lives.

These women spoke in one voice on two subjects, not without equivocation. They considered wife abuse far more common today than in the past, even taking into account the fact that this particular private trouble has become a public issue, yet—

...Abuse *might* have been common but nobody talked about it. They kept it private just the same way they did retarded children.... (Mary)

Further, they were adamant that their marriages were characterized by a greater degree of reciprocity or mutuality than is apparent in the more brittle relationships of their daughters' and (particularly) granddaughters' unions:

...There was more give and take in our day. It wasn't always perfect, but we didn't expect perfect. For better, for worse, we took our vows seriously...today, young people, after the least little tiff, it's over...in my day, you made the marriage, you made the best of it.... (Susan, Mary)

These were the traditional women, not the baroque elaboration that distinguished the late fifties and sixties, but traditional in the sense that these women did indeed define themselves by their relationships and by their strong sense of responsibility to the people who were the relationships. These personal relationships were orchestrated and nurtured within the status "married woman": marriage was both normal and normative, one expected to, wanted to, needed to marry:

...marriage was what you *did* with your life: you raised children, tended to your husband and worked hard...that was a woman's satisfaction.... (Mary)

Indeed, "women were directed relentlessly to the pursuit of husbands" (Strong-Boag 1987: 95) even though cultural depictions of domesticity were sometimes grim (Strong-Boag 1987: 93-94) and an unknown number lived lives of quiet desperation. Married men "knew they had a good thing" (Ruth); married women, on the other hand, had few choices and were tied by a decision made in their youth. Nonetheless, the alternative was:

...spinsterhood, *not* an attractive thought.... (Ellen)

Unmarried women were perceived as pitiable, unfulfilled and unhappy, even though past and present scholarship would suggest otherwise (Simon 1987, Strong-Boag 1987, Allen (1989). Women were pressured or encouraged to marry; their parents were concerned that otherwise they might "get into trouble" (Violet: gloss, "become pregnant"). It was "natural" to marry and those who did not marry were:

...very bitter, disappointed old maids.... (Mary)

Thus, these women defined themselves by their role of wife/mother.

How did my informants perceive themselves? As

dependants who were expected to be virtuous, caring, supportive and uncomplaining.⁸ These were the characteristics and attitudes that complemented the primary obligations of wifing-mothering. Certain rights were associated with fulfilling these responsibilities, of course; however, the cluster of attributes associated with this role was subsumed to the core status of dependant. To be a dependant was all-encompassing: it was a social, moral, economic, political and emotional package.

Socially, while these women were aware that their socioeconomic status was derived from their husbands, the women's lives were sequestered within family and in concert with other women. Female friendships were emphasized: church groups, card games and afternoon visiting were the primary social activities:

"I always had neighbours I could visit after my work was done, we would have tea. I talked on the phone just about every day.... (Emily)

Some of the women, particularly those whose husbands were professionals, had more involvement in mixed gatherings (card parties, dinner parties); their hostessing duties were tied partly to their husbands' professional position (i.e., not strictly social), entertaining was one aspect of proper wifing. Socializing among women apparently remained at a relatively superficial level; this generation of women did not bare their souls or express their grievances—the virtuous wife was an uncomplaining wife:

...I don't think that at that time you *ever* talked about what went on at home. Whether you'd be ashamed to talk or whether people didn't do it...I had friends, friends I went to the show with, I belonged to a card club, and friends at church. But I don't think we *ever* talked about our marriages.... (Emily)

These women were morally constrained to be "good" wives and mothers. To be good meant to accept, to make do, to put up with your lot in life. While Luxton's (1980) informants freely shared problems with their friends and neighbours, this social support was not available to my informants; conversations were not necessarily random "chit-chat" or idle chatter, but they were selective:

...You did *not* talk about sex or troubles or criticize your husband.... (Emily)

Indeed, problems were neither admitted to nor discussed and you certainly did not make negative comments about your husband!

...You looked after your family and got your work done and managed with what money you had. You saw that your children were looked after...if there was a problem, you didn't want everyone else to know.... (Emily)

...the better the wife, the less she complained...if she did, heaven help her if her husband found out! (Mary)

This virtue of loyalty was unqualified: a woman was expected to stand by her man no matter what. The informants that I interviewed would heartily endorse "Hannah's" contention that—

...I always honored my menfolks...women should keep their place.... A woman's place is in the home, trying to make a pleasant place for the man she married.... (Gallagher 79)

...it was worse for a wife to walk out than for her husband to beat her up.... (Susan)

Thus, the linked virtues of keeping your place and spousal loyalty were political in nature. The degree of risk of being beaten up is still unknown⁹; the potential, however, was very real for some women and certainly was effective in sustaining loyalty. A proper wife supported her husband in every way, in public and in private. This support included physical nurture:

...if a man works all day, then someone should have dinner ready for him... (Dorothy)

and deference:

...I always deferred to my husband's decisions and opinions. After I was married (at age forty-three), a friend said, "Why do you let *him* make all the decisions when you have always made your own?" I guess that I thought it was just part of being a wife.... (Nancy)

and maintaining face:

...you didn't air your problems.... (Judith)

...I didn't go to work after my first husband died because people would think he hadn't left me enough money.... (Susan)

Indeed, power inequities were rooted in the economics of proper womanhood and this was the area of their lives about which these women most acutely experienced any injustice in their marriages. Several of

the informants indicated that being a dependant was a vulnerable and unenviable status:

...You could be more independent if you didn't depend on your husband for every cent you got...the husband held the purse strings...my husband said he should be boss because he earned the money.... (Emily)

...being dependent was a sore point, it was difficult, but most wives were in the position of being dependent on their husbands. But I spoke up and asked for money...and I asked for joint ownership of the house so I could vote in the municipal elections.... (Constance)

Married women were discouraged, frequently prohibited, from working, sometimes as a moral injunction:

...a man felt demeaned by his wife working.... (Ruth)

Many women had received technical training of some sort and could work as teachers, secretaries or bookkeepers, or nurses. These women could be (meagerly) self-supportive. Women who had not completed their schooling and remained unmarried (but "not by choice", as Emily noted) hired out as housekeeper-companions or nursed relatives or specialized in specific components of housewifery such as dressmaking, cleaning or laundering. Both groups, in effect, performed wifely tasks even though they were not wives. On the other hand, there were some women who entered more fully into the capitalist system and worked as clerks or factory workers; however, they were expected to leave waged work when they married (Joan). (During the wars, of course, restrictions on female involvement in the work force were relaxed.) To be married meant that, whatever else it might entail, you had a right to and a need for economic support, even if this support was stringent. However, this meant assuming the status of economic dependant.

Husbands generally:

...held the purse strings...you want to make him mad? Ask him for some money! (Emily)

This was not always the case, of course, some men were more generous than others; the better off you were, the less likely that your husband was forced to be selfish or, perhaps a better choice of words, the less likely that the man was defensive about his competence as a breadwinner. (There were, of course, stingy well-off men.) Since husbands were the women's source of

economic well-being (or poverty), they were able to convert their economic power into domestic power: the husband was the boss. Even when the wife was in fact the keeper of the purse, this was not necessarily a position of power or even influence but a two-edged sword for, if you could not make ends meet, the fault was in the handling of the finances, not the quantity.

Nonetheless, several of the women did manipulate their situation in order to have some personal funds. For example, one informant

...kept hens, so I always had my *own* money, for clothes and things.... (Susan)

Another informant bought a house with money lent to her by her mother and the rent was hers to personally control (Constance). Two of the informants had openly confronted their husbands with their need for some personal funds to preserve their dignity.

The women who earned wages did not emphasize their dependency status as much as the non-waged women; however, typically, their earnings became part of the household economy over which they had little discretionary control:

..."my money" was mine, I spent it on whatever I wanted *in the household*.... (Edna, emphasis added)

...I only worked a few times when we needed it to make ends meet.... (Judith)

Working full-time did not necessarily correspond to independence: women, by definition, were not independent and their wages were pooled with the household resources (as, indeed, were their husbands' wages). It must be mentioned, however, that the two informants who worked *with* their husbands defined their marriages as fairly egalitarian partnerships, even though one of these women noted that "men *always* were in charge of the money". To some extent, their perception of their marriages supports Westhues's (1988) contention that, even within intimate relationships, reciprocity is economically based.

The one informant who did work independently of her husband throughout their marriage had attained the highest educational level of the informants. Indeed, she noted that her parents expected her to work, that she "went through university *to work*" (Ruth). This woman taught school and, although she had twice-weekly household help, she was not exempt from her domestic responsibilities:

...I was expected to do all his entertaining and everything.... (Ruth)

Ruth derived both "self-esteem" and economic advantages from her career. Although her husband referred to her career as her "little hobby", Ruth did not appear to perceive herself as either liberated or exploited: she described her relationship with her husband as "loving and respectful" (and it is) and she observed that:

...it's women trying to be liberated that destroys marriages—women are more selfish today....

This does not mean that the women who were engaged full-time in wifing and mothering felt subservient (although two explicitly stated that they did); evidently, the lines of power were simply clearer in these situations. The husband was invariably identified as "the boss" by these women and this was congruent with the background cultural assumptions and popular models of marriage in that period.

The fact that the informants initiated discussions of the constraints of dependence indicates the importance of this dimension of their lives. Indeed, marital weakness (rarely rupture) was attributed to one (or more) of three problems by these women: drinking, infidelity, financial problems. These problems were tolerated because the women were dependent on their husbands. The importance of economics supports feminist analyses (e.g., Eichler 1977) of the effects of patriarchy on opportunity structures as well as women's conduct and self-image.

The image of self held by these women is congruent with their politico-economic status of dependant. While there were certainly individual or personal differences, the model of proper womanhood inculcated by Violet's mother was typical:

...my mother went along with everything my dad suggested...she never once asked for anything, she never complained....

And Emily's insight into her enculturation is poignantly expressed:

...the way I was brought up, you were never to talk back, you just *did* what you were told. The nicest thing my mother could say about me was that I never talked back. And you never made any decisions of your own...this was what was wrong with me, I never could make decisions on my own, I always had someone to boss me...I wasn't able, I didn't have the confidence to do anything....

The ideal socialization for a personal dependant.

Discussion

We all mythologize the past. There are few of us so coolly introspective that we consciously recognize the non-obvious relationships between our lives as lived and the sociohistorical context in which they are lived. The purpose of life histories is not simply to transcribe individual biographies, but to demonstrate how the social and the cultural are played out on the personal level, to reveal the dialectical relationship between an individual and her cultural milieu. Ultimately, we must transcend the personal minutiae that people relate to us by integrating biographical facts and sociohistorical facts. In this way, we attempt to lay bare the interplay between human lives and humans' history.

This research was an examination of the lives of fifteen women whose marriages spanned the second and third quarters of the twentieth century. Wifing-mothering was the lifelong occupation of most women at that time and it was experienced as a "calling": to be a wife, to be a mother was not only one's occupation ("housewife") but one's total identity. Wifing and mothering were accomplished within the most "greedy" of institutions, the family.¹⁰ Within their marriages, these women acquiesced to the received definition of woman's reality without anger and also without complete passivity. Retrospectively, they perceive their marriages as sturdier constructions than the unions of their daughters and granddaughters. On the other hand, they are also cognizant of the constraints that were imposed upon them:

You never heard of a woman leaving her husband.... Where could they go? (Violet)

In fact, husbands and wives were stuck with each other in this generation:

...for better, for worse, we took our vows seriously.... (Nell)

And so did the law!

...you never heard of marital problems.... (Amy)

...divorce was a terrible disgrace years ago. You kept up.... (Violet)

And "keeping up" meant that women accepted drunkenness, other women, brutality:

...if a girl went to her parents, she was sent back.... (Violet)

...well, she likely had support and, if she left him with four children, what could she do? (Susan)

These women accepted these conditions (as do many women today) because, for the most part, they had no other choice. And, in hindsight, they accepted what we now refer to as "psychological abuse". Several informants observed that women of their generation were subjected to (and accepted) "demeaning comments" (Nancy):

...putting down was the most common form of abuse.... (Ruth)

...he always put me down, he was like that—he wanted to have control.... (Emily)

As one woman noted:

...women's lib has caused a lot of trouble, but I guess we have to stick up for the women, they were driven to it.... (Mary)

Time after time, the women volunteered that they had very little choice in the direction of their lives. This condition of limited choice was associated with the fact that, in their time period, personal happiness or affective individualism was neither the primary motivating factor for conduct (particularly women's conduct) nor the central cultural value. In fact, the fundamental character flaw for a woman was selfishness: women were expected to be selflessly devoted to the well-being of their greedy families.¹¹

...happiness didn't enter into it.... (Mary)

...you didn't think about being happy.... I never wondered about being happy or not, not being pregnant was important.... (Emily)

Women did not speak publicly of private matters and, while there were rumours and sometimes separate bedrooms, people stuck it out. They had no other choice and so they accepted their lots with quiet, uncomplaining dignity, sometimes from the invalid's couch, more often with acceptance and sometimes admirable courage.

Analysis

That was a woman's satisfaction.... (Mary)

This study presents only preliminary findings for a possibly larger examination of how women fared within

their marriages during the second quarter of this century. It is essential to retain an awareness of two constraints on research. First, "what is easy to find out is not always important to know" (Parr *Childhood and Family*:9): for example, we know that husbands and wives lived together (willingly and unwillingly, contentedly and discontentedly)—that is easy; yet, the nature of the experienced relationship evades us. Second, we must not erroneously assume that present family life implies or replicates past family life (Parr *Childhood and Family*:8): this was the particular sociological generation of wives for whom the "feminine mystique" was the model of proper womanhood (Cowan 1976) and the bourgeois, patriarchal family—as-lived was often experienced as a comfortable, reciprocal relationship. For example, a student of mine commented in a paper:

...I remember us serving my father tea and a snack or anything he wanted at the time because he got such joy from it, but he never demanded service—the love we received from that man made us want to spoil him, so we served him. There is a reciprocity in this serving that changes the meaning of the word to mean sharing.... (Bilec 1991, by permission)

Keeping these two provisos in mind, do we believe my informant when they contend that their marriages were characterized by more mutuality and less violence than today's unions?

Yes. No.

Yes. These women were so thoroughly inculcated with the feminine mystique of their sociological generation that conformity to their social role provided the foundation for their self-esteem. Non-conformity was viewed harshly: bitter spinsters were pitied, runaway wives were castigated. Conformity was reinforced by the fact that there were few other choices available for women of this generation; it was supported and validated by an ethic that viewed wifing—mothering as an honorable calling. Importantly, socialization was consistent with adult expectations (this is what sociologists refer to as successful "anticipatory socialization"). Moreover, these women could practise preventative socialization: they were in a position to instill the morality that "gentlemen did not hit ladies" (Mary)¹². Further, the weak association of personal happiness with one's identity means that conformity to social expectations "was a woman's satisfaction". This is congruent with Berger's (164–165) contention that, knowing your place in society, knowing your social role, may provide you with a stable sense of identity but must not be confused with happiness. While the women that I interviewed had a strong sense of who they were, personal happiness was peripheral to their concerns. If

proper manhood was as thoroughly inculcated as proper womanhood, the female–male roles would indeed be complementary, providing a sense of mutuality, shared concerns, and joint enterprise. At that time, of course, violence *per se* was not as ubiquitous as it is today.

No. While two-thirds of my small group of informants had knowledge of or had heard rumors of wife abuse, both the subject and the victim were consciously avoided:

...women did not help other women, they were afraid that their husband would find out that they were taking sides...you had to be very careful, very cautious, you *avoided* a woman when she needed your help.... (Mary)

...sometimes there were rumors...probably those things were just put on the back-burner, I guess.... (Edna)

Time and time again, these women noted that women had no other choice but to remain in their marriages, to "make the best of it." This was particularly true of women who were brutalized. When I asked about options for women who were abused, the responses were depressingly similar:

What could they do?
Where could they go?
Who would support her?
What choice did they have?

This would suggest that women's status as dependant within a context of limited choice pervaded their lives and determined the familiar "conspiracy of silence" redefined as a code of loyalty.

Among the Brazilian Mundurucu (Murphy and Murphy 1974), the threat of gang rape is apparently sufficient to maintain orderly female conduct. Gang rape is an institutionalized form of punishment for wayward wives. Perhaps it is not too farfetched to suggest that the threat of violence (and shame, possibly withdrawal of economic support) was involved in maintaining proper womanhood during the second quarter of this century. "Cruelty" was narrowly defined, difficult to prove and a major cause of marital breakdown in the United States (Mowrer 1972) during this time. Potential violence is a potent enforcer of norms.

Berger (1974: 165) has observed that:

Identity is grounded in socialization. That socialization takes place within an institutional context, which has a particular history. Thus, identity is finally grounded in history, *has* a history or, if one prefers, is a historical

product...every individual biography makes sense as part of a larger chronology....

The received knowledge of proper womanhood that characterized the biographies of these women was formulated within a historical context in which women were oriented to the maintenance of relationships; failed relationships were female failures. Abusive relationships were clearly faulty; shame and helplessness, yesterday as today, silenced both the victim and her potential allies.

Concluding Comments

Parr (1985: 44) has observed that:

...at any moment within families the family is experienced by members of different generations in very different ways....

The daughters and the granddaughters of these women, with the intense clarity associated with hindsight, might contend that these women do not represent themselves *as women* but as male-defined ladies, confined as they are within the conceptual models of early twentieth century proper womanhood. Thus, hindsight (and rationalization) suggest oppression and we must wonder if these are the voices of men speaking through women. Perhaps. The context of their lives was created, defined by men. Their lives were quite literally in the hands of men.

Ten of the women in this study acknowledged that they were aware of wife abuse, although they did not think that it was a common female experience and certainly not as prevalent as they perceive battering to be today.

The lived, organic experiences of these women, which differ so profoundly (yet not totally) from our own, while not entirely of their making, have been recreated in their own voices. The women with whom I spoke recognized the historical distinctiveness of the marital experiences of yesterday and today. They observed that their marriages were cooperative "partnerships" (Ruth) directed to caring for the family and rearing their offspring although the women spoke little of childrearing except as marital glue:¹³

...children kept a marriage together.... (Ruth)

...working together, in whatever way, kept a marriage together, even if that meant keeping the household while the man was at work.... (Mary)

...people sometimes stayed together for the children's sake.... (Judith)

and as a form of social control—

...if [boys, men] were brought up right, they wouldn't beat women.... (Susan)

...a gentleman did not hit a lady, they had greater respect for women in those days...boys were taught not to hurt girls.... (Mary)

...I don't think there was much hitting in those days, much cruelty.... (Violet)

The most striking differences between today and yesterday have been enormously inflated emphasis on personal happiness, not just as an expectation, but as a right, and the enlarged compass of women's activities:

...we had different expectations, happiness didn't enter into it...but people don't know what happiness is, my granddaughter got a divorce because she was "not as happy as I want to be".... (Mary)

...you didn't think about being happy, you didn't say you weren't...you had no other choice, that's all you had.... (Emily)

Now, what is the *significance* of these life histories? First, these women conformed, but not blindly: they were aware of the constraints on their behavior and of the limited choices that they confronted and they took these factors into account as they negotiated and re-negotiated their lives. Second, we can observe how the virtues of proper womanhood were assimilated to the code of loyalty which legitimized and supported the patriarchal ideology. Third, I would suggest that these women who have had to keep their own counsel—uncomplainingly—have broken their silence here, that they are speaking in the female idiom, even if their voices differ from contemporary discourse.

In fine, these women provided a text of their lives played out in a context of both limited choice and circumscribed personal expectations. Their voices resonated with the "authority of experience", couched in the idiom of woman and, through the text of their lives, these women have become the subjects of their narration and, in a very real sense, the authors of this paper.¹⁴

Notes

1. I would like to acknowledge the support of the University of Waterloo for this research which was accomplished under the supervision of Professor Kenneth Westhues, Department of Sociology.
2. This is a very fragile population—three of the informants have died since this study was completed in the Fall of 1990.
3. Husbands' occupations: salesman, warehouse foreman, minister, laborer, barber, small business owner, military, farmer.
4. Husbands' occupations: sales (3), accountants (2), university professor, engineer.
5. Deceased.
6. Deceased.
7. Deceased.
8. This was the ideal; men, of course, also had a constellation of ideal attributes that characterized the male breadwinner-husband role.
9. This was the focus of the original study where this issue is addressed in greater detail.
10. Coser (1974) included the family in his discussion of the "greedy institutions" which are characterized by demands for total loyalty, devotion, energy.
11. While this paper addresses women, a good argument could be made for the limited choices for the men who were also enmeshed in these greedy families.
12. This suggests that notions of a class-bias relative to battering (inverse relationship) at this time could be related to the fact that lower-class women were more likely to work out, thus giving them less control over socialization processes. If this study is expanded, we will explore the class relationship between physical and psychological forms of abuse (cf. Elias 1978).
13. This could be due to the particular phrasing of the questions and to the fact that women took the childcare component so very much for granted.
14. A shorter version of this paper was read by the informants and their responses could be summarized by the phrase "positive assent".

Works Cited

- Allen, Katherine R. *Single Women/Family Ties. Life Histories of Older Women*. Sage Publications, 1989.
- Berger, Peter L. 1974 "Modern Identity: Crisis and Continuity." *The Cultural Drama. Modern Identities and Social Ferment*. Ed. W.S. Dillon. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1974. 158-181.
- Bilec, L. A. "Life History Assignment." Unpub. Ms. Sociology 206, University of Waterloo, 1991.
- Cooley, C. H. *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Scribner's, 1902.
- Coser, Lewis A. *Greedy Institutions: Patterns of Individual Commitment*. New York: The Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan, 1974.
- Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. "Two Washes in the Morning and a Bridge Party at Night: The American Housewife between the Wars." *Women's Studies* 3, 2 (1976): 147-172.
- Eichler, Margrit. "Women as Personal Dependents." *Women in Canada*. Ed. M. Stephenson. Rev. ed. Don Mills: General Publishing Co., 1977. 51-69.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners*. New York: Urizen Books, 1978.
- Gallagher, Dorothy. *Hannah's Daughters: Six Generations of an American Family, 1876-1976*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1976.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn G. *Writing a Woman's Life*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1988.
- Luxton, Meg. *More Than a Labour of Love*. Toronto: The Women's Press, 1980.
- Mannheim, Karl. *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. Ed. P. Kecskemati. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952.
- Mowrer, Ernest R. *Family Disorganization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972 [1927].
- Murphy, Yolanda and Robert Murphy. *Women of the Forest*. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Parr, Joy. "Nature and Hierarchy: Reflections on Writing the History of Women and Children." *Atlantis* 11, 1 (1985): 39-44.

- Parr, Joy, ed. *Childhood and Family in Canadian History*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.
- Simon, Barbara Levy. *Never Married Women*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.
- Strong-Boag, Veronica. *The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919-1939*. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1988.
- Vipond, Mary. "The Image of Women in Mass Circulation Magazines in the 1920s." *The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History*. Ed. S. Trofimenkoff and A. Prentice. Vol. 1. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977. 116-124.
- Westhues, Kenneth. "The Main Social Problem". Paper presented at a Colloquium in the Department of Sociology, University of Western Ontario, 1988.