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ABSTRACT

Farm women in Western rural societies make an invaluable contribution to farming and farming communities. However, this contribution is underrepresented in agri-industry. Instead, farm women are predominantly associated with traditional support and service identities, such as carers and farm helpers. This thesis argues that farming women's organisations create spaces and strategic bases from which farm women may either maintain hegemonic service identities or challenge these through the performance of alternative identities. It addresses questions about the contexts in which farming women's organisations operate; the hegemonic and alternative identities farming women's organisations make available to members; the identities farm women subsequently recognise; and the way in which these identities are maintained or challenged by the collective action of the organisations.

This study explores the identities and action of farm women and their organisations, in Australia, Canada and New Zealand. It constructs an analytical framework that enables an analysis of rurality, narrative identities, organisational collectivity and political action. This framework provides the basis for a feminist methodology which incorporates multiple, and predominantly, qualitative methods. Farm women members and representatives participated in the research through organisational semi-structured interviews, questionnaires and subsequent in-depth interviews. Data were used to determine collective identity, organisational type, narrative identities, and leadership as a form of collective action.

The results indicated that farming women's organisations might be placed on a continuum based on a number of dimensions. This continuum acknowledged, but also blurred the existing binary between established organisations and newer networks. The collective identities of the organisations indicated that both the internalised and externalised constructions of collective identity are dynamic, and influence the narrative identities of farm women and their actions. Overall, members of the established organisations acknowledged and performed service identities, and undertook leadership in a feminised context, characterised by reactive communality. In contrast, members of the newer networks recognised and expressed predominantly occupational identities, and undertook leadership in a masculinised context, characterised by agentic competence. Exceptions to this, however, indicated that certain established organisations and newer networks might be placed towards the middle of this continuum, indicating a need to move beyond a binary categorisation of farming women's organisations.

In sum, the thesis has demonstrated that the spaces and practices that farming women's organisations create are influential in maintaining or challenging ontological narratives which have informed dominant notions of rurality, including the hegemonic, traditional, service identities for farm women.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accident Compensation Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACWW</td>
<td>Associated Country Women of the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture ITO</td>
<td>Agriculture Industry Training Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWB</td>
<td>Australian Wheat Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWiA</td>
<td>Australian Women in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADB</td>
<td>Clutha Agricultural Development Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFFO</td>
<td>Christian Farmers’ Federation of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFW</td>
<td>Concerned Farm Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFWN</td>
<td>Canadian Farm Women’s Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVWiA</td>
<td>Central Victorian Women in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWWA</td>
<td>Country Women’s Association of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWWA</td>
<td>Country Women’s Association of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td>Country Women’s Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFO</td>
<td>Dairy Farmers of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGF</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWIC</td>
<td>Federated Women’s Institutes of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWIO</td>
<td>Federated Women’s Institutes of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWIO</td>
<td>Junior Women’s Institutes of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nr</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWD</td>
<td>Network for Women in Dairying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZDB</td>
<td>New Zealand Dairy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZMB</td>
<td>New Zealand Meat Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZWB</td>
<td>New Zealand Wool Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCA</td>
<td>Ontario Cattlemen’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFA</td>
<td>Ontario Federation of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFVGA</td>
<td>Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFWN</td>
<td>Ontario Farm Women’s Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMAFRA</td>
<td>Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSH</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>Pork Council of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCW</td>
<td>Positively Clutha Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMT</td>
<td>Resource Mobilisation Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWNZ</td>
<td>Rural Women New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWRC</td>
<td>Rural Women’s Research Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDV</td>
<td>United Dairyfarmers of Victoria</td>
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<tr>
<td>VFF</td>
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<td>WDFF</td>
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<tr>
<td>WSA</td>
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GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Established organisation - traditional, hierarchically structured organisation, focusing upon domestic and community-based identities for farm women.

Narrative identity – the way in which a person characterises themselves; constructed through social action, institutions and structures (Somers, 1992: 606), and embedded within patterns of relationships that shift over time and space.

Newer network – informal, flat structured organisations, focusing upon farm and agri-industry-based identities for farm women.

Ontological narratives - the stories people use to make sense of, and act in, their lives. Organisations and institutions, to construct stories conducive to their own objectives, may selectively appropriate these narratives. Hence, some ontological narratives are more powerful and influential than others.

Organisational identity – constructed through an interactive and dynamic process. Members’ actions, and the spaces they act in, define an organisation’s collective identity. This is examined in Chapter Two, and again in Chapters Four and Five. Organisational identity has both internal and external determinatives. Internally, it is constructed through formation, structure, and membership characteristics and incentives. Externally, it is constructed by members, others (farm women), and apparatuses of social control (media).

Organisational type - based on Melucci’s (1996) analysis of collective action. Particular types of organisations in different relational settings produce differing types of collective action. Six factors are used to determine organisational type: solidarity or aggregation, consensus or conflict, and a maintaining or breaching of system’s limits.

Practico-inert structures – material objects and constraining structures, which are held in common by those recognising a similar serialised condition. For example, family farms, farm households, inheritance patterns, division of labour, physical and social isolation, mainstream farming organisations, the rural service industry. Further definitions and applications given in Sections 2.3.2, 4.2 and 8.1.

Social movement – forms of organisations that seek social and / or political change and challenge conventional ways of seeing the world (Kenny, 1994; Rowbotham, 1992; Painter, 1995). See Section 2.4.2 for further detail.
Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Farming Women’s Organisations: Questions of Rurality, Identity, Organisations and Political Action

In recent decades farm women have started to change the visible nature of who it is that farms in Western nations; challenging stereotypes in agri-industry, and creating new spaces in which to act as legitimate players and partners in farming. This thesis examines the role of farming women’s organisations and networks\(^1\) in the creation of these new spaces from which to challenge hegemonic assumptions regarding farm women’s identities in Western rural societies. Both established and newer network-style farming women’s organisations are investigated through case studies in three countries. The collective identities of these organisations are determined, and through an analysis of members’ narrative identities and political action, it is established that some organisations are creating spaces and a structural base for the maintenance of hegemonic identities for farm women, while others are challenging them.

In addressing the differences between these organisations, and the implications for maintenance or ‘reconstruction’ of farm women’s identities, this thesis draws upon much of the research undertaken in the last twenty years which details, and makes visible, the contribution farm women have made to both farm businesses and the wider agri-industry. This literature has focused on work, decision making on farms and leadership participation in mainstream women’s farming organisations (see Alston, 1995b; Gasson, 1980; Keating and Little, 1994; Teather, 1996a, 1996b). Farm women themselves, through economic necessity and a desire to view and legitimise farming as a career for women, have sought recognition for their substantial roles in the farming industry (see OFWN, 1992 and RWRC, 1998). But farm women still remain “othered” in the farming industry as popular discourses and narratives in

---

\(^1\) The definitions of, and differences between, established organisations and newer networks are dealt with more extensively in Chapter Two. Definitions of these two types of farming women’s organisations arise from existing literature (Carbert, 1996; Haney and Miller, 1991; Mackenzie, 1994; Shortall, 1994; Teather, 1996a, 1996b). Established organisations are considered to be traditional, hierarchically structured organisations, focusing upon domestic and community-based identities for farm women. In contrast, newer networks are classified as farming women’s organisations, which are informal, flat structured, and focus upon farm and agri-industry-based identities for farm women.

Previous research in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States of America has investigated the function of established farming women’s organisations in providing a social network for rural communities and a political lobbying vehicle for rural women and children (Carbert, 1996; Haney and Miller, 1991; Hughes, 1997a, 1997b; Teather, 1992; 1994b, 1996a, 1996b). More recent research has explored the emergence and growth of newer network-based organisations that offer a different function for farm women than did their predecessors (Grace, 1997; Liepins, 1995, 1998b; Mackenzie, 1992, 1994). To date this field of research has focused on how these networks have challenged the popular discourses and narratives regarding farm women’s positions in agri-industry and its politics. This thesis draws on these past works, particularly in terms of choosing the case study areas and the organisations for investigation. However, it also extends this literature in that it includes a closer investigation of notions of identity and political participation. Organisational collective identities, farm women’s narrative identities and leadership as a form of collective action are analysed to determine the spaces created by organisations for the recognition of contrasting identities. The thesis compares and contrasts identities and the resulting performance of collective action not only between countries but also between established organisations and newer networks.

In regard to farming women’s organisations, earlier observations and analyses by Teather (1996a, 1996b), Liepins (1998b), Mackenzie (1994), Shortall (2001), Grace (1997) and Alston (2000) are drawn upon in this research. These researchers have undertaken extensive investigations into various farming women’s organisations and subsequent action in Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Their work highlights the need for more research on the identities of farm women. Teather, alone, has looked at organisations in all three countries. She has established a precedent, which I have followed with this more in-depth doctoral research, for making comparisons between Australia, Canada and New Zealand. These three countries share broad similarities with gender relations circulating in other Western countries, including the United
Kingdom and the United States of America. However, these three, with similar settler histories and farming societies make for more productive comparison.

Teather’s work highlights the contrasting formation, structure and key objectives of the organisations (1996a, 1996b). However, by focusing upon the notion of ‘collective identity’ this thesis extends our thinking on the nature and effect of such organisations. It does so by critically analysing the identities adopted, and spaces created by farming women's organisations; considering the impact of these identities and spaces for farm women and collective action. In particular, this focus follows Teather’s (1996a) suggestion that researchers need to consider the role of these organisations in constructing gendered meanings. At the time of Teather’s work there were no functioning networks in New Zealand, and this has highlighted the need to investigate New Zealand-based networks. In doing so, this thesis extends upon her research, not only by analysing collective identity and how it impacts upon narrative identities and collective action, but by also providing a timely update on the case study organisations in New Zealand, Australia and Canada.

Liepins (1998b, 1999) and Mackenzie (1992, 1994), investigating newer network style organisations in Australia and Canada respectively, have indicated the importance of these networks in the construction of, and structural base for, an alternative identity for farm women; one which gives farm women a more active position in agri-industry politics. Liepins’ and Mackenzie’s work on newer networks in Australia and Canada fills a lacuna in research surrounding farm women’s developing political activism. Their work highlights the need to investigate the success of these networks, and this thesis extends upon their work, not only by revisitation, but also by comparing the new organisations’ impact and success with established organisations in each case study area. While Liepins and Mackenzie only investigated newer organisations, this thesis draws established organisations and newer networks together in an analysis of identity, organisations and collective action. Alston (2000) argues that women’s networks are invaluable points of resistance to
gendered leadership in agri-industry\textsuperscript{2}. The fieldwork undertaken in this thesis is complementary to that of Alston, but also enables a comparison between established organisations and newer networks, as well as between three countries. It seeks to understand how each organisation either maintains or challenges hegemonic identities for farm women and the leadership each organisation influences and encourages. Hence, this thesis looks at the function of these farming women's organisations in the construction of farming women’s collective identity.

The importance of farming women’s organisations in undertaking this role is recognized in rural studies. Brandth and Haugen (1997) identify the major role women’s organisations play in constructing farm women’s identity. They claim that the “politics of organisations are designed according to how they understand themselves and the members they want to attract and recruit.” (Brandth and Haugen, 1997: 327). Similarly, women are attracted to an organisation that they perceive shares their own identity (p328). Traditionally, these organisations have existed alongside mainstream farming organisations in a complementary fashion. Their role as such has been to provide social and community-based functions (Car bert, 1996; Haney and Miller, 1991; Hughes, 1997a, 1997b; Teather, 1992; 1994a, 1996a, 1996b), as opposed to the production-based lobbying, and scientific and technical objectives of organisations that have a predominantly male membership. This, I believe, has influenced and limited the identities available to women on farms in Western countries. The enhancement of mainstream male-dominated farming organisations has traditionally been the domain of the established women’s organisations, and this thesis’ investigation of these organisations establishes a link between the service-based collective identity of established organisations and traditional service identities for farm women. In contrast, analysis of the collective identity of newer networks and their members’ narrative identities indicate a link between an agri-industry focused collective identity and alternative occupational-based identities for farm women.

\textsuperscript{2} Recent work by Sally Shortall (2001) argues that farming women's organisations reinforce gender divisions within agri-industry. This thesis presents a different argument; that farming women's organisations can have a function in challenging the hegemonic identities that limit women from acting in agri-industry, and in encouraging leadership within mainstream farming organisations. This is addressed in Chapter Two, section 2.5.
In sum, this thesis extends previous work by Teather, Alston, Liepins and Mackenzie, in particular, by investigating established organisations and newer networks in three countries, examining the collective identities and spaces constructed for the performance of collective action. The analytical framework supporting the thesis is developed by four sets of literature that address: rurality, identity, organisational theory, and political action. The thesis establishes a link between these four sets of theory and previous empirical work. It commences with a recognition of the concept of rurality, its multiple constructions, and how these, in turn, underpin the identities available to farm women. Recent rural studies literature has reintroduced and redefined the concept of rurality (see, for example, Cloke and Milbourne, 1992; Halfacree, 1993; Hughes, 1997a and 1997b; Whatmore et al, 1994) as an imagined place of particular discourses and narratives which are not fixed or unchanging. Hughes, for example, explains that rurality is “constructed through social and cultural practices which have given [rurality] meaning in everyday life.” (Hughes, 1997a: 124). In this way, we can see that in a particular time and place, certain practices or popular discourses create a particular rurality. Popular discourses in Western societies in recent times have remained gendered, with specific hegemonic identities promoted for men and women (Hughes, 1997b; Little, 2002). This thesis contends that ‘contemporary rurality’ in Western societies, supports, and is supported by, certain social institutions, relations and practices, which in turn support or deter particular identities for farm women. Hence, rurality acts as a filter to identities, and can be used to discourage or censor alternative identities. The concept of rurality plays an integral, but underlying, part in this thesis, as it is rurality and the social institutions, relations and practices associated with it in three different countries, that are examined to ascertain whether particular farming women’s organisations are maintaining or challenging the identities available to farm women.

This study also has drawn upon and extended existing concepts of identity for farm women, with regard to identity (re)construction, and the hegemonic and alternative identities available to farm women. Drawing upon Somers’ (1992) approach to ‘narrative identity’ and Young’s (1994) articulation of ‘seriality’, an analytical framework for the construction and reconstruction of the multiple identities of farm women is developed. Somers’ (1992) theory of ontological narratives, the stories which people use to make sense of, and act in, their lives in particular times and
places (narrative identity), suggests that individuals may only select from narratives supported by public, cultural and institutional narratives. For farm women the dominant ontological narratives from which they may select are controlled by the narratives supporting rurality. Iris Young’s (1994) work prompts the consideration of farm women as a seriality; a serial from which a social collective may be formed, and act, in response to particular material conditions (ontological narratives) which limit the ways in which the members see themselves (narrative identity). This recognition of seriality may lead to resistance towards, and an attempt at the reconstruction of, the ontological narratives (rurality, in the case of farm women), which contextualises identity formation.

This thesis explores the range of contemporary identities that are available to farm women. Previous research into identities of Western farm women is reviewed, enabling the identification of two ‘themes’ of farm women identities – service and occupational. Three ‘identities’ are established in each category: carer, farm helper, and community worker are contained in the service category; and farmer, off-farm worker, and industry actor are included in the occupational category. As will be shown in Chapter Two, I have established a distinctive socio-spatial demarcation in my framework between the categories. Service identities are placed in the private/service arena, and the occupational identities in the public/industry arena. However, as will be discussed in Section 2.5.3, it should be noted from the start that while this public/private split may be theoretically possible, and also common in popular discourse, it is not so simple or uncomplicated in the day to day life and choices of farm women. The multiplicity of farm women’s identities is acknowledged and paralleled by the many arenas of action in which they and their organisations act.

Focusing thirdly on organisational theory, this thesis recognises the importance of farming women’s organisations in creating spaces and a structural base for constructing a collective identity farm women (see, for example, Brandth and Haugen, 1997; Teather, 1996a). The work of these women and others shows the development of two types of farming women’s organisations in Western countries: established organisations and newer network-based organisations. Research on various farming women’s organisations highlights the need to consider a number of ‘dimensions’ of collective action (after Melucci, 1996). In this case, the ‘dimensions’ of farming
women's organisations include formation, structure, membership characteristics and incentives in analysing these organisations and the spaces for action which they create (Liepins, 1995; Mackenzie, 1994; Teather, 1992, 1994b, 1996b). However, while research has focused on farming women's organisations, little academic work has been undertaken in the genre of organisational theory that focuses on not-for-profit, women only organisations. Most organisational theory focuses on corporate and profit-making business, with gender analyses focused frequently upon women’s career development and harassment. This thesis provides an alternative analysis of organisations structured in three parts. Drawing upon work by Atwater (1995) and Kenny (1994) an analysis of voluntary organisations is based on organisational characteristics and social context. Analysis of networks and social movements based upon work by Foy (1985), Grace (1997), Melucci (1996) and Painter (1995), enables a spatial and temporal contrast with formalised voluntary organisations. The work of Melucci (1996) is further drawn upon in creating an analysis of organisational type, and in investigating the processes of collective identity formation and collective action.

Finally, this study examines the collective or political action of organisations, drawing on traditional and feminist theories of power structures and participation. Dominant traditions in Western political thought have placed men and women in different and dichotomous spheres of political interest and action. The placement of women in the private sphere has had considerable impact on women’s involvement in political action, and indeed what is constructed as political action (Ackelsberg, 1988; Morgen and Bookman, 1988; Okin, 1998; Phillips, 1998; Squires, 2000). Feminist theorists have recognised and vocalised the need to reconceptualise political action to include social institutions, relations and practices that are part of everyday life (Morgen and Bookman, 1988; Abrahams, 1992). In uncovering the political action of women, feminist theorists suggest we must look beyond the public sphere to a multiplicity of scales, including the local and private (Staeheli and Cope, 1994). Recognition of farm women’s identities as multiple has extended to the recognition that the localities of farming women’s organisations’ action are multiple and varied (in particular, see Liepins, 1998a). This thesis investigates those spheres of action in three different contexts, and determines how the actions challenge or maintain farm women’s collective identity.
To conclude, this thesis draws from and contributes to each of these four sets of literature. By determining the factors that construct rurality in each place at a particular time, and by then determining how everyday political collective action can maintain or challenge that rurality, it provides a practical basis from which we may analyse farm women’s challenge to hegemonic rural gender identities. Recognition of hegemonic and alternative identities of farm women further adds to the academic literature on farm women, and adds a new dimension on the role of farming women’s organisations in the construction of this multiplicity of identities. By closely examining and contrasting the nature and characteristics of a number of farming women’s organisations and networks, this thesis adds to the existing literature focusing on not-for-profit organisations, where gender within the organisation is not of concern, but where the gendering of the complete organisation may affect collective action. Finally, this thesis supports feminist calls to reconceptualise political action, by highlighting the everyday nature of farm women’s political action, and its effectiveness in maintaining or challenging hegemonic identities for farm women.

1.2 Research Questions

The aim of this thesis is to determine the ways in which farming women’s organisations maintain or challenge hegemonic identities for farm women. In determining this, my research has posed four questions. First, what are the contexts within which farming women's organisations operate? This question enabled the investigation of the social and material practices, relations and institutions that inform and direct the gendered performance of everyday life in rural societies. It allows for an analysis of the contemporary ruralities in New Zealand, Australia and Canada that have influenced the formation of farming women's organisations.

Second, what hegemonic and alternative identities do farming women’s organisations make available to their members? This question focused specifically on organisational collective identity and allowed for a determination of the type of spaces and structural bases each organisation creates for the recognition of identities by their members. Analysis for this question drew upon identity theories such as narrativity and seriality,
and also organisational theories regarding voluntary organisations, networks and social movements.

Third, what hegemonic and alternative identities are recognised by farm women? This question supported an exploration of identities that members of each organisation choose for themselves. Farm women have multiple identities; however, not all farm women place similar importance on these identities. This question supported the idea that certain identities are given more importance by members of particular organisations, and that this recognition is influenced by wider ontological narratives circulating in rural societies. Literature focusing on rurality and identities has shown the strong link between ontological narratives circulating in rurality and the dominance of particular narrative identities for farm women.

This leads onto the fourth question, which asked how hegemonic identities are maintained or challenged by the collective action of these organisations? This thesis establishes a link between the collective identity of an organisation and the nature of its collective action – actual activities and issues promoted to members and the arena in which the action takes place. In relation to this question, and in recognition of feminist calls for a reconceptualisation of political action, leadership is explored; with consideration given to how leadership by members of particular organisations is influenced and constructed by the narrative identities they choose for themselves, and whether collective action takes place in the arenas of community or agri-industry.

1.3 Scope

While this thesis is a broader and more detailed multi-organisation study than has previously been attempted in rural feminist studies, it nevertheless required some delineation of practical dimensions, boundaries and timeframes. The fieldwork for this research on farming women's organisations took place in New Zealand, Australia and Canada during the period 1998-2000. Four case study areas were chosen for investigation. One established organisation and one newer network organisation within each area were studied. In Canada, these included the Federated Women’s Institutes of Ontario (FWIO) and the Ontario Farm Women’s Network (OFWN); in Australia, the Country Women’s Association of Victoria (CWAV) and Central
Victorian Women in Agriculture (CVWiA) were investigated; in New Zealand, Rural Women New Zealand (RWNZ)\(^3\) was studied in two case study areas – Otago and the Waikato, and Positively Clutha Women (PCW) and the Network for Women in Dairying (NWD) were also investigated in Otago and the Waikato regions, respectively.

Members from each organisation were invited to take part in the research which employed both qualitative and quantitative methods. Questionnaires, interviews and media analyses were used to collect data, which was analysed using a variety of qualitative and quantitative means, detailed in Chapter Three and Appendix A. The primary research has focused on the organisations’ and members’ actions in 1998-2000. Secondary data collection has included a media analysis, focusing on actions and images presented over the previous decade, and the analysis of organisational literature, in particular of the established organisations.

### 1.4 Thesis Outline

This thesis is presented in eight chapters that explore the function of farming women’s organisations in maintaining or challenging the multiple identities of farm women. Chapter Two provides a review of theory and presents an analytical framework that has guided the interpretation of the research results. As noted in Section 1.1, four literatures are considered. First, the gendered nature of rurality is noted, especially how this gendering supports/deters particular social relations and practices is discussed. This leads into an engagement with identity theory, in order to conceptualise farm women’s identities. Third, the framework draws on organisational theory, relating this to farm women’s organisations and networks. Finally, the chapter examines leadership and political action theories, with an emphasis on the consideration of spheres of action for farming women’s organisations and networks. The analytical framework presented in Chapter Two informs and then supports the argument presented in Chapters Four to Seven.

---

\(^3\) Until late 1999, RWNZ was known as Women’s Division Federated Farmers (Wdff), and as such was often, mistakenly, seen as a women’s branch of a New Zealand mainstream farming organisation, Federated Farmers. The name change occurred during the course of this research, and is relevant to RWNZ collective identity. This is discussed in Section 4.5.3.
Chapter Three outlines the methodology employed in this research. It begins with a focus on its feminist and situated nature and identifies how this has influenced the data collection, analysis and reporting. The case study organisations are introduced and a rationale for their inclusion is elaborated. The adopted qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods are outlined, including a discussion of how my positionality as a feminist researcher has influenced methodological decisions made.

Chapters Four to Eight present and discuss arguments resulting from this study. Chapters Four and Five focus on the construction of organisational collective identity noting how this relates to the arena/s within which each organisation creates spaces for the recognition and performance of identities by farm women. Chapter Four presents the social practices, relations and institutions which construct rurality in each of the case study areas, and also focuses upon generational differences present at the time of formation. The chapter continues by specifically examining internal dimensions of collective identity for each case study organisation (including their formation, structure and membership characteristics and incentives). The chapter closes by establishing an organisational type for each organisation.

Chapter Five complements the previous chapter in its analysis of external dimensions of organisational collective identity. It shows that organisations can be understood / recognised by external parties and in this case the views of members⁴, other farm women and the media are considered. Drawing upon Chapter Four, it concludes with a determination of each organisation’s collective identity, arguing that this collective identity impacts upon the identities recognised by farm women members and their collective action.

Chapter Six analyses the identities and spaces created by the case study organisations for the recognition and performance of hegemonic and alternative identities by members. The results present a picture of the importance placed upon, and recognition give to, particular identities by members of particular organisations. The chapter

⁴ Members are viewed as external to the organisation (Melucci, 1996) as the views of the organisation are what attracts them to join, or in some cases, discontinue membership, or seek fulfilment elsewhere. This is elaborated upon in Sections 2.4.3 and 5.2.
Chapter One

Introduction

continues by examining the differences between the identities important to certain farm women and the importance they consider is placed on these identities by external groups. The chapter concludes by arguing that there is a strong link between organisational collective identity, specifically organisational type, the circulation of ontological narratives, and the narrative identities recognised and enacted by farm women.

Leadership as a form of collective action is explored in Chapter Seven. An examination of the manifestation of leadership in the case studies, and other organisations, indicates a prevalence of particular forms of leadership amongst members of certain organisations. The impact of this collective action is determined by the positioning experienced by farm women with regard to wider ontological narratives informing their leadership actions. The chapter concludes by questioning the need for everyday political action to be placed in the masculinised arena of agri-industry for it to challenge hegemonic identities for farm women.

Finally, Chapter Eight syntheses the arguments established in the previous four chapters, integrating them with the analytical framework presented in Chapter Two. It continues by proposing the contributions this research and its findings make to academic debate. Finally, the chapter recognises the limitations of this study and the possibilities for future research.
Chapter Two: Analytical Framework

2.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the question of how to analyse the role of farm women's organisations in maintaining or reconstructing farm women's identity, through collective identity and collective action, exemplified by participation in leadership. It explores recent theories of, and research on, rurality, identity, social movements and organisations, and political action, and builds a four part analytical framework. Recent research and theories of rurality are reviewed, enabling an assessment of contemporary rural social practices, relations and institutions that determine identities available to farm women. This, and other rural research, allows an examination of the evolvement of farm women's identity. Feminist identity theories assist in determining how these identities may be maintained or challenged. The chapter, in considering the role of farm women's organisations in this identity construction, identifies conceptual tools for analysing the structures and objectives that construct collective identity. Lastly, the chapter explores the idea of farming women's organisations creating spaces for collective action, drawing upon previous research and feminist political action theory.

Alongside the materiality of farm life, rurality is presented as a cultural construct, created and conceptualised from lay, popular, and institutional discourse. These may inhibit or enhance the identities available to farm women. Section 2.2 reviews recent work on rurality, particularly in the United Kingdom, but also in Australia, Canada and New Zealand; illustrating the gendered nature of rurality and the discourses that influence everyday life. Attention is given to institutional discourses as constructing women’s participation in leadership and decision making, and farming women’s organisations as sites of resistance in reconstructing this participation, and indeed rurality itself, in the form of alternative identities for farm women.

In the past decade there has been an increased interest in the contribution of women to rural societies and the economies of Western countries. Research explored in Section 2.3 shows that this contribution has always been present, but that not only is the
nature of this contribution changing, but that it is becoming more visible and increasingly more important (Alston, 1995b; Rivers, 1992). Rural feminist research has contributed to this visibility, by providing accounts of the everyday life of farm women (Alston, 1995a; Anderson, 1993a; Keating and Little, 1994; Rivers, 1992; Shaw, 1993). Most importantly, farm women themselves have also gained increased recognition for their contribution, in the media and farming industry, although this recognition remains partial and limited (Liepins, 1996b; Rivers at al., 1997). The multiple identities of farm women, which are becoming more apparent, are explored in relation to the concept of rurality and a collective identity of farm women.

Farming women's organisations also contribute greatly to the construction of farm women's identities. In Section 2.4, recent literature on farming women's organisations in New Zealand, Australia and Canada is analysed. This section also provides a framework for analysing the two types of organisations identified in the literature, newer networks and established organisations. Both the internal characteristics of the organisations (organisational type) and the external factors, which create collective identity, will be analysed, helping determine the effectiveness of subsequent collective action.

Leadership, as an example of collective action\(^5\), is examined through the leadership displayed by members of farming women's organisations. Recent research on leadership among farming women is reviewed, providing a contemporary base from which to assess the collective action of the different farming women's organisations. Drawing upon a feminist reconceptualisation of political action and resistance, farm women's political action in the community and agri-industry is explored, as well as the success of that action in identity reconstruction.

Finally, the chapter presents framework, for analysing the role of farming women's organisations in farm women's identity construction. This framework highlights collective identity and collective action, particularly leadership. The relationship between farm women's identity, farming women's organisations, and collective action

---

\(^5\) For the purpose of this study, leadership is examined as a form of collective action. While leadership as action may be seen as individualistic, leaders provide the means of action for a collective group, enabling groups to maintain and reinforce preferred collective identities through their leadership activities (Melucci, 1996).
in either a feminised sphere of home and community or a masculinised sphere of agri-
industry is proposed and analysed. These relationships and the collective action of
farming women's organisations are vital in the consideration of how farm women's
identities, as supported by rurality, are maintained or reconstructed.

2.2 Constructing Rurality

Farm women’s identities do not occur in a vacuum or in isolation, rather the social
and material practices, relations and institutions that culturally construct Western rural
societies generate certain gendered identities for farm women within specific spatial
and temporal settings (Hughes, 1997b; Jones, 1995; Liepins, 2000; Little, 2002).
These constructions are often constituted in notions of rurality; a material and
imagined construct, where certain discourses, or narratives, about everyday life
prevail, and influence people in specific places (Halfacree, 1995; Hughes, 1997b;
Whatmore et al., 1994).

Rurality, as time and locationally specific, is particular to the diverse discourses by
which it is constructed. Rural researchers (Brandth and Haugen, 1997; Hughes, 1997a,
1997b; Liepins, 1998a, 1998b, 2000; Little, 2002; Morris and Evans, 2001) have
undertaken much work that identifies these discourses and, in particular, the resulting
gendered socio-cultural identities, which are constructed according to the
“assumptions and beliefs about the nature of rural society” (Little, 1999: 439). This
section draws on previous studies to determine the various discourses that construct
particular ruralities that encourage and deter certain identities for farm women.

Whatmore et al. (1994: 2) state that rurality is manifested through “everyday
experience, popular consciousness, and policy and media discourses”, and Jones
(1995) contends that lay, popular and professional discourses construct notions of
rurality. Jones provides an encompassing analysis of these many discourses that shape
people’s understanding and actions in their everyday lives. Jones (1995) defines lay

A post-structuralist understanding of discourse seeks to understand the links between power,
knowledge and the ways in which these are circulated, organised and materialised in social practices,
relations and institutions (Weedon, 1997).

The concept of a narrative, as used here, comes from the work of Somers (1992), who presents
narratives as discursive; as ways of giving meaning, or characterising, the self, others, activities,
consciousness and beliefs.
discourses, in the rural context, as everyday interpretations of rural places and ideas of the rural and bifurcates this into externalised discourse (a communicated discourse) and personal discourse (a process of reflection). These popular and lay discourses allow particular ideas about rural society and farm women to be circulated, and the significance of Jones’ externalised and personal discourses for this research is in the differences between the common structures surrounding farm women (externalised) and how they interpret these structures in their everyday life (reflection) (Rapport, 1993). These externalised and personal discourses may be compared with Somers' ontological narratives and narrative identities, respectively, as discussed in Section 2.3.2.

These lay discourses are shaped by popular discourses (such as the media) and professional or institutional discourses (such as policy and decision-makers in government and planning bodies). Similarly, popular and institutional discourses are intermeshed and influence each other. Across these discourses certain gendered identities are reinforced for both men and women, with dominant discourses supporting domestic and community work oriented identities of women (Hughes, 1997b; Little, 2002). Researchers in New Zealand and Australia have for example commented on the dominant identities for farm women and how they are shaped by hegemonic discourses. Liepins (2000: 374-376) outlines dominant and alternative identities for farm women in New Zealand and Australia; a traditional farming femininity based on domesticity, an alternative occupational femininity of the woman farmer, and a femininity in industry politics for women involved in agri-politics. Share (1995), writing on Australian rurality, claims that tradition suggests that masculinist discourses are dominant, with alternative voices only recently seeking to express their conceptualisation of rurality.

Institutional discourses, and the actual institutions and practices that support them, are influential in not/encouraging alternative identities for farm women, ones which exhibit leadership and decision making in agri-industry. Indeed these institutions are imbued with established patterns of behaviour that detail ‘the way things are done’ (Jenkins, 1996). Mackenzie (1994: 113), in her study of the Ontario Farm Women’s

---

8 The ruralities circulating within New Zealand, Australia and Canada at the time of the formation of each of the case study organisations are examined in Chapter Four.
Network, states that “…dominant discourse in legislation, agricultural policy, government committees, commodity and marketing boards, and farmer’s organisations” is masculinist and that this creates a particular rurality which makes it difficult for women to participate in agri-industry policy making and politics. Similarly, Alston, writing in an Australian context claims that:

Rural society is a man’s world where public positions of power are predominantly held by men, where much public space is co-opted and controlled by men… the role of women [is] in the private world of the family (Alston, 1995c: 88).

Rurality, and the discourses from which it is constructed, encourages only certain identities for farm women. These identities which are encouraged to permeate the barrier of rurality are traditional and domestic based. Indeed Hughes suggests that dominant discourses in rurality are also constructed by women’s organisations, arguing that the Women’s Institute in the United Kingdom has constructed a particular rural life for its members which emphasises its “caring community and rural neighbourliness” (1996: 221). Mackenzie (1994) and Liepins (1998a, 1999) claim that the Ontario Farm Women’s Network and the Women in Agriculture movement, respectively, have created spaces of resistance allowing the creation of a reverse discourse and increased acceptance by farm women themselves of alternative identities. This thesis contends that farming women’s organisations are sites of resistance to, or acceptance of, these dominant discourses and identities.

In order to understand the possibility of alternative identities, consideration of ‘reverse discourse’ is helpful. Foucault (1980) introduces the concept of ‘reverse discourse’, and Mackenzie (1992) has applied this to show how farming women's organisations use ‘reverse discourse’ to challenge dominant discourses that limit the visible identities that are available. Weedon claims that a reverse discourse, by challenging these dominant meanings, enables the production of new, resistant discourses or ways of interpreting social relations (Weedon, 1997: 106). Through the creation of a reverse discourse, farm women may be able to take up alternative identities with more acceptance and recognition by lay, popular and institutional discourses. Crouch (1992) suggests that people interpret dominant discourses in accordance with their own social practices and that there are complex interactions between various discourses. Acknowledging Crouch, this thesis contends that it is
possible for farm women’s collective action to influence and alter the discourses constructing rurality to further encourage alternative identities to become more accepted and dominant.

The following section expands upon the identities available to farm women, and examines ways of (re)constructing these identities. Further sections (2.4 and 2.5) explore the nature of particular organisations in creating spaces for resistance through leadership.

### 2.3 The Multiple Identities of Farm Women in Western Countries

#### 2.3.1 Identity Themes

Recent research (analysed below) indicates that the contribution of farm women is becoming increasingly visible and valued. Women are recognised not only in the traditional identities supported by dominant notions of rurality, but also in areas where alternative identities are placed, such as on farms and in agri-industries. This heightened visibility indicates that the multiple and diverse contributions of farm women are changing and challenging the dominant identities of these women. Analysis of this research on the identities and contributions of farm women shows the emergence of two themes: a service theme, and an occupational theme. The service theme encompasses the contributions of farm women as *carers, farm helpers* and *community workers*. The occupational theme includes the identities of *farmer, off-farm worker,* and *industry actor*. The importance of each of these identities differs from farm woman to farm woman, but recent literature has shown that some of these identities are more visible and dominant than others.

Earlier research on farm women in Western countries has identified various identities enabling analysis of farm women and their work. Although limited at first, this research has increasingly recognised and highlighted the multiple and vital contribution of farm women. Gasson’s (1980) earlier study of farm women in the
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9 This wealth of literature on individual farm women and their stories has directed the focus of this study away from re-presenting personalised narratives. The focus of the discussion is on the organisations themselves; engaging with more recent literature on farming women’s organisations. Chapter Six examines the narrative identities of farm women, but analyses them on an organisational basis.
United Kingdom identified only three identities\textsuperscript{10} for farm women: housewife, working on farm wife, and the woman farmer. These identities were very bounded in that they lacked an acknowledgment of the possibility of off-farm activities. In recent years however the increasing importance of other multiple identities has been recognised. For example, Taylor and Little (1995) argue that New Zealand farm women perform four distinct identities; household and family, farmwork, off-farm employment, and community work.

Service-based identities include \textit{carer, farm helper} and \textit{community worker}. These identities have been highlighted by researchers as the traditional and dominant identities of farm women (Alston, 1995b; Anderson, 1993a; Hughes, 1997a; Little, 1987). Researchers have attributed this dominance of service identities to a gendered division of labour on farms, the continued perception of the separation of the productive and reproductive spheres of social relations\textsuperscript{11}, and the placement of farm women in the reproductive sphere of wife and mother (Keating and Little, 1994; Liepins, 1996b). Keating and Little comment that "historically, the social status of farm women has been connected to their position in the reproductive spheres of farming." (1994: 721). This placement of women in the reproductive sphere is reinforced by traditional social processes and institutions manifested in notions of rurality in Western countries.

Much research has been undertaken which examines the role of patriarchy, the discourses it maintains, the construction of rurality, and its subsequent effects on farm women. Sachs (1996) claims that agrarian and domestic discourses support patriarchal relations; and Liepins (1996b: 4-5) also identifies the construction of agriculture as based on scientific knowledge, market economics and physical labour, which in turn constructs women in agriculture as "wives, mothers and homemakers devoted to home, community service and ancillary support work on the farm." (Liepins, 1996b: 5).

\textsuperscript{10} At the time of Gasson’s (1980) research contemporary theories discursively constructed identities as roles.

\textsuperscript{11} Whatmore (1994) advocates the fusion of the farm and home as a single productive identity.
While farm women's placement in the reproductive sphere may be traditional and of a patriarchal nature, the contribution of farm women as wives and mothers is diverse and vital. Research undertaken in New Zealand by Shaw (1993) and Anderson (1993b) illustrate the importance, and neglect, of these contributions. In Shaw's survey of farm women, 90% of the women were solely responsible for the running of the farm household (Shaw, 1993: 39); while Anderson states that women's unpaid work in the home "has largely been excluded from activities considered relevant to understanding the family labour process." (Anderson, 1993b: 294). This is supported by research in other Western countries which shows that farm women's reproductive farm activities are often invisible and undervalued in the operating of the farm unit (Alston, 1990; Little, 1987; Shortall, 1992, Whatmore, 1994).

The dominance of discourses which separate the productive and reproductive spheres, and thus do not acknowledge the importance of these 'service' identities in the farming enterprise, effectively render this contribution invisible. Bokemeier and Garkovich (1987) and Whatmore (1994) challenge this patriarchal assumption, claiming that the productive and reproductive spheres of a farm are closely linked. This view is supported by the research of Shaw (1993) and Alston (1995b) who identify the importance of reducing costs and increasing subsistence production during economic downturns.

However even the actual and extensive physical 'farm' work that women undertake (Gibson et al., 1990; Moran et al., 1989), remains mostly invisible and undervalued (Alston, 1995a, 1995b; Shaw, 1993; Waring, 1989). Non-recognition of farm women's physical involvement on the farm has resulted in farm women, not being seen as farmers, but as 'farm hands' or 'farm helpers' (Gibson et al., 1990).12 This farm work is often performed in or around the farm house, or involves the nurturing aspects of animal husbandry such as rearing of young animals, supporting Whatmore (1994) and Bokemeier and Garkovich (1987). However, this also continues to place farm women’s work in the reproductive, and often invisible, sphere.

---

12 A further discussion of farm women's physical contribution, with regard to 'farm work' will be made later in this section.
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The nature of this reproductive sphere has extended off the farm and into the farming community, with farm women's service identities increasingly including volunteer community work. The part that farm women play in providing community services in rural areas is well highlighted in research undertaken in Australia and New Zealand. Factors such as economic downturn in the agricultural and general economies, rural isolation and depopulation have all led to an increased need for, and a decreased public provision of, community services (Alston, 1990, 1995a, 1995b; Gibson et al., 1990; Shaw, 1993; Taylor and Little, 1995). This voluntary, unpaid, and often expected, community work has become invaluable to the survival of rural communities. In New Zealand, Pomeroy (1997) acknowledged the increasing demands placed upon women in rural communities, which resonates with British researchers contention that women are the lynch pin of British rural communities (Little and Austin 1996: 103).

These on- and off-farm service identities of carer, farm helper and community worker have been the dominant identities available to farm women, yet external recognition of the vital nature of these identities is low. These service identities have been constructed and sustained by the patriarchal social relations and institutions that dominate the ways of thinking about farm women (Little and Austin, 1996). However, research has indicated the increasing prevalence of occupational identities such as farmer, off-farm worker and industry actor, encouraged by feminism and the necessity for off-farm income (Alston, 1995b; Lyson, 1990; Shaw, 1993).

Increasingly farm women are venturing from the reproductive sphere, and are focusing on identities that are placed in the traditionally male productive sphere. For the purposes of this research I have classified these identities as farmer, off-farm worker and industry actor. These three identities are becoming increasingly more important to farm women, as highlighted here, and further expanded upon in the remainder of this section. The contribution of women to the farm unit has always been important, not only in a service sense, but also through physical work; and

13 For the purpose of this identity, community work is understood to be unpaid, voluntary work in the community, such as expenses only paid membership on committees; fundraising for the establishment and/or maintenance of public amenities such as schools, halls, churches, libraries; elderly care; childcare; and sporting activities. Milroy and Wismer (1994) define community work as a collective term for the work women do outside their homes and paid working hours, maintaining social adhesion in the community.
increasingly this contribution has included administrative work and management decisions (Alston, 1995b; Shaw, 1993; Boulding, 1980; James, 1990). Farm women have increasingly sought an off-farm career. More and more are participating in off-farm employment, whether it is due to economic necessity, or for personal fulfilment. However, while recognition of women as farmers, and the importance of women’s off-farm employment, is increasing, there is a new identity emerging in the traditionally male productive sphere of agri-industry. This new identity is that of farm women who are active in industry focused politics.

The identity of farm women, as farmer has often been overlooked and undervalued. Gasson (1980) and Shortall (1992) support this view; their studies of farm women in the United Kingdom and the Irish Republic show that family farming and the farming industry could not continue without the contribution of these women. Census and occupational data show that farm women themselves are beginning to recognise and acknowledge their own identity as farmers. New Zealand's Ministry of Agriculture provides statistics that reflect this recent recognition by women. From 1975 to 1990, farm partnerships have increased from 22.9% to 42.3% (Rivers, 1992: 24), and in 1992, 49% of farms had at least one female working owner, leaseholder or sharemilker (Pomeroy, 1995: 54). Similarly, analysis of census data pertaining to farm women in the United States and New Zealand showed an increase of women farmers during the period 1970-1981 (Lyson, 1990).

Alston claims that this increased recognition of their own identity as farmers is due to "younger women [who] are not as accepting of prescribed patriarchal gender roles as … older women…” (1995b: 135). Lyson also concludes that younger women entering farming are reflecting general trends in women's liberation, and also that women already in farming are coming to recognise themselves as farmers in view of their contribution (Lyson, 1990:66). Mackenzie (1994) and Liepins (1998c), investigating women's participation in farming organisations in Canada and Australia, see women themselves as more active in seeking recognition for their contribution14.

---

14 This trend is further explored in Section 2.4: Organising Farm Women.
Not only has farm women's contribution on the farm grown, and not only have they sought increased recognition of this identity, but research in Australia and New Zealand indicates that off-farm employment in reaction to recent economic downturns in rural communities has increased (Alston, 1994, 1995b; Gibson et al., 1990; Shaw, 1993; Taylor & Little, 1995). The importance of this off-farm worker identity in the construction of farm women is highlighted by a New Zealand study which claims that the "continual reference back to the 'farm' as the basis for definition may be less and less relevant in terms of the developing recognition of the multiple roles of women…” (Rivers, 1992:2).

Researchers investigating newer farm women’s networks in Australia and Canada, have undertaken work that has heralded the emergence of an industry actor identity. Liepins (1995: 25), commenting on the 'Women in Agriculture' movement in Australia, states that these farm women are “contrib[uting] to future visions for agriculture”. Mackenzie (1994: 113) sees the main function of the Ontario Farm Women's Network (OFWN) to be the creation of an alternative to the dominant discourse that is evident in "legislation, agricultural policy, representation in government committees, or commodity and marketing boards or farmer-based organisations", thus providing a structural base for the construction of the industry actor identity.

The growing importance and recognition of women as farmers, the necessity or desire to seek off-farm employment, and the increased involvement of women in farming industry politics, has meant that the identities available to farm women are growing; potentially challenging the rurality which defines these women in the gendered social practices, relations and institutions of their rural communities. The literature explored in this section has shown that farm women have access to a multiplicity of identities. The recognition and performance of these identities is fluid and can change in importance depending on the settings and relations involved. Farm women may identify with a range of these identities in different ways for different reasons, for example, lifecourse responsibilities, generational differences, or the gendered nature of a particular setting. For the purposes of this research the identities have been classified into two themes: service and occupational, as illustrated in Figure 2.1. The service identities have traditionally been regarded by researchers as the dominant way
of placing farm women, although increasingly the occupational identities are emerging as influential.

The prevalence of service identities, and the increased recognition of occupational identities, may vary according to ‘lifecourse’. While many rural studies have not utilised the lifecourse concept, feminist literature has done so. Lifecourse allows an analysis of everyday experiences within an age group, allowing for recognition of the impact of changing contexts across generations (Monk and Katz, 1993). Monk and Katz claim there is a need to identify the cohort to which a woman belongs (1993: 20). In this research, lifecourse themes within organisations may be seen as a reflection of collective identity, indicating a negotiation of changing identities in the face of the provision of new spaces and acknowledgement of alternative discourses and identities.

**Figure 2.1: Service and Occupational Identities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service / Dominant</th>
<th>Occupational / Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Helper</td>
<td>Off-farm Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Worker</td>
<td>Industry Actor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.3.2 Identity: Construction and Reconstruction**

The following section draws on theories established by Somers (1992) and Young (1994) to determine how identities for farm women are constructed and maintained. It also determines how dominant discourses may be challenged and alternative identities given a structural base from which farm women may realise them. Here the contention is argued that farm women’s organisations have a role in creating and providing a structural base for either maintaining or challenging the rurality that supports dominant discourses surrounding farm women’s identities.
Somers states that identities are constituted through narrativity - a "condition of social being, social action, institutions and structures" (1992: 606). This narrative identity, or the ways in which people characterise themselves, is embedded within patterns of relationships that shift over time and space. Somers suggests that this pattern, or relational setting, is formed from ontological, public, cultural and institutional narratives. Ontological narratives are the stories people use to make sense of, and act in, their lives. These narratives are multiple, ambiguous and conflicting. They structure activities, consciousness and beliefs. These public, cultural and institutional narratives that are selectively appropriated by organisations and institutions to construct stories conducive to their objectives affect ontological narratives. Hence, some of these ontological narratives are more influential and powerful than others. While individuals can select particular ontological narratives in characterising themselves, they can only select from those that are available to them. What is available is contested politically and depends upon the distribution of power in that particular time and place (Somers, 1992).

When applying this theory to the multiple identities which are available to farm women, 'rurality' may be seen as promoting a set of ontological narratives, which are based on the patriarchal placement of farm women in the reproductive sphere, supported by public, cultural and institutional narratives, such as farming organisations, gendered narratives, government policy and patriarchal social structures. As Section 2.2 argues, the dominant discourses maintaining identities for farm women are highly gendered towards reproductive-based and service identities (Hughes, 1997b; Jones, 1995; Little, 2002; Mackenzie, 1994). However, Somers’ theory is indicative of the public provision of narratives that support occupational identities for farm women; narratives which create space for these alternative identities to exist and begin to thrive.

Proponents of identity politics suggest that social action arises from resistance to two things: first, a resistance between how an individual understands a specific identity
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15 This can be seen in literature that highlights the nature of farm women's conflicting responsibilities in the home, community, on the farm and in the industry (Shaw, 1993; Alston, 1995b).
16 This view is supported by post-structuralist theory. Weedon states that "in order to be effective and powerful, a discourse needs a material base in established social institutions and practices." (Weedon, 1997: 96).
and how others see that identity; and second, a resistance between how an individual might see their identity (a possibility for a new narrative identity) and an identity which society says is possible, appropriate and valuable to be (Calhoun, 1994). Somers and Gibson (1994: 79-80) suggest that if people with a similar narrative identity (e.g. farm women) come together in a particular relational setting they may form a collective agency or action, which can reweave history, narrativity, social knowledges, and institutions and cultural practices which construct their identity. Therefore, this thesis argues that farm women can come together to reconstruct the stories and practices that have previously limited their identities to those of a service nature. Through the following chapters, the thesis explores the structural bases and spaces that farming women's organisations make available to farm women members to explore these alternative narratives and identities.

Young (1994) questions how women come together in these spaces to challenge hegemonic narratives. What social conditions motivate women to reconstruct identity? Young proposes that women are a series unified by their gender, oriented around common objects or practico-inert structures. She contrasts this seriality, where women feel powerless to alter the material milieu (p726), with collective groups who self-consciously mobilise around a purpose. This notion of seriality and collective groups can be applied to farm women and their organisations. We may see farm women as a series, or sub-series of women, who are defined by social practices associated with living on and in, and operating, farm properties and farm households. Based on Young’s argument, until farm women become aware of their serialised condition they do not recognise themselves as a group. This recognition is required for farm women to come together in politicised groups, i.e. farming women's organisations, and undertake a common project. This thesis questions what it is that draws particular farm women to certain organisations, what identities do they envisage for themselves, and in what ways do they wish to challenge the practico-inert structures which create particular ruralities and coded spaces (e.g. mainstream farming organisations, rural service industry and farming communities) for farm women? As such this thesis differs from previous studies on farming women's organisations (except Teather, 1996a, 1996b) by investigating more than one organisation, and thereby establishing the different identities, spaces and goals of the various organisations.
By viewing farm women as a serial population, it may be conceived that some farm women form groups from which they may contest the serialised condition that is placed upon them by dominant discourses or narratives; i.e. create new narrative identities which challenge the dominance of service identities. The literature explored earlier has shown the difference between the traditional narratives surrounding farm women and the actual multiple identities of farm women. The resistance that is possible either from feeling that society is not seeing you as you would construct yourself, or from wanting to reconstruct the ontological narratives from which you may construct your identity, can lead to collective action, or mobilisation in a collective group.

As shown in Figure 2.2, rurality, is based on a collective of ontological narratives, influenced by public, cultural and institutional narratives; reflecting social constructions of farm women and encouraging and deterring particular identities, i.e. service and occupational, respectively. Farm women draw upon notions of rurality and the narratives and stories it supports to create their own narrative identity. Depending on the dominance of particular narrative identities, farm women may recognise a particular seriality with other farm women. Farming women's organisations, as collective groups, established through serialised conditions based upon the two identity categories, service and occupational, may maintain or challenge public, cultural and institutional narratives by constructing spaces for farm women to act upon this recognition as a collective. In turn, this action may either maintain or challenge (and attempt to reconstruct) the ontological narratives supporting a particular rurality from which farm women may choose narrative identities.

In recognising that each farm woman's identities are particular to her and her relational setting, this thesis analyses the ways in which farm women come together as a group to enable collective action. It examines the differences in the action produced, due to influences of differing relational settings. It is my contention that it is the role of farming women's organisations to provide the spaces for farm women to recognise and act upon this collective action; hence, various organisations have developed to support the different possibilities for farm women. A framework based

---

on new social movements and organisational theory allowing analysis of these 
organisations, the collective identity they promote, and collective action subsequently 
produced, will be presented in the following section (2.4).

Figure 2.2: Construction and Reconstruction of Farm Women's Identity
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2.4 Organising Farm Women – Collective Identity and Collective Action

This thesis will examine the ways in which farming women's organisations continually maintain or reconstruct identities for farm women. An analysis of recent literature on farming women organisations in New Zealand, Australia and Canada identified two types of organisations (established organisations and newer networks) and four main functions. The functions involve organisations having: a social purpose; a community purpose; an industry agenda and a career focus. The following section reviews organisational theories in order to build a framework for analysis of organisational characteristics and identity, and the constructions of collective identities for farm women through collective action.

Weedon claims "…in order to be effective and powerful, a discourse needs a material base in established social institutions and practices." (1997: 96); hence the function of organisations in creating spaces and a material/structural base to construct a 'collective identity' or 'seriality' and discursive efficacy is important. Indeed, Teather commenting on farming women's organisations, claims they "are important agents in the shaping of gender identities…” (1996a: 44). Farming women’s organisations have the opportunity to either maintain the status quo regarding farm women identities, i.e. service identities; or to challenge and reconstruct these identities, thus encouraging a collective identity based upon a multiplicity of identities.

2.4.1 Established and Newer Farm Women's Organisations

Literature on farming women's organisations shows the development of two types of farming women's organisations in Western countries - established organisations and newer, emerging network-based organisations (Teather, 1996a, 1996b). This section explores organisational characteristics of established organisations and newer networks, establishing a link between established organisations creating spaces for the recognition of traditional identities, and newer networks creating spaces for the recognition of alternative identities.

Teather provides a useful overview of both established and newer farming women organisations in New Zealand, Australia and Canada, and it is in her work that it is
possible to distinguish four main functions in the objectives of the organisations she investigates. She explores the formation, structures and key objectives of three established and two newer organisations, and in doing so examines how these are reflected in membership and identities members envision for themselves (1996b). The three organisations, Country Women's Association (CWA) in Australia, Women's Division Federated Farmers (WDF) in New Zealand, and Federated Women's Institutes of Ontario (FWIO) in Canada were established over sixty years ago and largely reflect the concerns of farm women and their communities from that time and up until to the 1950s/1960s when they reached peak membership; concerns such as isolation, community facilities and domestic skills. Also reflected in their era is that these established organisations remain hierarchal and formally structured, and retain a focus on the home, community, and the ideology of motherhood, and lobby on rural community policy issues (Teather, 1992, 1996b; Cebotarev and Beattie, 1985). This structure and focus has seen these established organisations viewed as being in a dialectic relationship with mainstream male farming organisations, whose focus is agri-industry (Cebotarev and Beattie, 1985).

Teather's work identifies three key objectives of established organisations as opportunities for personal growth, the future of the family farm, and integrating people in rural communities. In contrast, she identifies equal treatment for farm women and a stronger voice for agricultural women as the main objectives of newer, emerging organisations in Australia and Canada (Teather, 1996b: 40). Teather's work, and that of Carbert (1996), Shortall (1994), Liepins (1998b), Haney and Miller (1991) and Mackenzie (1994) highlight the contrasting formations and structures, and further expand upon the objectives, of these new networks.

Research on the formation of farming women's networks, which emerged as alternatives to established organisations in Canada in the 1970s, and in Australia in the 1990s, identifies four common motivating factors in their development. Shortall (1994) and Carbert (1996) highlight nationwide farm crises and the women's liberation movement; Liepins (1998a) and Haney & Miller (1991) identify the
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18 Now Rural Women New Zealand (RWNZ); see Chapter 4.
19 FWIO in 1897, WDF in 1926 and CWA in 1927 (Teather, 1996b).
20 These organisations are Australian Women in Agriculture (AWiA) and Ontario Farm Women's Network (OFWN).
marginalisation of women from mainstream agriculture; and both Mackenzie (1994) and Teather (1996a) cite positive and negative legal developments as a motivating factor. This contrasts quite sharply with the motivating factors present in the formation of established organisations that were concerned with farm women's service functions and identities, as opposed to the more agri-industry sphere concerns of these newer networks.

The formalised objectives of these newer networks have emerged from the motivating factors in their formation. These objectives encompass and expand upon those identified in Teather's research mentioned earlier. Their objectives are to promote rural community life; sustain the family farm, recognising that farming is not just an economic activity; to increase the representation of women on farming boards and in census statistics; and to improve the recognition of farming women's work - both reproductive and productive (Shortall, 1994; Liepins, 1995; Cebotarev and Beattie, 1985). The objectives of these networks encompass not only the concerns of established organisations (with regard to the well-being of the farm and community through the service contributions of farm women), but also reflect the multiple identities of farm women. These multiple identities are positioned increasingly in the agri-industry sphere. These newer networks focus on promoting a collective identity of farm women that is predominantly positioned in the agri-industry sphere, historically the stronghold of male farmers. However, in contrast to the male-based farming organisations and established farming women organisations, the structure of these networks is non-hierarchical and grassroots-based, and they are seen as autonomous from mainstream male-based farming organisations (Cebotarev and Beattie, 1985).

The review of recent literature regarding farming women organisations has shown two distinctive types, established and newer networks. The established organisations are predominantly service / domestic focused, are closely aligned in structure to male-based mainstream farming organisations, and are seen as a social partner to their male-based counterparts. Teather's (1996a, 1996b) work in particular shows that these established organisations have an ageing membership and are failing to attract younger women, who identify themselves by what I have defined and substantiate in Chapter Six, as occupational identities, rather than service-based identities.
Increasingly, these younger women are becoming members of organisations that reflect an agricultural career focus and an industry agenda; promoting a stronger voice for farm women in a broad array of issues (Teather, 1996a, 1996b). These newer networks, in contrast to established organisations, by promoting a focus on agri-industry and gaining recognition for the farming family, are challenging the male stronghold on leadership and decision making in farming, and abandoning traditional structures for gaining these positions (Liepins, 1995, 1998a, 1998b; Mackenzie, 1992, 1994).

From this literature four main functions of farming women's organisations are distinguishable, and the preference for particular functions allows for analysis of the role of an organisation in maintaining or reconstructing farm women's collective identity. In Figure 2.3 I illustrate a grouping of organisational objectives that emerge from the recent literature. These objectives are categorised into four functions that loosely link with the six identities recognised earlier in this section: social purpose, community purpose, industry agenda and career focus. These functions are placed in either a service sphere or an agri-industry sphere. The functions and spheres are interlinked, recognising the conflating nature of farming women's organisations.\(^{21}\)

This exploration of recent research shows that established organisations tend to function as social purpose and community-based organisations, while newer networks are largely positioned in the agri-industry functions of industry agenda and career focus. This is not to say that individual organisations may not overlap into each function, or recognise the importance of all functions, but as the literature shows the two types of organisations position themselves around different functions, and this is reflected in their membership and collective action. The newer networks can increasingly create spaces of action that differ significantly from that of the established organisations.

\(^{21}\) This concept will be further explored in Chapters Four and Five.
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(Distilled from Australian, Canadian, Irish, New Zealand case studies (Carbert, 1996; Cebotarev and Beattie, 1985; Haney and Miller, 1991; Liepins, 1998b; Mackenzie, 1994; Shortall, 1994; Teather, 1996a, 1996b).

The emergence of networks, which promote the positioning of farm women in the agri-industry sphere, have been the specific focus of research by Mackenzie and Liepins. Mackenzie (1994) examines the ways in which the Ontario Farm Women's Network (OFWN) has created a 'reverse discourse' for farm women, re-negotiating what it means to be a farm woman and a farmer, by recognising the multiplicity of farm women's identities, and by creating a strategy for farm women's leadership. The
specific objectives of OFWN, Mackenzie claims, promote "farm women as professionals - with secure social, legal and economic equality" (1994: 103).

Liepins' investigation of Australia’s women in agriculture movement highlights the movement's purpose to increase the recognition of women's contribution to agriculture, and examines their function in legitimising farm women's "voices and perspectives" (1995: 118). She summarises the overall impact of the movement as an alternative organisational framework for women in agriculture, challenging the dominant discourses of farm women, and providing constructions of identity that include concerns of farm and family. The resulting collective action of members has reconstructed agriculture to include "cultural and political components alongside the dominant … economic and scientific aspects …" (Liepins, 1995: 123). These newer networks are creating and providing spaces and a structural base within and upon which farm women may contest the dominant narratives or discourses that surround them. They are able to collectively act to challenge and reconstruct a new collective identity or seriality for farm women.

Section 2.4.1 has shown that there are two types of organisations, positioned predominantly in either a service or agri-industry sphere. Recent research indicates that newer network-based organisations are creating spaces that allow for a collective action, which challenges the dominant constructions of farm women's identity. It has demonstrated that the formation, structure and objectives of these newer networks are different from established organisations; and it is this thesis’ contention that there is a clear link between established organisations and service identities, and between newer networks and occupational identities; therefore specific organisations either maintain or challenge hegemonic identities for farm women at certain points in time. Collective identity and the collective action of the members of these organisations are influenced by formation, structure and objectives. Hence, the following section establishes a framework that allows analysis of farming women’s organisations, in particular, establishing characteristics based on organisational type, collective identity and collective action.
2.4.2 Theorising Organisations

In an analysis of organisations it is necessary, not only to examine structures, the motivation for the formation, and the contemporary action and leadership of each particular organisation, but also, to examine an organisation's particular social context and raison d'être. Organisational theories commence from a premise that organisations are living and evolving entities reflecting their environment and membership (Atwater, 1995; Kenny, 1994). Indeed Burrell and Hearn state, "organisations … reflect the social structuring of time and space within their own social contexts…" (1989: 18). This section constructs a framework allowing this analysis, drawing on theories relating to voluntary organisations, networks and social movements.

Voluntary Organisations

This section draws upon the work of organisational researchers, predominantly that of Kenny (1994) and Atwater (1995), enabling an analysis of voluntary organisations based on two factors, organisational characteristics and social context. There has been little critical attention paid to farm women’s organisations by organisational scholars and rural sociologists (Wells 1998: 371), hence the need to develop a framework for analysis of the established organisations and newer networks in this study. Kenny is also critical of much literature on organisational structure, describing it as "antithetical to community development" (1994: 140) and therefore her analysis of organisations is helpful, in that it refers to community organisations as opposed to corporate and profit making businesses.

Kenny (1994) develops a continuum that places bureaucratic, formal organisations at one end of the continuum, and informal, collective organisations at the other, providing an overview of characteristics of these two extremes of organisations (1994: 141-145). Atwater’s (1995) study of organisational characteristics provides a further basis for analysis by considering a number of variables that allow categorisation of an organisation as 'mechanistic' (formal) or 'organic' (informal); specialisation, standardisation, formalisation, status stratification, the external environment and the managerial decision making climate.

Drawing upon Kenny's continuum of organisations and their characteristics; and Atwater’s variables for classification of organisations, Table 2.1 shows a matrix for
positioning organisations along the continuum. Four of these variables relate to organisational structure: specialisation - the degree to which jobs are well defined; standardisation - the existence of rules; formalisation - the extent to which procedures are documented; and, status stratification - the extent of hierarchical control. She also considers two other variables: the external environment and the managerial decision climate. Organisations in a stable environment are able to exert more control over structure and the organisation’s operation, while an organic organisation is likely to be the product of an unstable and rapidly changing environment. The managerial decision climate is influenced by either an innovative or controlled approach to decision making in an organisation (Atwater, 1995).

Table 2.1: Matrix for Positioning Organisations along a Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Bureaucratic/Mechanistic</th>
<th>Collective/Organic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Environment</strong></td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialisation of tasks</strong></td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-defined</td>
<td>Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Roles rotated</td>
<td>- low specialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardisation of rules</strong></td>
<td>Set rules for operation</td>
<td>Agenda informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formalisation of procedures</strong></td>
<td>Documentation standardised</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Stratification</strong></td>
<td>Hierarchical power structure</td>
<td>No hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defined channels of</td>
<td>Flat structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>command and response</td>
<td>Horizontal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial Decision Climate</strong></td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Decision making equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patriarchal(^{22})</td>
<td>Horizontal consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making controlled</td>
<td>No fixed authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and rooted in formality</td>
<td>Innovative decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{22}\) Kenny notes that feminists claim that the hierarchical, rule based and authoritarian nature of bureaucratic organisations renders them patriarchal (1994: 142).
In analysing organisations it is important to consider the particular time and place in which the organisation developed (Burrell and Hearn, 1989). Taking the example of farming women's organisations we can see how structure has been affected by context. The nature of established organisations, with their hierarchical structure and formal meetings, reflects their contextual origins where transportation and communication was limited, and these organisations functioned, in part, to combat isolation and the pass on practical skills (Teather, 1996b). In contrast, the effects of global time-space compression provides a context where newer organisations operate on a grassroots, flat structure enabled by technical developments such as fax, email and the internet (Teather, 1996b; Grace, 1997).

In summary, an analysis of organisations must consider two factors. Firstly, consideration must be given to the various characteristics that may position them along the continuum of organisations developed here - bureaucratic to collective, including structure, leadership style and environment (Atwater, 1995; Butler and Wilson, 1990). Secondly, consideration must be given to the social context in which that organisation was formed and operates, as this influences other considerations when determining the nature of the organisation (Burrell and Hearn, 1989). The remainder of this section analyses recent theory surrounding networks and social movements, which allows a continued development of a framework for the analysis of collective identities and collective action of organisations.

**Networks and Social Movements**

The previous section on voluntary organisations allows for a partial analysis of farming women's organisations. The focus of organisational theory has predominantly been the structural base upon which organisations begin to build their collective identities. This next section looks at theories surrounding networks and social movements. By doing so, the notion of the structural base of networks and social movements as distinct from established organisations is established. Researchers have described networks in Canada and Australia as social movements. Shortall (1994)

---

23 Time-space compression is characterised in part by the advent of new global communications technology that has meant that the rapidity of time annihilates the barriers of space. Harvey suggests that this creates a universalisation which can cause identity loss, senselessness and a homogenisation of culture (1989: 232); however in the case of othered farm women it appears to create a sense of collective identity, i.e. that one’s othered condition is not solitary, thus creating a sense of collectivity.
characterises the Canadian Farm Women’s Network as a social movement; and Liepins (1995, 1996a) and Grace (1997) collectively label newer organisations and networks in Australia as a movement. Networks, such as Australian Women in Agriculture, Ontario Farm Women’s Network, are challenging dominant ways of seeing farm women (Liepins, 1995; Mackenzie, 1994). The following section examines the common characteristics of these networks, and the ways in which they are distinguishable from established farming women organisations.

Network-based organisations are increasingly popular among farm women in Western countries. Grace (1997) has identified two main rural women's networks types in Western countries. The first are networks that are government initiated, guided by rural women, but government funded. The others are community-based networks, which are largely volunteer operated, and possibly have a specific agriculture related focus. The popularity of both of these network types lies in the material nature of these organisations; possibly suiting the busy lifestyles of farm women, with a web-based design affording them easier contact with a wider range of people and information without attending formal meetings. The objectives of information sharing and support provide farm women with a friendly and mutually supportive environment in which to gather and disseminate knowledge.

Grace (1997) contributes their popularity to global phenomenon, and Bovasso claims "the development of network organisations is increasingly necessary in a global information-oriented economy" (1992: 86). However little has been written on networks and their processes within the context of rural community development (Grace, 1997). Mirroring organisational theory, much is written from a management perspective, focusing on promotion and career development. The work of Foy (1985), although management-based, provides a definition and a starting point in distinguishing particular characteristics of networks. Foy defines a network as "a collection of people, usually with a specified realm of shared interest, who tend to keep in touch to exchange informal information" (1985: 245). Grace (1997) and Ackelsberg (1988), enlarge upon this, saying that the process of networking involves not only information-exchange, but also the provision of support systems for engaging in public activity. The importance of networks as support systems is acknowledged by researchers (e.g., Alston, 1995b, 2000; Grace, 1997; Shortall, 1999), who detail the
reluctance of farm women to contribute in male dominated environments; networks providing farm women with the opportunity to acquire confidence and self-esteem, as well as knowledge (Grace, 1997: 57).\(^{24}\)

Table 2.2 details common material characteristics of networks, with the most important being a non-hierarchical and informal structure. Based upon these characterisations, and with reference to Table 2.1, farm women’s networks may be classified as collective organisations.

**Table 2.2: Characteristics of a Network**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Network Has</th>
<th>A Network Does Not Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A non-hierarchical structure</td>
<td>To have a hierarchical structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An informal structure</td>
<td>To have a formal structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Focus</td>
<td>A Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Newsletter</td>
<td>A Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A List of members</td>
<td>By-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Annual Event</td>
<td>Regular Meetings (usually monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Contact - email, website</td>
<td>A Head Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While the newer networks of farm women display the network characteristics detailed in Table 2.2, to define a network as a social movement the focus, objectives and performance of those objectives must be considered. Social movements are forms of organisations that seek social and/or political change and challenge conventional ways of seeing the world (Kenny, 1994; Rowbotham, 1992; Painter, 1995). Painter suggests that they question taken-for-granted assumptions about the distribution of social and political power; challenging the legitimacy of political institutions and practices (Painter, 1995: 152). Kenny provides an overview of the characteristics of social movements; highlighting a specific issue platform, and a support of the right to participate in, or control, decisions relating to that specific issue. While they challenge the conventional social order and publicly state their objectives, they are unlikely to aim to seize political power in the sense of a governmental coup. In contrast to formal

---

\(^{24}\) This study examines networks as an organisational structure, a collective of information, individuals and patterns of behaviour (Melucci, 1996). The alternative, Actor-Network Theory, which seeks to analyse processes and actions mobilised through a network of relations between human and non-humans (Law, 1999; Latour, 1999), is not considered in this study.
organisations they are minimally organised, are non-bureaucratic, and usually don’t exist within conventional institutions (Kenny, 1994:39).

Social movements in their ideal state differ from formal organisations. In contrast to organisations with formal and bureaucratic structures, Melucci (1996) suggests that social movements are the result of actors choosing to project a particular identity at a particular time and place. In support, Carbert (1996) claims that while formal organisations become established in the social order and exist over a long period of time, social movements are less institutionalised, and act in a particular relational setting. These spatial relationships have also been recognised on a physical level with Painter (1995) suggesting that formal organisations commonly operate at a fixed locale that structures their actions, whereas social movements may permeate physical boundaries.

The geographies of formal organisations and movements (or networks) differ both spatially and temporally. This thesis contends that established farming women organisations, operating from a fixed locale, are less likely to challenge, and, in fact, do maintain, hegemonic identities for farm women; whereas newer networks, with recognition as a movement, are more likely to challenge those identities. This is further demonstrated later in the thesis through the analysis of case study organisations in three countries which support this contention.

Painter (1995) identifies some additional characteristics important to the analysis of social movements. In the desire for change, social movements are frequently recognised as oppositional and in conflict with dominant institutions in society that create and maintain traditional ways of seeing. Painter claims that the resulting action of social movements is never totally controllable or predictable in advance. This he links with the concept of 'reflexive monitoring of action', where we "observe ourselves and our actions and adjust future actions in light of the knowledge we gain of ourselves, others and our surrounding." (1995: 154). He suggests that this reflexive self-monitoring is a particularly strong feature of social movements. The significance of Painter's observation is the impact the self-monitoring has on political action. The collective structure of social movements, and indeed networks, better allows participants to quickly adjust their actions with regard to interaction with dominant
narratives. For example, established organisations with their hierarchical structures may be less flexible in adapting to changes in ontological narratives, whereas newer networks appear to be more responsive to these changes.

The purpose of social movements in challenging conventional institutions and practices, is better enabled and enhanced by this reflexive self-monitoring. By adjusting action, participants help to create what post-structuralist theory has identified as a 'reverse discourse'; a performance of particular narrative identities that challenge traditional ontological narratives. In the context of this research these ontological narratives construct service identities as dominant for farm women, while Chapters Four to Seven will explore how certain farming women's organisations create spaces for the more challenging alternative occupational identities. The following section examines how it is possible for participants of organisations to recognise a particular collective identity, and how that identity is expressed in collective action.

2.4.3 Analysing Collectivity
In order to analyse the collective identity of farm women's organisations it is necessary to consider more than organisational foci and objectives. Collective identity and collective action mutually shape one another, producing a fluidity and dynamism which means that the collective identity of an organisation, while forming around certain values and goals, may change over time. While foci and objectives certainly guide collective identity and collective action, externalised narratives also affect the collectivity of organisations. By applying new social movement theory to farming women's organisations, this thesis is able to engage in a deeper analysis of collective identity and action than earlier studies.

Painter and Melucci each present two main approaches to the analysis of social movements, which may be adapted to analyse the farming women organisations in this research. Painter (1995) suggests that there are two main schools of analysis: one which examines the objective conditions giving rise to social movements; and one

25 Melucci suggests that the objective factors referred to here relate to the structural field of relationships; resources available to, and physical constraints placed upon, social movements (1996: 17).
which provides an analysis of the subjective experiences of people who join and participate. Melucci's (1996) approaches are similar: an analysis of the specific causal context, and the collective action that is the product of beliefs and representations of actors. From these and other works, this section develops a framework for analysing the collective identity of farming women’s organisations and subsequent collective action; and most importantly, employs Melucci’s (1996) model for analysing organisational type that has particular reference to collective identity and action\textsuperscript{26}.

**Collective Identity**

Recognising that the collective identity of an organisation is ever changing, is an unfixed essence and an outcome of a network of active relationships of exchanges, negotiations, decisions and conflicts (Melucci, 1996), this thesis seeks to determine the collective identities of farming women's organisations at a particular time and place, and from that understanding to determine how this shapes collective action. While collective identity shapes the action of an organisation and individual participation within it (Friedman & McAdam, 1992), it is also a collective identity that the participants choose to project at a particular time and place (Melucci, 1996; Painter, 1995). Recognition of a collective identity, as with Young’s (1994) concept of a collective group (see Section 2.3.2), is dependent on place specific everyday experience, and individual interpretation of that experience (Hasson, 1997; Painter, 1995). Thus in analysing organisations, be they social movement-based or formal organisations, we must understand not only the relational setting of their formation, but also the experiences of the participants: experiences which suggest a sense of collective identity that is recognised in a certain relational setting.

Politicisation of individual identities to form a collective identity within a social movement is often in resistance to conventional ways of seeing. An important aspect of Painter's framework is his use of Young's 'ideal of diversity' where social

\textsuperscript{26} Resource Mobilisation Theory (RMT) is one such theory, which focuses upon the objective factors of social movements. It states that the success of social movements is dependent upon the (material and symbolic) resources that the movement is able to mobilise (Johnston et al., 2000). For the purpose of this study, RMT does not help address the question of the link between collective identity and collective action based on gendered social practices, relations and institutions, and the ontological narratives informing everyday life. Because of the gender challenges farming women organisations constitute it was decided that Melucci’s (1996) attention to ‘challenging the codes’ was more helpful.
differences are recognised in a positive manner. Young’s earlier work suggests that social differences have led to the formation of groups that challenge conventionality. She claims that the formation of these groups or social movements is not based on an enduring identity, but that the group is formed by a subjective affinity (1990: 158-159). That is, that the collective identity of the group is the result of recognition of one of many multiple identities that each member possesses; and that, out of many, that identity has become politicised in that relational setting. Thus this thesis argues that a particular identity, a shared social difference, perhaps of community worker or industry actor, is politicised by a relational setting to form a collective identity around which farming women's organisations gather.

The development of a social difference into a social movement depends upon the discursive construction of that difference and its political importance. In order to politicise the movement, to begin to challenge convention, social movements must construct themselves through discourses (Painter, 1995: 162). Through their actions and relations with other groups they will support or contest discourses; and in doing so may change discursive meanings. Painter's argument that social movements are better able to reflexively self-monitor their actions suggests that these movements are more adaptable than formal organisations in changing their future actions, and hence challenging conventional discourses, through the creation of a 'reverse discourse'. This is supported by Hasson who argues that a collective form of resistance encoded from settings, experiences and actions, creates a counter narrative of self identification, which challenges and resists traditional myths and symbols which affect ways of seeing (1997: 238). Hence it may be argued that the collective identities of newer networks, rather than those of established organisations, are more likely to engender collective action that will challenge dominant discourses.

Melucci claims that individual members of an organisation are bound together by specific dimensions to create a collective identity, and thus determining collective action. First, collective identity is expressed through rituals, practices and cultural artefacts particular to that organisation (cognitive definition). The second dimension considers the relationships between members; organisational structures and leadership

---

27 Painter’s use of ‘social differences’ is based on the recognition that particular identities, such as gender, ethnicity, sexuality, may be linked with oppression (1995: 158-159).
models, communication channels and technologies (active relationships). Finally, members must have an emotional investment, an ability to feel a common unity (emotional investment) (1996: 70-71). Thus, in adopting Melucci’s approach, empirical indicators of collective identity such as objectives, structures, leadership patterns, and membership characteristics and incentives can be examined. However, also crucial to this thesis is Melucci’s assertion that an organisation’s collective identity is also determined by the recognition received by external dimensions: competitors, allies, adversaries and the apparatus of social control (1996: 78). In this research, the experiences of members, other farm women and the media are analysed as external dimensions of collective identity. Hence, any analysis of collective identity must consider both internal and external dimensions in that construction. Remembering that collective identity and collective action have a relationship where each is determining and constructing the other, it is necessary to analyse collective action in the construction of an organisation’s collective identity.

Collective Action

This thesis contends that it is the role of farm women’s organisations to create spaces, both political and organisational and provide a structural base for negotiating the dominant discourses surrounding farm women’s identities. Analysis of the success of this must include an analysis of the ways in which these organisations enable collective action. The following section draws on Melucci’s (1996) concept of organisational type to provide a framework for this analysis of collective action, not only of the newer networks as possible social movements, but also of the more formal established organisations.

Melucci defines collective action as a set of social practices involving individuals or a group, who exhibit similar morphological characteristics in a specific relational setting, who have the capacity to make sense of what they are doing, thereby implying a social relationship (1996: 20). The collective action of an organisation, including networks and established organisations, is interwoven into everyday life and individual experience, thereby challenging or maintaining the meaning instilled in the institutions that govern society (Melucci 1996). Particular types of organisations in different relational settings produce differing types of collective action. Melucci provides a framework that allows the analysis of these types of collective action.
Figure 2.4 shows the six factors used by Melucci: solidarity or aggregation, consensus or conflict, and a maintaining or breaching of system’s limits. Solidarity is based upon the ability of actors to recognise each other as having the same social difference i.e. a collective identity, whereas aggregation is a reaction to a crisis or change. Conflict involves the opposition over control of resources, and in contrast there may be consensus over the governing of resources. Lastly the collective action may breach or maintain conventional social processes (1996: 23-24).

**Figure 2.4: Analysis for Collective Action – Orientation of Phenomena**

An organisation’s collective action can be categorised as to which set of three orientations is identified as pertinent to an organisation’s action. Thus Melucci states there are eight organisational types: *social movements*, characterised by conflict, solidarity and a breaching of the system’s limits; *competition*, characterised by conflict, solidarity and a maintenance of the system’s limits; *deviance*, characterised by aggregation, consensus and a breaching; *cooperation*, characterised by solidarity, consensus and a maintenance; *reaction*, characterised by solidarity, consensus and a breaching; *individual resistance*, characterised by aggregation, conflict and a breaching; *individual mobility*, characterised by aggregation, conflict and a
maintenance; and finally, *rituals*, characterised by aggregation, consensus and a maintenance (1996: 30-32).

In using Melucci’s framework for determining organisational type, and thus the nature of collective action, consideration must also be given to the fluidity of collective identity, and thus collective action. Indeed Melucci asserts that collective identity is tested in crisis, and that an organisation may act in one of two ways; either to restructure their action in line with a new orientation (fluid), or to compartmentalise their action to preserve the coherence of the organisation (rigid) (1996: 75). Farming women's organisations influenced by the discourses that construct a collective identity for farm women must consider their reaction to discursive changes that may challenge their organisational collective identity. Established organisations, in particular, may be more likely to act with rigidity to any challenge to their objectives and collective action.

Collective identity and collective action have a symbiotic relationship. Individuals acting collectively construct their action by means of organised objectives; thus creating meaning from their joint behaviour, a sense of being together (Melucci, 1996: 39). Collective action is grounded in, and is shaped by, a sense of collective identity, and in turn collective identity (re)constructs itself, and is made sense of, as a result of the collective action. Collective identity establishes the limits for collective action by regulating members and the prerequisites for joining, and influencing how members recognise themselves and are recognised by others. This interdependence establishes the need for analysis of both internal and external factors in determining the specific temporal nature of the collective identity and collective action of the organisations in this research.

These theories regarding formal organisations, networks and social movements show that the internalised collective identity of an organisation (which is determined by its length of existence, and relational setting at time of conception, its objectives and typical membership) and externalised collective identity (constructed by allies, competitors, adversaries and the apparatus of social control) influence the collective action of the group. The nature of that collective action, in terms of reflexive self-monitoring, and through a maintenance of, or challenge to, dominant discourses, in
turn affect the collective identity of a group. There is a need to consider not only whether farming women's groups are formal organisations or networks - the structure on which to base their action; but how their action defines their collective identity, and in turn how it affects identities for farm women. Melucci's work has provided an approach for analysing organisational type / collective identity and pre-determining the nature of collective action. His work can be applied to farming women's organisations by examining the spaces and arenas within which farming women's organisations operate, and the hegemonic notions of feminity that their action maintains or challenges. Section 2.5 further examines political action through leadership and feminist theories relating to power structures and participation.

2.5 Political Action Through Leadership

The previous section has highlighted the importance of collective action in constructing collective identity, and in turn the nature of that collective action is a reflection of collective identity. This section examines leadership as a form of collective action which is not limited to the traditional placement in the public and male-dominated sphere (Githens et al., 1994). Leadership is defined as a form of social interaction, whereby leaders act as representatives of a collective group, maintaining and reinforcing the collective identity of the group (Melucci, 1996). This section argues that the leadership of farm women is a tangible indicator of collective identity, and the spaces that an organisation may create for the recognition of traditional or service identities.

Recent research (Alston, 2000; Alston and Wilkinson, 1998; Brandth, 1994; Pini, 2002; Sachs, 1996; Shortall, 1992, 1999; Wells, 1998; Whatmore, 1991) has focused on the lack of farm women’s leadership in agri-industry; however, when analysing the impact of farming women’s organisation in constructing collective identity for farm women, it is necessary to consider both leadership in agri-industry and leadership in community. Farm women’s leadership in the community is of a traditional nature and therefore has tended to remain invisible. Responding to a feminist call to reconceptualise political action, this thesis contends that collective action through leadership in the community is important, and questions whether action must be in the
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Analytical Framework

public sphere of agri-industry (i.e. challenging ownership of public space) to challenge the dominant identity of farm women.

The focus on leadership as a form of collective and political action is justified for both theoretical and prescriptive reasons. While leadership is just one part of collective action Melucci (1996) claims leaders must provide the means for action; they must maintain and reinforce the identity of the group through their leadership action. They do so through their relationships with external groups and organisations that inform and circulate ontological narratives within society. Ridgeway (2001) claims that gendered beliefs about status are linked with hierarchy, thus the performance of leadership may be seen as a ‘battleground’ for the maintenance or challenge of traditional gender systems. Furthermore, Parry (1998) constructs leadership as a social influence process, associated with change and power, hence through leadership it is possible for farm women to change or maintain beliefs about legitimate identities for farm women. By its very performance farm women’s leadership in the community and agri-industry either gains or loses the support and consensus of others for their organisation and certain identities for farm women. On a more prescriptive basis, an analysis of leadership best covers the spectrum of action amongst the farm women of the case study organisations. The performance by members of leadership in the community or agri-industry is a visible performance of farm women as carers, community workers, farmers, and industry actors; thus maintaining or challenging hegemonic identities for farm women.

This section completes the framework necessary for analysing the leadership (as a form of political /collective action) of farming women and their organisations, and the effect of that action on their collective identity. A framework for analysing the leadership of farm women is established, drawing largely upon the recent works of Carli (2001), Ridgeway (2001) and Yoder (2001). A review of recent studies on leadership among farm women is undertaken, enabling a contemporary picture of farm women leadership to be established28. An analysis of political action, in its traditional and feminist senses, is undertaken, and in particular, a feminist reconceptualisation of action in public and private spheres is examined. Finally, the

28 This is further supported by contemporary leadership statistics provided in Appendix D.
function of organisations in engendering political action is examined; considering the placement of an organisation’s action in either the public or private sphere and the corresponding relationship with challenging or maintaining hegemonic identities for farm women, and hence rurality.

2.5.1 Analysing Leadership
While much leadership research has been undertaken in the context of profit-based and mixed gender organisations, recent studies in the gendered nature of leadership may be applied to leadership amongst farming women's organisations. It has been argued earlier in this chapter that organisations create spaces for the circulation of ontological narratives and the recognition of narrative identities. Valocchi (2001) states that it is within the spaces created by organisations that particular types of leadership are recognised and acted upon. This thesis contends that it is the politicisation and performance of certain identities by farm women that may maintain or challenge hegemonic identities.

The performance of leadership is very much gendered, both in terms of spaces and practices (Bartunek et al., 2000; Carli, 2001; Eagly and Johannsen-Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001; Yoder, 2001), and as such it is possible to analyse the performance of leadership by members of the case study organisations by considering the sphere within which they act, and whether they interpret any deterrents to their acting in that sphere.

Yoder (2001) argues that leadership is contextualised in a continuum of gendered spaces and performances. At one end of the continuum is a male dominated, hierarchical, performance and power driven leadership style, and at the other a more contemporary transformational/charismatic leadership focusing on influence and empowerment. This contemporary leadership style, Yoder claims, is more desirable to women leaders. The questions this raises for this thesis when considering the spaces and strategies organisations provide for leadership, is where do different farming women's organisations fit on this continuum? As seen in Section 2.4.2, and supported later in this thesis in Chapters Four and Seven, newer networks provide spaces within which empowerment is deemed important, and therefore they may be placed at the transformational end of the leadership continuum. However, when
considering established organisations for farm women it is difficult to place them on Yoder’s continuum. These organisations appear to be neither power-driven nor charismatic. It is possible to envisage established organisations as operating as traditional feminised contexts, acting communally (see below), and newer networks as providing an alternative feminised context, which is agentic and challenges masculine contexts. It is within these spaces that farm women are exposed to particular strategies and narratives about leadership.

Researchers argue that societal expectations influence the performance of leadership in such a way that the norms are for women to lead with reactive communality, and men with agentic competence (Carli, 2001; Eagly and Johannsen-Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001; Yoder, 2001). Thus, while male leaders are seen and expected to act assertively and competitively, with dominance and confidence, women are expected to compromise, consider the welfare of others, and be helpful and nurturing. Recent research has indicated that leadership in activities termed feminine or social are linked to female leaders (Eagly and Karau, 1991, cited in Ridgeway, 2001: 647). Women who act agentically are seen by others to threaten male dominance (Carli, 2001). Women leaders who violate the ontological narratives that support these gendered expectations and lead in traditionally masculine spaces, for example, agri-industry, encounter resistance (Eagly and Johannsen-Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001).

Therefore, leadership as an act of social influence, as a performance of collective identity, may maintain or challenge the hegemonic ontological narratives informing identities for farm women. However, does this leadership need to be performed in a masculinised context to challenge notions of rurality, must the ‘battleground’ be male dominated? This discussion has demonstrated that agentic leadership in a context that is a traditionally male gendered space may challenge the ontological narratives which surround and form ideas of what farm women ought to be. In accordance with this argument, it also suggests that communal leadership, traditionally gendered as female, and performed in a feminised context will not challenge hegemonic identities for farm women. The following section (2.5.2) examines empirical research that has been undertaken on farm women’s leadership in Western countries, indicating the marginality of such action.
2.5.2 Farm Women and Political Action Through Leadership

Contrary to an increased visibility, sustained by researchers and farm women themselves, of women in farming (Pettersen and Solbakken, 1998; Pini, 2002) farm women’s leadership, either in the community or agri-industry, has tended to be marginalized and invisible. Literature on farm women’s leadership in agri-industry indicates women operating as marginal, under-represented and secondary to men, with a focus on farm family issues (Alston, 2000; Pini, 2002; Sachs, 1996; Wells, 1998). This othering is accredited to hegemonic and masculine discourses that surround agri-industry, constructed in particular by patrilineal inheritance and a gendered division of labour, which have meant that farm women have traditionally had no forum or space in which to express their views (Alston and Wilkinson, 1998; Brandth, 1994; Shortall, 1992; Whatmore, 1991). Mainstream farming organisations are traditionally embedded with gendered discourse which support male dominance (McHoul and Grace, 1998) thereby making it difficult for women to participate; hence the role of farming women's organisations in creating space and opportunities for leadership is a very important one.

Farm women’s leadership roles in the community have received much less attention from researchers, even though hegemonic discourses encourage women's community work. While this community leadership is acknowledged there is a lack of political conceptualisation in literature and dominant rural discourses (Little, 2002). Literature on community leadership indicates that women are prominent in community services and decision making (Little, 1997; Hughes 1997a, 1997b; Teather 1994b). Little (2002) asserts that community is a powerful aspect in constructing dominant discourses in rurality, but questions if there is indeed any challenge in that important role, writing that:

> It is difficult to argue, however, that women’s greater involvement in voluntary activity within rural areas has given them any real additional power or enabled them to exert a special influence on the policy process… indeed… [it] serves to reinforce the power balance between men and women in rural communities and to protect established patriarchal gender relations.” (2002: 154).

There is a link between this community leadership espoused by established farming women's organisations and maintenance of a traditional domestic-based identity for farm women.
While community leadership is an 'approved' form of leadership for women, farm women’s leadership in the public sphere of agri-industry appears limited, not highly visible and not encouraged. In light of this, this thesis argues that it is the function of farming women's organisations to create spaces for farm women to conceive to lead not only in the community, but also in agri-industry. To do this, and for farm women’s leadership in both spheres to be recognised, a reconceptualisation of political action is required.

2.5.3 Political Action (Re)Conceptualisation

Feminist academics have called for a reconceptualisation of political action in recent decades, debating how political action is constituted, and where action must occur for it to be considered political (Ackelsberg, 1988; Frazer, 1998; McDowell, 1999; Milroy and Wismer, 1994; Morgen and Bookman, 1988; Okin, 1998; Phillips, 1998; Squires, 2000; Staeheli and Cope, 1994; Tronto; 1996; Weedon, 1999). This reconceptualisation has centred on the split between public and private spheres that is central to Western political thought (Ackelsberg and Shanley, 1996; Okin, 1998; Squires, 2000). The following section examines this public/private split, and feminist critiques of this concept, focusing on how it has marginalised women’s political action, and what must be done to reconceptualise political action. Particular attention will be paid to how the public/private split is conceptualised with regard to the family farm and farm household.

Public/Private Spheres

Classic liberal political theory, based on patriarchal rights, created a division between the public sphere of state and civil society and the private sphere of the family and domestic (Ackelsberg, 1988; Morgen and Bookman, 1988; Okin, 1998; Phillips, 1998; Squires, 2000). Milroy and Wismer (1994) claim that these patriarchal narratives are so interwoven into everyday life that it has become 'socio-politically credible' to split the domestic from the non-domestic. These two spheres were conceptualised as so distinct from each other that one did not encroach upon the other; thus making it possible for the private sphere to be deemed irrelevant and rendered invisible (Okin, 1998; Squires, 2000). This spatial division was crucial to the social construction of gendered divisions of home (feminine) and work (masculine).

For example, Locke in Laslett, 1967; Rousseau, 1968; and Hegel, 1945.
(McDowell, 1999), and as such, feminist academics have challenged this public/private dichotomy (McDowell, 1999; Milroy and Wismer, 1994; Sapiro, 1998).

The challenge has included calls to reconceptualise the public/private divide so that it no longer marginalises women; and a challenge of the apolitical status of the domestic, reconstituting the meaning of ‘political’. Squires, for example, claims that:

> The construction of the public/private distinction, and the assertion that those social relations deemed private are non-political, leads liberal theorists to marginalize the political significance of power relations within the private sphere altogether and to recognize only certain forms of power relations within the public sphere. (2000: 31-32).

The placement of politics and political action in the public sphere, retained for men, has conceptualised traditional images of action as voting, lobbying and protest activity within formal government structures (Abrahams, 1992). This concept of political action remains dominant in liberal democratic societies and predominantly focuses on the elite and men as actors (Abrahams, 1992; Burt, 1986; Githens et al., 1994). Ackelsberg (1988) claims that when women have acted outside the home, their activities have been ignored, and defined as being outside the political arena. This conceptualisation of politics and political action is the "most powerful reason for the invisibility of women as political actors..." (Morgen and Bookman, 1988: 3). As previous research has shown, farm women's leadership both in community and agri-industry is invisible or undervalued. Hegemonic identities for farm women construct service/reproductive identities for farm women, place them not as producers in the public, but as carers, farm helpers and community workers in the private/feminised sphere. Hence, their leadership in the community, unpaid and voluntary, is viewed more as maintenance work rather than building communities (Milroy and Wismer, 1994). Traditional conceptualisations of political action and the placement of women in a private, non-political sphere have serious repercussions for women's participation in politics and as effective actors, the distinction obscuring political action and power structures within the private sphere.

Feminists have vocalised the need to reconceptualise political action; to recognise that personal life is not immune to power, and that the private/domestic sphere and the non-domestic/public sphere are not isolated from one another (Okin, 1998), that the
boundaries between the two are permeable and mutable, with each implicating the other (Ackelsberg and Shanley, 1996: 214). Yeatman (1994) suggests redrawing the boundaries of the political to include greater inclusion of women within the public, institutionalised conception of the political, extending women’s functions in private into the public realm and displacing the boundary between public and private to recognise women’s political participation outside the boundaries of formal institutions, for example, community work.

Whatmore (1991) has considered the placement of the farm family in both spheres. She contends that wider social theory has viewed the family as in a dichotomous relationship with the wider world; conceptualising the farm family as marginalised from the (public) production process. She claims that a framework which dichotomises production and reproduction (private) "obscures the essential interdependence of these two processes" (1991: 38), proposing that this interdependence is reflected in relations occurring in the private arena of the farm household which "mediate access to property, resources and skills… in different ways in different times and places…” (1991: 146). In later work, Whatmore calls for this interdependence between the public/productive and private/reproductive spheres of the farm to be recognised by redefining farming experiences and perspectives to include women's own experiences and perspectives (1994: 109). Whatmore’s work recognises and values the relations between the two spheres, with actions in the private affecting the public. The following section examines political action, claiming that farm women’s action in the private sphere is just as political as that in the public sphere.

**Political Action**

Political action as a process is dynamic, and as such is affected by a multiplicity of factors. 'Politics' is about the activities of everyday life that are connected to the social institutions and political-economic processes of society. Political action may negotiate, resist, challenge, or even maintain those institutions and their power (Morgen and Bookman, 1988; Abrahams, 1992). A feminist approach to political action moves beyond the conceptualisation of action in formal governmental systems. The personal becomes political, and women are seen as political actors where values and resources are negotiated in everyday life, in the private and the public, from
interpersonal to global (Abrahams, 1992; Squires, 2000). However, traditional views of political action still exist and women's political action often remains invisible.

Staeheli (1996) proposes that community work and much of women's work has occurred outside the traditional political arena, thus making invisible women's political action; and Staeheli and Cope (1994) assert that we must look beyond the traditional political arena on two counts. We must consider the location of political action, suggesting that women traditionally operate on a local scale in homes, neighbourhoods and communities; and we must expand our concept of political action to incorporate multiple scales and politics beyond the public sphere thus challenging traditional meanings. Tronto (1996) proposes the consideration of ‘care’ as a political concept, claiming that it reflects structures of power, rather than the apolitical nature placed upon it since Aristotle’s Politics (Aristotle, 1923). For example, Sachs proposes that the political action of farm women has often taken a variety of forms that do not fit the public arena mould of social and political action. Rather, she claims that due to traditional, patriarchal values common in rural communities, women's individual and personal actions are often seen as outside of politics (1994: 123).

A feminist reconceptualisation of political action makes farm women’s action, through their organisations, more visible; however, their everyday life is still rooted in the socially constructed dichotomy of public and private spheres, and they act in that environment. This is recognised by feminists writing more recently who suggest that all distinctions between the two spheres should not be dissolved, but only that the boundaries become more permeable in recognition of the real material consequences for women living that everyday life (Morgen and Bookman, 1988; Phillips, 1998; Thornham, 2000). While traditional assumptions about political action must be challenged, this thesis contends that in analysing that action we must recognise that women at the grassroots level are acting in an arena where the public/private dichotomy is still operative, although mutable, and that the power to define what is political is still rooted in this dichotomy. Indeed, Halfacree (1993), defining ‘rural’, asserts the need to move from academic discourse to considering lay discourses. In
the context of farm women, the lay discourses surrounding political action are still limited to the public sphere, and very rarely consider home and community.\textsuperscript{30}

In analysing farm women and their organisations, it is necessary to consider the placement of political action in the public and private spheres. Consideration must be given to the nature of political action as particular social locations create distinctive political action (Morgen and Bookman, 1988) and, hence, recognition. A more important consideration is if action challenges the dominant assumptions of where farm women's action is to be placed. Carbert (1995), has undertaken an analysis of political action of farm women in Ontario, Canada, and validates this societal view of the public/private split. She presents farm women's political action as either community- or commodity-based; with a distinction being made between 'old' and 'new' farm women's organisations which places established organisations in the private sphere, and newer networks in the public. She claims, however, that social barriers facing farm women leave only community-based action as a practical political action for farm women (1995: 168). This would suggest that commodity-based political action might be seen as challenging dominant social processes.

2.5.4 Reconstructing Farm Women's Identity
The function of farming women's organisations of providing space for a collective political action is important. The previous section has shown that political action may occur in both the private and the public spheres, but that action in a feminised sphere of home and community is limited in its visibility. Thus, the effects of policy on the ‘farm family’ and ‘rural community’ have been deemed unimportant, and are indeed often less visible. Established farming women's organisations, and indeed some newer networks, have placed a strong emphasis on the farm family and community, and their leadership should reflect this emphasis. However, with recognition\textsuperscript{31} that this private sphere action is just as political as action in the public sphere of agri-industry, comes

\textsuperscript{30} For the purpose of this thesis I have considered community as being private space. This community work is unpaid work, and is separate from the public sphere, in that undertaking unpaid tasks often renders that contribution to society as invisible, as occurs with domestic work. Indeed, liberal political economy theory discounts informal/unpaid activities; it conceptualises the public as state and the private as the formal market economy (Milroy and Wismer, 1994; Pateman, 1989).

\textsuperscript{31} See for example: Ackelsberg, 1988; Frazer, 1998; McDowell, 1999; Milroy and Wismer, 1994; Morgen and Bookman, 1988; Okin, 1998; Phillips, 1998; Squires, 2000; Staeheli and Cope, 1994; Tronto; 1996; Weedon, 1999.
the question of whether or not political action, be it public or private, is challenging the dominant identity of farm women. This section provides a framework for analysing the political action of farming women’s organisations.

**Power**

Power and resistance are analysed in terms of challenging ownership of the public sphere, and reconstructing political action in the private sphere; thus suggesting that action which challenges the dominant identity of farm women does not have to occur only in the public sphere. However, it is proposed that if established organisations act predominantly in the private, feminised sphere they are able, but unlikely, to challenge these dominant discourses; and that newer networks, if acting mainly in the public, masculine sphere are more challenging of dominant discourses in their action.

Recent feminist and postmodern theories suggest that power consists of a set of social relations that are complex and shifting, often described as a web or network of intersecting relations. Power intersects in particular points on this web, and individuals may be variously located on the web in a particular relational setting, determining their access to, use of, and control over material and ideological resources of society (Cloke and Little, 1997; Endeveld, 1994; McHoul and Grace, 1998; Mackenzie, 1992; Morgen and Bookman, 1988). These theories draw upon Foucauldian notions of power; and although feminist analyses of Foucault claim his disregard of women’s discourses and reverse discourses as sites of resistance, his work provides a theory upon which we may build. Most important in this is the recognition that power is continuous, dispersed and localised (Diamond and Quinby, 1988; Layder, 1994) and that discourse is crucial in sustaining hegemonic power (Diamond and Quinby, 1988).

Traditional definitions of power, based on Hobbes’ juridical power of law and sovereignty and Marx’s discursive power of state apparatus and ideological representations of power (McHoul and Grace, 1998: 87), view the power process as one way and descending, where power acts upon something; a power wielder acts upon a subject. Instead, Foucault, asserting that power has a historical specificity related to this web of relations, views power as circulating amongst individuals and acting at local and regional points in everyday life (McHoul and Grace, 1998). Sharp
et al. neatly conceptualise Foucault’s power as “an amalgam of forces, practices, processes and relations” (2000: 20); force relating to coercion and influence, practices as knowledge utilised in particular settings, processes as actions which may develop and change events, and relations involving social, economic, political and cultural relations (2000: 21).

Foucault, in his work on criminology, claims that any institution operates with an apparatus of power techniques composed of power relations co-ordinated in relationships with systems of knowledge (Layder, 1994; McHoul and Grace, 1998). In the context of this thesis, mainstream farming organisations may be viewed as employing particular power techniques, and indeed hegemonic discourses, which exclude women from leadership positions. This relationship between power and knowledge, Foucault asserts, creates new opportunities for agency and resistance to power techniques. Foucault’s shifting network of power relations allows points of resistance in everyday life to open up and for individuals to construct new identities and discourses (Clegg, 1989; Layder, 1994; McHoul and Grace, 1998).

The interacting and temporal nature of power and identity, and the relations surrounding them, may generate negotiations of, and challenges to, power and the forms of knowledge, or discourses, which support that power. These contests between power and identity enable the construction of spaces of resistance that may aid effective political action (Staeheli, 1994). This action, or resistance can generate new alternative forms of knowledge, and a renewed commitment to resistance (Ackelsberg, 1988; Weedon, 1997). In a practical sense, Dale (1999: 286) defines a socio-political empowerment as the capacity to engage in collective action; developing confidence, political efficacy and knowledge. This empowerment is typical of women’s groups who are assuming a political role in informal groupings, pressing at the margins of political space (Weiss, 1999: 67), breaching the system’s limits (Melucci, 1996), challenging existing contexts and in the process reshaping and redefining the self (Hirschmann, 1996).

This thesis contends that a feminist reconceptualisation of political action as ‘the politics of everyday life’ and Foucauldian notions of power as a web of relations, constructed by, and reconstructing, knowledge and discourse, means that resistance
and socio-political empowerment must begin in everyday practices, and hence that both public and private sphere action must be considered, indeed recognising that in the everyday these two spheres blur and combine. In practice, however, the political action of women is often constrained by women’s traditional placement in the private sphere, governed by relations of power that construct this ‘private sphere action’ as irrational and situated (Cope, 1997; Staeheli, 1996).

Cloke and Little conceptualise rurality as an “‘accepted representation’ [which] reflect[s] dominant power relations in rural society…. reproducing the preferred composition and values of ‘the powerful’ in rural society and in turn reinforcing the distribution of power and status.” (1997: 276-7). This preferred composition is often reflected in the patriarchal structure of many mainstream farming organisations and limits or renders invisible women’s political action in this public arena (Alston, 1995b). Therefore by examining farming women’s organisations’ political action and leadership in community and agri-industry in their everyday life, we may see points of resistance forming. This thesis examines this political action/resistance, considering the effectiveness of action in the public or private sphere in challenging dominant discourses and identities for farm women.

The function of farming women’s organisations in encouraging and enabling farm women to become politically active and to assist in a reconceptualisation of political action is very important. Leighley proposes that “individuals’ incentives for belonging to a group are powerful constraints on the group’s ability to … mobilise political activity” (1996: 459), suggesting that the type of member an organisation attracts will affect the collective action of that group. Recent feminist writings on women’s organisations highlight their importance in providing a space where women may recognise their collectivity or solidarity, and develop skills in a supportive environment that will allow and promote activism and resistance (Ackelsberg, 1988; Bookman and Morgen, 1988; Carbert, 1995; Staeheli, 1994). The political action of women's organisations has traditionally focused on the private arena, for example established farming women's organisations (Carbert, 1995); but increasingly newer organisations, have attempted to redefine political action by taking the private to the public arena, and challenging conventionality (Staeheli and Cope, 1994). Indeed, McDowell asserts the importance of resistance in the public arena as that is “where
the diversity that constitutes ‘the public’ is most apparent and where idealized notions of ‘the public interest’ are challenged" (1999: 151).

In analysing farming women's organisations, be they established or recently constituted, we must consider the nature of the space provided for action and resistance; whether that space is promoting action and resistance in the public or private arenas; and more importantly, if that action is maintaining or challenging the status quo of farm women's collective identity. This thesis argues that the placement of political action of established organisations is predominantly in the private, feminised context of home and community with their action focusing on social and community-based issues, although they do operate in the interlinked public sphere. Furthermore, it argues that the action of newer networks is placed predominantly in the public, masculine arena of farm and agri-industry, dealing with farming and industry related issues; and is therefore challenging dominant assumptions of farm women's identity, which places them predominantly in the private, feminised sphere.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has assessed literature relating to research on farming women, and theories of rurality, identity, organisations and political action. This section draws these discussions together and creates an analytical framework that allows analysis of the role of farming women's organisations in maintaining or reconstructing farm women identity, via an analysis of their collective identity, and collective action. The thesis proposes a relationship between these organisations and particular collective action in the public or private spheres. In completing this analytical framework, the chapter asks if action by farm women in the community or in agri-industry is more compelling in challenging the identities for farm women that are supported by rurality.

This analytical framework presents rurality as a construction of social practices, relations and institutions which supports specific identities for farm women, in particular the traditional service identities of carer, farm helper and community worker. This rurality is challenged by the alternative occupational identities of farmer, off-farm worker and the industry actor. Organisations for farm women appear to
either support or challenge traditional rurality or service identities, and these organisations may be categorised by organisational type and thus collective identity. This collective identity, constructed by internal factors (formation, structure and membership characteristics) and external factors (members, other farm women and media) creates a particular ontological narrative that encourages and supports certain identities for farm women. Certain narrative identities are portrayed and taken up by members of particular farm women’s organisation; established organisations promote the service identities, and newer networks promote the occupational identities. The outward portrayal of particular identities is exemplified through leadership, with service leadership undertaken in the community (private sphere) and occupational leadership in agri-industry (public sphere). Figure 2.5 enlarges on this framework diagrammatically, and this is followed by a more detailed discussion, which highlights questions to be answered and resolved in fieldwork.
Figure 2.5: Function of farming women’s organisations in the (re)construction of identity
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2.6.1 Rurality
Research indicates that farming women have multiple identities, which in the 'everyday' of their lives, jostle for dominance; supported and restrained by dominant discourses and narratives. These dominant discourses and narratives, and the processes that exist between them, create certain sets of social and material practices, relations and institutions that in this chapter and other rural research have been termed rurality. Ruralities provide particular sets of ontological narratives, or ways of seeing one's self, which, for farm women, has traditionally supported service identities. These ontological narratives are constructed by, and in turn construct, public/lay discourses of everyday experience and imagination, popular/cultural discourses such as the media, and professional/institutional discourses disseminated by policy and decision makers in government, industry and mainstream farming organisations (as shown in the blue parts of Figure 2.5).

Research undertaken in New Zealand, Australia and Canada indicates similar ruralities that support dominant identities for farm women that are domestic and community-work oriented. This research and theories of identity suggest that farming women's organisations can be sites of resistance to, or compliance with, these dominant discourses, and this thesis contends that it is through collective action, exemplified by leadership, that a challenge to those practices, relations and institutions constructing rurality, and therefore farm women’s collective identity, may be made.

2.6.2 Constructing Farm Women's Identity
For the purposes of this research the multiple identities of farm women, identified in Western literature, have been classified into two categories. The identities of carer, farm helper, and community worker have been grouped as 'service' identities. The identities of farmer, off-farm worker, and industry actor are grouped as 'occupational' identities. These identities are not fixed, and many will figure in the construction of each farm woman's identity; however in specific relational settings, particular identities many be more apparent than others. Figure 2.5 illustrates how service identities constitute the dominant collective identity of farm; while occupational identities are viewed as alternatives to the mainstream service identities (green and violet parts of Figure 2.5, respectively). Research has indicated that while service
identities remain relevant in the construction of farm women, increasingly there is acknowledgment that occupational identities are becoming more relevant. It is my contention that the dominant collective identity for farm women remains centred on the service identities because of a lack of recognition, and practical realisation, given to occupational identities by established farming women's organisations in the form of leadership.

It has been proposed in this chapter that collective action may reconstruct the collective identity of farm women by challenging and reconstructing rurality. This may occur through farm women recognising a collective identity that will encourage particular collective action. In particular relational settings certain identities will become more apparent, or farm women may feel some dissatisfaction with dominant constructions of their identity; and in the case of both established and newer networks this has resulted in the establishment of farming women's organisations. This is shown in Figure 2.5, where the double-headed arrows indicate a cause and effect relationship between farm women recognising particular identities and a specific organisation. This thesis contends that it is the function of farming women's organisations to create spaces for farm women where that relational setting is more visible, and for farm women to recognise collective identities which engage with, and challenge, various identities. Through the politicisation of those identities, organisations can act to maintain or reconstruct the dominant identity of farm women. In recognising the dynamic nature of collective identity and collective action, it is possible and indeed likely, that organisations will be placed across these two sets of identities and actions.

2.6.3 Organisations and the Politicisation of Identity

This function of organisations in creating spaces for the recognition of collective identity is an important one, and the links between the characteristics of an organisation, its subsequent collective identity and the nature of its collective action, are critical in the (re)construction of identity. Analysis of literature on Western farming women's organisations has identified two types of organisations and the functions or objectives of those types (shown in Figure 2.5 within black boxes and identified by either green or violet). These two types, established organisations and newer network organisations, via these functions and objectives, can be placed predominantly in either the public/agri-industry sphere or the private/service sphere.
Research undertaken by Teather (1996a, 1996b), Cebotarev and Beattie (1985), and Carbert (1995, 1996) indicates that the established organisations are largely positioned in the private/service sphere, with objectives focused on a social purpose and community work. In contrast, Teather (1996a, 1996b), Liepins (1995, 1998a, 1999), Mackenzie (1992, 1994) and Shortall (1994), indicate that newer organisations are more likely to be positioned in the public/agri-industry sphere, focusing on an industry agenda and having a career focus; and this research also indicates that these newer organisations are creating new spaces within which farming women can act.

Established farming women's organisations are more likely to maintain ruralities and the dominant service identities, and subsequently they attract members who identify predominantly with those service identities. Their collective action is influenced by this concern for home and community. Newer organisations may challenge ruralities and dominant identities, suggesting the construction of spaces of action in the agri-industry sphere, which will reconstruct farming women's collective identity to include occupational identities.

Figure 2.5 highlights the link between these two types of organisations and a collective identity and collective action situated in the two spheres. The link indicates that internal and external factors create a particular identity, which along with organisational type, results in collective action in either the service or agri-industry spheres. This suggests that organisations may be analysed by considering their structure, their formation, and the membership characteristics, and I suggest that these factors can be analysed to place the organisations in an arena of action, and to determine their collective identity. Established organisations with hierarchical decision making structures; formation from a social and community need; and a membership which is older and more likely to have joined for social and community needs, point towards an unlikely challenge of the status quo of rurality and the identities it supports. In contrast, newer network organisations are more likely to attract members who are dissatisfied with mainstream farming women's organisations because they wish to promote a collective identity that considers occupational identities along with service identities. Newer organisational structures tend to employ faster communication methods enabling a flatter, grassroots decision making structure. This structure is also conducive to reflexive self monitoring, allowing the
adjustment of future actions; this allows actions to be adjusted to better meet desired objectives.

In this analysis of organisations it is not only important to consider the organisational structure as formal or informal, i.e. established organisations or network-based organisations, but also if the action of that organisation is conventional or resisting in its nature. New social movement theory suggests that to politicise identity, action must challenge conventionality; it must also breach the system's limits, acting in conflict with conventionality. In reviewing organisations and their capacity to (re)construct farm women’s position within rurality, we must consider not only the collective identity of an organisation, but we must also consider the nature of that collective action, in challenging or reinforcing conventionality. Established organisations with formal structures and a service identities focused membership are unlikely to act quickly to challenge conventionality; while newer network-based organisations, with their flatter structure and faster communication style will act more reflexively, thus being more likely to challenge farm women’s dominant collective identity in rurality.

2.6.4 Political Action and the (Re)Construction of Identity
The final part of the conceptual framework in the analysis of farming women's organisations and their maintenance or reconstruction of identity, is to consider if an organisation’s action is empowering farm women to challenge their collective identity. Contemporary agri-industry leadership by farm women lacks recognition, as does their leadership in the community. The agri-industry is imbued with masculinist discourses, while farm women’s community work is often rendered invisible, even though like its agri-industry-based counterpart, it contributes to the construction of rurality.

Feminist theorists have called for a reconceptualisation of political action and recognition of the permeability of the public and private spheres; challenging the apolitical nature of the private sphere and recognising that everyday life is part of the political. Farm women, in their everyday life act in both the private and public spheres without any easy demarcation of those activities. Rurality, though, has tended to support identities that place farm women in the private sphere, and they have acted in
this private arena of home and community. This thesis contends that even with a reconceptualisation of political action, farm women and their organisations must act outside their normal sphere of influence and act to challenge rurality in the public arena, if they wish to reconstruct farming women's collective identity. In analysing this action then, we must consider the space and power factors (force, practices, processes and relations) created and maintained by farming women's organisations that empower women to act collectively. Consideration must be given to the placement of spaces and actions in either the public or private spheres, and we must consider if those actions are challenging or maintaining the social practices, relations and institutions that create rurality.

2.6.5 Confluence of Themes
Drawing together the four strands of this analytical framework allows analysis of the function of farming women's organisations in challenging or maintaining the dominant identities for farm women that are supported through the social practices, relations and institutions inherent in traditional notions of rurality. It is possible through analysis of the identities recognised by particular farm women to associate the performance of service and/or occupational identities with specific farming women's organisations. Subsequent analysis of an organisation’s collective identity and action, through organisational type, the promotion of particular identities, and leadership performed in the community or agri-industry will allow assessment of a challenge to, or maintenance of, traditional identities for farm women.

This chapter has established a framework for analysing the relationships between farm women's identities, their organisations, and the influence of particular contexts and practices for action. The following chapter outlines the methodology employed in conducting this study, and the impact of the feminist and situated nature of the research on the following analysis. Chapters Four to Seven, respectively, address each of these themes and the associated research questions. Themes from Section 2.2 are taken up in Chapter Four which includes an analysis of the social practices, relations and institutions that contribute to gendered notions of rurality in each of the case study countries. An analysis of collective identity must consider both the internal and external dimensions of organisational collective identity and these are addressed separately in the remainder of Chapter Four and Chapter Five. Chapter Six analyses
the spaces and narrative identities created by organisations for the recognition and performance of identity by farm women, by examining the narrative identities important to groups of farm women. Collective action, via leadership as reconceptualised in Section 2.5, is examined in Chapter Seven, and considers the influence of everyday political action on the hegemonic identities for farm women.
Chapter Three: Methodology

Following the analytical framework set out in Chapter Two, this chapter outlines the feminist epistemology and principles guiding this research. To begin, Section 3.1 argues that a feminist methodology is required to examine how gender influences the production of knowledge about farm women, their identities, and their organisations. Section 3.2 acknowledges my positionality and the situatedness of the knowledge that is re-presented in this thesis. Section 3.3 introduces the case study areas and organisations, providing demographic data about the farm women who were participants in this research. Section 3.4 outlines the research methods and the phases of data collection, processing and analysis and reporting.

3.1 Methodological Approach

In Western rural societies women’s contribution to farming and agri-industry is under-valued and sometimes invisible. Chapter Two outlined various studies that have shown this, noting that, as a consequence, women’s voices are often silent in mainstream farming organisations. Their knowledge, experiences and everyday lives are not dominant in commentaries of agriculture or rural societies. In addressing this relative silence, this thesis is guided by an epistemology that is feminist in its approach. Feminist methodologies have been guided by an epistemology that considers how gender influences everyday social relations and who should occupy certain spaces within institutions and structures of power (McDowell, 1999). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that gender influences the production of our knowledge of the world, what counts as knowledge, and how that knowledge is legitimised, reproduced and represented (Cope, 2002; McDowell, 1999; Madge et al., 1997, Moss, 2002; Stanley and Wise, 1993). As such a feminist analysis seeks to demonstrate gender differences as a key organising principle in everyday experiences, beliefs and practices (McDowell, 1999). This approach recognises that gendered identities and social locations influence and legitimise what counts as knowledge (Cope, 2002).
Feminist critiques of geographic knowledge and rural studies have highlighted the need to recognise the unevenness of gender (Little, 2002; Moss, 2002; Rose, 1993). As a discipline, geography has traditionally privileged the masculine subject position over that of the feminine and advocated a binary or dualistic system that has positioned the masculine as dominant (Moss, 2002; Rose, 1993). Accordingly, feminist scholars seek to make visible previously invisible experiences that are othered by socially constructed power relations (Little, 2002; WGSG, 1997). Rural studies adopting a feminist methodology acknowledge that women’s voices and experiences in agriculture and rural society are often silent (for example: Alston, 1995b; Liepins, 1996a, 1996b, 1998a, 1998b; Mackenzie, 1992, 1994; Shaw, 1993), highlighting the importance of patriarchy in constructing notions of rurality; for example, the prioritisation of traditional gender relations, and the distribution of power within rural institutions and academic studies (Little, 2002).

As a piece of research that is guided by a feminist epistemology, this study employs methods that allow the everyday lives of farm women to be legitimised in the construction of knowledge. It also acknowledges the positionality and gendered experiences of my life and work as a researcher who is actively seeking specific research data and (re)constructing the knowledge of these farm women (Cope, 2002; Moss, 2002; Stanley and Wise, 1993). A key purpose of a feminist research project is not so much the choice of data collection methods, but the way these are undertaken and the ways in which data are interpreted so as to highlight the uneven conditions structuring women’s lives (Moss, 2002). Feminist researchers must seek to reflect the social phenomena in everyday life and to facilitate an understanding of women’s views of the world (Hall and Hall, 1996). Thus as feminist researchers, we must consider the questions asked, the way we locate ourselves within our questions, and the purpose of our work (Kelly, 1998, cited by Hall and Hall, 1996: 52). Once again, this involves an acknowledgement of positionality, but also the choices regarding methodologies and how these are undertaken\(^3\).

\(^3\) A phenomenological approach to this type of research could have provided a more detailed exploration of lived experiences through narratives and stories, as perceived by the actors in a situation. This approach lends itself well to challenging dominant assumptions in society (Lester, 1999; Luyt, 2003; Moustakas, 1994). However, studies of farm women have provided many lived-world accounts of farm women, and pragmatic and logistical issues surrounding a 3 country study was not conducive to an in-depth phenomenological study of the organisations. This could have been undertaken in New Zealand, but would have produced unevenly weighted data.
This study employs a multi-method approach, including both qualitative and quantitative methods. Feminist scholars advocate the use of multiple methods as opposed to a previously dominant scientific/positivist philosophy of scientific knowledge (Nairn, 2002) and the determination of ‘truth’ for a number of reasons. Feminist research seeks to make visible and scrutinise hidden power relations in society (McDowell, 1999), therefore a range of methods may add layers of information to a better and more responsive understanding of women’s lives and their contexts, illuminating previously discounted experiences (Reinharz, 1992). While qualitative methods have been predominantly advocated and used in feminist research (Kwan, 2002; Reinharz, 1992; WGSG, 1997) the use of quantitative methods has been increasingly legitimised. To a lesser extent, quantitative methods are now seen as an enhancement of the scientific validity of qualitative data (Reinharz, 1992), or as a reflection of positivism (Kwan, 2002). In a challenge to a qualitative/quantitative dualism, quantitative methods are viewed as one of many possible feminist methods used in a multi-method analysis (Cope, 2002; Kwan, 2002; Moss, 1995). The multiple methods used in this thesis are further justified and expanded upon in Section 3.4.

Regardless of the qualitative or quantitative nature of methods used in a feminist study, the researcher must seek to incorporate reflexivity into their methods and subsequent analysis (Falconer Al Hindi and Kawabata, 2002; McDowell, 1999; Stanley and Wise, 1993). The practice of reflexivity acknowledges the uneven power relationship that exists between researcher and respondent, and how that influences the research process. As such feminists seek to make visible the position of the researcher, the “situated knowledges” which structure the reasons for the research, the shaping of questions, the relevance given to certain knowledges, and the reproduction of that knowledge by the researcher (Falconer Al Hindi and Kawabata, 2002; Haggis, 1990; Hall and Hall, 1996; Reay, 1996; Stanley and Wise, 1993). This acknowledgement of my reflexivity and positionality is presented in Section 3.2.

As a piece of feminist research, I consider this study to be a political activity where my reconstructions of these women’s private experiences into public discourses about farm women may challenge mainstream masculinist accounts of agriculture. Not only does this study present an opportunity to challenge dominant agricultural power
structures, but also places an onus, on me, as researcher and knowledge interpreter, to reconstruct the knowledge these farm women have shared according to their own positionings (Edwards & Ribbens, 1998:2).

3.2 Acknowledging Positionality

The previous section has introduced the importance of reflexivity in the feminist research process, and in doing so a researcher must acknowledge their positionality. Such a process enables a consideration of how others may see them, and of how their experiences affect their research (England, 1994; Falconer Al Hindi and Kawabata, 2002; Marshall, 2002; Stanley and Wise, 1993). This process encourages an examination of our own assumptions and acknowledges our part in the research process and knowledge construction (Benton, 1997; Dyck, 1993: Haggis, 1990; Staeheli & Lawson, 1994; Stanley & Wise, 1993). Indeed, Stanley and Wise claim that “our consciousness is always the medium or technique through which the research occurs; there is not other method or technique of doing research other than through the medium of the researcher” (1993: 157). This call for reflexivity has led me to consider how I am situated as a researcher, and how others see me. Do they see me as an 'interloper' in their private and personal lives; as an interpreter and constructor of their knowledge, interpreting their private experiences into a public discourse or knowledge that will be powerful and challenging in academia and farming (Edwards & Ribbens, 1998: 2)? Reflection on these issues highlights how my situatedness or positionality has shaped the questions of this research project, the ways I collected the data, and most importantly, the ways in which I analysed and represent these farm women’s stories.

I spent the first eighteen years of my life living, playing and working on my parents' dairy farm in the Waikato region of New Zealand. During that time my mother was probably an exception in the farming community, in that she actively worked on the farm, had a part-time off-farm job, and explicitly called and considered herself a farmer. On reflection my farm work experiences were gendered. They were ancillary and supportive, for example, calf rearing, feeding out, driving the tractor at haymaking time, putting up electric fences and chasing cows, sometimes milking them. In contrast, I did not learn how to bale hay or operate the milking machinery,
which my older brother did. As such I must acknowledge my own gendered perspective and how that shapes my interpretation of the participants’ stories (Cope, 2002). Therefore, I bring all of my farming experiences with me in my research on farm women, and I also bring with me a belief in their vital, yet poorly valued, contribution to all aspects of farming; the family farm, the community, and the agri-industries.

In the process of this study I had to consider if my upbringing and my knowledge and experiences of farming, embodied in particular locations (Valentine, 2002; Rose, 1997), allowed me a closer relationship with the farm women I interviewed, or had they seen me as a student who has lived, worked and studied in an urban environment for most of the last decade? Attendance at key informant meetings in the preliminary stages of this research illustrated this concern. At a meeting in Dunedin, I was verbally challenged by one woman who perceived me to be a student who was taking their knowledge for my own gain. In comparison, at a meeting in the Waikato, I was introduced as a farming person, from the surrounding district, who was concerned about and supportive of their issues as farm women, and subsequently accepted by the group. On the one hand was a woman who from her viewpoint had been 'over-researched' by students, and who had not received feedback of the knowledge constructed. The Waikato group also was concerned with 'ownership' of the knowledge they would share with me, and with the way that I would interpret into a public discourse.

Although my story was there for the asking, and indeed some women did ask, assumptions were made about my positionality as a researcher. In some instances I was seen as an ‘insider’ and in others as an ‘outsider’ (Valentine, 2002). My experiences in the field resonate with debates amongst feminist scholars about the ‘insider/outsider’ positioning. Some debates suggest researchers who share the same identities as participants are positioned as ‘insiders’ and this enables a truer connection and more correct interpretation of the participants’ knowledge (Valentine, 2002). At times during my fieldwork this was partially true. At other times however, the differences between the participants and myself undercut any commonalities (Gilbert, 1994; Valentine, 2002), and this also influences my reconstructions of the participants’ knowledge.
These differences were most apparent where differences were the strongest, and subsequently the level of trust was low. The organisational representatives, and some of the members, of established organisations FWIO and CWAV, viewed me as a student and as a feminist, and were concerned that I would misrepresent their stories and organisations. The president of FWIO had sent a fax to the two representatives meeting with me which said, “I have a couple of other reports University students have done on WI for their thesis and they were not flattering [her emphasis]” (FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999). The CWAV representative was also concerned that I would write an unflattering report, and asked to see what I produced to make sure that I had correct factual data (CWAV Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999).

My acceptance was also locational, with participants in different countries, and indeed regionally within New Zealand, placing more or less trust in me as a researcher according to where I came from. In the Waikato I was considered more of an ‘insider’; members of the newer network, NWD, knew of my parents and family’s involvement in dairy farming, and were accepting of me as a person knowledgeable of farming. In Canada, even as an ‘outsider’ I was also at an advantage for two reasons. Firstly, as a New Zealander I was a novelty, and my sharing of the way things were done in New Zealand farming and agri-industry was interesting. Secondly, I had spent three months in Southwest Ontario (where most interview participants were located) and British Columbia on a youth farming exchange, so I knew a certain amount about Ontario and the way of farming there. In Australia, I was not such a novelty, coming from a country just across the Tasman Sea, and the women were less interested in how things were done in New Zealand.

One other aspect of my positionality shaped responses from older farm women; an aspect that highlighted the differences between many of the participants and myself. It was apparent that I was 29 or 30 years old and was not married. At times it also became apparent that even though I was engaged, I was living with my fiancé, and I often felt that they disapproved of this, and this somehow became of more importance than my farming background (my ‘insider’ identity) and my identity as a researcher. My marital and parental statuses have subsequently become more important in my positionality as a researcher since I constructed my questions, and the interviews that I
undertook. During the research process I became a mother, and towards the end of this research project my son is almost two years old. My understanding (and awe) of women who are mothers, and in particular those who continue to undertake work outside the home, on the farm and in the community has increased most dramatically. My analysis of data and the ways in which I have reported that knowledge is different from what it might have been. I acknowledge that I had no real understanding of the great importance these women place on being carers, and how challenging it must be to perform a multiplicity of other identities. I do now, and I hope it is reflected in the knowledge that I re-present in the coming chapters of this thesis. However, also acknowledged is my farming knowledge and experiences, my feelings about the politics surrounding farm women, and my academic background when I ask questions, when I listen to the responses, and when I interpret that knowledge and construct it as a public discourse.

3.3 Case Study Areas

Methodological literature has advocated advantages in undertaking multiple case studies (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Reinharz, 1992; Sarantakos, 1993) and this multiple case study approach was taken in this thesis, incorporating seven organisations in three countries. This section introduces these organisations and the demographics of their farm women members. However, prior to this it also provides an explanation for choosing to undertake a multiple case study approach, and acknowledge the constraints associated with this approach.

As acknowledged and explored in Chapter Two, there has been previous research undertaken on farming women's organisations in Western countries. In particular, research conducted by Liepins (1995; 1996a, 1996b; 1998a; 1998c) and Mackenzie (1992, 1994) has highlighted the emergence of new organisations for farm women in Australia and Canada, which have led to political action by these organisations that challenges dominant discourses in farming. These studies have examined individual organisations in-depth, and have engaged in participant observation and action research. However, while there has been little research that includes comparative analysis of farming women's organisations across Western rural societies (see as an
exception, Teather, 1996a, 1996b), there are methodological and practical justifications for doing so.

There are advantages in undertaking research on farming women's organisations in a variety of places; particularly in enabling a comparison between countries or regions where farming women's organisations and networks may be at different stages of development, but also where there are enough similarities between the social processes and institutions which shape farm women's everyday experiences. Teather (1996a; 1996b) investigated farming organisations in Australia, Canada and New Zealand, and identified colonialism, ethnicity, farming practices, and the countries' developed natures, as making them suitable for comparison. This is developed in Chapter 4.2, which identifies social practices, relations and institutions and material practico-inert structures that are common in each of the case study countries. Further to this, research by Monk and Katz (1993) on lifecourse substantiates a comparative study of the spaces created by organisations, which influences and shapes lifecourse and the dominance of particular narrative identities, in these three countries. They claim that women aged 15-64 years carry maximum responsibility for both productive and reproductive work, including paid work, and caring for others, and they further state that this responsibility is the highest in developed nations, including Canada, Australia and New Zealand (1993: 10).

In addition to these practical reasons, multiple case study analysis aids in our knowledge of localised and particular structures, processes and outcomes (Sarantakos, 1993), and in particular importance to this study, as a piece of feminist research, it aids in our understanding of how social phenomena shapes the everyday life of women, over time and space. Indeed, Reinharz states that “the paucity of case studies of women’s experience hampers our ability to engage in cross-cultural or comparative analyses of women’s lives and organisations” (1992:166). This multiple case study approach examines how farming women's organisations shape dominant and alternative identities for farm women across a number of locations, and allows for a comparative analysis of the social phenomenon that have influenced this process. An investigation of more than one organisation in each country where practico-inert structures are similar may help determine the different identities, spaces and goals of the various organisations.
The farming women's organisations investigated in this study emerged for a number of reasons. Organisations in Australia and Canada are identified in the literature mentioned above: Federated Women's Institutes of Ontario, Ontario Farm Women's Network, Country Women's Association, and the Central Victoria branch of Australian Women in Agriculture. In New Zealand there is only one established organisation representing women on farms, Rural Women New Zealand\(^\text{33}\); and through personal knowledge, key informant interviews and media stories two developing network type organisations were identified in the Waikato and Otago: Network for Women in Dairying, and Positively Clutha Women. Figures 3.1-3.3 provide maps of the case study areas. The following discussion presents basic demographic data for each organisation\(^\text{34}\). The collective identity of these organisations are analysed in Chapters Four and Five, the purpose here is provide basic data on the membership of each organisation.

\(^{33}\) The Country Women’s Institute exists in New Zealand. However, this organisation was not included in this study for two main reasons. First, RWNZ is acknowledged as the female counterpart of mainstream farming organisation, Federated Farmers. Second, CWI is a predominantly small town based organisation, focusing on homemaking and community (http://www.cwi.org.nz), and as such is less of an organisation for farm women in comparison to RWNZ.

\(^{34}\) Further detail is provided in Appendix A9.
Figure 3.1: Map of Waikato and Otago (New Zealand) Case Study Areas
Figure 3.2: Map of Ontario (Canada) Case Study Area
Figure 3.3: Map of Victoria (Australia) Case Study Area
The members of established organisations, FWIO and CWAV, are quite similar. They are likely to be 61 years or older and married or widowed. They identified their occupation as a farmer’s wife or retired. While they tend to be highly educated and highly involved in community work, and have equal ownership with their spouse of the farm property, they are unlikely to undertake farm or other paid work, or to be involved in farm decision making (see Boxes 3.1 - 3.2).

**Box 3.1: FWIO Member Demographics**
- Likely to be 61+ years in age
- Married or widowed
- Farmer’s wife or retired
- Higher secondary or tertiary educated
- Less likely to have undertaken informal education
- Equal farm ownership with spouse
- Unlikely to undertake farm activities
- Unlikely to undertake paid work
- Childcare not undertaken
- Housework high
- Community volunteer high participation
- Average decision making influence
- Unlikely to have access to internet

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire.

**Box 3.2: CWAV Member Demographics**
- Likely to be 61+ years of age
- Married or widowed
- Farmer’s wife
- Higher secondary educated
- Less likely to have undertaken informal education
- Equal farm ownership with spouse or family trust
- Mid to low participation in farm activities
- Low participation in paid work
- Mid to low childcare
- Housework high
- Community volunteer high participation
- Below average decision making influence
- Unlikely to have access to internet

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire.

Members of the two RWNZ regional organisations, Otago and Waikato, are likely to be slightly younger than their established organisations counterparts in Australia and Canada, and this is reflected in their marital status (married as opposed to widowed) and their occupations as farmers as well as farmer’s wives (see Boxes 3.3 - 3.4). Their education ranges from lower secondary to tertiary level and this is reflected in
participation in informal education, with Otago members more likely to undertake informal training. While members from both regions are likely to have an equal farm partnership with spouse and/ or family, a medium level of participation in farm work and decision making, Waikato members are more likely to undertake paid work, and less community work in comparison to members of all the established organisations.

Box 3.3: RWNZ Otago Member Demographics

- Likely to be 51-60 years of age
- Married
- Farmer / Farmer’s Wife
- Tertiary educated
- Of established organisations, more likely to have undertaken informal education
- Equal farm ownership with spouse, family trust or partnership with spouse’s family
- Medium participation in farm activities
- Low participation in paid work
- Little childcare
- Housework high
- Community volunteer high participation
- Average decision making influence
- Unlikely to have access to internet

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire.

Box 3.4: RWNZ Waikato Member Demographics

- Likely to be 51+ years of age, but some members in 21-30 group
- Married
- Farmer / Farmer’s Wife
- Lower secondary educated
- Less likely to have undertaken informal education
- Equal farm ownership with spouse or family trust
- Medium participation in farm activities
- Medium participation in paid work
- Medium childcare
- Housework high
- Community volunteer participation lower than other established organisations
- Average decision making influence
- Unlikely to have access to internet

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire.

There are many similarities amongst the members of the four newer networks, but also some significant differences (see Boxes 3.5–3.8). Overall, these women are younger than those of the established organisations, but where the women are older
they are more likely to have an above average decision making role and slightly less childcare commitments. The women of these networks are predominantly married, but are more likely to be single, de facto or divorced than members of established organisations. They identify more frequently as farmers and are likely to be tertiary educated, with equal farm partnerships with spouse and/or family. All have medium to high participation in farm activities, paid work and community work.

Box 3.5: OFWN Member Demographics

- Likely to be 41-60 years of age
- Married, although more likely to be single / divorced or de facto than established organisations
- Farmer / Farmer’s Wife / Off-farm Worker
- Tertiary educated
- More likely to have undertaken informal education
- Equal farm ownership with spouse or family trust
- High participation in farm activities
- Medium - high participation in paid work
- Medium childcare – less likely to have dependent children than other networks
- Housework high
- Community volunteer high participation
- Above average decision making influence
- Likely to have access to internet

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire.

Box 3.6: CVWiA Member Demographics

- Likely to be 31-50 years of age
- Married or widowed
- Farmer
- Tertiary educated
- More likely to have undertaken informal education
- Equal farm ownership with spouse or family trust
- High participation in farm activities
- Medium - high participation in paid work
- High childcare
- Housework high
- Community volunteer medium participation
- Average decision making influence
- Unlikely to have access to internet

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire.
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Box 3.7: PCW Member Demographics

- Likely to be 31-50 years of age, but significant members 21-30 group
- Married, although more likely to be single / divorced or de facto than established organisations
- Farmer / Farmer’s Wife
- Lower secondary / Tertiary educated
- More likely to have undertaken informal education
- Equal farm ownership with spouse
- High participation in farm activities
- Medium participation in paid work
- Medium - high childcare
- Housework medium
- Community volunteer medium participation
- Average decision making influence
- Unlikely to have access to internet

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire.

Box 3.8: NWD Member Demographics

- Likely to be 41-50 years of age, none older
- Married, although more likely to be single / divorced or de facto than established organisations
- Farmer / Farm Manager
- Tertiary educated
- More likely to have undertaken informal education
- Equal farm ownership with spouse
- High participation in farm activities
- Medium - high participation in paid work
- Medium childcare
- Housework high
- Community volunteer high participation
- Above average decision making influence
- All have access to internet

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire.

The information discussed here and presented in Boxes 3.1 – 3.8 and in Appendix A begins to demonstrate some of the similarities and differences amongst and between the established organisations and newer networks. These are expanded upon and considered throughout the thesis, in particular Chapters Five and Six.

3.4 Research Methods

The research methods employed in this thesis reflect its feminist methodology. The collection, analysis, and reporting of data all sought to record and re-present the
narratives of the participants in such a way as to value and legitimise their knowledge. While these methods enabled the collection and analysis of some quantitative data, qualitative data was predominantly gathered. To begin this section outlines the ethical procedures followed during the course of the fieldwork, and which informed the ways in which data was collected and re-presented. The section then outlines the methods utilised, presenting them in three phases: data collection, data processing and analysis, and reporting. The first and second phases overlap as data collection and much of the processing of this data was done within the period of time spent in each case study area. The reporting phase also overlaps as papers have been presented and status reports sent to participating organisations during the research. The overlap of these research phases have contributed to my reflexivity as a researcher (Reinharz, 1992), and as such subsequent analysis has been undertaken at times to glean extra relevant information. Table 3.1 outlines these research phases, the main activities in each phase and the timeframes. The following sections (3.4.2–3.4.4) expand on this table, providing detailed information on each phase.

### 3.4.1 Ethical Procedures

Following University of Otago ethical procedures, a Category B ethical approval was sought and approved at Departmental level. This ensured that participants at all levels of the research gave informed consent, participated voluntary, and were assured their data would be held in confidence with anonymity maintained. Introductory letters were sent to organisations and members who received a questionnaire, which contained the relevant information as per the Ethics Policy. All interviewees were asked to sign a consent form before interviews were undertaken, ensuring they were aware of their voluntary participation and right to discontinue the interview at any time. Those respondents who volunteered for an interview, but were not selected, were thanked for their participation by letter or email. Copies of the Ethics application, letters and consent form are included in Appendix A1-A5.

### 3.4.2 Data Collection

The methods employed in this study sought to discover the ways in which farming women's organisations create spaces for farm women to recognise and perform certain identities. It also sought to determine if those spaces supported or deterred a challenge to dominant service identities for farm women. As such the methods focused on three
main sources of information, the farming women’s organisations themselves, the farm women members, and the media, as an indicator of ontological narratives circulating in the rural societies of which these women were a part. Four main methods of data collection were undertaken: organisational interviews; a farm women questionnaire; subsequent in-depth interviews; and a media collation. In addition to this, initial key informant interviews were undertaken in New Zealand, particularly to establish the viability of researching two emerging networks, subsequently to become Positively Clutha Women and Network for Women in Dairying. Additional information has been collected from census documents in the three countries, and organisational websites have been consulted since the initial data collection phase. This secondary data was explored, not to validate the predominantly qualitative data, but to help situate these other forms of knowledge within a context of social practices, relations and institutions (Kwan, 2002), and in particular to establish a wider set of ontological narratives which shape hegemonic identities for farm women. Each of the main methods is detailed below.

**Key Informant Interviews**

Key informant interviews were held with representatives of the three New Zealand case study organisations during 1998. These interviews were unstructured and predominantly conversation-like, with a sharing of information about the research and the organisations. While it was not possible to undertake such interviews with organisations in Australia and Canada due to financial and time constraints, the New Zealand interviews were very helpful for the development of the thesis. As well as establishing the suitability and likelihood of sustainability of newer networks, PCW and NWD, these interviews, including ones with RWNZ Otago and Waikato representatives, highlighted areas of focus for the thesis and also assisted in the piloting of the Farm Women Questionnaire. In a much greater sense it ensured the support of these organisations in the research process.
Table 3.1: Research Phases, Activities and Timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key Informant Interviews</td>
<td>• Oct &amp; Nov 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisational Interviews</td>
<td>• Mar 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farm Women Questionnaire</td>
<td>• May 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farm Women Interviews</td>
<td>• Jul &amp; Aug 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media Collation</td>
<td>• Aug 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key Informant Interviews</td>
<td>• Aug &amp; Oct 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisational Interviews</td>
<td>• Aug &amp; Sep 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farm Women Questionnaire</td>
<td>• Nov 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farm Women Interviews</td>
<td>• Dec 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media Collation</td>
<td>• Apr 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisational Interviews</td>
<td>• May 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farm Women Questionnaire</td>
<td>• May 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farm Women Interviews</td>
<td>• Jun 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media Collation</td>
<td>• Jun 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisational Interviews</td>
<td>• Sep 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farm Women Questionnaire</td>
<td>• Sep 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farm Women Interviews</td>
<td>• Oct 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media Collation</td>
<td>• Oct 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Processing and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisational Interview Analysis</td>
<td>• 1999 &amp;2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SPSS database creation for analysis of Farm Women Questionnaire &amp; ongoing</td>
<td>• 1999 – 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transcribing of Farm Women Interviews &amp; ongoing analysis</td>
<td>• 1999-2000 &amp; 2001-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media Analysis</td>
<td>• 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation of initial findings to RWNZ Region One Conference</td>
<td>• May 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Status Updates to Case Study Organisations</td>
<td>• May 2000 &amp; Feb 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thesis Writing</td>
<td>• 2000-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Summary to Case Study Organisations</td>
<td>• Proposed Jan 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were held with organisational representatives, usually a member or members of the executive, at the beginning of the data collection phase in each case study area. In the case of the Australian and Canadian organisations, this was the first face to face contact between myself and the organisations, and with FWIO and CWAV trust was not apparent (see Section 3.2). It was a necessary part of the process to introduce myself and my research project and its aims, and establish a
rapport. The interview itself (provided in Appendix A6) sought information on five themes: structural data, membership data, formation data, intentions and action, and collective action. Representatives were able to prepare answers ahead of the interview, and these were discussed and the representatives and myself asked subsequent reflexive questions (Falconer Al Hindi and Kawabata, 2002). The final section (F) on collective action presented the most difficulty, and it was necessary to explain each of the characteristics of collective action.

Predominantly these interviews were held in the representative’s home and varied in style. The CVWiA interview was held with five representatives over lunch, illustrating the collective nature of the organisation. However, the interviews with (two) FWIO representatives and the CWAV representative were held at the organisations’ head offices and were very official, perhaps reflecting their wariness of my intentions (Reinharz, 1992). The organisational interviews were also the opportunity to organise the delivery of the Farm Women Questionnaire to members, and endorse the organisation’s participation in the research. This was particularly important in Australia and Canada where no key informant interviews had been possible, and where no previous communication had completely indicated their willingness to participate.

**Farm Women Questionnaire**

The Farm Women Questionnaire was sent to members of the case study organisations, in some cases all members and in others a selection. The ways in which participants were selected and the details of questionnaires sent and returned is provided in Table 3.2 below. Distribution of the questionnaires required flexibility on my part, and subsequently varied from mailing lists provided by the organisations, questionnaires handed out at district/group meetings, to members being asked to provide postal details via email if interested. The response rate across the organisations varied from 32% to 73.3%, and the overall response was 39%, with a total of 237 participants. Generic profiles of participants were provided in Boxes 3.1-3.8 and in Appendix A9.

The questionnaire (provided in Appendix A7) contained a mix of open-ended and closed questions, and was divided into the following sections: personal profile, farm enterprise and roles, which included questions on the six identities, farming/rural
organisations and networks, leadership and decision making, farming/rural women’s organisations and networks, and finally, participants were asked to complete their contact details if they would like to volunteer for an interview. Overall, 46% of participants volunteered for an interview. The questionnaire sought a mix of quantitative and qualitative data. In particular, participants were asked to quantitatively rate the importance placed on the six identities (Q24-29), and then following that they were asked to describe how they saw themselves and / or others as farm women (Q30). This qualitative response provided an analytical opportunity to contextualise the quantitative answers to the previous questions about identity. This type of questioning was undertaken throughout the questionnaire, with participants being asked to provide everyday narratives with regard to information provided in closed and quantifiable questions (Hall and Hall, 1996; Miles and Huberman, 1994).

Table 3.2: Distribution and Response Rates of Farm Women Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Distribution Method of Farm Women Questionnaire</th>
<th># of Farm Women Questionnaires Provided</th>
<th># of Farm Women Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Farm Women Questionnaire Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FWIO</td>
<td>Provided to 3 District meetings in Wellington Area</td>
<td>80 provided, 62 taken from meetings</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWAV</td>
<td>Provided to 3 Group meetings in Victoria</td>
<td>80 provided and taken</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWNZ Otago</td>
<td>Postal list of 100 members provided</td>
<td>100 mailed to members</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWNZ Waikato</td>
<td>Postal list of 100 members provided</td>
<td>100 mailed to members</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFWN</td>
<td>Postal list of 100 members provided</td>
<td>100 mailed to members</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVWiA</td>
<td>Postal list of all 50 members provided</td>
<td>50 mailed to members</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCW</td>
<td>Mailed to members by organisation</td>
<td>100 mailed to members</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWD</td>
<td>Request via email list to send postal details is interested in participating</td>
<td>15 mailed to most members of organisation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>607</strong></td>
<td><strong>237</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FWIO 21%, CWAV 34%, RWNZ Otago 54%, RWNZ Waikato 39%, OFWN 62.5%, CVWiA 50%, PCW 29%, NWD 45%.
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**Farm Women Interviews**

From those participants that had volunteered for an interview, farm women who held leadership positions within the community and agri-industry were approached for an in-depth interview. These interviews sought to discuss further the spaces created by the case study organisations for leadership and either the maintenance of, or challenge to, hegemonic identities for farm women. An interview schedule (provided in Appendix A8) highlighted generic questions to ask all participants and subsequent questions were asked specifically of each interviewee based on the questionnaire responses. The open-ended questions in the interviews enabled the voice of the women to be clearly heard, reflecting everyday experiences in localised places (Hall and Hall, 1996; Miles and Huberman, 1994). The interviews were undertaken in such a way that reflexivity was extended with extra questions being asked of the participant based on her own reflexive statements (Falconer Al Hindi and Kawabata, 2002) and as a researcher I sought to answer participants’ questions about myself and the projects (Hall and Hall, 1996). This reflexivity guided the interview, depending on each farm women own narratives and identities. This use of reflexive questioning was of particular importance in fully recognising the multiple identities and the importance placed upon these by the women themselves. It allowed further exploration of spaces and individually specific issues in the development of identity of these farm women and their organisations (Brannen, 1992).

All but one of these interviews took place in the participants’ homes, usually sitting around a kitchen table. Most of the interviews were audio taped (two participants declined) and were usually about one hour long. Often children and partners were coming and going while the interviews took place. In most cases hospitality was offered, and accepted, usually morning or afternoon tea, and included an overnight stay in Ontario, where the interview was substantially longer. The information we shared with each other in this interview had us sitting at the kitchen table crying. This type of interviewing sought to make the interview process a non-exploitative and empowering one (Cope, 2002; Hall and Hall, 1996), perhaps both for the women I interviewed and myself.

However, interviewing in homes had its advantages and disadvantages. On one hand, the women’s homes can be viewed as comfortable, non-threatening environments
where the women feel there is a more equal power relationship between researcher and respondent (Cope, 2002; Dyck, 2002). The one interview that was not in a home was, unfortunately, in my small, shared office in a tall concrete building at the University of Otago. It was not a comfortable environment for either of us; it felt hurried and stifled, and did not elicit much information. However, the safe space of the home, advocated in feminist research, may not be such an advantage as it may appear (Dyck, 2002). Most of the interviews were undertaken on a notion of trust and confidentiality, and often these women would tell me of their experiences where they had been ridiculed and humiliated at mainstream farming events. In some cases, however it was obvious that an interruption, by children, the phone ringing, and particularly, by a husband coming in from outside that these women felt uncomfortable talking about these experiences. Not only did these interruptions disturb the flow of the conversation, but also particularly in the case of husbands arriving home, the reflexivity of the interview was lost, with women about to talk about their awareness of everyday experiences as gendered stopped in mid-sentence.

**Media Collation**

A study was undertaken of a metropolitan daily and a farming weekly in each case study area over three time periods. These newspapers were: *The London Free Press* and *The Ontario Farmer* in Ontario, the *Bendigo Advertiser* and *The Weekly Times* in Victoria, the *Otago Daily Times* and the *New Zealand Farmer* in Otago, and the *Waikato Times* and the *New Zealand Farmer* in the Waikato. The collation of articles about the organisations sought to determine their collective identities as reproduced through a gendered media filter (Aitkin, 1997). The Victorian and Ontario analyses took place while fieldwork was undertaken in each location and involved both hard copy and microfiche/film searches. The Otago and Waikato analyses took place at a time separate to fieldwork in these areas and involved hard copy, microfilm and electronic searches.

**3.4.3 Data Processing and Analysis**

The data collected during fieldwork was analysed in a number of ways. Key informant, organisational and farm women interviews were all transcribed verbatim,

---

36 Time periods are detailed in Chapter Five.
and analysis was based on themes derived from the analytical framework; collective identities, narrative identities, ontological narratives, and leadership (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Sarantakos, 1993). Qualitative data from the Farm Women Questionnaire was transcribed verbatim and analysed using the same themes. Quantitative data from the organisational interview was entered immediately into comparative tables and structural diagrams were formulated. Quantitative data from the Farm Women Questionnaire was coded and entered into SPSS 10.1, which enabled frequencies and cross-tabulations to be made. From this patterns were interpreted and interwoven with those established through qualitative analysis (Sarantakos, 1993).

Media articles were analysed with the results being entered onto a specially designed form, which enabled a comparative analysis. This analysis sought to determine the media coverage that each organisation received, not only on the basis that socially dominant parts of society appear as legitimate voices in media discourses (Fairclough, 1995), but also that certain themes and indicators of identity are presented in these discourses (Jäger, 2001). The analysis of these media articles considered these themes, constructions and implications about identity shaped by photos, vocabulary and style, but also who the players were in the articles and who was referred to as knowledgeable, and what understanding of the organisation was portrayed (Jäger, 2001).

The processing of large amounts of data collected in each of the four case study areas was mostly done at the time of fieldwork, however there were instances where a transcriber was employed to transcribe some of the interviews, and this was done verbatim. As with any project of this size, faced with time and financial constraints, there has been some lapse of time between data collection, processing and the subsequent analysis. This analysis has been revisited many times during the reporting phase in an attempt to truthfully re-present these women’s narratives, and also in an acknowledgement of my changing positionality during this timeframe.

3.4.4 Reporting Phase
The reporting of this study has occurred in two ways: the provision of findings to the case study organisations, and then in the writing of this thesis. Following a feminist
commitment to legitimise women’s voices (Cope, 2002; Moss, 2002), reports of initial findings have been made available to the case study organisations, in the form of status reports, and in one case, a presentation as a RWNZ regional conference. In the writing of this thesis, attention has been paid to legitimising farm women’s voices, and re-presenting their knowledge as accurately and truthfully as I can. As such, some illustrative extracts remain mostly intact so that they reflect the middle as well as the beginning and end of the story.

Finally, some conventions have been adhered to in the reporting process. All participants remain anonymous, where names have been used these are pseudonyms. Each questionnaire respondent (and subsequent interviewees) was assigned a number. The first part of the number relates to the organisation of which they are a member, and the second part of the number is a participant number. Following is ‘Q’ or ‘I’, indicating that the quote is from the Farm Women Questionnaire (Q) or a Farm Women Interview (I). This is followed by an occupation indicated on the Farm Women Questionnaire. The organisational codes are as follows:

- 1 Federated Women’s Institute of Ontario
- 2 Ontario Farm Women’s Network
- 3 Rural Women New Zealand Otago
- 4 Positively Clutha Women
- 5 Country Women’s Association of Victoria
- 6 Central Victoria Women in Agriculture
- 7 Rural Women New Zealand Waikato
- 8 Network for Women in Dairying

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the feminist methodology that has shaped the ways in which this research has been conducted. The significance of acknowledging women’s everyday experiences as knowledge has been highlighted, as well as the importance of considering the influence of my own everyday experiences on my research: in question design, the relevancy placed upon responses, my interpretation of that knowledge, and the construction of that knowledge into a public discourse. The methods employed in this research have been chosen to highlight and to legitimise the
voices of these farm women. My interpretation and analysis of their voices has been influenced by my own experiences as a young woman who grew up on a farm, but also by my feminist beliefs and by my new experiences as a mother. By employing these methods and undertaking to situate this knowledge in the context of my own everyday experiences, this thesis aims to re-present their voices in meaningful and contextualised ways. What follows in Chapters Four to Eight is the re-construction of their everyday experiences and knowledge into a public academic discourse.
Chapter Four: Constructing Organisational Identity: Internalised Collective Identity

4.1 Introduction

Farming women’s organisations do not emerge from, or operate within, a vacuum. They are dynamic and fluid entities. As such the characteristics of their collective identity must be recognized to better understand the historical and contemporary ways in which they exist and operate within wider contexts and understandings of rurality.

In addressing the first research question of this thesis, the contexts existing within each of the case study areas are examined in Section 4.2, enabling an identification of relational settings that have given rise to comparable organisations at similar times. This chapter also begins to address the research question of what spaces and structural bases organisations create for the recognition of a collective identity. In doing so, this chapter identifies and examines the characteristics that construct the internalised collective identities of the case study organisations: formation, structure, and membership characteristics and incentives. Cumulatively, these considerations enable an analysis of organisational type. Sections 4.3-4.5 address each of these characteristics in turn. In recognising that these characteristics are dynamic, not fixed nor static, Section 4.5.3, in particular, examines RWNZ as having a fluid identity. Section 4.6 concludes with an analysis of organisational type.

As argued in Chapter Two, farm women come together through the recognition of a serialised condition; this leading to the formation of collective groups. These groups are reinforced by the actions of the women and the spaces in which they act; and the groups may crystallise into more, or less, formalised groups. Hence, the construction of the identity is dynamic and not fixed. However, due to this dynamism, organisational collective identity goes beyond the identities of the farm women, and can thus be studied independently. Both internal and external dimensions come into play in the construction of organisational collective identity.

This chapter examines the three dimensions for the internalised construction of collective identity: cognitive definition, active relationships, and emotional
investment (see Section 2.4.3). Cognitive definition considers the rituals, practices and cultural artefacts of an organisation, involving an analysis of formation factors such as objectives, aims and mission statements. Networks of active relationships between members engender collective identity. These relationships include structural aspects such as organisational form, models of leadership, and communication channels and technologies. Collective identity is also constructed by members’ emotional investment: it is important to consider who is seen as a member, and what activities bind members to each other and to the organisation (Melucci, 1996: 70-71). These three sets of dimensions are analysed in Sections 4.3–4.5, comparing and contrasting established organisations and newer networks.

Finally Section 4.6 considers organisational type. In doing so, this section examines each organisation’s perceptions of its characteristics as a farming women’s organisation, and of its collective action, drawing upon Melucci’s (1996) analysis of collective phenomena that determine action and subsequently, collective identity. This section determines a contemporary organisational identity based on the internalised collective identity of each case study organisation. In doing so, Chapter Four provides a foundation upon which Chapter Five, and indeed the whole thesis, further builds; that established organisations have collective identities, which (although dynamic) operate largely in a conservative context, and that in contrast to this, newer networks challenge and resist that conservatism which dominates contemporary ruralities. By utilising Melucci’s analysis this thesis contributes to literature on farming women's organisations and collective action in general. Previous literature on farming women's organisations (Teather, 1996a, 1996b; Carbert, 1995) indicates a binary model of established organisations and newer networks; Melucci’s organisational type suggests a continuum of organisations. Melucci’s approach is useful for understanding collective action and determining whether such action is breaching or maintaining social codes. However, this thesis further extends these perspectives by providing an understanding of the spaces within which this action occurs.
4.2 Contemporary Contexts

The contexts within which each of the case study organisations have formed has helped determine the nature of each. This section examines the contexts present at the time the established organisations and the newer networks were formed in New Zealand, Australia and Canada. It argues that the ontological narratives circulating in these societies constructed similar ruralities, thus supporting the formation of comparable collective identities of these farming women's organisations.

The formation of organisations for farm women in New Zealand, Australia and Canada has occurred at similar times in all three countries, and broadly similar social, economic and political forces have shaped these organisations and the contemporary ruralities circulating in these particular times and spaces. Farm women during the early part of the 20th century in these countries faced comparable issues, as with farm women of the last few decades. This section examines the forces contributing to notions of rurality that circulated in each country during the formation of the established organisations, followed by more recent forces and ruralities relating to the formation of the newer networks.

Farming industries in New Zealand, Australia and Canada have evolved from their original British colonial history37, and as such social and political ties were comparably strong to Britain. Le Heron’s claim that New Zealand developed as a colonial farm, determined by British investment in agriculture (1996: 21) may also be applied to Australia and Canada (see also Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001; Carbert, 1995). Table 4.1 below shows a certain amount of comparability based on farm type, with sheep, beef cattle and dairying being predominant farming types in all three countries. Further to this, Teather has set a precedent for examining farming women's organisations in these three countries, arguing that British colonisation, ethnicity and farming types make comparison worthy (1996a; 1996b). Research undertaken by Liepins (1995; 1998a; 1998c; 1999) and Mackenzie (1992; 1994) also lends itself to further building upon work regarding farming women's organisations in these countries.

37 Canada also has a French colonial history and this is illustrated by the participation of La Femme et la Gestion de la Ferme in umbrella organisation, OFWN.
Table 4.1: Farm Type in New Zealand, Australia and Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Area</th>
<th>Population Type</th>
<th>% Beef +/-or Sheep</th>
<th>% Grain</th>
<th>% Dairy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Beef 27.4%</td>
<td>Grain 18.6%</td>
<td>Dairy 15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Sample</td>
<td>Beef 15%</td>
<td>Grain 22%</td>
<td>Dairy 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria, Australia</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Sheep &amp; Beef 35.5%</td>
<td>Dairy 22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Sample</td>
<td>Sheep &amp; Beef 19%</td>
<td>Dairy 19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago, New Zealand</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Sheep +/-or Beef 49.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Sample</td>
<td>Sheep +/-or Beef 63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato, New Zealand</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy 43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy 83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the case study areas of this research there is a predominance of family farming (Alston, 1995b; MAF, 1994; Statistics Canada, 2001). Family farms are those where family members contribute to farm labour, whether paid or unpaid and/or the farm is family owned (Gasson and Errington, 1993). Previous research has shown that there are gendered relationships between the farm business, the farm household and the farm property (see for example, Alston, 1995b; Endeveld, 1994; Gasson and Errington, 1993; Rivers et al., 1997; Shortall, 1999; Whatmore, 1991). These gender relations have been influential in patterns of farm ownership and inheritance, farm labour and governmental policies.

Ownership patterns, which have excluded women, have been challenged in the last few decades, with joint spousal ownership of family farms predominating (James, 1990; MAF, 1994). Lay discourses attribute this change in New Zealand to tax

---

38 Comparable statistical information on the percentage of family farms operating in New Zealand, Australia and Canada is not available. However, many research papers published by Agricultural ministries in these countries are based on an acceptance that there is a predominance of family farming. For example, a New Zealand report states, “Of the farms with one or more resident working owners, by far the most farms were owned by a male/female ‘couple’” (MAF, 1994). Information provided by Statistics Canada, indicates that while 56% of farms in Ontario are sole proprietorship, 42% are partnerships or family corporations (Statistics Canada, 2001).

39 For example, husband only, father and son, brother and brother ownership of farms.
incentives in the early 1970s. Personal communication with a farm tax accountant indicates that an effective method of lowering of taxes paid was for male farmers to form a 50:50 partnership with their wives, which after scrutiny from Inland Revenue, effectively meant that overall tax liability was reduced (Nobes, pers. com., 2002). Similarly, farm women in Australia and Canada talked of an increase in equal farm partnerships for this reason (CVWiA Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999; OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999). However, female ownership of farms is usually in conjunction with a male partner, predominantly spousal, and this in conjunction with the continued dominance of male inheritance of family farms, has contributed to the continuing under-recognition of women as farm owners and operators. This can be seen in governmental policies, for example in the case study areas. In Canada, the federal Canadian Pension Plan’s fairness was questioned as farm women as unpaid farm workers were not included in the plan (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999; 2-136I, farmer). In New Zealand, women, as unpaid farm workers, are only partially covered by a compulsory government operated Accident Compensation scheme, and only if they pay a levy as an employer (8-201I, farmer). In Australia, discrimination against women is practised in inheritance and matrimonial property settlements, with women’s labour on farms being devalued, in line with patriarchal institutions shaping everyday life (Voyce, 1992, 1993, 1996). These social and institutional practices contribute to predominantly farm-based notions of rurality in these countries which continue to question and not recognise women’s rights to be accepted as farm owners and contributing partners in farm work and management.

Political rights of women have followed similar patterns in the three countries, and these have impacted on the women involved in the formation of both the established organisations and the newer networks. In New Zealand, Pakeha and Maori women gained the right to vote in 1893, and the right to stand for office in government in 1919. Euro-Australian women in Victoria gained state and federal votes, and could stand for office in 1908, 1902 and 1923, respectively. Similarly, Euro-Canadian women in Ontario gained provincial and federal voting and the right to stand for office in 1917, 1918 and 1919 (Morgan, 1984; www.abc.net.au, August 2002).

40 New Zealanders of predominantly European descent (Orsman, 1997:567).
Figure 4.1 below compares the political rights given to women in each country, and the formation of the established organisations. Women’s suffrage is seen as a result of first wave feminism, a maternal or social-based feminism\footnote{Maternal feminism describes the maternal orientation of first wave feminists, highlighting the presumption that women were nurturing and moral, that women had a common experience or capacity as mothers. Social feminism describes the women who formed organisations and acted for social reforms (Carbert, 1995) such as temperance (from whence New Zealand’s suffrage for women was lobbied (Morgan, 1984)).}, and it is from this era that the established organisations formed and developed their objectives. In these three countries, first wave feminism and the traditional family farm combined to create an environment where women could legitimately be acknowledged and participate in public life, even if conservatively and within the constraints of the identities and farm-based contexts available to them.

Figure 4.1: Timeline of Political Rights and Formation of Established Organisations

Sources: Morgan, 1984; \url{www.abc.net.au}, August 2002.

Just as the established farming women’s organisations were a result of an early form of feminism (Carbert, 1995), the newer networks followed on from urbanised feminism in the 1970s. There were both political and economic reasons for their formation, and these occurred in all three countries. Globalisation, overproduction, deregulation and lack of tariff protection have affected farming in these and other countries (Alston, 1995b, 2000). Recent economic downturns in agriculture have affected farm families and communities; increasing off-farm employment,
predominantly undertaken by women, placed higher expectations on women to provide community services, and increased family labour. Taylor and Little (1995) cite examples of the effects of this downturn: in Canada, farm families rely on income sources other than agriculture, and in New Zealand, farmers have been under financial pressure since the economic reforms in the mid 1980s.

While the effects of this downturn have meant that farm women have had to increase and diversify their contribution to agri-industry this is not comparatively reflected in their leadership in the industry. In all three countries there has been a focus on the unrecognised potential of farm women as leaders in agri-industry. This is expanded upon in Chapter Seven, but in summary leadership in these rural societies at the time of the formation of the established organisations and the newer networks was dominated by men (Alston, 2000; Liepins, 1998b; Nieman, 1996), reflecting hegemonic practices, both socially and institutionally. Newer networks in each of the case study areas have sought to increase farm women’s participation as industry actors; reflecting significant improvements in women’s rights and participation in the economy occurring in the late 1970s. The change in expectations of how women could act politically, together with economic changes, meant that farm women in the 1980s and 1990s wanted recognition that reflected their contributions and expectations.}

The outcomes of the social, economic and political forces, and contemporary contexts presented in this section have contributed to the establishment of comparable organisations and networks at similar times in the case study areas. This section has shown farm women positioned in broadly similar rural settings. They can be seen as a series (Young, 1994), where common practico-inert structures (such as the family farm, farm household, and physical and social isolation) and certain historical and contemporary social practices (such as gendered patterns of farm ownership, inheritance, division of labour) that create ruralities and coded spaces are identified. It has also highlighted certain social and material practices that may lead to the recognition of a serialised condition by farm women, and lead to the formation of

42 This has been seen globally by the growth of international Women in Agriculture Conferences, held in 1994, 1998 and 2002.
collective groups. However, it must be noted that while farm women from the three countries are positioned similarly in terms of context, there may still result a difference in politicisation of identity that is not based on generational differences. As will be seen in the following chapters, there are distinct variations in political spaces and performances of identity. The contexts of each country, and the tensions occurring at the time of formation, and more importantly, the time of creating or providing strategic bases may have been diverse enough to politicise certain identities, and create diverse collective identities.

The following sections analyse the formation objectives, structural establishment, and the membership characteristics and incentives of each of the case study organisations, comparing and contrasting established organisations and newer networks, recognising that these cumulatively combine to convey each organisation’s internalised collective identity.

4.3 Formation of Organisations: Objectives and Context

This section examines organisational formation as an initial indicator of how collective identity is constructed internally. It analyses the initial purposes of the case study organisations, their objectives, both formal and informal, and the contextual sphere within which they predominantly operate. The organisations are analysed as two cohorts, established organisations and newer networks, and a summary of this analysis is provided in Matrix 4.1. There are definite themes that emerge in these two cohorts; however, there are exceptions to these, which will be expanded upon below.

4.3.1 Established Organisations

The Federated Women’s Institutes of Ontario, Country Women’s Association of Victoria, and Rural Women New Zealand\(^{43}\) were all established within ten years of each other in the early 1900s. They all evolved from a perceived need to combat isolation and poor conditions for women and their families living in rural areas. These objectives illustrate the maternal-feminist notion of farm women as carers and builders of farm families and communities (as discussed in Section 4.2). FWIO

\(^{43}\)As noted in Chapter One (Section 1.3) RWNZ was formed as Women’s Division Federated Farmers.
founder, Adelaide Hoodless saw a need to educate farm women in what an FWIO Past President refers to as her four pillars:

Hoodless had what I call her four pillars and everybody else is finally catching up with this now. Nutrition, Food Safety, Health and Fitness, Sanitation. And the whole world is on to this now. Basically it’s the same things since WI was founded (Rep.A in FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

Similarly, the CWAV attributes their formation to a recognition of a vital need for a better understanding of the problems of women living on the land – her health, her welfare, and often the greatest problem of all the loneliness of her life (CWAV, 1978:1).

Likewise, a representative of RWNZ believes that the main concern for farm women has not changed, stating that the organisation formed to address the isolation, and I don’t think it’s changed a lot. (RWNZ Otago Key Informant Interview, pers. comm., 1998). Our organisation started way back in the mid 20s, when rural women were really, really isolated, they couldn’t drive and if they could their husband wouldn’t let them off the premises for five minutes (RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

These initial needs evolved into formal objectives, which are reproduced in Appendix B.1 and summarised in Matrix 4.1. These show a strong concentration by all three established organisations upon family, community, service provision and lobbying for rural women and communities. However, whereas FWIO and CWAV focus upon domestic education, craft and music, and friendship, RWNZ has objectives that promote the role of the primary production sector. Indeed where FWIO’s and CWAV’s formal and informal objectives mention little about women living on the land or specifically meeting the needs of rural women, RWNZ promotes stewardship of the land, seeing itself as a voice for rural women, ensuring access to essential services and educational opportunities for rural people in the face of centralisation and user-pays policy (WDFF, undated c), and addressing environmental and family-based policy (Website: http://www.ruralwomen.org May 2001).
### Matrix 4.1: Summary of Organisational Formation, Objectives and Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>FWIO</th>
<th>CWA V</th>
<th>RWNZ</th>
<th>OFWN</th>
<th>CVWiA</th>
<th>PCW</th>
<th>NWD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Improve conditions for farm women through domestic science education (Carbert, 1995; FWIO, undated a)</td>
<td>Provide support and companionship for isolated rural women and families (CWA V Organisational Interview, pers.com., 1999)</td>
<td>Combat physical and social isolation and better the lives of women and children in rural areas (RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers.com., 1999; RWNZ Waikato Organisational Interview, pers.com., 1999)</td>
<td>Share information and resources gathered through pre-existing networks (OFWN, undated a)</td>
<td>Benefit members' families and rural communities (AWiA, 1994) Development of primary production and rural industries (AWiA website [<a href="http://www.awia.org.au">http://www.awia.org.au</a>], April 2000; Liepins, 1998a)</td>
<td>Rural women required empowerment to attain goals and potential (website [http://www.notjust.org.nz.positively_clutha_women], April 2000) Identify support and training needs of rural women (PCW Key Informant Interview, pers. com., 1998)</td>
<td>Involve, encourage and develop leadership amongst farm women Become a strong and informed political force (Webber, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Family Community Domestic education Service provision Lobbying</td>
<td>Family Community Personal skills Service provision Lobbying Friendship</td>
<td>Family Community Stewardship of the land Service provision Lobbying</td>
<td>Equality for farm women Support family farm and farm family Increase farm women's representation in agri-industry Forum for lobbying</td>
<td>Profiling women in agriculture Addressing agricultural inequalities Securing recognition for women in agriculture Political and economic focus</td>
<td>Programmes to develop business respect and skills Promote women and their work Liase with organisation to address needs identified</td>
<td>Information and issues for women in dairying Promote knowledge and experience of members Support through email Recognise women's contribution in agriculture and rural communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Social / friendship Craft / music</td>
<td>Social / friendship Craft / music Community service</td>
<td>Welfare of family and community Promotion of role of the primary production sector</td>
<td>Farm women Family farm Farm family (OFWN, undated a)</td>
<td>Confidence, community activity and industry support for women Networking for leadership Education, awareness</td>
<td>Seminars Community communication strategy Personal confidence</td>
<td>Network Support / mentor Promote recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual Sphere</strong></td>
<td>Service – social and community purpose</td>
<td>Service – social and community purpose</td>
<td>Service – social and community purpose Agri-industry – industry agenda</td>
<td>Agri-industry – industry agenda and career focus Service – social purpose</td>
<td>Agri-industry – industry agenda and career focus Service – social purpose</td>
<td>Agri-industry – career focus Service – social and community purpose</td>
<td>Agri-industry – industry agenda and career focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 Sources are acknowledged in Matrix 4.1, other than where information is drawn from and already acknowledged in Appendix B.1.
All three established organisations remain steady in their original focus with little change made or perceived with regard to objectives and strategies. The CWAV representative claims that these perceived needs remain relevant today in their objectives (CWAV Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999) and this perception has meant that there has been little change to the values and organisational structure (Teather, 1994a). The comment earlier from an FWIO representative clearly indicates a focus which remains based upon the founder’s four principles. Similarly, RWNZ representatives sadly claim that the needs facing rural pioneer women in New Zealand are still relevant. A RWNZ Otago representative states that the “needs are ‘different’ now but similar and certainly still relevant – equal access to many services is certainly being eroded” (RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). A conversation with a RWNZ Waikato representative draws a similar statement:

DS: the needs of the membership originally were especially the social contact because they were so isolated?
Rep: Yes. A lot of women fought for rural concerns... all of those things, and it was just carrying on.
DS: and its coming around again...
Rep: Yes very much so. It’s really scary. Are the rural people being disadvantaged? So we are always looking and I think that was probably why the organisation was formed, so that rural people were not disadvantaged. And I think that still applies today” (RWNZ Waikato Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

While RWNZ representatives consider that their objectives remain the same, in contrast to the other two established organisations, their primary focus on sustainable rural communities and the promotion of the primary production sector is highly apparent and emphasised. CWAV’s formal and informal objectives reflect an organisation that is concerned with personal betterment and community service; indeed their history Years of Adventure describe “the word ‘service’ [as] the one which portrays the clearest picture of the activities not only of those past days but right up until those that are with us” (CWAV, 1978: 33). FWIO objectives still clearly project an image of an organisation which focuses on “better[ing] the lives of women and families through personal growth and community action” (Rep. A in FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). These objectives reflect the beliefs of early feminists of supporting and enfranchising women for the betterment of families, communities and nations.
The formation and purpose of FWIO and CWAV indicate that they can be identified as operating within the service sphere of social and community purpose. While RWNZ is also identified with this sphere, they may, in contrast to the other two organisations, also be placed in the agri-industry sphere, focusing on an industry agenda and promoting farm women’s involvement in the farm industry. In this way, RWNZ illustrates that there is no simple binary placement of farming women’s organisations. In contrast to these established organisations, the newer networks predominantly identify with the agri-industry sphere.

4.3.2 Newer Networks
The Ontario Farm Women’s Network, Central Victoria Women in Agriculture, the Network for Women in Dairying, and Positively Clutha Women are all grassroots-based networks specifically aimed at increasing recognition and participation of women in all aspects of agri-industry. They have, however, emerged at different times, and from differing contexts. While the four networks (although less so PCW) have similar objectives, the catalyst for their formation occurred over the space of 10-15 years.

OFWN was initially formed in 1988 as an umbrella organisation linking local groups such as Women for the Survival of Agriculture (WSA), Concerned Farm Women (CFW) and La Femme et la Gestion de la Ferme (FGF). OFWN’s initial purpose was to share information and resources gathered through these pre-existing networks (OFWN, undated a). These networks were very much “grassroots driven”, and emerged in the context of an agricultural crisis in Canada in the 1970s (Mackenzie, 1992). An OFWN Director states that farm income had decreased; there was more stress, and an increased need for support and solutions for farm women (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

Researchers associate these original Ontario networks’ formation to a changing social environment where feminism was influencing women on farms in such a way that they began to see themselves as political actors in the economy and farming industry (Carbert, 1995; Mackenzie, 1992; Mackenzie, 1994; OFWN, undated a; Teather, 1996a). Teather, supported by other relevant research, attributes the appearance of
these types of networks to a changing social context visible through five factors. Firstly, generational differences meant that farm women in the 1970s held “values and aspirations beyond the domestic sphere” (Teather, 1996a: 4). They wished to be viewed as equal partners, as opposed to farmers’ wives and helpers (also Carbert, 1996; Cebotarev, 1995). Secondly and thirdly, developments in law and the feminist challenge to male control (also Carbert, 1995) made farm women more aware of the fourth factor, their powerlessness and alienation from the farm and industry decision making structures. Finally, there was a governmental response to these challenges and government agencies were set up to deal with reference groups such as OFWN (Teather, 1996a).

An OFWN representative's comments add a more personal note to the perceived need for, and formation of, these networks. She explains that

I was farming on my own and every time I went to a meeting there was no other women, so I was looking for others to talk to, not that I have a problem with my neighbours and going to local meetings, I know them all and they are very friendly, they know me. They don’t make me feel out of place that much; but it’s just sometimes that you want to talk to other women... with your feelings. Men don’t talk about stress problems. So I guess that was when I started looking. And I went to the local group which was the Middlesex Women in Support of Agriculture, and from there went to the Ontario Farm Women’s Network (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

While these early networks attempted to construct an alternative image of farm women as equal partners in farming (Mackenzie, 1992: 697) by 1988 it was evident that a national group was required to address the political arena, an OFWN representative stating “there was a gap between the WI and the OFA, and the farm family fell into that gap” (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). Hence the ratification of the OFWN constitution and the election of directors in 1989 provided a more formal and strengthened structure within which farm women could act.

Australian Women in Agriculture (AWiA) was formed in 1993 (Teather, 1996b) as a "supportive network of like-minded women" (AWiA website http://www.awia.org.au) and acts as a national organisation for a number of Women in Agriculture networks around Australia, including CVWiA. It evolved from an ongoing series of seminars /
gatherings for farm women, and gained momentum after the First International Women in Agriculture Conference in Melbourne, Australia in 1994 (CVWiA Organisational Interview, pers. comm. 1999). The organisation's initial purpose was to be active in benefiting members' families and rural communities (AWiA, 1994), with an added commitment to the development of primary production and rural industries (AWiA website http://www.awia.org.au; Liepins, 1998a).

Liepins (1998a, 1999) attributes the development of the 'women in agriculture movement' in Australia, of which AWiA is a part, to three factors: the marginalisation of women in agricultural arenas, climatic and economic conditions, and a political environment favourable to a women's movement in Australia. Supporting Liepins, Central Victorian Women in Agriculture (CVWiA) representatives list isolation, traditional gender roles resulting in male decision making in farming organisations and on the farm, women's lack of agricultural training, a necessity for equality and a recognition of women's strengths as being the needs originally perceived that led to the formation of their own group under the AWiA umbrella (CVWiA Organisational Interview, pers. comm. 1999).

The Network for Women In Dairying (NWD) began in the Waikato in 1998 after three dairying women attended the 2\textsuperscript{nd} International Conference for Women in Agriculture in Washington D.C., USA. These women were inspired by farming women’s networks in Australia, Canada and the USA, and wished to set up a similar network in the Waikato of New Zealand. They believed there was a need for an informal network, which aimed to involve, encourage, and develop leadership among farm women, with the intent of becoming a strong and informed political force (Webber, 1998).

The group felt that the existing organisations available to farm women were not meeting their needs, and those of many younger farm women, and the aim was to provide a network which would focus on the practical and technological aspects of farming, and on mentoring women to become leaders in the formal structures of agri-industry (NWD Key Informant Interview 2, pers. comm., 1998). The main aim was
to provide an environment that encouraged the confidence to become involved in the agri-industry decisionmaking.

Similarly, Positively Clutha Women (PCW) formed in 1997. It was originally the Rural Women’s Research Committee (RWRC) and was a sub-committee of the Clutha Agricultural Development Board (CADB). This committee came into existence because two women members of the CADB felt that rural women, particularly those in farming partnerships, had unique needs, and required empowerment to attain goals and potential (RWRC, 1998; website http://www.notjust.org.nz/positively_clutha_women, April 2000). Their objective was to “identify the support and training needs of rural women of the Clutha District” (PCW Key Informant Interview, pers. comm., 1998). As such they differ from the other three networks in that while they saw a need for empowering rural women, they did not specifically focus on women’s role in primary production, but also in household, community and off-farm work. This is also reflected in the way in which the network grew. A questionnaire was distributed to rural boxholders, which subsequently led to discussion groups and seminars; all designed primarily to identify training needs and interest, and receive feedback (RWRC, 1998). By sending questionnaires to rural boxholders only, this effectively meant their research was limited to farm-based women only. A PCW key informant commented on this decision:

We talked long and hard about delivering the questionnaires to the townships... and after some discussion we decided that we would go for the country areas. Not because the town areas weren’t important, or the women weren’t important, or that they didn’t contribute to the whole community economy, but we felt that the women that were rural boxholders were likely to have problems extenuated because of isolation, and so we decided to target there (PCW Key Informant Interview, pers. comm. 1998).

Although PCW concedes that the word ‘rural’ had “not done much to encourage town women” (PCW email from representative, pers. comm. 2000), their determination to include all rural women and not just farm women in their organisation is reflected in the way in which their objectives differ from the other three networks. PCW’s mission statement, “to support the rural women of the Clutha District to realise their full potential by strengthening their choices and opportunities” (RWRC, undated) is exemplified in their objectives which focus on providing programmes designed to
enhance business and personal skills of rural women and promote all aspects of their work.

The main foci of the objectives of OFWN, on farm women, family farms, and the farm family, are perhaps the closest in comparison to PCW’s objectives, in that OFWN strive for recognition of the contribution of these three in agri-industry. Their objectives readily project an image of an organisation that is for and about farm women. The network and its members are concerned with promoting farm women as equal partners, and the farm family and the family farm as integral parts of the farming industry, with social factors and impacts needing to be taken into account when constructing agricultural policy. Simply put, “the farm itself is a business, but it involves the whole family” (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

CVWiA’s, and its umbrella organisation, AWiA’s, objectives demonstrate a commitment to farm women, their families, communities and agri-industry. Similar to OFWN, they strive to promote, grow and solidify farm women’s participation in agri-industry, the rural community, and the political sphere. At a more grassroots level (i.e. specifically CVWiA) they seek to educate farm women for leadership and confidence, and create an awareness in the local community of farm women’s contribution and abilities.

In contrast to the other three networks, NWD, while recognising the importance of farm families and women’s role in sustaining rural communities, focuses unmistakably upon farm women’s position in agri-industry. Their objectives concentrate upon disseminating information to, and promoting the knowledge and experience of, their members. The function of their network is to support and mentor farm women and promote recognition of their vital contribution to agri-industry. This desire is reflected in a comment made by a Key Informant during the initial stages of the network:

…one of my own personal goals is I would like to see women actually involved in the structures formally and involved in decisionmaking… I would like us to help them and mentor them, to be able to get on their feet in a room that might have six of seven hundred farmers, maybe 95% of men and be able to say what they think, be able to debate an issue with
rigour, and also stand for positions of responsibility in the industry
(NWD Key Informant Interview 2, pers. comm., 1998).

All four networks may be placed in the sphere of agri-industry (see Figure 2.3
Chapter Two), in stark contrast to FWIO and CWAV. However, while OFWN,
CVWiA and NWD all maintain an industry agenda and an on-farm career focus,
PCW, illustrating the non-binary nature of farming women's organisations, shows a
commitment to a career focus, one which is more off-farm driven than on-farm, as
opposed to an industry agenda. All except NWD may also be placed partially in the
service sphere in that they seek to have a social purpose, and in the case of PCW a
community purpose also. However, this social purpose differs from that of the
established organisations. While they aim to promote personal growth and
networking, they have a different purpose, in that they maintain a farm focus rather
than a domestic one.

4.3.3 Conclusion
All the case study organisations formed in response to perceived needs of farm
women; be it isolation, lack of domestic education or services in former years, or a
contemporary desire to gain more recognition for farm women’s contribution to
family farms, rural communities and agri-industry. These initial perceptions are
reflected in each organisation’s objectives. The association of the organisations with
either, or both, the service sphere or the agri-industry sphere lays a foundation for the
development of each organisation’s collective identity. Members gain a sense of
collectivity, the nature of which is determined by the initial purpose and resultant
objectives of each organisation.

4.4 Organisational Structure as a Signifier of Collective Identity

Types of active relationships between members of an organisation assist in
determining an organisation’s collective identity (Atwater, 1995; Kenny, 1994;
Melucci, 1996). As outlined in Chapter Two, collective action shapes collective
identity. Four structural aspects assist in determining collective action: the frequency
and ease of communication between members and various levels of an organisation,
the communication technology utilised, the hierarchy and the modes of leadership
within this structure, and the type of member attracted to the organisation. This section examines the structures of the case study organisations, considering organisational stratification and formalisation, communication channels, and leadership and decision making climates. This is analysed by established organisations and then by newer networks, and summarised in Matrix 4.2. This matrix is based upon Table 2.1 Matrix for Positioning Organisations in Chapter Two, enabling an analysis of structure based on certain characteristics and a bureaucratic-collective organisational continuum (Atwater, 1995; Kenny, 1994). Details of the individual organisational hierarchies are shown in Appendix B.2, as are additional tables of hierarchical positions for FWIO, CWAV and OFWN.
Matrix 4.2: Summary of Organisational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>FWIO</th>
<th>CWAH</th>
<th>RWNZ</th>
<th>OFWN</th>
<th>PCW</th>
<th>CVWiA</th>
<th>NWD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation of tasks</td>
<td>Bureaucratic and well defined</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucratic and well defined</td>
<td>Some bureaucracy reflecting funding from CADB</td>
<td>Little bureaucracy and specialisation of tasks</td>
<td>Collective and low specialisation of tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardisation of rules</td>
<td>Set rules for operation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set rules for operation</td>
<td>Some rules for operation</td>
<td>Some rules for operation</td>
<td>Few rules for operation</td>
<td>No rules for operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalisation of procedures</td>
<td>Documentation standardised and formal meeting procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attempt to increase informality, but still fairly standardised documentation and formal meeting procedures</td>
<td>Informality at grassroots, with some formality at executive level</td>
<td>Informal, although reporting to funding body is formalised</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural stratification</td>
<td>9 levels, with a junior organisation and many Provincial committees. Hierarchical Defined channels of command and response</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 levels, with many working committees at State level Hierarchical Defined channels of command and response</td>
<td>2 levels, with National umbrella body Little hierarchy Open and horizontal communication</td>
<td>2 levels, with funding body, still at local level Little hierarchy Open and horizontal communication</td>
<td>2 levels, inclusive of National body Little hierarchy Open and horizontal communication</td>
<td>1 level with inclusive core body No hierarchy Open and horizontal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Environment</td>
<td>Stable for many years, so not used to change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some changes in structure and willingness to use modern communication, but only minor changes to operation of organisation</td>
<td>Unstable economic crisis, with network forming as umbrella group to many grassroots activist networks</td>
<td>Some instability with agri-industry economy and family farms undergoing change</td>
<td>Some instability with agri-industry economy and family farms undergoing change</td>
<td>Some instability with agri-industry economy and family farms undergoing change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial decision making climate</td>
<td>Decision making controlled and rooted in formality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making controlled and rooted in formality</td>
<td>Little fixed authority, collective and innovative decision making</td>
<td>Little fixed authority, collective and innovative decision making</td>
<td>Little fixed authority, collective and innovative decision making</td>
<td>Marginal fixed authority, collective and innovative decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrix 4.2 is based on Table 2.1 Matrix for Positioning Organisations (after Atwater, 1995; Kenny, 1994).
4.4.1 Established Organisations

The three established organisations are highly structured, each governed by Constitutions which include objectives, mottos, official badges, crests, odes, hymns and graces, as well as by-laws for membership and elections, procedures for meetings, and responsibilities for office bearers (CWAV, 1999a; CWAV, undated b; FWIO, 1987; WDFF, undated a). They are all extremely hieratically stratified with many office bearers at each level. While CWAV and RWNZ have four levels up to and including State and Regional levels, with associated committees at those levels, FWIO is by far the largest of the established organisations, with seven levels up to and including Provincial level. All three report to a national level, and belong to the same global organisation, Associated Country Women of the World. Structural diagrams are shown in Appendix B.2, with green denoting ‘grassroots’ branch levels, blue the middle reporting levels, maroon provincial, state and regional parent bodies and associated committees, and finally, red denoting national and global levels.

Activities and decision making at each of these levels is formalised and specialisation of positions at all levels is highly defined and controlled. This is demonstrated in the huge number of office bearer positions that must be undertaken and shown in Tables B.1 (FWIO) and B.2 (CWAV) in Appendix B.2. However, in contrast to this strongly bureaucratic structuring, recent restructuring within RWNZ has reduced some of the congestion, with regional instead of provincial representation at national executive and by eliminating a district level. While this reduces ‘top-heaviness’ and “is a much more effective way of representation… the downside for those … doing the representation is [that their] patch has increased quite a lot” (RWNZ Otago Key Informant Interview, pers. comm., 1998). This has resulted in the formation of Regional Consultative Groups to assist the Regional Councillor as a support network. In contrast to FWIO and CWAV, changes are also occurring at branch level, with an informal air pervading some ‘younger’ branches. A RWNZ Otago Key Informant comments on these changes:

And we have developed … the desire [for] our branches to be much more flexible. The old structure, the president, the secretary, the treasurer, was seen to be a little formal and sometime was a bit of a barrier to someone who wanted to be involved, but didn’t want to take the suitcase home with all the paperwork. Others where our membership is a little bit older and they perhaps want to be more traditional and less political have opted
not to change too much. (RWNZ Otago Key Informant Interview, pers. comm., 1998.)

With the many stratified levels in these organisations communication from the grassroots member to higher decision making levels may be hindered. At some levels representatives only meet annually to discuss resolutions and lobbying decisions; and although there is a claimed flow of communication in both directions, the great number of levels may deter all but what leaders interpret as being important from reaching the extremes. However, and this may be applied to all three established organisations, representatives of RWNZ believe that a national framework means a larger and more effective support network, vitally important in isolated rural communities. A national framework may also mean a larger effect on policy change at governmental level; RWNZ “don’t go public on an issue until [they] have canvassed the support of all our members, which gives [them] that sort of collective clout when [they] do”. (RWNZ Otago Key Informant Interview, pers. comm., 1998).

This consultation between national and branch levels, while ensuring total organisational consensus, also means that communication can often be slow between the levels, and the timing of comments on consultation documents can be problematic. This is also evident within FWIO and CWAV, who also consult branch members on remits and resolutions; communication is “from the top down, from the bottom up” (Rep. A in FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999). The communication methods with which this consultation is undertaken vary amongst the organisations. These methods as presented below predominantly reflect the context within which the organisations were formed (Burrell and Hearn, 1989) and indicate a more bureaucratic structure (Atwater, 1995; Butler and Wilson, 1990).

Within FWIO communication with members is traditional – a quarterly provincial newsletter and monthly local branch meetings being the most important methods of communication. Newer methods using various telecommunication practices are limited and of little importance in communication (FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). There is little communication outside monthly branch meetings and meetings at levels further up the hierarchy are limited in their occurrence (usually
A CWAV representative ranks local branch meetings, as well as the organisation’s newsletter, as of great importance in communicating CWAV policy. These traditional methods of communication far outweigh the importance of more modern technology, with the use of phone, fax and email seen as of less importance (CWAV Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). Both Otago and Waikato RWNZ representatives believe that publications (national and regional) and meetings are the major methods of communication in the organisation. Phone and fax are of importance in communicating immediately, but consensus on submissions and policy is generally undertaken at meetings, with results informed in publications and further meetings (RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999; RWNZ Waikato Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). Only RWNZ is starting to make use of faster and more immediate communication technologies; and other slower and perhaps ‘edited’ methods of disseminating information must hinder quick decision making and collective action.

Each of the established organisations has operated in a stable environment for many years, and this has resulted in little change in organisational structure. FWIO has operated for many years in an environment that was stable and, for women, domestic-based. Indeed, Carbert states that FWIO’s “program is an example of a … strategy focused on household work that was appropriate for that stage in Canada’s development…” (Carbert, 1995: 10-11). Although CWAV was founded in times of economic crisis, the social structures in which it is placed have, until recent years, remained stable and relatively unchanging. However, recent attempts to adapt and de-formalise RWNZ are a reflection of the organisation’s recognition of recent changes in New Zealand’s rural communities; changes similar to those perceived by OFWN and CVWiA in Ontario and Victoria, but not acted upon by FWIO and CWAV.

The established organisations are all bureaucratic and mechanistic styled organisations, reflecting the organisational structures and practices of the time in which they were established. Their structures are highly stratified and leadership positions are specialised and controlled. This also has implications for the leadership and decision making climate; decision making in these organisations is controlled and
formalised, and more often than not leads to conservative leadership and collective action. In contrast to the established organisations, the newer networks are collectively structured and operate on a more informal and impromptu basis.

### 4.4.2 Newer Networks

Reflecting the desire to be participant driven, with consultative and innovative collective action, the networks in this research have a far flatter structure. However, while the established organisations are all structured and operate similarly, the networks differ in structure, illustrating the varying aims and formational issues. The differences amongst the networks are largely shown in organisational stratification, depicted in Figures B.4-B.7 in Appendix B.2. However, the networks range along a continuum of organisational structure (Kenny, 1994), with OFWN being the most mechanistic of the networks, and NWD the most collective.

OFWN is governed by a constitution, which, although brief in comparison to the established organisations, still includes objectives, membership rules, management of the organisation, terms of office, brief meeting procedures and a code of ethics (OFWN, 1996). Space is dedicated to outlining the responsibilities of the Executive Committee and the Directors; these are discussed in very broad terms only, and are shown in Table B.3 in Appendix B.2. While weighty when compared to the other networks, it is still indicative of a less formal and non-hierarchical nature that the management of the network is relatively unhindered by rules, regulations and duty stipulations. Indeed this standardisation of procedures is much less evident at the ‘grassroots’ level than it is amongst the established organisations, indicating an informal agenda (Atwater, 1995) and allowing for more spontaneous collective action.

OFWN effectively has two tiers, with an additional national reporting body, the Canadian Farm Women’s Network. Members at the grassroots mostly belong to county-based groups of WSA, CFW and FGF and informality and collectivity are the focus of these groups who prefer to “just have a kitchen meeting rather than having a structure to it.” (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). The OFWN organisational structure is shown in Figure B.4 (Appendix B.2), which shows two
levels, with the management level of Directors and Executive coming directly from
the grassroots membership, without the many levels which are characteristic of a
more hierarchical and structured organisation.

PCW has three tiers consisting of the parent organisation, the Clutha Agricultural
Development Board, the PCW committee, and at the very grassroots level, the rural
women of the Clutha District. CADB provides practical support for agri-industry in
the Clutha District, and as such they are the financial basis for PCW. The PCW
committee is a core group “who hold responsibility for projects and associated
committee members whose expertise [is called upon]” (PCW Organisational
Interview, pers. comm. 1999). It consists of 8-13 core members (including a
Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, Treasurer and Rural Women’s Co-ordinator) and a
number of associated members (RWRC, undated). The network has few rules and
regulations, most pertain to membership of the core and associated committees, roles
in the committee, meeting procedure and financial matters, and are brief and non-
defining in the way in which the network may wish to act to achieve the network’s
aims, i.e. the rules do not define how particular actions must proceed.

AWiA, parent organisation to CVWiA, consists of two tiers, the AWiA Board of
Management and the 600 members based in individual and autonomous groups and
networks. The Board of Management is responsible for national activities such as
training, publicity, policy and membership development, while each group or
individual on the other tier remain autonomous from AWiA. CVWiA, autonomous to
AWiA, views itself as a reference group for lobbying and activities in Victoria, and
this unstructured nature is to their benefit as they claim to have gained experience in
'doing things' because they have direct access to politicians and policy makers
(CVWiA Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

A simple structure was favoured amongst NWD members for its ease of organising,
i.e. less time commitment, and for the way it would fit into farm women’s busy lives.
This is reflected in comments made by two core members:

Women could use a less formal, flatter organisational structure than
traditional farming groups, so that’s why I think we’ve got to set up this
kind of structure. By the time you’ve got your kids, maybe some of them are at school, you’re involved there, maybe you’re involved in the farm, maybe you’re even involved in outside employment, you haven’t a lot of time left, so who wants to attend meetings really? (NWD Key Informant Interview 1, pers. comm., 1998).

We don’t want to be hierarchical, we don’t want to run around and have secretaries and treasurers or that kind of structure. We want to be who’s got some time, and who can do it. (NWD Key Informant Interview 2, pers. comm., 1998).

The vision of a grassroots network has been successful; the only “hierarchy” in the network is the initial nucleus of women who organise an annual conference.

Communication between members and executives of the networks is direct and open with little stratification to slow down this process. A OFWN representative compares her network’s communication style with that of the FWIO illustrating how many levels of communication may hinder action:

And for them [FWIO] to do any lobbying for issues it takes a long… it’s a long process through their organisation. Ours [OFWN] is as direct as possible to keep it from being bogged down with paperwork. (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

Teaming this lack of stratification with modern communication methods means that the networks are informative and directional in their strategies and activities (Atwater, 1995). Apart from NWD, the networks place high importance on communicating with members through newsletters and localised meetings, but greater importance is placed upon modern means such as phone, fax and email, allowing for immediate and everyday action (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999; CVWiA Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999; PCW Organisational Interview, pers. comm. 1999). While there is more than one level in these networks, executive members are still very much in touch with everyday concerns, a consideration which may often be lacking in the established organisations. For PCW, media publicity plays a large part in promoting network activities, and a paid Rural Women’s Co-ordinator, is responsible for what is seen as an important component of the organisation’s functioning (PCW Key Informant Interview, pers. comm., 1998).
In respect to communication, NWD differs from the rest of its cohort; communication between members is via an email network. While there was some initial disappointment that the network would be limited to farm women with internet access, it was recognised that “none of [the members] have got time to write letters, or even send faxes” (NWD Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999), and despite this initial misgiving, membership has continued to increase. The dissemination of ideas, opinions and information via an email network ensures almost immediate communication, and members can act upon information received as soon as desired.

The ways in which these newer networks are structured lends to a style of leadership and decision making that is more collective and immediate in comparison to the established organisations. Even though there has been criticism expressed, regarding OFWN, the oldest of the networks, that with the formation of OFWN from WSA, CFW and FGF activism became less spontaneous, with Mackenzie referring to WSA’s action in particular as unplanned and immediate (1994: 102), and describing OFWN as less dramatic and less visible in the public arena (1994: 113), there still remains a structure, which is apparent in all the networks, that promotes swift and immediate communication and disseminations of issues and information.

The networks have grown out of recent instabilities which in a global economy have meant that responsive action must be more immediate and innovative. OFWN grew from groups which were established in the unstable period of economic crisis in the late 1970s, and which was still being felt by farm families in the 1980s, when OFWN itself was formed. AWiA grew from a need to promote and recognise farm women’s concerns about farming conditions affecting not only their businesses but also their families, and their lack of inclusion in mainstream farming organisations. PCW has evolved from recognition of a need to provide better recognition and training for rural women in the Clutha District. And similarly, NWD saw a need to provide farm women with information and support to enter into leadership positions in other farming organisations.

The newer networks are structured to operate on a collective, co-operative basis with an open communication style, and there is low specialisation of roles. The nature, and
hence, action of the networks is informal, spontaneous and flexible. The managerial decision making environment is one where the decision making is equal among members, with little fixed authority, and without the many levels of hierarchy through which decisions must be discussed and ratified. This unstructured environment and the communication methods employed allow for easy and fast consultation, and innovative action.

4.4.3 Conclusion
Controls over, and formalisation of, communication, decision making and leadership determine ways in which members of an organisation sees itself. The differing structures of the case study organisations have indeed affected and continue to determine collective identity and hence collective action. FWIO and CWAV are very highly structured organisations, with their collective identities remaining very much rigid in the face of change. In contrast to its generational counterparts, RWNZ, while hierarchical and structured is making more of an attempt to be fluid in its communication and decision making climate. By nature of their original formation, the newer networks are flat and simply structured, featuring collective and everyday reactive communication and decision making, with NWD the less structured of its cohort. The ways in which an organisation is able to act and devise strategies and activities which appeal to members is reliant upon the speed of communication and decision making, and this next section examines membership characteristics and incentives to determine what type of farm women is a member of a particular organisation.

4.5 Membership Characteristics and Incentives of Organisations
Particular women may belong to either established organisations or newer networks for farm women depending upon the characteristics and incentives that the organisation circulates for members. The ‘emotional investment’ that women have in their organisation illustrates the importance of these organisations in creating collectivity. Melucci claims that emotions “are all part of a body acting collectively, particularly in those areas of life that are less institutionalised, such as social movements” (1996: 71). As such, it is necessary to examine the characteristics and incentives for joining an organisation; what ‘serialised condition’ (Young, 1994) is
recognised and satisfied by belonging to a particular organisation? This section focuses on how each organisation understands itself in relation to its servicing of members and, in particular, farm women. Identifiable phenomena such as membership stability, services provided and the users of those services are analysed with relation to how they contribute to a sense of collective identity. These are provided in detail in Appendix B.3 and summarised in Matrix 4.3. Membership characteristics and incentives of the established organisations are examined first, followed by the newer networks. In Section 4.5.3, RWNZ is identified as having a fluid identity, illustrating that these membership characteristics, while identifiable at a particular time and place, are also part of wider dynamic social processes, and adaptable in reaction to those processes.

### 4.5.1 Established Organisations

The three established organisations offer their members similar incentives for joining, and thus position membership characteristics in comparable ways. Members are offered opportunities for personal growth and community action, with members positioned as responsible, loyal and community minded citizens. In each of the organisations, however, membership numbers are decreasing (FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999; CWAV Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999; RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999; RWNZ Waikato Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999). Even with this membership decline, and an ageing membership\(^{46}\) all still credited their organisation with meeting the needs of contemporary rural and farm women. Both RWNZ Otago and Waikato representatives attribute this decline primarily to the increased need for women on farms to earn off-farm income, and the “increasing expectations of contributions to Boards of Trustees, Health Trusts, many fundraising requirements, and greater time and distance factors in accessing basic social services for families” (RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). However, even considering this justification, the characteristics of the existing members and the services that the organisations provide to these members are indicative of a certain collective identity.

\(^{46}\) FWIO and CWAV 75% over 40 years, RWNZ 90% over 40 years (FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999; CWAV Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999; RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999; RWNZ Waikato Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999).
CWAV’s ageing membership is reflected in the major users of its services: older farm women and older women in rural towns (Table B.8 in Appendix B.3). This is demonstrated by the organisation’s role in farming which is seen by the organisation as educational; providing farm safety days, law forums and health checks (CWAV Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999), as opposed to the lobbying and recognition objectives of farm women oriented networks. The services that CWAV provide are tailored to meet the demographics of their membership focusing on social and community issues, with various social events, handcrafts, and music and drama playing an important role in membership activities. Companionship and attributes such as care, respect, leadership and competence are also valued (CWAV, undated a). A focus remains on providing members with information on social issues seen as pertinent to them, such as law changes, and environmental issues. The September 1999 issue of *Victorian Country Woman* (CWAV, 1999b) includes wide-ranging issues of concern such as gene technology, suicide, and phone billing.

While FWIO was originally formed for the education and training of farm women, its membership is increasingly moving away from this group: younger farm and rural town women are minor users of FWIO’s services; instead indicators show an ageing and increasingly urbanised membership. The domestic focus of the organisation remains with mothers and housewives perceived as being major users as opposed to women who are also in the paid workforce, however there are very few new and younger members. A FWIO representative attributes this ageing (and decreasing) membership to “the situation of the family, where two people work. [FWIO] membership was stronger when women were at home, where women had more time for WI, rather than in the workforce.” (Rep. B, FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). Indeed, Louise Carbert claims that the appeal of FWIO lies in its “domestic-oriented discourse…creat[ing] a personal identity as a good wife, mother and neighbour.” (1996: 47-48). Carbert continues to state that this discourse is transmitted through the “rituals of women’s organisations” (1996: 48) and this can be seen in the nature of the main services provided by FWIO to its members.
### Matrix 4.3: Summary of Organisational Membership Characteristics and Incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Characteristics</th>
<th>FWIO</th>
<th>CAVW</th>
<th>RWNZ</th>
<th>OFWN</th>
<th>CVWiA / AWiA</th>
<th>PCW</th>
<th>NWD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Urban/Rural split</td>
<td>75% aged 40 years+ 85% 10 years+ membership</td>
<td>80% rural 75% aged 40 years+ (50% aged 70 years+) 98% 10 years+ membership</td>
<td>65% rural 87% aged 40 years+ 85% 10 years+ membership</td>
<td>Must be actively farming or contributing capital to farm Rural 90% aged 40 years+ 95.5% under 10 years membership</td>
<td>Must be involved in farming or agri-industry Rural 50:50 aged and above 40 years 100% under 10 years membership</td>
<td>Must be resident in Clutha District Rural 91% aged under 40 years 100% under 10 years membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Users of services</strong></td>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td>Mothers Housewives</td>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td>Mothers Housewives</td>
<td>Younger farm women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Important Services</strong></td>
<td>Education Person growth Fellowship and networking Leadership in community Lobbying</td>
<td>Companionship Craft and domestic-based skills Information on social issues Social issues lobbying</td>
<td>Social contact Lobbying Personal growth Homecare Continuing education Networking and information dissemination</td>
<td>Networking w farm women Lobbying Farm social issues Support farm family Education re farming</td>
<td>Networking Practical demonstrations Support Mentoring Leadership</td>
<td>Awareness of opportunities Co-ordination of services Seminars Communication network Rural women’s week</td>
<td>Email networking Information sharing Network conference Mentoring Profile within industry politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Membership Incentives</strong></td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Craft, choral, drama-based activities Social picnics and dinners (CAVW, 1998)</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Informal structure and involvement Action at all levels ‘make a difference’ (CVWiA, undated b)</td>
<td>Rural women’s week celebration Women’s farm fieldays Tourism and farm diversification Business growth (<a href="http://notjust.org.nz/positively_clutha_women">http://notjust.org.nz/positively_clutha_women</a>, April 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The services that FWIO provides for its membership are very socially and community-based, with an emphasis on providing education and leadership in home- and community-based services. For example, a report in the 1998 FWIO Annual Report places great emphasis on particular types of volunteer activities undertaken by members:

… the 12,200 WI members in Ontario volunteered 549,000 hours in 1997-1998. The largest percentage was spent in leadership activities, followed by health-related activities. The least number of hours was devoted to 4H clubs (FWIO, 1998:18).

As the types of leadership, education and volunteer work that FWIO undertake are traditionally social and community-based, so too is their lobbying generally confined to these matters. In recent publications FWIO list some of the areas in which they act: road safety, food safety, censorship, school curriculum and domestic violence (FWIC, undated; Smith et al, 1995). FWIO’s lobbying style also remains traditional and non-confrontational. This is illustrated by a comment from a FWIO Representative regarding FWIO’s lobbying style and success:

Making lots of noise – that’s not our style, we work in the community. We don’t make a lot of noise about it. We don’t call press conferences. Our activities and workshops lend us esteem. We have a big network in rural Ontario, which nobody else has but us (Rep. A in FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

The services provided by RWNZ reflect an organisation focused primarily on home and community aspects of rural communities, indeed the RWNZ Waikato representative acknowledged that the organisation takes a different perspective to other mainstream farming organisations by focusing on social and farm family issues pertaining to changes in rural communities (RWNZ Waikato Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). While RWNZ offers training in leadership, confidence building, communication and small business management to members, more specifically, they see their role in farming as focusing on legislation affecting farming practices and products, disseminating information, commenting on policy and ensuring equal access to services (RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999; WDF, 1997). Many RWNZ activities are open to non-members, and seminars and fieldays focus on topics such as Women and the Law, farm safety, internet training, and Agri-build business skills. Members are encouraged to take part in community work, with Homecare and personal care playing an important part of
the organisation’s overall aims. These strategies suggest an organisation that focuses on women as members of a rural community, not solely as farm women.

FWIO does not see itself as an organisation specifically for farm women. While it has representation on mainstream and educational farming organisations – Ontario Federation of Agriculture, 4H, Ontario Agriculture Training Institute, Agriculture in the Classroom, their focus is on farm and food safety, environmental and economic issues. Their emphasis remains on the farm family and rural community aspects of these organisations; as does the incentive for women joining FWIO. It is for reasons associated with family and community that the organisation was originally formed, and in many respects the services offered and strategies employed by FWIO remain unchanged in their ideal.

CWAV promotes itself as “a progressive vibrant association, meeting needs in a caring and responsive manner” (CWAV, undated a), with a focus on making things happen and the world a better place (CWAV, undated a); in short “worthy of the word “Service”” (CWAV, 1978: 33). The incentives they provide to members continue to focus on social and community issues and as such CWAV remains little changed in its objectives over the last few decades. Originally an organisation for women living on the land, it remains focused on traditional domestic-based activities and issues, and the incentives for members still focus sharply on domestic activities and community service.

RWNZ’s Otago and Waikato regions are faced with a declining membership that is becoming more interested in the social aspects of the organisation’s objectives, as opposed to the political concern for rural communities and younger farm women facing changes in rural communities. Unlike FWIO and CWAV who promote themselves as attracting women interested in social activities and community work, RWNZ does not market itself to a particular ‘type’ of rural woman. However, the organisation does admit to having an image of ‘tea and scones’ (RWNZ Waikato

\[^{47}\] 4H is a community-based organization dedicated to the growth and development of rural youth. Members participate in technical skill development, club projects (many related to agriculture) as well as activities like camping, public speaking, travel, and conferences. (Website: http://www.4-h-canada.ca/ September 2000).
Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999) and this is reflected in its attentiveness to providing personal growth, social support, community services and domestic skills. While RWNZ also focuses on issues placed in the agri-industry sphere of farm and industry, such as creating agricultural awareness and creating a stronger voice for farm women, these are often overshadowed by their mistaken identity as a women’s branch of Federated Farmers.

All three established organisations have membership incentives which focus upon social, domestic and community service agendas. These incentives attract, and are indeed shaped by, the characteristics of a particular membership. This membership is older, and increasingly urbanised, women. FWIO and CWAV, in particular, appear to continue to cater for this membership. RWNZ representatives, however, claim RWNZ is aware of their declining members, and that there must be a change in the incentives they give to farm women to join (RWNZ Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999). The strategies undertaken by RWNZ to adapt their collective identity is analysed in Section 4.4.3.

4.5.2 Newer Networks
Farm women to whom the established organisations do not appeal have joined networks which focus on promoting and encouraging women in farming and agri-industry. This next section examines the membership characteristics of these newer networks, analysing how these contribute to a construction of collective identity.

The objectives of the four networks focus strongly on women as valuable contributors to farming and agri-industry, and membership reflects this motivation. OFWN’s members are all “woman farmer[s] [their emphasis] who contribute land, labour, management and/or capital assets to a farm” (OFWN, 1996:1). AWiA’s, (parent organisation to CVWiA) membership is open to women involved in all aspects of Australian agriculture (http://www.awia.org.au). NWD’s email network is moderated to only include women involved in the New Zealand dairying industry. However, while OFWN, CVWiA and NWD maintain a focus on farm women as equal, knowledgeable partners and leaders in the farming community and industry at local,
national and global scales, PCW seeks to promote and position its members in multiple roles, recognising the diversity and value of these roles. In reflection of this PCW’s fieldays and seminars are attracting not only original members who are involved in farming, but increasingly rural town women (PCW email from representative, pers. com., 2001).

The type of woman who is a member of a newer network is similar across the four case study organisations, as are the perceived users of services. Almost all members are rural-based and new to the organisation (less than ten years), as opposed to an increasingly urbanised and stagnant membership in established organisations. Most OFWN, and half of CVWiA, members tend to be over 40 years, but as active farmers, with less than ten years in their networks, the membership is much younger and more industry focused than that of the established organisations. This membership distribution clearly shows the farm woman orientation of the network and very high importance is placed upon farm women, both younger and older, as users of the networks’ services. High importance is also placed upon mothers and housewives as users, reflecting in particular OFWN’s farm family policies on childcare and domestic abuse (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999). NWD\(^{48}\) attracts mainly older farm women, but younger farm women, mothers and women in the paid workforce (who may also be involved in the farm business) are also major users of the network and this is reflected in the nature of the emails on the listserv. Emails range from technical, financial and managerial aspects of farming to personal and family issues. This sharing of information is one of the basic tenets of the network: the mentoring of younger farm women by older farm women. Almost all PCW members are below 40 years of age, and this is reflected in the users of their services; younger and older farm women, mothers and housewives. Whereas the other three networks focus on the woman as farmer, with perhaps the exception of OFWN, clearly focusing on their farm and agri-industry involvement; PCW makes a strong commitment and recognition of farm women’s identity as carers and as off-farm workers. PCW sees their role in farming as going beyond the woman as farmer:

\(^{48}\) Age demographics are not available for NWD members.
[Our role] may be to promote and foster more interest of women in farming, support their important role in primary childcare, increase awareness in the business community of women’s roles and therefore promoting business respect (PCW Organisational interview, pers. comm., 1999).

PCW claims to address the frustrations and barriers facing rural women in a unique fashion (http://www.notjust.org.nz/positively_clutha_women), and they do this by providing a wide variety of events and celebrations. Initially, seminars which were specifically farm or women related were held, with the aim of encouraging women to become more active in the running of their farm as a business, by growing knowledge and self-confidence. A PCW representative states that many farm women are not involved in their business and “a lot of that is to do with knowledge and self-confidence” (PCW Key Informant Interview, pers. comm., 1998). These seminars have grown in diversity in an attempt to include rural women who live in small towns, and/or are not specifically involved in the farm business. PCW’s aim is to provide “a variety of activities, an abundance of fun and entertainment, as well as opportunities for personal growth, and renewing friendships…” (PCW, 2000:1). These activities have included women’s farm fieldays, tourism and farm diversification seminars, business growth and computer training workshops, to dinners, parades and competitions. PCW’s emphasis is to provide the type of training and celebrations that encompass and reflect the many roles of women in rural and farming communities.

CVWiA also recognises the important service they provide to women in the paid workforce; both women employed in agri-industry and those that work off-farm to supplement farm income. However, the membership distribution of CVWiA clearly shows a focus upon, and on issues affecting, farm women. This orientation is extended to national level, with Teather asserting, "it is clear that farm issues will remain central to AWiA's agenda…” (Teather, 1996b: 3). The AWiA website outlines what the organisation offers to members: support and the opportunity to initiate action, lobby government, industry or community bodies, friendship and information (http://www.awia.org.au). These joining incentives are enlarged upon in CVWiA's promotional brochure emphasising informality and a chance to ‘make a difference’ from local and family levels to the policies of Australian agriculture (CVWiA, undated b).
Emphasis clearly lies with promoting farm women in all aspects of farm life and agri-industry. CVWiA does so by issuing newsletters, organising conferences and workshops on technical and administrative farming issues, environmental and health issues, tours of local farms, by acting as a media watchdog, and working with government and policymakers (CVWiA, undated a). These activities are clearly reflected by CVWiA’s five most important services to members; providing mutual support through networking and mentoring, fostering leadership among members, sharing information and providing practical demonstrations to boost knowledge and confidence (CVWiA Organisational Interview, pers. comm. 1999), which all reflect the focus on farm women, their families, farms, communities and industry. On a national scale, AWiA’s activities also promote the same ideals of networking and support. All members receive a quarterly magazine which includes comment on agricultural and rural community policy, international issues, conferences, and reports from other mainstream agricultural organisations and regional sub-groups of AWiA (AWiA, 1999). AWiA, and sub-group CVWiA, incorporate strategies which reflect their objectives to promote farm women in all aspects of farm life. CVWiA encourages women to join who believe that "the teamwork of rural communities… and Australian agriculture are important… [to them, and who] believe that women have an important contribution to make (CVWiA, undated b). Members are encouraged to use the structure of AWiA to support and mentor them in their contributions to the agri-industry and rural community.

OFWN promotes itself as a network for women who are farmers, and seeks recognition for the family farm and farm family. As such promotional documents outline to prospective members what membership offers: “a forum for farm women to express their views, […] a vehicle for positive change in legislation and policies” (OFWN, undated b), a fostering of “learning, [and a] sharing of information and personal growth” (OFWN, undated c) through dissemination of information on farming issues, networking, leadership training, and a collective voice to government and the media (OFWN, undated c). Their emphasis clearly lies with providing farm women with information they need to effectively run family farm businesses, while still taking into consideration the farm family.
These objectives are put into practice through a variety of strategies and publications. OFWN in the first few years of its existence published three booklets that assisted in exposing the realities of farming for farm women. These publications were; *Breaking Barriers: The Role of Women in the Decision-Making Process of Ontario Agricultural Organisations* (Research Associates, 1990); *Let Us Introduce Ourselves – A Directory of Ontario Farm Women* (OFWN, 1992), and *Cover Your Assets, Guide to Farm Partnerships* (OFWN and WSA Winchester, 1994). OFWN have also produced a video on chemical safety, developed a community abuse programme, provided workshops on farm assets transfer, sustainable farming and leadership, and promoted membership and leadership on farm commodity and marketing boards. In addition the network has lobbied for rural childcare, and farm women’s eligibility as unpaid workers for the Canada Pension Plan (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). Their strategies reflect their claim to be for and about farm women, the farm family and the family farm; to “put the family part of the family farm back into farming, [and] to be the emotional crossover from business to family” (OFWN Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

In contrast, to the farm family objectives of the other three networks, NWD remains firmly focused upon women as leaders in agri-industry. In addition to this, NWD remains predominantly an email discussion network, neither lobbying nor organising activities as an organisation. Instead, NWD seeks to mentor and support farm women encouraging them to enter leadership roles in agri-industry. One of the network initiators outlines the function and focus on the network:

> I believe it will be involved in things like consumer issues, environmental issues. I don’t think we will get off on things like health issues, and all that sort of thing. I might be bold, but I would think we will be very much focusing on dairy, the consumer issues. I would get on the computer and discuss it with the other women in the network to see what they think about it. And new products, innovation, and specifically to do with our industry (NWD Key Informant Interview 2, pers. comm., 1998).

This concept of sharing and asking for information about issues of concern via email, is the main service the network provides. The range of topics discussed over the email network is mainly farm business and agri-industry-based, with some concern about rural families and communities present. To date, the network has achieved its initial vision of providing an easy access forum, where women may ask questions, and proffer
their opinions and experience in return. Personal input is seen as vital as many women feel more comfortable introducing themselves and talking about family issues as an initial foray into the email network. A network representative describes it thus:

There has been some really, really good discussion on deregulation, on industry politics, on general farming practices, on our busyness of course, ... the personal stuff is kind of important as well. I put a personal email on the other day, and suddenly a new member came out of the woodwork and let us know she was there, by responding to something that was a bit more low key in my message. And it gave her confidence... the personal stuff actually has that sort of value. If they think we are just talking about high pressure policy and they don't know what to say, then that's not very welcoming (NWD Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

In a practical, tangible sense, NWD has also provided one other main service to members. Since 2000 they have held successful annual conferences aiming to "uplift, inform, motivate and inspire all women connected to the dairy industry" (Paterangi School, 2000), and have offered topics such as personal development, networking, profitability in farming, globalisation, animal health, and computing (Paterangi School, 2000; website http://www.stuff.co.nz/inl/index 3 May 2001). As well as the email network and annual conferences, NWD believes it provides an encouraging space for farm women to recognise their talents, and gain knowledge about agri-industry. While the network does not see itself as a lobby group (NWD Key Informant Interview 2, pers. comm., 1998), they do see a role in encouraging and mentoring farm women who wish to become more involved in lobbying for rural communities and in the agri-industry politics. This "service" is a perfect expression of the type of collective action to which NWD adheres, and is described by a Key Informant below:

...I would see us as encouraging and as helping people. If they want to stand in an election... if they wanted to do anything, we would say okay we'll help... we'll clap, we'll come to your meeting if you want us, or we'll give you some ideas on how to get about in the community... we'll mentor you. I would see us actively mentoring women who want to get involved in politics (NWD Key Informant Interview 1, pers. comm., 1998).

In contrast to the other networks, and indeed the established organisations, NWD's style of organisation is one that allows the network to be driven completely by the members. The resulting action taken by members in their family and farming roles may be individual, yet they intend it to be collective, in that they see their empowerment and actions as benefiting farm women as a whole. The network as a
body does not control the actions and strategies of its members, and indeed its one organised event, its annual conference, is dissimilar to those of mainstream farming organisations. It is not about passing recommendations and preparing strategic plans, but about providing attendees with knowledge and skills to be used where they will, to empower them.

The newer networks, in contrast to the almost heterogeneous established organisations, are varied in the membership characteristics and incentives that contribute to construction of their collective identities. They all, however, portray and promote farm women as valued contributors to all aspects of the family farm and agri-industry. PCW, while aiming at younger rural women, provides incentives that focus widely on farm-based and rural-town based women, and in some ways provide similar incentives as RWNZ, except for younger women. OFWN and CVWiA promote objectives and strategies which encompass the farm and family concerns of farm women, incorporating the intertwined nature of these two. Their membership is limited to farmers, but their incentives for participation encompasses both the family and farm as business aspects of farm women's contribution to farming. In greatest contrast to the established organisations, NWD focuses on individualised farm and agri-industry decision making and leadership, through mentoring and support enabled by an email network. While these networks all offer different incentives to farm women, and thus begin to construct differing collective identities, the characteristics of membership, with the partial exception of PCW, concentrates upon farm women as farmers.

4.5.3 Rural Women New Zealand as an example of a dynamic identity
The collective identity of an organisation is neither fixed nor unchanging. Melucci (1996) claims that in times of crisis an organisation’s collective identity is put to the test and how it responds determines whether that collective identity is rigid or fluid (1996:75). Melucci categorises a rigid identity organisation as one that compartmentalises its spheres of action to preserve coherence, whereas a fluid identity organisation implements reconstructive action in line with a new orientation (1996:75). The construction of an organisation’s identity often changes due to external factors, for example, perception by members, others in the community and
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media, rather than due to internal factors, such as the objectives and strategies of the organisation itself. One exception to this is when an organisation actively seeks to change their image or collective identity. RWNZ is one such organisation, having changed their name and recently introduced a strategic plan aimed at revitalising their organisation and publicising their role in the rural community. They form a useful example of the more fluid and less fixed possibilities for farming women's organisations and the construction of farm women identities.

In contrast to FWIO and CWAV, RWNZ is actively seeking to reverse a declining membership and perceived lack of identity as an organisation with much to offer farm women. In 1999 they changed their name from Women’s Division Federated Farmers, and its perceived association with Federated Farmers as a women’s branch, to Rural Women New Zealand, and in 2001 launched a strategic plan to revitalise the organisation. Interviewees who held leadership positions higher up in RWNZ often held the opinion that there was inevitability about the name change if the organisation was to survive. However, they also stated that there would need to be extensive remodelling of the organisation and its strategies to reverse a declining membership, and the two quotes below illustrates this feeling amongst respondents in leadership positions:

P: I think we had to do it, Deirdre, because it kept coming up at every conference, it kept coming up! And until we changed it, that would have kept coming up and coming up, because there was such a band of women there that felt that it was just a ridiculous name and didn't like it and felt it had to change and once it changed everything would sort of be rosy in the garden. That won't happen.
DS: So you think perhaps people will think in a couple of years’ time ‘well we changed the name and nothing's changed’?
P: They may unless we actually make sure it changes.
DS: So what do you think needs to be changed?
P: I think we've got to be more proactive and get out there and have the public image (3-69I, farmer’s wife).

Well we've got to change. The older women who are WD are old. I mean even myself at 56 well I don't consider myself old, and I think that our age group are the ones that can see that it has to change. And anyone sort of over 60 had seen WD as it worked well and in the past, and as an identity on its own, could still continue to work, why should we change? But the younger generation, the 30 year olds that are coming in now, they don't see it that way! So for WD to survive we've had to become Rural Women. And pick up those ones who aren't involved in farming. (3-98I, retired farmer’s wife).
In 1999, interviewees’ maintained mixed feelings regarding the then upcoming name change, some waiting with almost bated breath for a fresh and appealing organisation which would attract younger members, and others less optimistic about any changes that a new name could yield. A younger RWNZ member welcomed the change, hoping that other younger women would join:

S: I really, really like it. Its more modern . . . I just think its really good. Women's Division Federated Farmers I thought was . . . I don't think we had anything to do with Federated Farmers anyway, as far as I knew, perhaps in the beginning . . .
DS: Do you think its going to change the image?
S: I think it might get younger people involved, interested (7-182I, sharefarmer/primary caregiver).

An older member was much more sceptical of a name change as a drawcard for young women:

A: But as for the young women, I mean nationally they are desperate for young farmers to come into... and we're changing the name … now I personally don't think its going to make any difference at all.
DS: Why?
A: I don't think Rural Women NZ is going to attract the likes of you. Let's say you’re on a dairy farm. If you wanted to come you'd come if it was WDFF, you wouldn't suddenly get up in the morning and say oh RWNZ, I'll join! (3-129I, farmer’s wife).

Others believe that the name change, while making a small identity change, would not change the aims and objectives of the organisation, as it would still continue to fight for rural women and families. Two Otago members’ comments reinforce two widespread concerns that while a name change would disassociate the organisation from Federated Farmers, it would not alter the objectives or structure. The first quote expresses a feeling of cosmetic change, while the second vents frustration at a lack of deeper change:

I don't see the name change making any difference to anything. I believe that all its going to do is for those in Wellington. They were getting to the stage that they felt that people took them as being associated or part of Federated Farmers. But for anywhere else I don't see it, RWNZ, bringing any more members than it was before. I don't - I mean a name shouldn't make any difference, its what your aims and objectives are that matter. It’s not a name. Going on from what the conference reports have come through, I don't see any difference in their aims and objectives. I mean, our objective, our aim is to strengthen rural families, well... I mean that's not going to change, even if we have got a name change (3-59I, farmer’s wife).
I think it will lay a few things to rest, because until they changed it, it was going to be a bone of contention. And Women’s Division isn’t a relevant name in terms of where you’re a division of Federated Farmers. I mean they had nothing to do with Federated Farmers... But part of the problem I think is that their constitution is so unwieldy that it took so long to affect any kind of change. And that I think is part of the biggest problem overall. It was too many rules and regulations, and how you behave and how you do things (3-95I, farmer / primary caregiver).

At the end of 1999 the name was changed, and a RWNZ representative considers the “name change [to have made] a significant difference” (RWNZ Interview, pers. comm., 2001), stating that the organisation was previously seen as an appendage of Federated Farmers; and that throughout New Zealand members are not just involved in farming, but are far more diverse. The name change reflects that they are however rural dwellers and depend on rural New Zealand for their livelihood.

Following on the heels of the name change to RWNZ, the organisation launched a website49, and recently an action plan which places a renewed focus on publicity for the organisation. The website is more interactive and forward thinking in contrast to the other established organisations’ websites. The history of the organisation is not as extensive in comparison, and the focus is solely on the work done for rural women and communities in the areas of service provision, education, environment and welfare legislation, as opposed to any focus on social or domestic activities. There is a forum section that consists of members’ viewpoints on current issues like rural services, RWNZ activities, farm issues, membership and branch news. The organisation’s news and media releases were up to date and aplenty, with three to four health, education and agri-industry issues covered each month. The findings from RWNZ’s recent nation-wide rural health survey were discussed, and this received major media coverage, and has the potential to have a significant impact on government health policies50.

49 The creation and importance of RWNZ’s website is in contrast with the number of members who were internet users at the time of the Farm Women Questionnaire implementation in early 1999. Data from the New Zealand 2001 Census indicated that rural internet usage has increased over the census period to between 26-37% (New Zealand average 37%) (http://www.stats.govt.nz May 2003).
50 RWNZ’s Rural Health Survey results were well received at the Setting the Agenda for Rural Women Conference in New South Wales, Australia. The RWNZ President reported that it was considered as a major piece of statistical data and valuable piece of research by researchers (http://www.ruralwomen.org/newsoct02-issues October 2002). A major New Zealand daily newspaper described it as the “first comprehensive survey of access to health services in rural areas (Tyson, 2001:D4).
RWNZ’s current action plan (2001b) focuses on eight broad strategies, with each, for the first time, expanding upon these strategies with “more practical, more achievable, more do-able” action plans (RWNZ Interview, pers. comm., 2001). In analysing RWNZ as a fluid identity, attention can be paid to RWNZ’s successful development of flexible local structures (branch meetings), development of a Rapid Response Team to act on issues at local levels, organisation of practical seminars and fieldays for farm women, development of links with ‘allied’ organisations, streamlining structures and systems, and most importantly “develop[ing] a strong public image of energetic, enterprising rural women [and] develop[ing] strong local and regional media coverage of community activities and events” (RWNZ, 2001b) through a minimum number of press releases, website and email development, and visibility of RWNZ sponsorship at events, which RWNZ “genuinely believes” is happening (RWNZ Interview, pers. comm., 2001).

RWNZ has reacted to indicators of a fatally declining membership by trying to revise their collective identity. The change from Women’s Division Federated Farmers to Rural Women New Zealand indicates not so much a change of direction in the organisation itself, but rather a political repositioning, an attempt to gain public recognition and respect as an organisation not linked to mainstream organisation Federated Farmers, and as an organisation which is dedicated to rural women, of which farm women are a sub-group. Part of this identity change is to modernise the organisation to make it more appealing to younger women by acknowledging the changing positions of younger farm women, and in doing this they are adapting structures and strategies to suit contemporary lifestyles and means of communication and collective action.

RWNZ, as an organisation with a fluid collective identity, and one which is moving away from that of the other two established organisations, illustrates an organisation that is situated between the two outer positions of collective identity shown in Figure 2.5 in Chapter Two. Traditionally, RWNZ has acted to maintain hegemonic identities for farm women, but increasingly their strategies, both in the rural community and agri-industry seek to challenge and resist these identities.
4.5.4 Conclusion
Membership characteristics and incentives help construct an internalised collective identity through the emotional investment members and organisations make in each other. Organisational characteristics concerning who may be a member, the strategies employed, and activities undertaken by organisations are constructed twofold. Existing members shape the characteristics of an organisation, and in turn the very nature of what the organisation does, i.e. the incentives for members to participate, constructs collective identity. The established organisations, FWIO and CWAV in particular, have, and cater to, an ageing and increasingly urbanised membership with more interest in social and community activities than farming and agri-industry. The emotional investment of the members may be based upon the ideal of family and rural community. While RWNZ has similar characteristics and incentives for members, the organisation seeks to change its collective identity, demonstrating the dynamic nature of collective identity, with their name change and associated changes in strategies. As shown in Section 4.5.3, RWNZ is seeking a new and varied emotional investment from members, one that encompasses not only family and rural community, but also agri-industry. Yet while they attempt to encompass the needs of younger women, they maintain a wider focus than three of the four networks. PCW is similar to RWNZ and is the exception amongst the networks. PCW provides incentives for members as rural women, not specifically farm women; members emotional investment focuses predominantly on farm and family, as opposed to agri-industry. OFWN, AWiA and NWD require members to be actively involved in farming and agri-industry, and as such their focus lays predominately in that arena. The emotional investment of members of these networks is one that seeks change for farm women.

Recognising that collective identity is dynamic, and that membership characteristics and incentives are identifiable in a particular time and place, it is possible to argue that the emotional investment of members and organisations in each other is reflective of the serialised condition that Young (1994) contends must be present for individuals to form collective projects. This dimension of internalised collective identity, perhaps more so than formation and structure, is active in the construction of a collective group that acts upon that recognised serial condition. So, we can see in the case of the established organisations that members have mostly placed emotional investment in certain conditions surrounding family and community; and in the case of the newer
networks that members have mostly placed emotional investment in specific conditions surrounding the farm family, farming and agri-industry.

4.6 Analysing Organisational Identity

The preceding sections have developed an analysis of the internalised construction of collective identity. Section 4.6 builds upon this analysis, and incorporates Melucci’s conceptualisation of organisational type (see Section 2.4.2). It examines the characteristics of organisational function and action as indicated by representatives, to determine organisational type (see Appendix B.4). This analysis of organisational type is important in the construction of collective identity. While classifying farming women's organisations as either established organisations and newer networks offers a pragmatic solution to differentiating between the generational cohorts, it is a continuum of organisational type which demonstrates the fluid and dynamic nature of collective identity. Organisational type is then considered in conjunction with formation, structure, and membership characteristics and incentives to establish an internalised collective identity. Established organisations and then newer networks will be examined and this is summarised in Matrix 4.4. In conclusion, an internalised collective identity is indicated for each organisation.

4.6.1 Established Organisations

As shown in Sections 4.3-4.5, while FWIO and CWAV maintain a home and community-based focus, RWNZ’s membership incentives extend beyond that into the arena of agri-industry. This is reflected in the characteristics and organisational type of these three established organisations. FWIO and CWAV representatives identified similar characteristics that were provided in the Farm Women Questionnaire. These emphasised that while they are concerned about the welfare of women and families, they do not specifically have a farm women focus. Indeed their organisational focus remains firmly on providing a social support network, personal growth opportunities and community services, as well as lobbying to create a stronger voice for all women, or in the case of CWAV, specifically rural women.
Matrix 4.4: Summary of Organisational Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Sphere of Activity</th>
<th>Organisational Type</th>
<th>Characteristics of Collective Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FWIO</td>
<td>Family, Community</td>
<td>Co-operative</td>
<td>• Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of system’s limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWAV</td>
<td>Family, Community</td>
<td>Co-operative</td>
<td>• Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of system’s limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWNZ</td>
<td>Family, Community, Industry</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>• Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of system’s limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCW</td>
<td>Family, Farm</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>• Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of system’s limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFWN</td>
<td>Farm, Industry, Farm family</td>
<td>Social Movement</td>
<td>• Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Breaching of system’s limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWiA / CVWiA</td>
<td>Farm, Industry, Farm family</td>
<td>Social Movement</td>
<td>• Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Breaching of system’s limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWD</td>
<td>Farm, Industry</td>
<td>Individual Resistance</td>
<td>• Aggregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Breaching of system’s limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RWNZ representatives characterise their organisation in a similar, but extended manner. While they provide personal growth, social support, and community services to their members, they extend their focus to the farm and agri-industry arena. Creating agricultural awareness, and a stronger and equal voice for farm women, as well as maintaining a farm issues and industry focus are seen as important characteristics of RWNZ. This desire to create awareness of the contribution of farm women, is expressed in the RWNZ Waikato representative’s comment that the organisation is concerned with the distribution of society’s resources, and conflict and consensus:

Challenging social norms?… probably, no. More access to society’s resources?… probably. Well, I wouldn’t say we are seeking control, but
more access. So yes, I think we would [be conflictual]. Its quite important (RWNZ Waikato Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999).

A sense of conflict is the deciding factor in defining RWNZ as a competitive organisation as opposed to FWIO and CWAV who can be defined as co-operating organisations. Representatives of these two established organisations indicated that they considered solidarity, maintenance of the system’s limits, and consensus as describing their collective action based on formation, structure and membership characteristics and incentives. These three behaviours, Melucci claims, indicate a co-operative organisation: “cooperation designat[ing] the area of collective action that is based on solidarity but not oriented towards a conflict, and which is entirely located within the limits of compatibility of the system.” (Melucci, 1996:30-31). RWNZ’s indication that their determination to gain more resources for rural communities was conflicting as opposed to consensual defines them as a competitive organisation. However, this action remains within the system’s limits, and this is what defines them from the majority of the newer networks.

4.6.2 Newer Networks
The newer networks' characteristics build upon those of the established organisations, with personal growth, providing skills and a social support network still recognised as important characteristics. However, more evident is the importance of farming oriented characteristics. Creating agricultural awareness, a stronger voice and equality for farm women are major indicators of the focus of all four networks. In addition to these are farm issues and industry foci, combating attitudinal isolation, and providing farm-based education were indicated by one or more of the networks. These characteristics assist the visibility of the contribution and importance of women to agri-industry, but also continue to acknowledge the importance of the farm family and family farm. These are the characteristics of networks that challenge the assumption that women on farms are solely home and community-based; and while acknowledging the importance of family, it places farm women’s role in the farm and industry on an equal footing.
In contrast to the other networks, PCW characterised itself as promoting community interaction, as too did the established organisations. This is further reinforced by the analysis of PCW as a competitive organisation, as is RWNZ. The network may be, at first glance, characterised as a social movement. A PCW representative indicated solidarity, breaching of the system’s limits and conflict as very important to PCW. This network is breaking down barriers to rural women wholly participating in their community by providing them with skills and empowerment which enables them to challenge assumptions about their ability. The argument for PCW as a social movement is further supported by this comment from a representative:

The work we [do is] valuable, and that work range[s] from actually contributing on the farm to even the work we [do] on a voluntary basis, as in service to the community... and yet it [is] very hard for that contribution to be recognised. [but] if you are confident about your role and you’re valued for your role, then you are going to project better, as a group (PCW Key Informant Interview, pers. comm., 1998).

This illustrates the concepts of solidarity, and a challenge to hegemonic positioning of women in rural communities. However, a PCW representative stated in a later interview that while a breaching of the system’s limits and conflict “describe the basis of [their] work, [they] are not challenging or conflicting to an extreme” (PCW Organisational Interview, pers. comm., 1999). When applying the intent of this statement, and considering the membership characteristics and incentives of PCW, to Melucci’s analysis PCW’s collective action may be analysed differently. If we consider that PCW is in fact maintaining rather than breaching the system’s limits, PCW’s action may be best described as competitive, and similar to RWNZ.

Melucci’s analysis of a social movement, defined not just as expressing a conflict, but pushing it beyond the limits of society’s rules, challenging the legitimacy of power (1996: 30), is better applied to OFWN and AWiA/CVWiA. Representatives of each network identified solidarity, a breaching of the system’s limits and conflict as characteristics of their collective action. Both networks can be characterised as challenging the hegemonic forms of rurality that fail to recognise the important contribution of farm women to the farming community and industry. Indeed, the women in agriculture movement in Australia, of which AWiA is a part, has been to seen to be "breach[ing] the more hierarchical and patriarchal dimensions of the agri-
political system..." (Liepins, 1998a: 135) and "pushing for change" (Grace and Lennie, 1998: 353).

NWD differs from the other three networks in such a way that it may not yet be termed a social movement. The main difference lies in the immediate nature of an email network. Expression of opinions, action and support is almost instant. NWD almost exclusively exists in cyberspace; very few physical meetings are held. The network does not have any promotional literature, and apart from conference publicity, new members are gained from a snowballing technique of existing members introducing new farm women to the network.

As such, analysis of NWD’s action characterises the network as one of individual resistance; epitomised by aggregation, a breaching of the system’s limits and conflict. The concept of aggregation reflects perfectly the action of NWD. It is an action which may be broken down to the level of the individual i.e. separate action, but which stays within the structure of the network, as the members aggregate through a generalised belief. The structure of an email network fits Melucci’s definition of aggregation – “express[ing] a spatio-temporal contiguity” (1996: 23) in that members of the network are highly dispersed in time and space. The attitude of the network is one of a reactive collective action based on recognition of a common identity, best described in the words of one key informant:

I think we have to absolutely support women and encourage them when they get any sort of recognition in the industry. I mean really get behind them! Let's be positive! Let's start saying we're women and we're good! And that's the kind of attitude I want to take (NWD Key Informant 1, pers. comm., 1998).

4.6.3 Determining Internalised Collective Identity

Melucci’s analysis of collective action provides a useful tool in determining an organisational type: co-operative, competitive, social movement or individual resistance. However, to determine an internalised collective identity, i.e. how an organisation sees its own collective identity, it is necessary to also consider the impacts of formation, structure and, more importantly in terms of recognising identity as a dynamic social process, membership characteristics and incentives in conjunction with organisational type. This is presented pictorially in Figure 4.2, which places
each organisation on a quadrant based on sphere of action membership characteristics, and organisational structure, as well as considering organisational type.

The internalised collective identities of FWIO and CWAV are similar to one another; both are co-operative organisations, their focus remains on family and community. However, that focus has not changed over time to meet the demands of contemporary farm women, neglecting to change that focus from domestic-based activities and issues to the particular social and agri-industry issues challenging younger farm women. The status quo remains, with little effort made to change traditional hierarchical leadership and conservative, non-confrontational lobbying. The membership characteristics and incentives reflect ageing and increasingly urbanised organisations with services and leadership firmly focused on family and community.

RWNZ is similar to the other established organisations in its formation and structure, but has made an attempt to revitalise and challenge their collective identity through adaptations to membership incentives and it is hoped, characteristics. Strategies and activities focusing upon leadership in the community and agri-industry challenge their positioning in the sphere of family and community. Their internalised collective identity straddles the boundary between the service and agri-industry spheres. In retaining a focus on family and community, but also displaying a commitment to agri-industry, RWNZ is similar to PCW, also a competitive organisation. While RWNZ and PCW’s formation, structure and membership characteristics differ, they are the same organisational type and their incentives are similar.
Figure 4.2: Organisational Identity Quadrant

Bureaucratic / Mechanistic: hierarchical, formalised, specialised, controlled decision making climate

Masculinised sphere of action: farm / agri-industry. Farming and industry focus

Collective / Organic: flat structure, informal, little specialisation, collective decision making climate

Feminised sphere of action: home / community. Social / community focus

Organisational Type
Co-operating
Competitive
Social Movement
Individual Resistance
PCW stands out from the other networks because it does not focus specifically on agri-industry, but rather like RWNZ, packages up that aspect with the other multiple identities that farm women have. While they challenge the invisibility of farm women’s contribution they do not seek to increase participation in agri-industry as do the other networks. The incentives they provide for farm women are very similar to RWNZ, however their structure is very much contemporary and grassroots, and their membership characteristics epitomise younger farm women. As a very fledgling network, PCW has been able to formally construct an internalised collective identity that reflects the current needs of these farm women. This collective identity, while perhaps not challenging the position of farm women, nevertheless seeks for appropriate recognition of farm women in all their roles.

OFWN and AWiA / CVWiA have changed little in their raison d’être since inception, and as such their objectives and structure still reflect the needs of contemporary farm women. Classified as social movements, these networks seek better recognition for farm women as knowledgeable and skilled actors in agri-industry. In conjunction with this they also seek to include the farm family and family farm as important factors in agri-industry politics. While they focus on the importance of family, it is dissimilar to the focus of the established organisations. There, the focus is on farm women as carers and farm helpers in a traditional service sense, whereas in the newer networks those identities are important, but are intertwined with their farm- and agri-industry-based identities. These two networks have internalised a collective identity that reflects enthusiasm for leadership and mentoring of women as farmers.

NWD is the most recently established of the networks, and its formation was influenced by the existence of networks such as OFWN and AWiA. Its objectives and motivations are similar, but the very basis of its structure and functioning give to a very different collective identity. Classified as a network of individual resistance, the email network provides a different set of membership characteristics and incentives and collective action for farm women. In providing a forum for the dissemination of information to farm women which is accessible and non-threatening, NWD is challenging the hegemonic dominance of male farmers in agri-industry and farming
politics; and while highly dispersed, the network has created a collective identity in the Waikato and beyond through its conferences and individual involvement in industry politics.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated the importance of context in the construction of collective identity. The internalised collective identity of each organisation can be linked with the context within which they formed. Section 4.2 has addressed the first question guiding this research by examining the context within which the farming women's organisations operate. It has done so by investigating the gendered social and material practices, relations and institutions that shaped everyday life, and subsequently, the focus and operation of the case study organisations.

Sections 4.3-4.6 address the second research question by determining the internalised collective identity of each organisation, and how this may impact on collective action and the spaces created by the organisations for members’ recognition of hegemonic and alternative identities. These sections have examined formational, structural and membership dimensions of collective identity, as well as identifying organisational type as a strong signifier in collective identity and action.

Relational settings have contributed to the structural aspects, as well as the initial formation of each organisation. The formation and membership characteristics and incentives are a reflection of a particular time and place where farm women have recognised a serialised condition which they wish to act upon. As demonstrated in Section 4.2, the series, farm women, is produced by prior histories and past practices (Young, 1994) which contribute to particular notions of rurality. Certain social and material practices, relations and institutions (for example, family farming, gendered ownership, labour and inheritance patterns, influence of feminism, male dominated agri-industry) have produced the recognition of certain serialised conditions (for example, isolation, unrecognised contribution) upon which the members of these organisations choose to act; to invest in emotionally.
The formation, structure, membership characteristics and incentives of an organisation, in conjunction with an analysis of organisation type allow a construction of a collective identity as perceived by the organisation itself. Chapter Five further expands upon this internalised construction by considering the external dimensions that construct organisational collective identity: members, other farm women, and the media. Chapter Six compares this collective identity with the narrative identities of the members and the identity placed upon the organisation by society through public, cultural and institutional narratives i.e. women’s place within rurality.
Chapter Five: Constructing Collective Identity: External Dimensions

5.1 Introduction

Chapter Four identified and examined the internal dimensions contributing to organisational collective identity. In doing so it began to answer the second research question surrounding the spaces and structural bases organisations create for the recognition of collective identity. Chapter Five continues to examine the collective identities of the case study organisations, by analysing the external dimensions of collective identity. In the previous chapter, Young’s (1994) idea of a serialised condition and subsequent recognition of that condition was acknowledged as applicable in analysing the formation of the individual farming women's organisations. A link was made between certain social practices, relations and institutions underpinning notions of rurality that contributed to a serialised condition for farm women. This context stimulated and contextualised the formation of these organisations. Just as notions of rurality and a recognised serialised condition have influenced internal dimensions of collective identity, so too do they influence the external dimensions of collective identity. This thesis argues that the incentive for joining an organisation, and the recognition an organisation receives from others, depends largely upon the narratives circulating in society and informing notions of rurality. It is also dependent upon a conjoining of organisational purpose and a recognised serialised condition.

Chapter Two identified three relevant external dimensions for analysing collective identity: the experiences of members, other farm women and the media. This chapter examines these dimensions as they indicate an organisation’s collective identity, presenting a portrayal of each organisation as they exist within their contemporary relational settings. Melucci argues that relationships with outsiders must be considered in the (re)construction of collective identity. He identifies these outsiders as competitors, allies, adversaries and the apparatus of social control (1996: 78). Consequently, this thesis identifies members as allies where there is a certain degree of mutual agreement on an organisation’s objectives and raison d’être. It identifies other farm women as competitors and even adversaries, competing for recognition,
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society’s resources, and possibly denouncing a rival organisation. Linking together Melucci’s (1996) conceptualisation of ‘emotional investment’ and Young’s (1994) idea of a serialised condition, this chapter argues that women who recognise a particular serialised condition, and who are willing to make an emotional investment in the beliefs of an organisation may be considered an ally. In contrast, those that do not experience a similar serialised condition will not be willing to make that emotional investment, and may consider their own serialised condition to be of more importance, thus becoming competitors or even adversaries. Finally, it analyses the public construction of farm women’s identities by the media as an apparatus of social control, recognising that the media may be to externalised others the public face of an organisation and who its members are, presenting certain identities and images to society. Liepins (1998b) argues that media as a discourse forms meanings and articulates power, and that agriculture in New Zealand, and Australia is gendered\(^{51}\). In a wider sense, Acker (1991) argues that the media creates and reinforces the gendering of organisations. Following these arguments, it is argued that media is an apparatus of social control, justifying its contribution to collective identity.

These three dimensions are analysed in Sections 5.2 – 5.4, comparing and contrasting established organisations and newer networks. Section 5.2 analyses the experiences of the members of the case study organisations, considering why these women wish to join particular organisations and how they envisage their organisation’s collective identity. Section 5.3 focuses on the construction of the collective identities of the established organisations by other farm women and the media, as does Section 5.4 with regard to the newer networks. This analysis focuses upon whether respondents feel each organisation is suitable for women as farm women or members of a rural community. A media analysis is also undertaken to determine the image portrayed to the wider community. Finally Section 5.5 draws upon the previous sections and Chapter Four to argue a particular and relational collective identity for each organisation.

\(^{51}\) While Liepins’ (1998b) study did not include Canada, Section 4.2 substantiates the assumption that agriculture in Canada is also gendered, and we may assume that media discourses are similar.
5.2 Membership Constructing Identity

The narratives that members construct and circulate about their organisation contribute to the construction of collective identity. This section considers the narratives of members in terms of why they have joined these organisations, the role they envisage for their organisation, and the importance they feel their organisation places upon the six identities established in Chapter Two. As identified in Chapter Four, the established organisations and the newer networks largely operate in two separate spheres – service and agri-industry, and this is reflected in the membership attracted by these two types of organisations. In recognition of these two different types of environment in which the organisations operate, this analysis examines the established organisations and then the newer networks.

5.2.1 Established Organisations

Members of the established organisations construct positive images of their organisations, ones that are similar to those constructed by the organisations themselves. The ways in which they see the role of their organisations and their reasons for joining are comparable to organisational objectives and aims (refer to Section 4.3 in Chapter Four). All recognised traditional service roles for their organisation, commenting upon friendship, social and community work aspects. However, the views of RWNZ members differed from those of the other two established organisations. While FWIO and CWAV members focused on serving the rural community, RWNZ members focused on promoting stronger rural communities. However, even within RWNZ there was a distinct difference apparent between the two regions studied. Considerably more Otago members considered this promotion of rural communities to be more important than Waikato members, perhaps reflecting rural Otago’s isolation in comparison to the Waikato.

Social and friendship reasons for joining are consistently strong across the three organisations. However, secondary reasons differ; FWIO members focus on education and community work, CWAV members on music, drama and craft, and RWNZ members on addressing local and national issues for rural women. In all the organisations, members joined for multiple reasons, exemplifying the many functions they felt their organisation had to offer. FWIO and CWAV members tended to
identify more service oriented reasons for joining, as described in this comment from a CWAV member:

I joined CWA over 50 years ago, first because I think I realised it had much to offer one as a farmer’s wife besides friendship and company and it has been for me much more than I ever thought. It also taught me leadership and broadened my outlook considerably. Educational, friendship, the security of always knowing there was someone to help you (5-232Q, farmer’s wife / unpaid farm worker).

In keeping with RWNZ agri-industry focus, members also acknowledged the skills that they could learn through their organisation:

Anyone with a farming background or interest can take part in any farm oriented days i.e. farm safety, cooking for haymakers or shearsers, farm walks etc., plus all the types of education and handcrafts (7-196Q, farmer / farmer’s wife).

This additional focus on farming by RWNZ is further exemplified when considering if the organisations are meeting the needs of members. All three organisations were perceived as doing so through education, friendship and community work. However, while FWIO and CWAV members further cited homemaking and craft, RWNZ members also acknowledged the relevance of issues for rural women. For example, in the quotes below the CWAV member highlights the domestic skills learnt, while the RWNZ member cites rural / farming issues and the involvement of RWNZ in these issues:

CWAV member: It has helped in many ways, helped me to understand others’ needs and how best to give help. It has taught me skills, sewing, knitting, handiwork, cooking, which have been a real help to me in my role as a mother, wife and helpmate to my husband and family (5-232Q, farmer’s wife / unpaid farm worker).

RWNZ member: We are interested, intensely interested, in education and welfare of rural families, and health – intensely. And that is probably something that WD does better than Federated Farmers. And we may leave the Dairy Board and deregulation and all that more to FF, although we do definitely put submissions on it up at national level (3-69I, farmer’s wife).

Strong majorities felt that their organisation was meeting their needs, however dissatisfaction focused on inflexibility and hierarchy, urbanisation, and an ageing membership out of touch with the needs of younger farm women. Comments from

52 WD refers to Women’s Division Federated Farmers, the former name of RWNZ. Federated Farmers is the national male dominated organisation in New Zealand.
FWIO and CWA members illustrate that the increasing ageing of members not only goes hand in hand with a poor understanding of contemporary issues facing younger farm women, but also reflects the changing nature of farm women’s lives. Younger farm women’s focus is less and less on the domestic and community-based activities these established organisations advocate.

FWIO is not a [farm] organisation in this day. Many members are over the age of 50+ … Programs would have to be geared to young working women with children and a very busy schedule. Also there are few pure farm women these days. Most are working off the farm and at the same time are trying to manage a young family and just have no time left for organisations, but this is sad because they are missing a lot (1-34Q, retired farmer’s wife).

FWIO is] an old ladies’ organisation, and we can’t seem to bring younger women into it, because they have busy lives and a lot of people don’t like going to meetings (2-14I, farmer’s wife)\(^{53}\)

CWA is perceived [as being] for older women. Not true, but!!! Many younger women are looking for more action (5-168Q, retired farmer).

I don’t believe [CWAV] has kept up with current farming issues (5-172Q, farmer).

Dissatisfaction and a feeling that the organisation does not meet the needs of farming women in general was highest amongst RWNZ members, faulting the organisation’s ‘tea and scones’ image, as well as formality and lack of pertinence to younger farm women. Three RWNZ farmers’ comments support this argument:

[RWNZ’s] profile is not well known. [Its] public face [is] not very attractive e.g. bays at A&P shows, looks like grandmas making things for grandmas to look at. Not being disrespectful to grandmas! (3-95Q, farmer / primary caregiver).

When young people come into the district usually somebody asks them to come and then they don’t because they think it’s a bunch of fuddy duddies [who] have afternoon tea and gossip (7-208I, farmer).

I think they perpetuate [the traditional domestic image]. We have competitions at branches and provincial days, and they were based on cooking, sewing and craft work. And if you’re not keen to go to them… (7-202I, farmer).

Reasons for joining an organisation, and feelings of whether that organisation is meeting needs, constructs among members a collective identity of what and whom

\(^{53}\) This respondent was a member of both OFWN and FWIO, hence the organisation number identifying her as an OFWN member.
their organisation represents. Further to this, perceptions of the importance placed upon particular identities by the organisations are also an important consideration. Respondents were asked to rate the importance they considered their organisation placed upon the six identities. FWIO and CWAV members had similar perceptions, and the first two graphs in Figure 5.1 show these results in detail. In both organisations, carer rated significantly high, while in FWIO farm helper received a similar rating and community worker slightly less. CWAV members rated farm helper and community worker similarly, but slightly lower than carer. In both organisations, members rated the occupational identities of farmer, off-farm worker and industry actor significantly lower, signifying organisational foci upon traditional service identities.

While RWNZ members perceived that their organisation placed a comparable emphasis upon the service identities, the occupational identities of farmer and industry actor rated much higher (see third graph in Figure 5.1), and this is reflected in the organisation’s focus on rural and agri-industry issues. However, the majority of RWNZ interviewees felt that the organisation had still benefited them more as a member of the rural community than as a farm woman, and the following interview comment highlights the strength of RWNZ’s rural community focus.

I don’t know that it’s been a lot of help to me as a farm woman. Although there has been a few business courses that I have been to through WDF when I think about it. Fielday type things, the farm safety type things, organising those type of things are often good for farming women. But no perhaps it’s mainly [been] the help and the leadership type thing, and being involved with your school, doing different things down here with them, and planting trees (3-68I, farmer’s wife).

Recognition of collective identity
Acknowledging that members are allies in constructing collective identity, we can see that the members predominantly construct a collective identity that is similar to that of the organisation itself. However, there is differing recognition amongst members of the established organisations that others do not envisage a similar collective identity, or place as much importance on particular functions of the established organisations. While many interviewees commented upon RWNZ’s community focus, very few considered that the community gave recognition to the very important role RWNZ fulfilled in lobbying for social and community issues. Instead they perceived that the
organisation’s image was one of traditional domesticity, with members being older women socialising over tea and scones, catering for men’s and community meetings. CWAV interviewees also felt that the community considered the organisation to be full of old ladies doing good community works, even if, as argued in this comment from a CWAV member, this may not be the case.

[I think the public] still probably think that all the old nattering women go to CWA. And I think they are - although our club is not like that because we have quite a few young ones. A lot of the clubs are still the dodderly old women; knitting and crocheting that sort of thing…. But I’d say the community perception is still that the CWA is still the old country women having tea and scones. (5-155I, farmer’s wife).

Indeed, the interview transcript below exemplifies the feeling that many acknowledged; that the organisation while being a good outlet for social and stress relief did little for them as farm women.

A: CWA I’ve been heavily involved in. Because it’s an outlet for craft, but at the same token you can’t sit and talk to a lot of [the] women about farming.

DS: Would you say CWA helps you more as a member of the rural community or as a farm woman?

A: Its not as a farm woman. No. I’d have to say no. As a rural woman, yes. But as being a farm woman definitely not. Just those things – you wouldn’t even talk to the group of women I mix with because they have no idea… about what you do on the farm. (6-153I, farmer).

Many FWIO members, while acknowledging that their organisation held little appeal for younger women, still felt that it had much to offer farm women; a social outlet and a way of working to better the community, as well as providing leadership and confidence building skills. This strongly supports members’ perceptions of their organisation as having a community focus, one which they feel, in contrast to RWNZ and CWAV, is acknowledged and valued. The two interview quotes below illustrate this overall perception:

I think WI activities are always known for their good food, for their community spirit and for their good works in the community (1-39I, retired).

Oh [the community] approves of us and thinks its great what we do… I am seeing women that have really good ideas and they have the vision to see what is needed, and you have to have that… we need to have these things in the community. (1-29I, office worker).

54 Member of CWAV as well as CVWiA.
The members of all three established organisations envisage a collective identity for their organisations which is traditionally based on service and support. Socialising and friendship, learning new skills, and community work feature in the appeal and persona of these organisations. RWNZ members recognise a further emphasis for their organisation, acknowledging a comparably stronger concern for rural and farming communities and issues affecting them; and most importantly for this research, a perception of an increased recognition of the *farmer* and *industry actor* identities (see Figure 5.1). More so, in comparison to FWIO and CWAV members, they perceive a lack of recognition by others of their important contributions to farming communities, and in particular by younger farm women, of their attempts to meet the needs of these women.
Figure 5.1: Importance Placed Upon Identities by Members of FWIO, CWAV and RWNZ

FWIO, Canada:

CWAV, Australia:

RWNZ, New Zealand:

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, q 24.
5.2.2 Newer Networks

Members of the newer networks perceive their organisations as advancing women in farming and agri-industry, as well as gaining recognition for that contribution. There is a definite perceived need amongst these farm women for this function of promoting women as professional farmers and equal partners, and the role of networks in this is exemplified in this comment from an OFWN member:

Women at this point in time need to express themselves in a group by themselves, gain strength and knowledge, esteem without fear of ridicule, then they can move on. It will take time. I think it is extremely important farm women have a group they call their own. There are so many issues only they can express and expose so we as a community can learn and move on (2-21Q, farmer’s wife).

Women-only farming groups are seen as invaluable in networking, disseminating information and in acting upon issues of concern to farm women. PCW members see the provision of women’s discussion groups and fieldays as an important function, not only in giving women a chance to gain new skills in a friendly environment, but, as this comment demonstrates, by publicly highlighting women’s interest in agri-industry.

They had a fielday which was really good - just for women. In this area there was a farmers’ fielday which was notorious for just men going to, but this was actually just for women. And it was really good! No one was afraid to ask anything, even if they thought it was silly, whereas, normally there’s only a couple of women that go to the normal ones, and its possibly a bit intimidating just ‘cause it’s all men. And even the presenters were really intrigued with some of the questions they were getting from the women. They said they got far more questions at the women’s fielday than they ever do at the men’s ones (4-64I, farmer’s wife / primary caregiver / off-farm worker).

In contrast to the established organisations, the newer networks members do not see lobbying as one of the roles of their organisation. They do, however, hope that action for the promotion of farm women as knowledgeable actors will result from mentoring and networking. This function is expanded upon in this quote from an NWD interviewee, demonstrating not only the informal nature of these organisations, but also their commitment to providing knowledge and information for change.

What we see is a combination of providing information and knowledge to the women, so that they can make whatever decisions they need to make. They may want to go further with decision making; they may not. I think

55 While AWiA and OFWN as organisations do undertake lobbying, the members themselves do not see this as one of the organisation’s roles.
it’s important that it’s up to the individual women to do what they wish with that knowledge and information. I see it as a nurturing and mentoring role rather than an active lobbying group. But one would hope that with that knowledge and information there will be some women that will go out and lobby; and there will be others that never want to do that kind of thing. If you keep it general and provide the skills and the facilities then you will see a natural evolution of the different ones depending on their personality and ability. Whereas if you restrict yourself by trying to be lobbying all the time then you preclude a lot of people who don’t feel comfortable with that. If it’s just purely a nurturing, mentoring role then it’s up to the individual. (8-210I, farmer).

Across the four networks there were four main themes that encouraged members to join; networking and support, empowerment for farm women, recognition for farm women, and action. The potential of the newer networks in supporting farm women in their many identities, and in providing specific information, was acknowledged by these farm women. Also acknowledged was the difference of these newer networks from the established organisations:

Rural networks have always been there i.e. Women’s Division, but computers have taken them into a modern day and relevant to “today’s” rural women. The potential of these “networks”, and the information that can be disseminated, has a powerful role to play in the future of our dairy industry because it allows [for] informed women who can make informed choices about their future. This can only be healthy (8-185Q, farmer’s wife).

Opinions on the empowerment of farm women took varying forms amongst the networks, in particular PCW focused upon empowering women in their carer and off-farm worker identities as well farming-based identities. PCW’s broader view is exemplified in this comment from a farmer:

I think [PCW] are a great thing in bringing women out and showing them that they can do other things, they’re not just tied to the house. They show men that women are interested in going to these fieldays and taking an interest in the farm. I think what they are doing is great, cause they’ve got a good mixture. Some women just aren’t interested in agriculture and never will be, so they are doing things for them. That women’s week they had, that was excellent, they had a bit of everything. There were different sports, things you’d never tried before, there was the fashion parade, and then we had a meal, and a few speakers. And so I think they’ve got to have a mixture to suit everybody. Because not every woman wants to work on the farm, and not every woman wants to go to a fashion parade either (4-109I, farmer).
While the members of the three other networks listed empowerment of farm women as reasons for joining, their focus was directed towards agri-industry, encouraging women in their everyday lives to act, as is suggested in this comment from a CVWiA member about why she joined the network:

Confidence, awareness, linking with like minded women, doing ‘something’ for [the] agricultural industry. Showing potential of ‘ordinary’ farm women (not necessarily tall poppies) to have an opinion, start and maintain an action (6-141Q, farmer).

The desire for action about issues relevant to farm women is expressed by members of all four networks, and covers a wide range of issues, and for OFWN, in particular, includes issues relating to the farm family, as outlined in this comment:

[OFWN acts] from advancing farm women on decision making positions (political), advancing environmental agenda; rural health; childcare, (political; social; economic; environment spectrum) (2-37Q, off-farm worker).

It is obvious however, that in contrast to the established organisations the newer networks are not lobbyist organisations. They seek to empower members, provide them with information and support and mentor them as leaders in farming and agri-industry, so they may act on a more individual basis as opposed to the resolution-based and structured style of the established organisations. Above all they want this action to result in recognition for farm women:

I mean I think the key word is recognition. We’re not wanting bells and whistles, nor do we want the world to stop, but we are talking about recognition. (8-210I, farmer).

There is a strong consensus across the four networks that the needs of members are being met. Predominantly this was due to simple structures and informality allowing immediate action, as well as the mentoring and skill and information provision. Satisfaction was strongest amongst members of NWD (100%) and CVWiA (90%), both agri-industry focused networks, and newer and fresher than OFWN which was formed much earlier. The mutual support for women in agri-industry that these two networks offer through their informal structures is reflected in the two statements below:
Even those who are not involved at [a] high level become the support / safety network for those stepping forward. Different women have different passions / issues, therefore traditional structures [are] not necessary (6-141Q, farmer).

I would like to think that with the network [NWD], with women's access of all ages to email, that those who want to progress beyond the farm gate will be able to with the support of the women in the network. Because it has been such a hard slog for all those women who want to get anywhere. And they are pretty much an island. They're on their own. To be able to have that support and network and say look, so and so is going to stand for such and such, this is your area, what do you think? You know she's a super person, these are her philosophies. Have you thought about it? And get that support out there for women who are wanting to go beyond that farm gate. Instead of having to do it on your own, and have to fight against this old boys' network all the time, because it is a hard slog, and demoralising at times (8-180I, farmer).

This feeling that the networks are meeting the needs of members is extended to other farm women. Just over half of these women felt that other farm women would benefit from their organisation. They see that the functions performed by the newer networks are vital in empowering farm women to act for recognition as equal contributors in farming and agri-industry. An NWD member identifies mentoring and the supply of information as vital, just as a CVWiA member highlights the need to bring farm family issues to the forefront in farming policies:

[The] identification of issues concerning women, support in leadership roles, mentoring and the supply of information in a format which is rural women oriented is vital (8-180Q, farmer).

Women think differently to men so management need not have [a] president or the job could be rotational and working as [a] small group with decision making power on behalf of the group; and issues … yes there’s time to discuss safety, children / rural finance from a woman’s point of view. Also raising the profile of farm women (6-231Q, farmer / off-farm worker).

Members of PCW take a slightly different perspective, reflecting the network’s focus on gaining recognition for the service oriented identities of farm women, as opposed to the agri-industry focus of the other three networks. A comment from a PCW member illustrates this focus:

I certainly I see them as far more go ahead and out there promoting farming women to be a really crucial part of the operation, instead of just a person who takes care of the house, the children, the meals and that side of it. They are making women feel more important about their role even if it is only those things; that those things really are really
important, and actually make everything tick along. [PCW] is doing that, and I think they’re doing quite a good job of it. [PCW] is a far more upbeat for farming women, as opposed to WD and CWI (4-64I, farmer’s wife / primary caregiver / off-farm worker).

Members’ awareness of the role of their networks, their reasons for joining and how those networks meet farm women’s needs all indicate that the networks focus on action in agri-industry, with PCW, in particular, placing added emphasis on service-based identities. This is reflected in a majority perceiving that the networks place a strong importance on the identities of carer, farmer and industry actor. Excluding NWD, a strong emphasis is also placed on the farm helper identity. An off-farm career is also given strong importance by CVWiA and PCW members, reflecting specifically PCW’s rural town inclusion in its membership. High importance is placed upon the occupational identities particularly in comparison with the established organisations. Carer is also given a high rating reflecting the farm family concerns of these networks. In the starkest contrast to the established organisations, community worker is given much less importance overall, reflecting the move from community focused organisations for farm women to ones which accommodate a contemporary farm family and agri-industry focus (see Figure 5.2).
Figure 5.2: Importance Placed Upon Identities by Members of OFWN, CVWiA, PCW and NWD

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, q 24.
Recognition of collective identity

The move to focus on farm women’s agri-industry has resulted in these networks enjoying less external recognition than their established organisations counterparts. They feel that there is a gap between the collective identity they envisage for their network, and the acknowledgement and construction of collective identity by others. While most networks interviewees felt that their organisations were little known, NWD and PCW members considered this is be due to the fledgling nature of their organisation. However, OFWN and CVWiA have been in existence longer, but members still felt that if they were known at all, they were considered to be “a bunch of radical women” (2-16I, farmer / off-farm worker) or as “com[ing] across a bit too heavy [and] far too political” (6-153I, farmer). For OFWN this radical view and subsequent slump into invisibility can be attributed to an initial flurry of action in the 1980s when the network and its contributing organisations were very active, followed by a recent period of inactivity, as argued by two OFWN members in these interview transcripts:

[OFWN] had a really good image in the '80s. There were women who stood up and put things straight as to what women were doing, what they wanted to do and how they wanted to support agriculture; that there was a role for them to play. In some way they wanted to shake up the agriculture establishment - all the organisations which were mainly male, and say look here there are lots of other issues that are important not just economic issues. So for a while OFWN got a lot of attention. It was really in [her emphasis] to be farm women. Right now it’s parallel to what's happening to the women’s groups in this country - the attention is away from them, it’s totally out of the spotlight. It's a bit of a backlash. (2-234I, farmer).

I think with every organisation you ride a crest, you get down in the bottom of the wave, and its an up and down thing, and I think right now [OFWN is] in the trough. I think there is no doubt about it we're in the trough. Just because farm women are so busy. They just don't have enough hours. And I think OFWN is not doing enough to publicise what they are doing (2-16I, farmer / off-farm worker).

CVWiA members consider that their network does much to empower its members to ‘act’ as equal partners in agri-industry, but that this does not always equate to action in everyday life as expressed in this comment from a member:

The group might enable the women to get together and bolster themselves up and send them away feeling empowered and all that gender empowering stuff. But when it really comes down to it, you come home and you do what you want to do (6-175I, paid farm worker).
This inaction teamed with a lack of hierarchical structure, members feel, can translate into invisibility for their network, a lack of knowledge by the community, as indicated in this comment from an interview with a CVWiA member:

DS: How do you think people view CVWiA – the general public or farming community?
H: The general public wouldn’t have a clue about it.
DS: What about the farming community? Do you think they know it exists? Is it prominent at all?
H: Not really prominent. Not really prominent at all.
H’s Partner: A farmer whose wife is in it may not know of it.
H: They keep a very low profile (6-175I, paid farm worker).

The members of the newer networks envisage a collective identity for their organisations that is farm family and agri-industry-based. Empowering and gaining recognition for farm women in all aspects of their contribution to farming are the main features in the incentives for joining these organisations. PCW members are closest to the established organisation members in their view of their organisation and its function, placing more emphasis on the service identities and less on agri-industry than the other newer networks. NWD members see their network as empowering and mentoring women as leaders in agri-industry, placing less emphasis on women’s service identities. CVWiA and OFWN occupy the middle ground (see Figure 4.2), members envisaging a focus on the farm family and agri-industry, and this may well attribute to their feeling that they are viewed as radicals. While PCW members seek more recognition for their roles in the home, and NWD members wish to increase participation of women as leaders in agri-industry, members of CVWiA and OFWN seek not only these, but also to move farm family issues out of the private arena of home and community, into the public arena of agri-industry, claiming that industry policy affects the social aspects of farming.

5.2.3 Conclusion
Members of the established organisations and newer networks, as ‘external’ allies to their organisations, construct their organisation's collective identity in similar ways as the organisations themselves. Members of each organisation have recognised a certain serialised condition, and have acted upon that condition by joining a particular organisation. Members of FWIO, CWAV and RWNZ have made an emotional investment in the social, home and community focus of the established organisations.
In addition to this, RWNZ members have recognised and acted upon a need to be more involved in agri-industry. Members of the newer networks while also recognising a serialised condition which, for OFWN and CVWiA members in particular, places the family farm at the forefront of the agenda, have also made an emotional investment in an organisation which seeks to act in the farm and agri-industry arenas. Matrix 5.1 summarises these members’ external constructions of identity.

These themes, in part, confirm existing literature about farming women's organisations. This literature has suggested that there are two distinct groupings of farming women's organisations: established organisations and newer networks (as per Teather, 1996a, 1996b and Carbert, 1995), predominantly based on formation and structure. However, Chapter Four has argued that the internalised collective identity of these organisations is based not only on formation and structure, but also that membership characteristics and incentives and organisational type distinguish further categories along a continuum. This has been further highlighted in Section 5.2, where it is argued that RWNZ members have more of an agri-industry focus and awareness, than members of the other two established organisations, of the differing views by others of the organisation’s collective identity. In addition to this, there is variance amongst the newer networks, with PCW members placing less focus than the other networkers on farm and agri-industry, and OFWN and CVWiA centring action on the farm family, more so than NWD members. Like Teather's (1996a, 1996b) study, this section considers how members envisage their organisation's collective identity, but by analysing how much importance members think their organisations place on the six identities we may begin to develop a sense of the spaces and structural bases these organisations create for the recognition of identities for farm women. As such we may see the service identities linked with spaces constructed in a feminised sphere, and occupational identities linked with spaces in a masculinised sphere.
### Matrix 5.1: Summary of External Constructions of Collective Identity by Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>FWIO (n=28)</th>
<th>CWAV (n=29)</th>
<th>RWNZ (Otago n=52, Waikato n=44)</th>
<th>OFWN (n=32)</th>
<th>AWIA/CVWiA (n=12)</th>
<th>PCW (n=29)</th>
<th>NWD (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation’s Role as Envisaged by Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating and providing information on rural and domestic topics 81%</td>
<td>Serving rural community, particularly women and children 97%</td>
<td>Promoting stronger rural communities, particularly for women and children; Otago 90%; Waikato 42%</td>
<td>Recognition of women’s contribution to agri-industry</td>
<td>Providing avenue for farm women to discuss and act upon issues important to them</td>
<td>Networking, information and learning farming practices 62.5%</td>
<td>Advancement of women in agriculture, particularly dairying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving community in health and welfare 58%</td>
<td>Avenue for friendship and social networking 24%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of uniqueness of family farm and farm family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valuing farm women and their issues 58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting rural women through friendship and social networking 58%</td>
<td>Social / friendship 40%</td>
<td>Lobbying 37%</td>
<td>Community work 26%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advance women in agriculture 12.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons Members Joined</strong></td>
<td>Social 58%</td>
<td>Social 76%</td>
<td>Social 82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational 35%</td>
<td>Music, drama and craft 41%</td>
<td>Local /national issues 32%</td>
<td>Community work 22.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community work 35%</td>
<td>Education / skills 19%</td>
<td>Community work 22.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and homemaking 15%</td>
<td>Family Tradition 14.5%</td>
<td>Networking and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family tradition 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>to farming 20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation Meeting Needs of Members, and suits Farm Women</strong></td>
<td>Meeting needs 88.5%</td>
<td>Meeting needs 92%</td>
<td>Meeting needs 77.5%</td>
<td>Meeting needs 70%</td>
<td>Meeting needs 90%</td>
<td>Meeting needs 68%</td>
<td>Meeting needs 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suit farm women 68%</td>
<td>Suit farm women 50%</td>
<td>Suit farm women 52%</td>
<td>Suit farm women 52%</td>
<td>Suit farm women 70%</td>
<td>Suit farm women 70%</td>
<td>Suit farm women 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance Placed on Six Identities (% rated 1 or 2) by Organisation According to Members</strong></td>
<td>Carer 93%</td>
<td>Carer 87.5%</td>
<td>Carer 83.5%</td>
<td>Farm helper 95%</td>
<td>Farm helper 83%</td>
<td>Carer 87.5%</td>
<td>Carer 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm helper 93%</td>
<td>Community worker 73%</td>
<td>Farm helper 81%</td>
<td>Community worker 66%</td>
<td>Carer 84%</td>
<td>Carer 66%</td>
<td>Farm helper 87.5%</td>
<td>Farmer 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community worker 67%</td>
<td>Farm helper 72%</td>
<td>Farmer 58%</td>
<td>Industry actor 68%</td>
<td>Farmer 66%</td>
<td>Farmer 66%</td>
<td>Farmer 75%</td>
<td>Industry actor 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational identities rate significantly lower</td>
<td>Occupational identities rate significantly lower</td>
<td>Industry actor 51.5%</td>
<td>Off-farm worker 66%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Off-farm worker 66%</td>
<td>Off-farm worker 75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire.
In combination with Chapter Four, this section confirms Liepins' (1995, 1998a) and Mackenzie’s (1992, 1994) studies on farm women and their organisations in Australia and Canada, respectively, which highlight the mutual recognition of some serialised condition which has resulted in the creation of AWiA and OFWN. This thesis extends their work however, by contrasting a number of organisations and their members in three countries, showing comparisons and contrasts between the established organisations and newer networks across the countries. By providing detailed studies of the three New Zealand organisations this research augments and broadens earlier literature by investigating two networks previously unstudied, and investigating RWNZ at the time of its name change and strategic refocus. The contrast between the recognition of a serialised condition and the resultant collective groups by members of PCW and NWD is evident; differences in the importance seen to be placed upon the six identities are apparent not only between these two New Zealand networks but also from OFWN and CVWiA. Similarly, RWNZ members construct a collective identity for their organisation that differs from that of FWIO and CWAV, a difference that sees members placing more emphasis on an agri-industry focus for their organisation's collective identity.

While this section has demonstrated a mutual agreement of members' constructions of collective identity with that of the organisations themselves, the next two sections argue that the two other external dimensions, other farm women and the media, may not place as much importance on, or give as much recognition to, those organisational objectives and identities constructing an internalised collective identity.

5.3 Established Organisations and External Constructions

The three established organisations have all undertaken important roles in the functioning of their rural and farming communities. The members of these organisations, as an external dimension in the construction of collective identity, identify their organisations in ways similar to the organisations’ own internal constructions of collective identity. However, two other external dimensions must be considered in this construction (Melucci, 1996); other farm women and the media. This section examines the ways in which other farm women, as competitors and/or adversaries, and the media, as an apparatus of social control, contribute to the
construction of collective identity. In doing so, this section continues to address the question regarding the spaces and structural bases organisations create for the recognition of identities by farm women. The ways in which other farm women and the media construct these organisations’ identities and whom they envisage these organisations are for is contributory in the construction of collective identity.

Members of the four networks were asked about their perceptions of the established organisations, whether they were meeting needs, both of themselves and other farm women, and how much importance they considered the established organisations placed upon the six identities. In addition, a media analysis was undertaken of newspapers (a metropolitan daily and a farming weekly) in each case study area, allowing for an analysis of the dominant identities associated with these established organisations by the media. Matrix 5.2 presents summary information regarding these external constructions of collective identity and more detail can be found in Tables C.1- C.9 in Appendix C.
Matrix 5.2: Summary of External Constructions of Collective Identity by Other Farm Women and Media (1988-1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>FWIO</th>
<th>CWA V</th>
<th>RW NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Farm Women’s Perceptions of Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Community work Social Older rural women Not farm oriented</td>
<td>Community work Social Older women not in farming Tea and scones</td>
<td>Community work Social Older women not in farming Tea and scones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Needs of Self and Other Farm Women? Why/Not?</strong></td>
<td>No 92% No re all farm women 92% Non farm and farm women focus 57% Structure and decision making traditional 27% Older women 20%</td>
<td>No 78% No re all farm women 100% Structure, members and activities traditional 92% No appeal to younger farm women 50% Not address farm women issues 33% Older non farm women 25%</td>
<td>No 78.5% No re all farm women 88.5% Domestic-based organisation for farmers wives not farmers 71% Lacks in appeal to younger farm women 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance of Six Identities to those Organisations According to Other Farm Women</strong></td>
<td>Farm helper and carer 74% Community worker 48% Occupational identities rate significantly lower</td>
<td>Carer and community worker 100% All others rate significantly lower on 36%</td>
<td>Carer 92.5% Community worker 85% Farm helper 75.5% Farmer 61% Off-farm worker 53.5% Industry actor 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Constructions of Identity – Metropolitan Daily</strong></td>
<td>Domestic and community focus</td>
<td>Domestic, community and social focus</td>
<td>Community and industry lobby Farmer and off-farm workers Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Constructions of Identity – Farming Weekly</strong></td>
<td>Carer and community focus Some farm-based roles in 1999</td>
<td>Carer and community focus but also rural lobby and some industry lobby</td>
<td>Community lobby No recognition 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1 Other Farm Women- Perceptions of Established Organisations
Network members’ perceptions of the established organisations in their case study area were similar. The majority of members considered the organisations to operate as a social network for older rural women who were interested in community work. These farm women recognise the past importance of the established organisations, but like this OFWN member, question their continuing relevancy:

They have some very worthwhile efforts in WI, and they are there for a reason, and they are serving the needs of their people … [however] the needs of their people have changed from a hundred years ago. Their population is older women… so they have crafts, or just the fellowship of it, and they go on excursions and little trips… (2-136I, farmer).

Network members claim that this focus on social events and crafts is not of interest to younger farm women, and that the issues that are considered important are of little concern in the contemporary everyday life of younger farm women. These two comments from CVWiA members demonstrate the perception of older women socialising, reflecting a lack of change.

When I think of CWA, I think elderly grey-haired ladies sitting and knitting. Now I don’t know what the reality is in that. But yeah that’s what pops into my head (6-143I, primary caregiver).

[Its for] women who have time to do extra-farming activities – most just want to socialise, not embrace issues. I think they are stuck in a time warp, maybe ’60s era of being seen but not heard (6-176Q, off-farm worker).

Younger farm women do not see the appeal of the activities of the established organisations, arguing that any collective action is always in the background and not reflective of the issues facing younger farm women:

Their activities and conversation topics fail totally to interest or stimulate me, I’d be bored witless in no time and frankly, I’ve got more pressing things to see to. Women have left the kitchens and gardens. Swapping cake recipes and geranium cuttings isn’t quite enough anymore (6-175Q, paid farm worker).

Well they take their best carrot and their best parsnip along, or their best flowers, and I don’t know that they do a lot more than that. But they’ve really never had teeth or the presence of getting things moved, you know changing legislation and all that. I know that they do things in the background, but it’s always very in the background (4-74I, off-farm worker).
I perceive that WDFF has a very strong support of loyal women who have been there for many, many years. But I believe they are not reaching the young farmers. The perception of WDFF is tea and scones. To me they seem to be involved with the “social” issues of rural women. Rather than some of the nitty gritty and possibly “real” issues (8-180Q, farmer).

These comments illustrate the feelings that these organisations are not only not meeting the needs of the respondents of the newer networks, but also the needs of other farm women. Hierarchical structures and traditional decision making were seen as deterrents, as were a lack of focus on farm women’s issues, reflective of memberships of older non-farming women and a lack of appeal for younger farm women. Each of the four comments below supports this argument of a collective identity for the established organisations as hierarchical and lacking in appeal to younger farm women. The first two quotes illustrate the concern over collective action – a lack of it, and the issues tackled in FWIO:

B: [re lobbying] they go through layers up and [her emphasis] the layers down - six weeks later we're [OFWN] finished, six years later they're still on the go on it.
DS: So you think that their structure, the way that they are so hierarchical, is very limiting on their action?
B: Yep!
DS: They can't respond quickly?
B: That's right. Very much so (2-16I, farmer / off-farm worker).

They are traditionalists. I think they are promoting safe home values, traditional home values, safety in our communities. I think because of the age of the membership of the WI, they've forgotten a lot of what its like to be where young women are today (2-31I, farmer / primary caregiver).

In Australia, a member of CVWiA, who is also a CWAV member, comments on the decision making structure in the established organisations:

[CWAV have] a group of women that sit on a board and that make decisions... And now some of these women are in their 80s... shift some of those old ladies who are just so old fashioned – and I think there was about eight on this board, and six of them are spinsters. And I thought ‘this is just rot!’ (6-153I, farmer).

In New Zealand, PCW and NWD members also feel that RWNZ does not represent younger farm women or address the issues that concern them, and that, as the comment below shows, there is a public perception of an ageing organisation:
I hardly tell anyone [that I belong to WD] because I feel like its an old fogey [organisation], all these old ladies, I mean my mother in law, she’s 70 something, belongs to about 3 branches of it. I’m not a sewer; I’m not a knitter. I read some of the things they put in the newspaper and I think oh gosh, they have some stupid competitions. I shouldn’t say that – that’s what they’re happy doing. But anyway what I am saying is that in terms of recognition by the public at large, they are rated quite frankly. And so I don’t tell too many of my friends that I’m a member. They run WD down, and I do attempt to say they do quite a bit of lobbying work, but honestly that’s how I feel. I don’t feel very comfortable telling too many people (8-210I, farmer).

The reasons that network members feel the established organisations are not meeting their, or other farm women’s, needs are echoed in the perception surrounding the importance placed upon the six identities (see Figure 5.3). Amongst all four networks carer was considered to rate very strong, with farm helper and community worker rating highly, but less consistently across the board. In contrast, the occupational identities of farmer, off-farm worker and industry actor were not rated as high, except for RWNZ. NWD and PCW members placed a similar emphasis, if not more, upon these identities in comparison to RWNZ members, yet still saw RWNZ as being for older women. This perception supports this thesis’ argument that while RWNZ has a lot in common with the two other established organisations, it places substantial emphasis on the occupational identities and acts in the sphere of agri-industry as well as the service arena; however, as the comment below suggests, this is not always acknowledged:

The perception, unfortunately, that [people] have of WD, and it’s probably completely wrong, is that they have scone making competitions and this sort of thing. I mean that’s the perception, that’s what the younger people laugh about. But having said that I know of a woman locally here that was head of one section of WD and its quite political and she was quite high up. And that made me think ‘oh it can’t be all that sort of silly stuff, you know women together and have a bit of a gossip type of thing’ (4-64I, farmer’s wife / primary caregiver / off-farm worker).
Figure 5.3: Importance placed upon identities by established organisations as per newer networks members. FWIO as per OFWN, CWAV as per CVWiA, RWNZ as per PCW and RWNZ as per NWD (Source Farm Women Questionnaire, q27)
Members of the newer networks see the established organisations as being for older women, and furthermore, do not see the lobbying style and issues as compatible with the everyday lives and collective action styles of younger farm women. The collective identity that they construct for the established organisations is that of an organisation for older women, working to meet their particular needs, which they envisage centring on the service identities and social and community needs. There is however, some recognition given by members of PCW and NWD of the focus of RWNZ on farming and agri-industry. As such RWNZ’s collective identity as constructed by other farm women differs from that of FWIO and CWAV.

5.3.2 Media- Perceptions of Established Organisations

Media representations of the established organisations and their members reflect traditional hegemonic identities for farm women. Established organisations are portrayed as domestic oriented, community minded and as providing social networks, with members identified as carers, farm helpers and community workers. There were exceptions to this, in particular in the media presentation of RWNZ, and the portrayal of the organisations in the farming newspapers. Analysis of three separate years of a daily metropolitan and a farming weekly for each case study area is shown in detail in Tables C.1- C.9 in Appendix C. A summary of this data is combined with that presented in Section 5.3.1 in Matrix 5.2.

FWIO is presented as having a long history as a community minded organisation, promoting domestic pastimes. The London Free Press, a metropolitan daily, focused solely on the community and domestic aspects of FWIO, portraying FWIO as an organisation that acts "through education, demonstration [and] advocacy" (8.6.91:E3). However, The Ontario Farmer also portrayed members as farm helpers and valued in this function as this extract suggests: "a lot of farm wives can do the job better than hired help anyway" (18.5.88: 32). In the 1998/99 analyses there was one report of a member as a farmer, but while there was some recognition of their importance as "an agriculturally-based organisation" (24.11.98: 44), for the most part they were recognised as an "important institution in the rural community across Ontario" (8.9.98: 16B). This media portrayal promotes identities for FWIO members that occupy the service arena, and this is confirmed by the following comment from an OFWN member regarding FWIO press releases in community newspapers.
The WI has something in the papers all the time. I love reading them, and some of the statements they make - they're ridiculous what they say most of the time. “And at the end of the meeting all the women went home to their own homes.” I cracked up when I read that one. … The WI would start: “we had the meeting, such and such was a lovely hostess, we started with the Mary Stewart call up, then we had the roll call saying what flower we were growing differently in our garden, followed by a reading of the minutes, then we had discussion of new business, and then we had a guest speaker that talked about tying scarves. Mary poured the tea, and we all left and came home, to our own homes.” Every one of their reports reads that way (2-16I, farmer / off-farm worker).

This traditional domestic imagery and the importance of socialising is also apparent in articles about, and submitted by CWAV. Articles in the *Bendigo Advertiser* were predominantly about CWAV news and social events with a clear domestic, community and social focus, accompanied by headlines such as "CWA members take time for refreshments" (15.890: 8) and reports submitted by the organisation which included "a pretty bread and butter plate" (29.6.94:6) and "the roll call… seeks a household hint… the competition… a wooden spoon novelty" (7.9.94:6). No articles presented a farm-based identity for CWAV members. Plate 5.1 provides a pictorial example of the image portrayed in the media, one of older women drinking tea and socialising. While *The Weekly Times* also presents CWAV members as older non-farming women, there is some emphasis on the organisation as a rural lobby group, with minor recognition of members as farm helpers and industry actors. Articles on CWAV activities included comments that reflected their lobbying objective and concern with family, such as: "we have heard the voices of our women" (13.1.90:2) and "[the Year of the Family reflects] our concept and values of family life" (16.2.94:48). Indeed the power of the organisation as a lobby group for rural women and communities is demonstrated in Plate 5.2, with the associated article claiming that CWAV is attempting to change and update their activities and identity. However, overwhelmingly the media portrays members as *carers* and *community workers*.

In contrast to the other two established organisations, RWNZ’s portrayal in the media focuses less on social aspects and more upon the occupational identities, and the lobbying and political nature of the organisation. The *New Zealand Farmer* portrayed the organisation as a community focused group, lobbying for the maintenance of rural services, but gave no recognition of members’ roles in farming or agri-industry. Their reporting of a WDFF National President gives value to the importance of farm women's important contribution in this area:

> A man will view an issue solely from an economic or political point of view… women are aware of these, but also look at the people and social issues behind it, and how it affects women and families (15.6.94:2).

The *Waikato Times* and *Otago Daily Times* focus on RWNZ as a rural community lobby for social issues, acknowledging not only identities in the service arena, but also, to a lesser extent, in agri-industry. Reporting on WDFF/RWNZ has focused on their rural community lobbying, as shown in this extracts from *The Waikato Times*:

> A key lobby group for rural women, WDFF has pledged to monitor government legislation which affects women in country communities (2.5.92: 2).

> The WDFF works to promote rural communities and the welfare of rural families, and provides community services and development according to local needs… the organisation today means far more than tea and scones (16.2.99:13).

This 'tea and scones' theme is refuted in recent articles in the *Otago Daily Times* as well as *The Waikato Times*, exemplifying RWNZ's attempt to change other's constructions of their collective identity:

> Traditionally, WDFF has been seen as the scone making distaff side of Federated Farmers, even though it had a separate constitution and its own focus on community work (*Otago Daily Times*, 2.7.99).

> The nation's biggest lobby of rural women [have taken] the final step of a campaign to shake off its 'fuddy-duddy' image [seeking to] rebrand and restructure as a high profile lobbyist for rural communities, with a special interest in social issues (*The Waikato Times*, 15.6.99:2).

While in 1999, both metropolitan dailies increasingly portrayed RWNZ members as *farmers and industry actors*, dominant pictorial images were, however, of older women not actively involved in farming, as shown in Plate 5.3. This resonates with
the constructions of RWNZ’s collective identity by other farm women, both highlighting the mixed identities and issues of foci for the organisation.

Plate 5.3: “Beyond the tea and scones” Waikato Times, 6.7.99:13.

Media conceptions of the established organisations are similar to those held by the members of the newer networks, that the established organisations are for older women less involved in farming, and concerned with socialising, domestic pastimes and community work. Increased media portrayal of RWNZ members as farmers and industry actors is reflected in PCW and NWD members’ small recognition that RWNZ places importance upon these identities. However, FWIO and CWAV are not envisaged as organisations for younger farm women; their members identified as carers, community workers, and less so as farm helpers. This analysis confirms Liepins’ (1998b) argument for a hegemonic placing of farm women in domestic spaces, not only in Australia, but also Canada and New Zealand.

5.3.3 Others Constructing Collective Identity
The construction of collective identity by these two external dimensions has challenged both the internal constructions of collective identity and that of members. The recognition that these established organisations have received from other farm women and the media indicates that the spaces and structural bases that the established organisations provide for the recognition of certain identities
predominantly maintain hegemonic identities for farm women. The members of the established organisations are predominantly characterised as *carers, farm helpers* and *community workers*. However, RWNZ receives mixed attention. There is a definite external focus on the organisation as a home and community-based organisation, but there is increasing recognition that this organisation also acts in the arena of agriculture. Once again, this reiterates the importance of organisational type in the construction of collective identity. RWNZ, as a competitive organisation, is more likely to challenge hegemonic identities than co-operative organisations, FWIO and CWAV.

The members of the newer networks consider that the established organisations hold little or no appeal to younger farm women, claiming that the strategic spaces and resulting collective action do not pertain to their own interests. As such they don’t see the established organisations as adversaries of competitors. However, the very fact that they see these organisations as maintaining hegemonic identities for farm women must be frustrating. Correspondingly, the established organisations can be seen as adversaries or competitors in the (re)construction of identities for farm women.

### 5.4 Newer Networks and External Constructions

The four newer networks have all undertaken important roles in the recognition of the contributions of farm women in their everyday lives. As demonstrated in Section 5.3 it is necessary to consider the perceptions of other farm women and the media in the construction of a collective identity. Members of the established organisations were asked about their perceptions of the newer networks, and whether the style of the networks appealed to them. As most respondents of the established organisations did not know of the newer networks they were not asked to rate importance of the six identities or if they were meeting their needs. In addition to this a media analysis was undertaken (a metropolitan daily and a farming weekly) in each case study area, allowing for an analysis of the dominant identities associated with these networks by the media. Matrix 5.3 presents summary information regarding these external constructions of collective identity and more media analysis detail can be found in Tables 5.10- 5.14 in Appendix C.
5.4.1 Other Farm Women – Perceptions of Newer Networks

The perceptions of the established organisations members of the newer networks were limited in that because these networks were not as well established (or in the case of PCW and NWD, hardly established) they had little knowledge of the networks foci or action. Based on what knowledge they did have, they often viewed the newer networks as competitors for members and resources, and even adversaries in providing what they often saw as similar services and activities, and in dividing the collective voice of farm women.

Matrix 5.3: Summary of External Constructions of Collective Identity by Other Farm Women and Media (1988-1999)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>OFWN</th>
<th>AWiA/CVWiA</th>
<th>PCW</th>
<th>NWD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Farm Women’s Perceptions of Organisation</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge by FWIO members</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge by CWA members</td>
<td>Very few heard of network</td>
<td>Unknown by majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aims could be met by FWIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Localised activities</td>
<td>Believe RWNZ had more to offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal of Network to Other Farm Women</td>
<td>96% no appeal</td>
<td>56% no appeal</td>
<td>42% no appeal</td>
<td>57% no appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Constructions of Identity – Metropolitan Daily</td>
<td>Lobby group for farm women</td>
<td>Farming diary entries only</td>
<td>Localised skill provision</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational identities as well as carer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Farmer, carer, off-farm worker</td>
<td>Subsequent years promoted identities of farmer and industry actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Constructions of Identity - Farming Weekly</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Active, challenging, political</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on farm families</td>
<td>Farmer, industry actor, women as political agents / leaders</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As most respondents of the established organisations did not know of the newer networks they were not asked to rate importance of the six identities or if the networks were meeting their needs.
The style of the newer networks held little appeal for members of the established organisations, and this feeling was much higher amongst FWIO members. Although most had little knowledge of the networks, those that did felt that their own organisation could fulfil the aims of the networks. There was a strong feeling amongst those with knowledge of the networks that they were one-issue organisations with little power at governmental level, NWD, for example being described as “a little group” (7-196I farmer / farmer’s wife). This interview quote with a younger FWIO member demonstrates how she sees FWIO as being a substantial long-term actor with more power compared to OFWN:

I think a lot of them [OFWN contributing organisations] started up with the same ideas as WI… but unfortunately they started them and didn't have that support behind… I think their problem was that they had nowhere to go with these things, and because they were small and new you get nowhere with the government. If they had got in with the Institute and presented their concerns that way then I think they would have been happier about it. And a lot of them maybe just decided it was going to take too much of their time- they didn't have the energy or ambition. And the other thing is that they started with a specific concern, and maybe they would address that concern and then decide it wasn't needed and it just generated into a monthly meeting, with no real reason there in front of people (1-29I, office worker).

RWNZ members felt that the PCW network was very localised, and was not acting upon matters of policy that deter women from advancing in agriculture. This, and the feeling, similar to the FWIO respondent, that PCW was not able to act with a wider, national focus, as did RWNZ, is argued in this interview comment with a RWNZ member:

DS: So you feel that the Clutha Rural Women's Committee, that while they can act to do things, offer things for a local area, but that when it comes to the bigger issues they're not going to be able to act?
R: Not without a parent body, no. I think they are only aiming at their own council district. I think that's been their aim to work within their Clutha district. And I don't think they see themselves as becoming more than that. But there will be issues. Their focus is basically looking at the women themselves and their skills, whereas WD focuses on the whole community and political issues (3-98I, retired farmer’s wife).

Members of the established organisations felt that these newer networks were “one hit wonders” constrained by a localised focus; either catering for a minority group of women, or lacking a hierarchical-based power structure which effectively meant that the networks’ actions were ineffective. The established organisations considered this
narrow focus on farming to be unreflective of the multiplicity of women’s identities on farm, in the home and community, which they perceived as their own organisations as servicing.

5.4.2 Media- Perceptions of Newer Networks

Media representations of the newer networks and their members reflect the challenge of the traditional hegemonic identities for farm women that is undertaken by these networks. OFWN and AWiA/CVWiA, and to some extent NWD, are portrayed as activist groups, lobbying for leadership positions for farm women. PCW did not have a lobbyist profile, but was rather portrayed as providing new skills to farm women. Overall, network members identified as farmers, industry actors, off-farm workers and carers. Analysis of three separate years of a daily metropolitan and a farming weekly for each case study area is shown in detail in Tables 5.10- 5.14 in Appendix C. A summary of this data is combined with that presented in Section 5.4.1 in Matrix 5.3.

OFWN is portrayed as a lobby group for farm women by both The London Free Press and The Ontario Farmer. In both papers, in 1991, attention was given to a Farm Women’s Conference, and members were portrayed as farmers, off-farm workers, industry actors, and, in line with the network’s focus on the farm family, as carers. This linking of the occupational identities and that of carer, the importance of the farm family, and the challenge that entails are highlighted in these two extracts from The London Free Press.

[there is a] struggle between loyalty to traditional roles and making women equal partners in farming families (9.3.91:13).

[these] women [who are] fighting for the survival of the family farm are challenging… (23.11.91: C11).

The Ontario Farmer has a much greater awareness of the network, and has reported on their launch through to the various activities and issues regarding the farm family and family farm that have been the focus of OFWN. The paper reported on OFWN and University of Guelph research on leadership barriers to farm women, validating OFWN’s necessity as a network for farm women.
The [existing] groups do not truly represent the farm community and they may lack sensitivity to the impact decisions will have on farm women (3.4.91:10).

Later reports in 1998 confirm this collective identity as a group that focuses on the farm family and family farm, and continues to validate the network’s raison d’être, as shown in this extract.

There is a need for more information, more research, and more communications on rural social issues, or what she [OFWN President] describes as ‘the soft issues’ that strengthen the family farm and the family (23.3.98:8B).

However, while there is an overall lack of articles about the network, particularly in the metropolitan daily, (reflecting members’ concerns about a lack of activity directed by the network), pictorially, members have been presented as farmers, as seen in Plate 5.4, and vocabulary used in both newspapers has portrayed the network as activist, challenging, fighting and struggling for equality.


CVWiA has a lower media profile than CWAV, however, whereas the social aspects of CWAV are the focus, AWiA, and its sub-branch CVWiA, are portrayed as challenging, active and political. The *Bendigo Advertiser* lacks any real
acknowledgement of the existence of local group, CVWiA, apart from entries in the ‘Farming Diary’ which cover times and topics of meetings. These meeting topics did however promote a farmer identity for the members. Farming newspaper, *The Weekly Times*, did publicise the network’s drive to encourage women into leadership positions in agri-industry, and the dominant identities promoted were those of farmer (see Plate 5.5), industry actor and women as political agents and leaders. As with OFWN, the existence and necessity of the network was validated by reports in this farming paper, highlighted by this explanation of why there was a need for the network

> I always felt there weren’t enough women and then I realised they weren’t there because they weren’t comfortable being there for all sorts of reasons (6.4.94:35).

The collective identity of the network has been constructed in the farming media as women who include “agricultural scientists, journalists, researchers, marketers, agribusiness and farmers” (22.9.99:78), a collective identity which challenges dominant identities for farm women.

**Plate 5.5: “Power of one a win for women”* The Weekly Times 6.4.94:35.**
PCW’s launch generated much media attention. However, as an indication of their focus on recognising the diversity of farm women contribution to farming and rural communities, as opposed to specifically promoting women as leaders in agri-industry, there was no media coverage in the *New Zealand Farmer*. Local metropolitan, the *Otago Daily Times*, has provided media coverage of the local events that the network has organised, exemplified in this review of a farm fielday.

The venue was a woolshed and there was a crèche... the topics... included lamb production, hogget lambing, dipping residues, the Australian greenfly and stresses in the home (27.3.99).

While there has been an acknowledgement of the network’s objective to gain recognition of farm women’s diversity, the main identities promoted for members have been those of *farmer, carer* and *off-farm worker*, but not *industry actor*. Photo images show the contrast with the established organisations and indeed the other networks. Plate 5.6 is an example of the depiction of younger women pursuing non-domestic pastimes.

**Plate 5.6: “Week Dedicated to Rural Women” Otago Daily Times, 25.5.99.**

A media analysis of the *Waikato Times* and the *New Zealand Farmer* for 1999 elicited no articles about NWD. This reflects the lack of public awareness about the network, and its fledgling nature. Media articles in subsequent years have focused mainly upon
the individual women who were the original initiators of the network, with the network activities a secondary consideration. Plates 5.7 and 5.8 and the identities promoted in the associated articles demonstrate the portrayal of network members as knowledgeable farm business partners and farmers, actively participating in agri-industry.

Plate 5.7: “Bush telegraph goes online” *New Zealand Herald, 7.5.2001:D4.*

While members of the established organisations give little recognition and kudos to the newer networks, media attention has certainly promoted particular identities for the farm women members. OFWN and AWiA / CVWiA members are identified as *farmers* and *industry actors*, with the recognition of those identities alongside the more traditional identity of *carer*. In contrast, the two New Zealand networks are identified quite differently. Even though the media analysis for these two networks was constrained by their infancy, it is possible to determine dominant identities for these two groups. NWD members are identified as *farmers* and *industry actors*, occupying the agri-industry arena, whereas PCW members are placed as *farmers*, but also as *carers* and *off-farm workers*, not as leaders in agri-industry. Liepins' (1998b) study of gendered discourses in agricultural media suggests that for farm women the identities of *farmer* and *industry actor* are alternative identities. This suggests that the self-recognition of these identities is challenging and any recognition by the media of this expression may be seen as a challenge to the dominant ontological narratives informing notions of rurality which hegemonise service identities for farm women.

### 5.4.3 Others Constructing Collective Identity

The constructions of collective identity by these two external dimensions differ, not only from each other, but also to those constructed internally by the newer networks. The members of the established organisations construct the newer networks as competitors and adversaries, giving them little recognition. Their perception of a challenge to the spaces they create for farm women, however, validates the very challenging nature of these newer networks. The construction of collective identity by the media begins to corroborate the internal constructions of collective identity, and that of the members. While the media has provided some good coverage it has been more sporadic than that of the established organisations. In saying that, however, the construction of identity for these farm women members has been increasingly occupational, demonstrating a challenge to the hegemonic masculinity of farm and agri-industry spaces (as argued by Liepins, 1998b).

### 5.5. Conclusion: Organisational Collective Identity

This chapter has examined the collective identities of the case study organisations, by analysing the external dimensions of collective identity. As such, it has addressed the
second research question regarding the spaces and structural bases organisations create for farm women to recognise and perform certain identities. This concluding section links material on the internal dimensions and organisational type analysed in Chapter Four with the external dimensions that have been analysed in the preceding sections of this chapter. In doing so, it is argued that each organisation has a particular and relational collective identity. Furthermore, it is argued that FWIO and CWAV, and to a slightly lesser extent, RWNZ, operate predominantly in a conservative and traditional context. In contrast, OFWN, AWiA/CVWiA, NWD, and to a slightly lesser extent, PCW, operate in a context that is challenging and resisting. Finally, this section, in considering the collective identities of these farming women's organisations, argues that certain organisations create spaces and structural bases that maintain hegemonic identities for farm women, and that others challenge and resist traditional identities for farm women which circulate hegemonically in contemporary ruralities.

In seeking to determine a collective identity for each of the case study organisations, there is, however, also recognition that this collective identity is part of a dynamic social process. This is highlighted in the ways in which RWNZ’s internal and external dimensions contrast, demonstrating an organisation in flux. While RWNZ members' construction of collective identity gels with that of the organisation itself, recognising the need to change their focus to incorporate the issues facing younger farm women, this is not necessarily recognised by the other farm women members of PCW and NWD and the media. The developmental stages of newer networks also illustrate the dynamism of collective identity. The ways in which the present collective identities of the newer networks have been affected by the length of time since formation is demonstrated in the recognition by other farm women (members of the established organisations) and the media.

FWIO and CWAV have very similar collective identities as co-operative organisations that focus on family and community. The social and community focused objectives and activities essential to the organisations’ internal collective identity are mirrored, not only by members, but also by other farm women and the media. Their hierarchical leadership and lobbying styles do not appeal to younger farm women and this is reflected in the ageing and increasingly urbanised membership of both
organisations. Members identify, and are seen by others to identify, with the service identities of *carer, farm helper* and *community worker*. FWIO and CWAV act within the bounds of the social relations and practices supported by traditional rurality in Canada and Australia, therefore failing to challenge the dominant identities available to farm women. As such, the organisations’ collective identities appear to be conservative, non-confrontational and mostly unchanging.

RWNZ is similar to the other established organisations in its formation and structure, but the organisation maintains a focus on agri-industry in addition to family and community. A recent name change and revitalised strategies and incentives for members highlight that difference more so. As a competitive organisation, RWNZ seeks more resources for their members and rural communities. A stronger concern for rural and farming communities, an increased recognition of the *farmer* and *industry actor* identities, and a perception of a lack of recognition of their own and other farm women’s contributions, dominate the differences between RWNZ and the other two established organisations. However, this internal collective identity and that expressed externally by members is in contrast to the collective identity recognised by other farm women and the media. The organisation and members believe that RWNZ is changing and moving more into the agri-industry arena and seeking, like OFWN and AWiA / CVWiA, to place social issues in the public arena. However, others still envisage the organisation as one for older women less involved in farming, concentrating on socialising, and domestic and community interests. This contrast, and the lag between perceptions of collective identity, effectively illustrates the nature of collective identity as a dynamic and ever-changing characteristic. As such RWNZ may be collectively identified as similar to FWIO and CWAV, but also recognised as increasingly occupying the agri-industry arena, challenging their own collective identity and that of older farm women.

PCW, like RWNZ, is classified as a competitive organisation. However, it does not act in the same sphere as RWNZ. PCW’s activities have, since its inception, reflected the diversity of farm women’s needs, and its focus is largely on the family and farm-based aspects of women’s roles. Women as *industry actors* is just one of many identities for farm women, and while PCW challenges the invisibility of farm women, they do not challenge women’s low participation in agri-industry. Members’
perceptions of PCW are similar to the organisation’s own, and the perceptions of the importance placed upon the various identities are reflected in the organisation’s focus on recognising the diversity of farm women. While members find the contemporary and collective structure of the organisation appealing, other farm women criticise it as local-based with little real power, and this is reflected in the particular identities portrayed and the emphasis on localised events in the media. PCW’s media portrayal has been one of farm women as *farmers, carers* and *off-farm workers*, but not *industry actors*, and as such their collective identity is not perceived as one which completely challenges traditional identities for farm women, but instead seeks adequate recognition. Even though the network recognises and acknowledges women as *farmers*, they don’t seek to challenge the alternative nature of the identity. The spaces they create and the structural bases they provide for members do not construct this identity in as challenging a way as the other networks.

The objectives and structure of OFWN and AWiA/CVWiA reflect the needs and time requirements of contemporary farm women in that they recognise the busyness and diversity of their everyday lives. They promote a collective identity for farm women that is supportive of women as knowledgeable and valuable actors in farming and agri-industry. They seek to empower farm women not only as leaders, but by pursuing acknowledgement of farm family issues in the public arena of agri-industry. As social movements, both have challenged the legitimacy of hegemonic power that is endorsed by the traditional ruralities in their countries. Whilst there is little recognition or approval from other farm women, there is some acknowledgement in the media that they are politically active and challenging, with members recognised as *farmers, carers* and *industry actors*. In the case of OFWN, the older of the two networks, media perception has changed over time with regard to the nature of collective action. A lack of collective action in recent years, as perceived by members, has resulted in a lack of recognition from others, impacting directly, and in the future, on collective identity. However, both OFWN and AWiA/CVWiA may be collectively identified as informal networks for younger farm women, seeking to empower farm women as leaders in agri-industry, and gain recognition for the farm family as an important aspect of that industry.
NWD is identified as a network of individual resistance, operating in the sphere of farm and agri-industry. Unlike OFWN and AWiA/CVWiA, NWD remains the most organic of the networks, relatively unstructured and dispersed in cyberspace. The network’s collective identity is limited by the lack of promotional literature, and reflects the focus of the women who are members – multi-faceted and sporadic in its visibility. As such, action is very much on an individual basis, with mentoring seeking to empower women to become leaders in agri-industry, as opposed to the network commenting collectively on policy. While there is little recognition of this fledgling network from other farm women, since the 1999 media analysis, the media have portrayed members as farmers and industry actors. In contrast though, to the media attention surrounding the PCW network launch, NWD’s beginning received scant attention, and this may be attributed to the very challenging nature of the network when compared to PCW. Like its Canadian and Australian counterparts, NWD seeks to challenge traditional ruralities and promote farm women as leaders in agri-industry and knowledgeable actors in farming.

Chapters Four and Five, in analysing the spaces and strategic bases for the recognition of certain identities, have argued that both internal and external dimensions of collective identity contribute to the collective identity of an organisation. This collective identity mutually relates with the spaces and structural bases that an organisation provides to its members for the recognition of certain identities for farm women. The internalised construction of collective identity, based on formation, structure, and in particular, membership characteristics and incentives, and organisational type, has allowed the placement of the spaces and structural bases created by each organisation in relation to the feminised context of home and community or the masculinised context of farm and agri-industry (see Figure 4.2).

Analysis of the external construction of collective identity, based on members, other farm women and the media, has confirmed this placement, but has also highlighted the dynamic nature of collective identity, and the impact of these external dimensions on that collective identity. The members of each organisation, as allies, support and validate the particular spaces their organisation creates. Following Young (1994), they recognise a certain serialised condition, and that the spaces a particular organisation creates may be associated with that ‘condition’, be it isolation, a need for volunteer
work in the farming community, or a desire to receive recognition as a *farmer* or an *industry actor*. Members are willing to make an ‘emotional investment’ (Melucci, 1996) in an organisation, endorsing the internalised construction of collective identity. This analysis corroborates Teather’s (1996a, 1996b) work on farming women's organisations, identifying the particular focus of each organisation that attracts certain members. However, it extends her study to consider not only the impact of collective action (i.e. organisational type) on collective identity, but also the important function of outside influences on collective identity.

Other farm women, either of the established organisations or newer networks, predominantly do not wish to make that ‘emotional investment’ in another farming women’s organisation. They do not envisage the spaces and structural base created by that organisation as meeting the needs they recognise as part of their serialised condition. For instance, the younger farm women of the newer networks do not see that the established organisations meet their farming and agri-industry needs, nor do they seek recognition for the associated identities. The members of the established organisations view the newer networks as localised and ineffectual, unreflective of the multiplicity of farm women’s identities, focusing predominantly on the occupational identities.

In the media analysis undertaken we can begin to see further evidence of the influence of external dimensions on collective identity, and indeed, the media as an apparatus of social control. The particular identities associated by the media with certain organisations may reflect the internalised construction of collective identity, but almost certainly influences how other farm women construct identity for other organisations. As shown in Sections 5.3.2 and 5.4.2, the portrayal of certain identities through the reporting of particular types of events and through specific images constructs certain identities for the organisations and influences the gendered notions of farm women and their organisations circulating in, and informing, social practices, relations and institutions. The media analysis further substantiates Liepins’ (1998b)

---

57 It is important to note that as actors women do have a choice, or selection capacity, when deciding which group to join. This is illustrated by the choices of farm women not joining the established organisations, evidenced by declining memberships; further illustrating the lack of ‘emotional investment’ by younger farm women in the dominant identities supported by established organisations. This is also reflected by an over-subscription to recent NWD conferences in both the North and South Islands of New Zealand (NWD email, pers. comm., 2003).
study of gendered discourses in agricultural media by confirming these gendered identities for farm women circulating in the media. However, it also adds to her work, not only by analysing media in Canada, but also by associating certain gendered discourse and the identities it substantiates with particular farming women's organisations and the spaces they create.

As demonstrated in this chapter and the preceding one, the binary division of organisations into a feminised or masculinised context is problematic. In particular, RWNZ creates spaces for the recognition of a mixture of identities and associated issues. PCW, in contrast to the other newer networks, does not seek to increase farm women participation in agri-industry, rather acquire more recognition for farm women contributions. Adaptation of Melucci’s (1996) concept of organisational type allows this multi-dimensional analysis of farming women's organisations and their collective identity. This extends beyond past literature that suggests a binary notion of established organisations and newer networks. It advocates a continuum of collective identity and resulting collective action be recognised.

The collective identity of each organisation is crucial in making identities available to women who are members, and indeed to other farm women. Organisations may create space and structural bases for traditional service identities to be contested and occupational identities acknowledged and celebrated by farm women, or vice versa, by circulating particular ontological narratives within their organisational space. This thesis argues that these spaces and the circulation of ontological narratives subsequently support certain narrative identities for farm women. The dominance of particular narrative identities amongst members of each organisation is examined in Chapter Six. This thesis also contends that the dominance of narrative identities in particular organisations, in turn influenced and legitimised by organisational collective identity, is reflected in collective action, and this action, as practised through leadership, is examined in Chapter Seven.
Chapter Six: Farm Women’s Identities – Constructing Narrative Identities

6.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the third research question regarding the importance of hegemonic and alternative identities to members of certain farming women's organisations; and moreover, how these identities correlate with wider ontological narratives for farm women. Chapter Two conceptualised the role of farm women’s organisations as one which creates spaces and a structural base for the recognition of a serialised condition for farm women, and that action within these spaces either maintains or challenges the ruralities that support dominant discourses surrounding farm women’s identities. Chapters Four and Five argued that the internal and external constructions of organisations’ collective identities are crucial in determining the types of spaces created by farming women organisations for the circulation of ontological narratives. These ontological narratives affect how farm women might characterise themselves; their narrative identities. Thus Chapter Six turns to examine the narrative identities recognised by members of each organisation, and argues that depending on type, each organisation creates spaces that maintain or challenge dominant identities for farm women.

This chapter builds upon past literature that has focused on farm women and farming women's organisations. Previous literature has identified the importance certain women place upon the identities for farm women (Alston, 1995b; Anderson, 1993a; Shaw, 1993; Shortall, 1992; Taylor and Little, 1995). Analysis of this trend allows an understanding, not only generational and lifecourse changes, but also of the impact of the newer networks on recognition of these identities. It also allows for an analysis of the effects of changes to organisational collective identity upon the dominant identities for farm women.

By studying the prevalence of particular identities amongst members of certain types of organisations, Section 6.2 argues that certain organisations encourage members who recognise specific identities, which are linked with a particular serialised condition. This section examines the manifestation and expression of identities in
different organisations. The spaces established by the case study organisations for identity is analysed in relation to wider ontological narratives in Section 6.3. In examining how members of each organisation think farm women are identified by the farming community, rural service industry, and mainstream farming organisations, this section shows that there is a clear link between collective identity and the spaces created for the circulation of specific ontological narratives. In conclusion, the chapter will demonstrate that co-operative-style organisations that maintain dominant identities for farm women, while competitive organisations partially challenge, and social movements and networks of individual resistance explicitly challenge dominant identities for farm women. There is a strong link between organisational collective identity and maintenance of, or challenge to, dominant identities for farm women.

6.2 Recognition of Different Identities Within Organisational Spaces

Farming women's organisations create spaces in which farm women may recognise and acknowledge particular identities. Indeed, identities manifest within each organisation in different ways, with particular identities being given a different focus from members of one organisation as opposed to members of another organisation. The following section argues that women may access certain narrative identities that are positioned and encouraged within the contrasting organisations depending upon: the organisation’s generational type (established organisations and newer networks), organisational type (as determined in Chapter Four), and by the collective identity that each case study organisation has constructed (as analysed in Chapters Four and Five).

Sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 examine the particular narrative identities dominant amongst members of specific organisations (established organisations and newer networks, respectively), and identify the different ways in which the identities manifest amongst the participating women. Respondents were asked to indicate the importance they placed upon each of the six identities, with 1 being very important and 6 of no importance. Qualitative data from both the Farm Women Questionnaire and in-depth interviews are used to support and expand upon these results, often indicating multiple and differing understandings of what is encompassed by each identity. Further analysis in Section 6.2.3 highlights lifecourse changes, and generational differences. In conclusion, this section argues that there is a clear indication from the
analysis that certain organisations create spaces and structural bases for the recognition of certain serialised conditions and their associated identities; the expression of these identities either maintaining or challenging the dominance of service identities for farm women.

6.2.1 Narrative Identities in Established Organisations’ Spaces

As established organisations, the Federated Women’s Institutes of Ontario, the Country Women’s Association of Victoria and Rural Women New Zealand predominantly create spaces within their organisations for the recognition of the three service identities of carer, farm helper and, to a lesser extent, community worker. Members of these organisations demonstrate this by the importance, or lack of importance, they personally place upon certain narrative identities. The following discussion identifies the distinct clustering of importance, or variability, placed upon certain identities amongst the members. Differences between the established organisations are also visible, in particular between RWNZ and the two others.

The dominant identities portrayed by members of the established organisations are carer and farm helper. These women value these identities with large majorities rating these identities highly. Figure 6.1 shows that these two identities are rated either 1 or 2 by members. Members articulated the importance of these two identities in the functioning of the family farm:

The farm woman is usually the invisible driving force behind the man. She encourages him to get the ‘job’ done early, efficiently, correctly; she usually ‘keeps the books’; prepares the meals (feeding the extra farm hands if required on a moment’s notice); does the wifely duties of raising the children (laundry, driving, feeding, watching for dangers, entertaining etc) and jumps on the tractor when needed in the fields (1-27Q, retired).

In our community the woman is always in the background as back up. Particularly at busy times at harvests and sowing. They help change machinery, go to town for parts, feed everyone and ferry meals to wherever needed. Have meals at all times of day and night to fit in with the seasonal work. They are the extra hand and are forever holding things. They take shifts to give the men a break (5-145Q, farmer’s wife).

---

57 This refers to the women’s own identities as opposed to the collective identities constructed by the organisations.
Figure 6.1: Importance of Identities to Members of FWIO and CWAV

FWIO, Canada:

CWAV, Australia:
Figure 6.1 cont.: Importance of Identities to Members of RWNZ Otago and RWNZ Waikato

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, q24.
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While these traditional identities of *carer* and *farm helper* are given space for recognition within each established organisation’s collective identity and are very important amongst members, this is not the case with the identity of *community worker*. Even though community involvement is a very strong part of the collective identity of the established organisations, this identity is only rated as of average importance across the established organisations, and indeed is of similar importance to newer networks members (see Figures 6.1 and 6.2).

Members of the established organisations place little importance on the *off-farm worker* identity, and indeed, FWIO and CWAV members place very little importance upon all the occupational identities. In contrast, members of RWNZ rate *farmer* and *industry actor* as of high to average importance. This reflects an organisational collective identity that incorporates a focus on farming and agri-industry. A recognition that farm women not only identify with traditional service identities, but also have multiple and vital contributions to make to agri-industry is shown in the quotes below from RWNZ members.

[I am] a very busy [farm woman]. Probably wear too many hats. Am committed to being involved in overall running of farming business (3-122Q, farmer).

[I see myself] as an important cog in the agricultural wheel. My husband and I are a team - he couldn't do the job without my input and I certainly couldn't do it without him. It's a way of life but it is a business and has to be run as one. I also consider myself the cornerstone of the family. I think my many roles are important (3-129Q, farmer’s wife).

I see myself as a woman with mud on my face dashing between cowshed and house with a car with a constantly hot engine rushing between community nursing jobs, riding for the disabled, music, pedigree cow breeding meetings. Women on the land do everything required and then create things of great beauty while caring for the environment, true nurturers (7-190Q, farmer’s wife).

However, even as these women talk of their contribution to farming and agri-industry, the majority still consider themselves as farmer’s wives and not as *farmers* in their own right. FWIO and CWAV members are more likely to construct themselves as farmer’s wives, while RWNZ members may also sometimes construct themselves as
farmers\textsuperscript{58}, reflecting the importance of that identity in constructing narrative identity for RWNZ members.

There are clear links between the identities highlighted by members of each of the established organisations and the organisational types established in Chapter Four, and with organisational collective identity determined in Chapters Four and Five. These links are outlined in the following paragraphs and are supported by ‘typical member profiles’ in Boxes 6.1 and 6.2. These profiles were established by determining a member whose demographic characteristics and farm involvement met those that were the most common for each organisational type.

The two co-operative organisations, FWIO and CWAV, are the most traditional organisations, supporting notions of rurality in their societies that is traditionally service-oriented for farm women. Section 4.2 highlighted the formation of these organisations at a time where early feminism supported women in these traditional identities. Hence, there is a lack of any strong focus on the occupational identities, as demonstrated by the ‘typical member’ profile in Box 6.1. In keeping with the collective identity of these two organisations (see Section 5.5), there was a strong consensus amongst members surrounding the very high importance of the farm helper and carer identities. However, community worker only rated as of average importance, and this does not comparably reflect the two organisations’ strong commitment to improving rural community life. The members of these organisations rated the occupational identities the least important overall, and this is in accordance with the strategic spaces created by their organisations (for example: social events focusing on craft, music and drama; and the provision of community services such as catering and homecare). These spaces, in turn, reflect the ageing of members who are shifting their own focus from farming, and generational attitudes towards paid off-farm work. The identities that are valued by the members of these two organisations mostly coincide with the identities that are promoted within the spaces FWIO and CWAV construct for members.

\textsuperscript{58} See Appendix A.
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Box 6.1: FWIO and CWAV Typical Member Profile

Nancy identifies as a farmer’s wife, and is over 61 years of age. She is a trained teacher, but hasn’t taught school, or had a paid job, since starting a family. She hasn’t undertaken any further informal courses either. Her husband is still farming, and she is in a legal partnership with him, although she has only become a partner recently for financial reasons. Before that, she says “I had always felt like we were equal anyway and there didn’t need to be any[thing] legal…” (1-301, farmer’s wife). The only farm work Nancy does now is the financial records, but during most of her time on the farm she worked in the barn and out in the field*. She considers her input into the decision making on the farm is equal with her husband, and is happy with her involvement. She rates farm helper, farmer and carer as very important identities. She considers that farm women should get recognition for their input, and commented on this in an in depth interview: “if you decide to dissolve your partnership, like if you want a divorce, this has been a big issue for farm women. I’m sure almost all the time the farm originally belonged to the husband, but this woman has put in 40-50 years whatever of her effort and they want to give her nothing!” (1-301, farmer’s wife). Nancy undertakes some community work, and this is mostly through her membership in an established farming women’s organisation, a youth farming group and the church.

* Although the farmer identity is of high importance, the typical member undertakes little farm work.

Note: These profiles were established by describing a member whose demographic characteristics and farm involvement met those that were the most common for each organisational type. Therefore it is possible to have one member’s profile for two organisations.

Box 6.2: RWNZ Otago and Waikato Typical Member Profile

Jan is married, in her fifties and identifies as a farmer. She has a university qualification and has done some informal education courses, such as computing and accountancy. Her husband is a farmer, and they own the farm together in a family trust. She has never had paid work commitments, but still does farm work, both physical and administrative, as well as a significant amount of community work. Jan and her husband have an equal influence in the farm decision making, although their son takes on most of the day to day management. She rates farm helper, farmer and carer as very important identities for farm women. Like many of her cohort she feels she “probably wears too many ‘hats’, [but she] is committed to being involved in [the] overall running of the farming business” (3-122Q, farmer). She belongs to RWNZ to keep in touch with the local community, but also the organisation provides a number of strategic spaces, from craft and community involvement to government submissions.

RWNZ, classified as a competitive organisation, maintains a focus that is not only service-based as with the other established organisations, but also targets sustainable rural communities, which means it takes more of an interest in agri-industry affairs than FWIO and CWAV. In reflecting the development of these particular strategic spaces, their membership places more importance on the farmer and industry actor identities, as well as the service identities. Members of RWNZ also more readily recognise the multiplicity of their identities as opposed to their counterparts in Australia and Canada. This recognition is exemplified not only in the member profile
in Box 6.2, but also by the two comments below, all highlighting the mix of farm, community and family-based identities for farm women.

Most women these days play a vital role in farming, some in equal partnership and working alongside their husbands. Farming women are generally very versatile and adaptable and manage to fit in many community activities as well as following their family's sporting activities and interests. In many cases they are also helping on the farm so they lead very busy lives. Also, the accounting skills and financial side is often the woman’s job. Being a farmer’s wife is a very busy and full life (7-227Q, farmer’s wife).

After all these years being a farmer's wife and having had a hand in almost everything connected with farming I see myself as being able to cope with any situation whether at the farm or the community (7-196Q, farmer / farmer’s wife).

The contrast in narrative identities recognised by members of RWNZ to those of FWIO and CWAV is demonstrative of the differences in organisational type (competitive and co-operative, respectively) and collective identity. FWIO and CWAV, both the majority of members and the organisation itself, seek to maintain traditional service identities for farm women. The members construct themselves as carers, farm helpers and to a lesser extent, community workers. This description of herself a farm woman, by a CWAV member, highlights the importance of these three service identities:

As a person who can adapt to any situation at short notice e.g. take over in the cowshed!,! or provide that extra pair of hands where needed. The one who does the housework; cooking, washing, ironing, baking, gardening, calf rearing, and many other chores. The one who usually provided the transport for children's activities and appointments, or to go collect a farm requirement immediately. To take phone messages and deliver to whoever they're for. A person who visits neighbours or friends with baking / flowers when the need arises (5-148Q, farmer’s wife).

RWNZ members and their organisation, while acknowledging these service identities, also seek to further construct spaces and narratives which recognise the farmer and industry actor identities for farm women. In doing so they seek to challenge those ontological narratives which place farm women predominantly as farm helpers and carers. A RWNZ member explains the importance of being involved in agri-industry, and of RWNZ creating the spaces for this involvement:

I think we've got to look at the big picture of what's actually happening with farming families. I mean we've had [issues with] ACC, we've had
OSH. [In RWNZ] you're always fighting for something, or lobbying for something to get better (3-73I, farmer).

The narrative identities valued and expressed by the members of the established organisations mirror the strategic spaces and structural bases created by each organisation. These identities are a reflection of a recognised serialised condition, which the members envisage their organisations also reflect. The organisations are constructing particular strategic spaces that allow these women to act with regard to this serialised condition. In the case of the established organisations these spaces also encourage the circulation of certain ontological narratives, which in turn support the recognition and expression of hegemonic service identities for farm women. This confirms Carbert’s (1995) association of ‘farm housewives’ with the Women’s Institute in Canada, and Teather’s (1996b) argument that FWIO and CWAV are ‘service delivery’ organisations. However, while Teather positions RWNZ as a ‘service delivery’ organisation, this study shows that RWNZ has moved beyond creating these service spaces for their members, and has also created strategic spaces for members to recognise occupational, and more challenging, identities of farmer and industry actor.

6.2.2 Narrative Identities in Newer Networks’ Spaces

The Ontario Farm Women’s Network, Central Victoria Women in Agriculture, Positively Clutha Women and the Network for Women in Dairying construct spaces for their members which encompass both service and occupational identities. However, these organisational spaces differ not only from those created by the established organisations, but also between the newer networks. The following discussion identifies the distinct clustering of importance, or variability, placed upon certain identities amongst the members. Differences amongst the newer networks’ members are apparent; in particular, that PCW members place different emphasis on certain identities than members of the other networks (see Figure 6.2).
Figure 6.2: Importance of Identities to Members of OFWN and CVWiA
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Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, q 24.
There is a wider variance amongst the newer network members than those of the established organisations with regard to the recognition of particular identities as farm women. While this section shows that these farm women value occupational identities more highly than the members of the established organisations, they also place high importance upon the identity of carer, which of the service identities rated consistently high. However, in contrast to many established organisation members, this identity was seen as an integral part of the functioning of the farm, as opposed to family, and this is demonstrated in the comment below from a PCW farmer’s wife:

I see myself as an important link with home and farm - being able to run the house, attend to children's needs and help on the farm also when needed. Being able to attend to the financial dealings each week that is needed and keeping [records] up to date (4-80Q, farmer’s wife).

The above quote also constructs a narrative identity of farm helper and not only PCW members see this identity as of strong importance, but also OFWN members.

Whereas PCW members considered the more occupational farmer identity of only average importance, members of OFWN and the other two networks constructed farmer as very important. Network members hold strong convictions on what a farmer is, emphasising, as does the CVWiA farmer below, that a full and knowledgeable involvement in the farm is required in identifying with this farmer identity.

I consider myself as a fulltime farmer because I milk twice a day, 11 months of the year. I work alongside my husband in all facets of farming. I believe the farm comes first. As I work on the farm full time I feel I could run the farm on my own if needed, as I feel confident in all aspects. Depending on the time spent by other women on their farms and the impact they are having on the functioning of their farm is the difference between a farmer and being an assistant on occasions for their husband, if they know the complete 12 month functioning of a farm and could manage the running of the farm I would class them as a farmer (6-153Q, farmer).

The networks, with the exception of PCW, construct spaces for the recognition and expression of the industry actor identity, and this is reflected in the high importance placed upon this identity by members of these three networks. These farm women see their identification as an industry actor as challenging hegemonic identities for farm women, and one NWD member comments upon her involvement in agri-industry and
how she seeks to construct a narrative identity as an *industry actor* which challenges traditional identities for farm women.

I like to see myself as a farmer who is industry-involved. My husband and I spend a lot of time in the farming industry. I don't make a big noise about being a 'woman' but at the same time feel that I deserve as much as respect as a man. Things are good most of the time with industry-involved people but I find in the community in general it [is] hard for those of us who wish to get rid of the tea and scones image (8-203Q, farmer).

NWD members’ strong focus upon the identities of *farmer, carer* and *industry actor* is similar to that of CVWiA and OFWN members. This focus demonstrates recognition of the multiplicity of farm women’s identities and a sense of internal acknowledgement that they are capable and multi-skilled women, who face many challenges and claims on their time. The breadth of this combination of service and occupational identities is emphasised in this comment from an OFWN farmer outlining her narrative identity as a farm women.

I am here for my children every day. I work on the farm with my husband and enjoy life as a farm woman. It is what I wanted as an occupation. I'm involved in decision making and look after the financial part of the partnership. I am treated as an equal among the farming community. I am active in agricultural groups, seminars, workshops. I am always looking at new ideas in agriculture for the farm. I'm not afraid to invest or borrow large amounts of money for improvements on the farm. I have spoken at farm organisations on the expansion of our farm and goals for the future (2-178Q, farmer).

This quote also outlines the particular strategic spaces which OFWN, and CVWiA and NWD alike, construct for their members to recognise these *farmer* and *industry actor* identities for farm women. By constructing spaces for the acknowledgement and performance of these identities within the organisations, members are able to act not only within their own network, but also externally in other farming organisations.

PCW constructs spaces for their members to recognise a multiplicity of identities as farm women, but less emphasis is placed upon the *industry actor* identity, and this is seen in the lesser importance placed upon it by PCW members in comparison to the other networks. Also in contrast to the other three networks, and also the established organisations, PCW members place more importance on the *off-farm worker* identity.
The fact that they are the only organisation to do so is in direct contrast to research highlighted in Chapter Two that argues for an increasing importance of this identity as one of multiple identities for farm women (see Rivers, 1992: 2 specifically, but also Alston, 1994, 1995b; Gibson et al, 1990; Shaw, 1993; Taylor & Little, 1995). The previous research has indicated that off-farm employment would be a financial necessity for farm women, however, this study indicates that while off-farm employment might be undertaken, it is not of importance to most members of the case study organisations. PCW is the only organisation to specifically construct spaces for the recognition of this identity. The other networks focus upon women’s contribution to the farm and agri-industry, and the established organisations construct a collective identity that maintains traditional service identities for their members.

There are clear links between the identities acknowledged by members of each of the newer networks and the organisational types and collective identities established in Chapters Four and Five. As in the preceding section these links are outlined in the following paragraphs and supported by ‘typical member’ profiles.

PCW as a competitive organisation creates, to a certain extent, spaces for the acknowledgement of identities that are similar to RWNZ, but for a younger membership. There is a definite and strong emphasis by members upon the service identities of carer and farm helper, and an average amount of emphasis is placed on the occupational identities of farmer and industry actor. Whereas RWNZ members and the organisation itself create narratives and spaces for the community worker identity, there is instead, a high importance placed upon the off-farm worker identity by PCW and its members. While PCW and RWNZ are both competitive organisations, PCW members construct narratives for themselves which focus more upon the occupational identities than service. However, the emphasis placed upon the farmer and industry actor identities by PCW members is lesser in contrast to the other networks, and this is in keeping with PCW as a competitive organisation with a collective identity that is not as challenging as the other networks. The typical member profile in Box 6.3 demonstrates an acknowledgement of a multiplicity of identities for farm women, but also exemplifies a lack of focus on the industry actor identity which is present in the other three networks.
Box 6.3: PCW Typical Member Profile

Ann identifies as a farmer’s wife and operates her own home host business. She is in her forties, married and, along with her husband, shares the care of their three children. She is educated to secondary school level and has done a small amount of informal education in computing. She is in a legal farming partnership with her husband, and undertakes an equal amount of the farm work with him. Because of this she does not have a paid off-farm job, and only does a small amount of community work; however she runs her home hosting operation largely by herself. She shares all aspects of the farm decision making with her husband. Ann rates farm helper and carer as very important for farm women, with farmer, off-farm worker and industry actor almost as important. She says: “I see myself as an important link with the home and farm – being able to run the house, attend to children’s needs and help on the farm also when needed.” (4-80Q, farmer’s wife). Ann enjoys the seminars and fieldays provided by PCW, particularly the ones addressing current farming practices.

Box 6.4: OFWN and CVWiA Typical Member Profile

Sandra identifies as a farmer and primary caregiver for her two dependent children. Her husband now works off-farm fulltime and is away from home often for week-long periods. Aged between 40 and 50, Sandra is a registered nurse, and has continued to do lots of informal training. When first married she combined off-farm work as a nurse with on-farm work and looking after two young children. She has found this sort of workload difficult since her husband started working off-farm: “when I nursed I would come home after whatever shift I worked and Matthew’s mum and I would feed the pigs, and then Matthew did the crop work and the shovelling the manure and helped when he could. That’s how it worked. [But when he stopped working on the farm, I realised] you can’t work fulltime outside the home and do another eight hours in the home, plus parent properly and everything else. And I feel I am a single parent in many ways, cause my husband is gone all week.” (2-31I, farmer / primary caregiver). The farm is a corporate family farm with employees, but Sandra does lots of farm work, childcare and community work, and her decision making input is above average in reflection of this. She rates all but community worker as very important identities for farm women. She sees that change for farming women has been inevitable: “The average farm woman, for her morning to night duties, they do more. I really believe, on the whole, they really do more when it comes to taking care of the details, and pulling things together and hands on... You know, we were out last year, and I thought 'hmmm' you know I can do that on the tractor too now that I'm home on the farm. But before I didn't, and that was the established role model when we were first married. So... I'm waking up and I think that helps bring change.” (2-31I, farmer / primary caregiver). Regardless of the changes, Sandra sees women as still holding the family together. Sandra sees her network as providing her with strategic spaces for uniting her voice with other farm women’s to comment on childcare, and the realities of farming for women.

Social movements, OFWN and CVWiA, are the more established of the four networks, displaying a strong sense of the value of farm women to the family farm and farming community. This is solidified in a strong recognition of the farmer identity, along with the service identities of farm helper and carer. In line with the farming oriented nature of these two networks, off-farm worker is of little importance
to the members, while industry actor is increasingly important. While both networks place emphasis on involvement in agri-industry, it is of more importance to OFWN members perhaps because they may be more established in these roles, and the overall age of the members is older than that of CVWiA, thus alluding to lower childcare commitments. Box 6.4 portrays a ‘typical member’ as one whose narrative identities of farmer and carer match the spaces that are constructed by OFWN and CVWiA; spaces that acknowledge and make possible the expression of the farmer and industry actor identities, alongside the carer identity which reflects the importance of the farm family to these farm women.

NWD is classified as a network of individual resistance, and using Melucci’s (1996) analysis this indicates a lack of collective identity amongst the membership. However, members do express a depth of consensus regarding narrative identities. Farmer and industry actor, as well as carer, rate the most important amongst NWD members. However, NWD as an organisation, unlike its counterparts, does not seek to create spaces for the recognition of the carer identity, but focuses strongly on the farmer and industry actor identities, and this is replicated in the ‘typical member’ profile in Box 6.5, where industry actor and farmer are identified as very important narrative identities for farm women.

**Box 6.5: NWD Typical Member Profile**

Raewyn identifies as a farmer, is aged between 41-50 years and has two dependent children. She is tertiary educated and has worked off-farm before working fulltime on the farm with her farmer husband. She shares decision making with her husband except for the day-to-day management, in which she plays a lesser role. This is balanced by her greater involvement in the farm’s financial management, in line with her tertiary training. With two dependent children she spends some time performing childcare and household duties, and in addition to this she undertakes community work. Raewyn identifies very strongly as an industry actor and as a farmer, and has been very involved in organising women-only discussion groups. Of her identity as a farm women she comments: “[I] believe that [women] have an equally important role to play in all these areas involved in farming, particularly in decision making as men in industry matters, as I believe the dairy industry historically and currently is in a mess” (8-210Q, farmer). Through her involvement in NWD, Raewyn wants to give other women the opportunities that she has had to be involved in agri-industry decision making. Raewyn sees the strategic spaces NWD provides its members as ones that enable mentoring and empower women to participate in agri-industry.
This analysis has demonstrated that there is more variance across the four networks than is apparent amongst the established organisations with regard to the narrative identities recognised by members. Indeed, there is more variance in the spaces created by the networks for members to acknowledge narrative identities and challenge ontological narratives. PCW is the least challenging of the newer networks, similar to RWNZ in its competitive nature. Members give little recognition to the *industry actor* identity, which is constructed as the most challenging identity by members of the other networks. OFWN and CVWiA members and their organisations acknowledge the service identities of *carer*, and to a lesser extent, *farm helper*, but a strong challenge to traditional identities is present in the recognition and performance of the *farmer* and *industry actor* identities. NWD members also recognise the *carer* identity, but their organisation focuses predominantly upon creating spaces for the *farmer* and *industry actor* identities. By creating spaces for the performance of these two identities, these networks seek to challenge hegemonic ontological narratives surrounding farm women.

The results of this section, in particular, confirm and extends previous literature. Teather’s (1996a, 1996b) and Carbert’s (1995) studies of farming women's organisations not only positions the organisations in a binary dichotomy of established organisations and newer networks, but from their work we may also position the predominance of service identities and occupational identities, respectively in each classification of organisation. This study however, shows that there is more variance in the identities valued and expressed by members of the newer networks. The high value placed upon the identities of *farmer* and *industry actor* by members of OFWN, CVWiA and NWD resonates with the work of Mackenzie (1992, 1994) and Liepins (1998a), which indicates that these networks specifically create spaces for the acknowledgement and performance of these identities, and argue that in doing so challenge and resist dominant discourses regarding what farm women should be.

6.2.3 Contrasting and Comparing Narrative Identities – Organisational Spaces and Lifecourse.

The multiplicity of identities recognised and expressed by farm women, reflects the organisational spaces created by their organisations. These spaces are contextualised;
they reflect the certain conditions experienced by farm women when the organisations were formed. As such, they acknowledge specific serialised conditions and identities, and the strategic spaces they offer to members support the expression of these identities; some of which may maintain or challenge ontological narratives informing notions of rurality. In this recognition of a multiplicity of identities for farm women, there is also an acknowledgement of changing emphasis on particular identities according to lifecourse (Monk and Katz, 1993), and more so a recognition of generational differences. Not only does lifecourse make women more aware of certain serialised conditions at particular stages of their lives, but this also makes certain organisations more or less attractive. In Chapter Four, ontological narratives were shown to influence the lifecourses of women at the times of formation of the established organisations and newer networks differed. In recognition of this, this section also acknowledges the generational differences that influence the expression of specific narrative identities.

In Chapter Two, it was contended that an analysis of lifecourse highlights the negotiation of changing identities resulting from the provision of new spaces and the acknowledgement of alternative ontological narratives and narrative identities (Somers, 1992; Young, 1994). This section examines the generational changes in the identities of farm women over lifecourse as acknowledged by respondents, particularly the generational shift from service to occupational identities. In doing so, it is possible to identify a cohort to which a woman belongs (Monk and Katz, 1993: 20), this being a reflection of organisational collective identity. Comparison of the lifecourse developments amongst farm women of the established organisations and the newer networks allows an analysis of agency in challenging or maintaining dominant ontological narratives informing farm women’s identities.

Identities are not fixed, or singular (Hetherington, 1998; Massey, 1999), and farm women not only acknowledge and express multiple and diverse identities, but, as this section will demonstrate, also face changes regarding the importance placed upon various identities over a lifecourse. Younger farm women may be more involved with farming or off-farm work, then with the advent of young children, the identity of carer will become more important. Later, as children grow older, farming activities and off-farm work may increase, or involvement with community organisations, or
voluntary work with education and health might develop. The manifestation of these identities changes over time and there are generational differences apparent in the construction of various identities by members of the established organisations and the newer networks.

Few respondents did not have dependent children, but many commented that prior to beginning families their choice to be actively and physically involved in farming was an easier one to make. However, with the advent of children the *carer* identity is seen to take prominence in this stage of their lifecourse. A comment from a PCW farmer without children, highlights how she expects her life to change and other, service-oriented, identities to dominate.

I see myself as equal to male farmers but if and when we have children I expect to take a more family-oriented role as housekeeper, cook, community-helper involved with children's activities. This would probably not be my first choice, I would rather share these tasks with my husband and do more farm work but in reality, this doesn't appear to happen in many partnerships (4-109Q, farmer).

The same farmer comments on other farm women who have children and how this affects their involvement in the farm, and may limit their participation in agri-industry. Her comments exemplify the ways in which ontological narratives that place farm women as *carers* impact upon women’s everyday lives, in this case, the timing of industry events.

I think a lot [of women] aren't as involved, mainly cause they've got children. We're the only couple in the discussion group without children. I don't know many others that have ever got much involved. I've found one, she said she used to go to discussion group, but since kids, she's got to pick them up off the bus and is quite tied to work. She’s got to be home for kids. (4-109I, farmer).

Younger farm women are beginning to challenge narratives circulating in society which support a lifecourse which sees farm women performing only service identities during child bearing and rearing years. A younger RWNZ farmer and primary caregiver, and a NWD farmer, provide a dramatic contrast, illustrating a challenge to dominant service identities. Their comments also show the multiplicity and diversity of farm women identities, with the *carer* identity intermeshed with that of *farmer*.

My husband's parents retired, we found ourselves doubling our farm size and dropping a labour unit and unable to find a replacement. The next
five years were very tough with 3 pre-schoolers and a fulltime farm job. During grain time I did the night shift on the tractor, while him and the children got some sleep... Now I do 95% of the bookwork, including budgets, bills and bankers. I do 100-150 tractor hours p.a., raise a few calves, lambing beat, mothering up shed, drive trucks for harvesting/silage, stack hay/straw bales in shed, drench lambs, drag lambs out for crutching. Then with a quick change you need to be transformed into an energetic mother performing obligations to your children and their activities (3-95Q, farmer / primary caregiver).

The children are four years apart the three of them. I didn't have three or four little children, and it just meant that you do all of those things with the kids. You bale hay; you’re on the tractor. You’ve got kids in backpacks. You make provisions at the cowshed while you are milking, or else you milk with them, or if you're pregnant and you’ve got this huge stomach you still go down the cowshed and do all those things. You have to lean further …those were the things you just did (8-180I, farmer).

In contrast, an older RWNZ member demonstrates the dominance and acceptance of carer and farm helper identities during this childbearing period of lifecourse for older generations, and in particular also highlights the changing involvement over lifecourse. This example also illustrates the tendency for older farm women to be less likely to take up occupational identities once children are no longer dependent, for she explains:

Foremost, [I’m a] home manager (changes as children get older, intensive when young); farm helper when required (this also changes over the years as sharemilkers or 1st farm owners this can be almost fulltime and extremely difficult with a young family). I’m content with a backseat role in management (farm and financial) but am always informed and involved with all aspects of farm life and work (7-223Q, farmer’s wife / unpaid farm worker / off-farm worker).

The dominance of the service identities amongst older farm women and members of the established organisations is illustrated in the continuance of service-based identities once children are no longer dependent. These older women are more likely to become involved in community work as opposed to undertaking a greater role in the function of the farm or off-farm work. This demonstrates the generational differences between the members of the established organisations and newer networks, with the patterns of lifecourse of older women reflecting the wider ontological narratives that have been available for these women. It also demonstrates the certain types of spaces that these established organisations have created for members; spaces that predominantly promote the expression of service identities. As
these two established organisation members explain, they see their contribution as supportive, both to their family and their community.

I see women on the family farm as the carer of the working man, having the meals prepared and the home warm at the end of a long day, then as assistant on the farm when needed, and doing the volunteer community work (5-165Q, nr).

[I see myself as] a person who keeps the meals coming, house cleaning, feeding hens, pig and dogs. Help on the farm when needed, mainly tailing lambs, shifting sheep and occasionally driving a tractor. I do less, as I have got older. As this is a family farm the wives are not so involved in the decisions of the farm organisation. I am involved in the small local community (3-55Q, farmer’s wife).

Dominant ontological narratives support the carer, farm helper and community worker identities, particularly for older farm women, and while this comment from a RWNZ farm executive is more of an exception to the rule, it succinctly highlights the challenge made by farm women as farmers to these ontological narratives.

Now my family has grown up and left home I find that being a fulltime milker on a dairy farm is much more enjoyable and productive without the involvement of caring for a growing family. I make more decisions regarding the farm, and make financial decisions. I find that the bank managers, accountants will now converse with me where once they insisted on speaking to my husband. Society generally probably wonders why at 60 years of age I choose to report to the cowshed for morning milkings and again in the afternoons but I find it a new challenge to be part of this changing dairy industry (7-208Q, farm executive).

While it has been unusual for older farm women to perform identities such as farmer, off-farm worker and industry actor once children are no longer dependent, younger farm women, mostly members of the newer networks are more likely to do so. There is an acknowledgement amongst some older farm women that there has been change, with established organisation members envisaging this change mostly manifesting itself in women working off-farm. A RWNZ member sees generational changes in the ways in which farm women contribute to the farm business; with the women still being able to physically farm as well as work off-farm.

Well I suppose during my own married life [women working off-farm has changed]. You see the women used to do a lot of looking after the men. I think probably nowadays that the cow shed is so much more automated that the women do not have to spend hours in the cowshed. It's a lot quicker. I don't think women used to work off-farm in the early
days. I mean you never heard of it (7-206I, farmer’s wife / off-farm worker).

This FWIO member acknowledges that there is a necessity that was not present in her farming life, for off-farm income to support the farm family, which has meant that farm women must consider an off-farm career. Or that they must be more involved with the physical aspects of the farm while their partner works off-farm.

I think there’s very few farmers in this area who don't have at least one income off-farm. In that respect, if you are away working you're not on the tractor. I think more women are working off-farm. Or the men are working off-farm and the women are taking over the farming side of it. It’s going both ways. I know there's not as many women working like my mother and her contemporaries did. They had a few chickens, and they’d help with the milking (1-39I, retired).

Older farm women, however, tend to envisage off-farm work as a financial necessity, whereas younger farm women who do work off-farm do so for different reasons, interspersing and mixing on- and off-farm work and childcare, as these interview transcripts from two PCW and NWD members show.

K: We've been married about 5 years and some of that time I've worked fulltime, some of it I've worked part time. So when I've been part time I've been involved more on the farm. But obviously not fulltime so much now.
DS: And you're working fulltime now?
K: No just part time. Part time now, and we've got a daughter, so that doesn't allow me to be out there so much.
DS: And she's obviously reasonably young.
K: Yeah, she's just 15 months. So I've sort of come and gone how involved I've been on the farm. Depending on whether I've been working or not (4-64I, primary caregiver / farmer’s wife / off-farm worker).

DS: Did your involvement on the farm change when you started having children? Did it cut down your physical work at all?
W: Not a lot no. I kept working as I also worked off-farm too. I’ve always earnt some form of income off-farm. And if the kids were sick [my husband] would take them. So it was a sharing of that. It worked very well. No, the children made no difference (8-180I, farmer).

Even though these younger farm women do not envisage an off-farm worker identity as very important for their narrative identity as a farm woman, they speak of easily mixing carer, farmer and off-farm worker identities. The way in which they manifest this off-farm worker identity differs from that of older farm women, for whom it is unusual and seen as a financial necessity rather than a personal choice.
During their lifecourse younger farm women are more likely to continually act as a farmer and as an industry actor, whereas older farm women have indicated a turn to community and volunteer work once children are no longer dependent. While women acting in farming and agri-industry are becoming more prominent in contemporary farming circles, these women are also challenging ontological narratives that construct women in service identities. As a member of an established organisation explains, to be an older woman in the farming industry is to challenge expectations and stereotypes.

I'm very involved in our farming business. While I don't have the knowledge of my husband I've learnt plenty, and can hold my own in most farming discussions. At times this can be isolating as often I'm at different fieldays/discussions and I may be one of the few women there. Other women often find this threatening (3-73Q, farmer / farmer’s wife).

Those expectations are very much generational, and younger farm women acknowledge that their farming and decision making involvement is very much more equal than that of even their mother’s generation. This NWD farmer explains how she has a much more active role in the farm and in the decision making processes.

I think it has changed, maybe more that women are taking more of an active role in the decision making... [My husband and I] have a total partnership where if I don't particularly like something he's doing we'll sit down and talk about it and vice-a-versa. Then either one will concede or come to a compromise. Whereas I still think at the end of the day the generation previous well he was still the boss, so you may question slightly but only just slightly, and he was still the boss and what he said was final. I'm not always too sure that [my mother in law] had as much input into the finances as what I have. I think that the financial side has had a huge, huge change, because it was always that the farmer went to the bank manager and the little missus tagged along. Now I think the role has totally changed a lot where the husband can say look you check this out with the bank manager. Because we have so much more to do you delegate some of those roles and women are taking on some of the roles very readily, and very happily, and very well (8-180I, farmer).

Overall, younger farm women envisage their contributions as farm women differently to older women. While they still consider their carer identity as very important, they see themselves as farmers rather than farm helpers. Instead of becoming community workers they become involved as industry actors, or to a lesser extent they undertake off-farm work. This is summarised in a comment from a NWD farmer’s wife, showing the involvement in farming and the desire to be, and the challenge of being, involved in agri-industry.
I see myself as a typical farmer's wife of this generation - starting out married life where everything was focused on the one farm, both carrying out farming duties, living up to the perception one has of "farming". Women farmers of today need to be aware of what is going on outside the farm gate, they are taking on a more dominant and recognised role in farming partnerships and making their voices heard in a male dominated industry (8-185Q, farmer’s wife).

Farm women recognise and express a myriad of identities. During a lifecourse these diverse identities may be performed at different stages depending on the spaces provided for their performance and the ontological narratives circulating which allow that performance. Generational differences within lifecourse are apparent, with older women from the established organisations tending to perform service-oriented identities, and younger farm women and some older, from both the established organisations and the newer networks, taking up occupational identities which challenge ontological narratives.

The expression of multiple identities may be conflicting, and at times, overwhelmingly so. The combining of service and occupational identities is not simple, and the expectations placed upon farm women to be ‘everything to everyone’ can be exhausting and confusing. The manifestation of identities constructed by farm women is diverse even within the six main identities, and this is a clear illustration of the unfixed and dynamic nature of identity. Women who are actively involved in physical aspects of farming may find their involvement suddenly hindered by childcare responsibilities, and may find it difficult to return to their previous involvement. Older women may place less emphasis on the carer identity as their children grow older and may chose to accentuate the farmer, industry actor, community worker or off-farm worker identities. Indeed, the different narrative identities that farm women recognise for themselves change throughout their lifecourse, and a generational change in recognition and acceptance of occupational identities is evident.

This section, and the previous two, have analysed the performance of certain narrative identities amongst members of particular organisations. These sections have argued that members of the established organisations construct a narrative identity for themselves which is in keeping with dominant ontological narratives which support
service identities for farm women. RWNZ, a competitive organisation, opposed to co-operative, is an exception to this argument, members giving some placement to occupational identities in construction of their narrative identity. Similarly, it is argued that members of the newer networks construct identities for themselves which challenge and resist hegemonic ontological narratives, combining over their lifecourse the *carer* identity with occupational identities. However, women belonging to PCW, a competitive organisation, rather than a social movement or individual resistance network, are less likely to place great importance on these identities.

These performances of narrative identity are in keeping with the spaces that are provided by the organisations themselves, through collective identity, organisational type, and the maintenance of, or challenge to, ontological narratives circulating in ruralities which support service identities for farm women. Section 6.3 further expands upon this maintenance or challenge to analyse how farm women consider others influence their identities by constructing these ontological narratives.

### 6.3 Engaging with Ontological Narratives: Impact of Wider Narratives in Maintaining or Challenging Identities.

Wider narratives of rurality that are created, supported, and circulated in the farming community and agri-industry shape the spaces created by farming women’s organisations for the recognition of certain narrative identities. In Chapter Two, this thesis argued that these narratives circulating in contemporary Western ruralities predominantly placed farm women in the arena of home and community. It also contendeds that there must be some public provision of narratives that support occupational identities for farm women. This section demonstrates that if there is a difference between how certain farm women see themselves, their narrative identities, and how they think others construct them, then there must be a provision of alternative narratives allowing for this difference; that is, that certain farming women's organisations create space for the recognition of alternative identities, and therefore a challenge to hegemonic identities for farm women.

The following sub-sections show how members of each of the case study organisations think the farming community, rural service industry and mainstream
farming organisations construct identities for farm women. This is supported by qualitative data from the Farm Women Questionnaire and in-depth interviews. Section 6.3.4 concludes with an overview of the differing outcomes of the strategic spaces of the case study organisations. It considers how the ways in which these spaces shape narrative identities also influence members’ views of wider narratives. In doing so it demonstrates the differences amongst farm women in their consideration of the influence of others in constructing identities for farm women.

6.3.1 Maintaining identities: FWIO and CWAV - co-operative organisations

The Federated Women’s Institute of Ontario and the Country Women’s Association of Victoria are classified as co-operative organisations, seeking to maintain and cooperate with dominant discourses circulating in their societies. The ways in which members of these two organisations construct narrative identities for themselves also maintain these discourses, and indeed, as this section argues, these farm women see others as constructing identities for farm women which also maintain dominant identities.

Members of both organisations considered that each of the external groups (farming community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations) placed as much importance upon the three service identities as they themselves did. Farm helper and carer were of high importance (see Table 6.1). Community worker was considered of average importance although FWIO members felt that the rural service industry placed slightly more importance upon this identity than members did. There is more variance in the ways in which members felt these external groups constructed occupational identities for farm women. FWIO members considered the external groups placed average to low importance on the off-farm worker and industry actor identities, as they themselves did. In contrast, their thoughts on how external groups viewed the importance of the farmer identity varied from very important to average, with the farming community seen as placing the least importance on this identity. However, while CWAV members felt there was a comparability in the importance they and the external groups gave the farmer identity, this was not so for the other two occupational identities. They felt that the farming community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations placed more importance on
farm women being an *off-farm worker* and an *industry actor* for farm women (see Table 6.1).

### Table 6.1: Wider Views of Farm Women’s Identity held by FWIO and CWAV Members (Median Values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members’ Views</th>
<th>Farm Helper</th>
<th>Carer</th>
<th>Community Worker</th>
<th>Farmer</th>
<th>Off-farm Worker</th>
<th>Industry Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FWIO members view of farming community’s construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWIO members view of rural service industry’s construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWIO members view of mainstream farming organisations’ construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWAV members view of farming community’s construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWAV members view of rural service industry’s construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWAV members view of mainstream farming organisations’ construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values indicate importance placed upon identity. Based on median value, with 1 being very important and 6 of no importance.

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, questions 25, 26 and 28.

There is a feeling amongst these women that this off-farm work is not related to the farm business itself, and this may be why members considered others placed more importance on this identity than they themselves did. An FWIO interviewee supports this argument with her comments regarding farm women receiving recognition for off-farm careers, but not for on-farm work, explaining that the work they do off-farm is not linked to the farm.

I don’t think they do [get recognition for farm work]. Most people think the man is the boss, no matter what they say. I think maybe only the women that have gone into business [get recognition]. And they’re known for something else apart from just being the farm wife. If they are working off-farm, then they get the recognition - teachers and nurses give that guaranteed income (1-27I, retired).
Many FWIO and CWAV members interviewed considered that farm women were given recognition by the community and industry, and did not comment further. The comment below, while an exception to the viewpoints of the majority of members of these two organisations, does indicate awareness amongst the few younger members that there is a lack of recognition for farm women as *farmers* and *industry actors*.

[Farm women are] not recognised for much of the contributions made to society. Rural women are beginning to have a voice but much is needed to be done by policymakers and media - show respect and recognition of proper role women play in rural Australia. Even history doesn't recognise the role of women in this area enough!! (5-158Q, farm manager).

Overall, members of FWIO and CWAV feel that the farming community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations construct identities for farm women in ways similar to themselves. The dominant identities for these women are the service identities of *carer* and *farm helper*, and to a lesser extent, *community worker*, and they see outside groups creating and supporting ontological narratives that maintain these dominant identities. The members and their organisations seek to maintain traditional hegemonic identities for farm women.

### 6.3.2 Effecting change? RWNZ and PCW - competitive organisations

Members of competitive organisations, Rural Women New Zealand and Positively Clutha Women, wish to gain a greater share of available resources without breaking societal norms. The members of the two organisations display this in different ways. RWNZ members while placing a similar amount of importance upon the service identities as the other two established organisations, also place a comparably higher importance upon the *farmer* and *industry actor* identities. PCW members, in comparison to the other three newer networks, were less challenging in their construction of narrative identities for farm women, placing less importance overall on the *farmer* and *industry actor* identities. The importance placed upon the service and occupational identities by members of RWNZ and PCW, when compared to their cohorts (established organisations and newer networks, respectively), is contrasting. RWNZ members are less accepting of ontological narratives than FWIO and CWAV members, and PCW members are more accepting of these wider narratives circulating
in the community and industry, than members of the other networks. Table 6.2 shows the importance placed upon the six identities by PCW and RWNZ members.

Members of both organisations considered that the external groups placed the same high importance upon the service identities of *carer* and *farm helper* (see Table 6.2), with the exception of PCW members feeling that the rural service industry considered the *farm helper* identity to be of only average importance. This is not, however, compensated for by a feeling of an increased importance of the *farmer* identity. Indeed, both RWNZ and PCW members feel that external groups place much less importance on this identity than they themselves do. While many RWNZ respondents were more accepting of this, the quotes below from PCW members show a lack of tolerance for, and respect and recognition of, farm women as knowledgeable *farmers*.

You have to develop that respect, and being a female I find it’s harder. First of all, you're just the wife. I go to discussion group, and I'm the only female. I find it takes a bit of time to feel a part of it. I go to buy a new motorbike or a new tractor. They'll talk to [my husband]. I think being a female in agriculture, there’s a lot of males that are very chauvinistic (4-109I, farmer).

I am the farmer and have been for 20 years, yet I am still talked down to by most men in the industry and just tolerated by many neighbours (4-104Q, farmer).

I enjoy my position as a farming partner being involved with farm work and the decisions being made and a part of the discussions on decisions. A lot of farming men do not recognise women as an important or knowledgeable partner involved in the farm (probably older generation!) (4-126Q, farmer).

Constructions of the other two occupational identities were diverse between the two organisations and between the external groups. Whilst RWNZ members placed little importance on *off-farm worker*, it was considered, by members, as being of average importance by the farming community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations. In contrast, however, PCW members felt that the farming community and mainstream farming organisations placed a value on *off-farm worker* similar to themselves, but that the rural service industry placed less importance on this identity. The difference between the importance placed upon the *off-farm worker* identity exists not only between PCW and the established organisations, but also with the other three networks. However, while PCW members are less agri-industry oriented,
they do seek recognition for their off-farm work and its contribution to the farm business.

Table 6.2: Wider Views of Farm Women’s Identity as per RWNZ and PCW Members (Median Values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members’ Views</th>
<th>Farm Helper</th>
<th>Carer</th>
<th>Community Worker</th>
<th>Farmer</th>
<th>Off-farm Worker</th>
<th>Industry Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RWNZ members view of farming community’s construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWNZ members view of rural service industry’s construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWNZ members view of mainstream farming organisations’ construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCW members view of farming community’s construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCW members view of rural service industry’s construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCW members view of mainstream farming organisations’ construction of farm women’s identities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values indicate importance placed upon identity. Based on median value, with 1 being very important and 6 of no importance.

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, questions 25, 26 and 28.

The *industry actor* identity was also varied in how it was considered to be valued by external groups. While PCW members placed an average importance in this identity, they felt that each external group viewed it quite differently, from high to little
importance (see Table 6.2). Compared with the other networks, this placed PCW members as less challenging regarding this identity; they don’t really see the industry actor identity as important to themselves and do not need to resist external constructions of this identity as unimportant. RWNZ members saw more acceptance of farm women as industry actors, in all but the farming community, where it was seen as being of little importance (see Table 6.2). The indifference amongst the farming community is commented upon in this quote from a RWNZ interviewee.

[There are] more [women in Federated Farmers] now than there used to be. [But] you don't know whether to go or not. You feel you're going to be the only woman there, so you don't go. And then you ask your husband, how many women were there? And he might say two or three. Well, maybe I could have gone. It’s been a bit like that. I don't think the men really want them there anyway. Its just an impression I get from my husband, I don't think he'd want me there. It’s just what he said about some other woman who was there and she was sort of asking all the questions. I don't know, it’s probably their age group, they probably think running the farm is a men’s thing (7-202I, farmer).

There is, however, a perception amongst RWNZ members that the rural service industry and, in particular mainstream farming organisations, are more accepting of farm women as industry actors, members considering these external groups to give the same average importance to this identity. A RWNZ member supports this argument that there is a perception of change.

[Federated Farmers] is very male dominated around here, [although] the chairman of the dairy section [in this area] is a woman. Not a lot of women go to the meetings, but you get the odd one. Whereas, when my husband used to go to FF when we were first married there were never women. But you get a few, and at the conference, their local conferences here, you get a few women coming too, and they stand up and speak and are listened to, so there is a change (3-68I, farmer’s wife).

RWNZ and PCW, as organisations, may be seen as effecting change. Members see differences between how they see themselves and how others do. They consider that the farming community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations place similar importance upon the service identities as they themselves do. However, in contrast to FWIO and CWAV, there is often a variance between how they see themselves as farmers, off-farm workers and industry actors. The difference is mostly that the external groups place slightly less importance upon these identities. The wider ontological narratives that are supported by, and circulated through the farming
community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations are often in conflict with the narrative identities that are recognised by the members of PCW and RWNZ. This conflict reflects their status as competitive organisations. However, there is still consensus with the dominance of the importance of service identities for farm women. The contrast with FWIO and CWA is that these farm women while acknowledging the importance of the farm helper, carer and community worker identities, seek to perform identities beyond these dominant service identities, in particular, farmer and industry actor.

6.3.3 Challenging identities: OFWN, CVWiA and NWD - social movements and individual resistance

The members of the Ontario Farm Women’s Network and the Central Victoria Women in Agriculture network belong to organisations that are classified as social movements, and the members of the Network for Women in Dairying to a network of individual resistance. The members’ views indicate a challenge to societal norms, a resistance of ontological narratives that support the hegemonic nature of service identities for farm women. Although NWD is organisationally classified in a different manner from OFWN and CVWiA, members of all three networks construct similar narrative identities for themselves. All place high importance upon the carer, farmer and industry actor identities. Similarly, they also consider that external groups construct identities for farm women in comparable ways. Overall, members of these three networks felt that external groups placed an importance on the service identities as they themselves did, but that less importance was placed upon the occupational identities of farmer and industry actor (see Table 6.3).
Table 6.3: Wider Views of Farm Women’s Identity as per OFWN, CVWiA and NWD Members (Median Values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Farm Helper</th>
<th>Carer</th>
<th>Community Worker</th>
<th>Farmer</th>
<th>Off-farm Worker</th>
<th>Industry Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFWN members view of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farming community’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women’s identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFWN members view of</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural service industry’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women’s identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFWN members view of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstream farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisations’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women’s identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVWiA members view of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farming community’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women’s identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVWiA members view of</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural service industry’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women’s identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVWiA members view of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstream farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisations’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women’s identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWD members view of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farming community’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women’s identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWD members view of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural service industry’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women’s identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWD members view of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstream farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisations’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women’s identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values indicate importance placed upon identity. Based on median value, with 1 being very important and 6 of no importance.

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, questions 25, 26 and 28.

While network members felt that external groups placed a similar importance on the service identities as they themselves did, there were exceptions and differences between the farm women and the external groups regarding the manifestation of these identities. The *carer* identity was very important to the vast majority of respondents, but there was an indication that this identity was only one of many. However, network
members felt that others still considered this identity as a core identity of farm women. This comment from a NWD farmer comments on the manifestation of the *carer* identity by past and current generations, indicating a slow change, but still a dominance of this identity in ontological narratives circulating in farming communities.

You’re still dealing with men who were brought up by mothers who came from a generation where they perceived their role, like my mother, to be the caregiver and the person responsible for domestic arrangements. I mean they’re aged ... well... in fact I can think of one...my husband although he's changed - …so he's in his late 40s, so there are still a lot of those guys around. Now some have adapted and others haven't. I think we need a bit more - one more generation. And in reality women still have the primary caregiver role in the family. At the end of the day if someone's going out to a meeting, usually its the women who has to arrange the babysitter, thought about who's getting tea, those roles are still falling at the moment to the women, even though they are both working (8-210I, farmer).

The expectations of farm women to undertake the *carer* identity is predominant in ruralities in the case study areas, and this expectation extends to other service identities. OFWN and NWD members considered that external groups placed more importance on the *community worker* identity (see Table 6.3). The quote below taken from an interview with a NWD farmer indicates the tension that exists between the need to fulfil traditional community obligations whilst also maintaining involvement in the farm.

Its very hard - you've only got a limited amount of hours in a day, so if you want to be involved with the farm, maybe its just me, but you still feel guilty if people ring you up and say, there's such and such on, can you make a batch of scones and bring it in and you say, sorry I haven't got time, I'm doing this, that and the other thing. Its just pressure. And I find from that in a lot of communities and not just farming, little towns [as well], because all the other women are making the scones - and you're not making the scones - I think you get that pressure from some people who maybe don't know where you're going or what you're trying to do (8-203I, farmer).

The pressure to undertake traditional service identities is strong, and while members of these three networks indicated that there was some sense of agreement between farm women and external groups about the importance placed on service identities for farm women, changes have been hard won. The networks have had to create spaces for farm women to challenge external expectations regarding their narrative identities.
An OFWN founding member explains how OFWN farm women have started to challenge ontological narratives in the farming community.

Definitely we've made inroads into how women perceive themselves. I wasn't from a farm and I didn't have a business background when we bought the farm. And we had a little boy, and what did I do, but want to put on the mailbox, Bob Loeven and Son. You know, and it's the women that paint the mailbox. If you go through the countryside you see George and Ralph on the barn an awful lot; almost every barn. And I think what we have really influenced is that you can see a change in perceptions. When you drive down the concession roads and you see Bob and Diana Loeven and Family on the farm sign, or we have Loevenvale Farms, or you have Joe and Shirley and Family, or some of them you see Joe and Shirley and Girls. So we really see a difference in that sort of thing; that really has changed in the last ten years. So that is one way we have impacted on who actually is on the farm and doing the work, and maybe ownership of it. I think that is one visible sign of change (2-136I, farmer).

The challenge to ontological narratives made by these farm women, however, has not extended to a complete agreement by farm women and how they consider external groups value the importance of the farmer, industry actor and off-farm worker identities. The first two identities are of very high importance to members of OFWN, CVWiA and NWD, but they all consider that the farming community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations place less importance on these two identities (see Table 6.3). In contrast these farm women feel that these external groups place more importance upon the off-farm career identity (median values of 2-4 (Table 6.3) compared to 4-4.5 by the farm women (Figure 6.2)

OFWN members indicate that the farm helper identity is important to them as well as the farmer identity, and an OFWN respondent’s comment indicates why this may be so, claiming that the change in women’s own manifestation of themselves as farmers has been a slow process and is only just being reflected in ontological narratives circulating in, and supported by, governmental policy.

Women have struggled to be seen as equal partners on the family farm; it was easier and convenient for others to see us as 'helpmates'. But [lobbying for change in] the census demonstrated women's involvement at the managerial/decision making level and this, along with other societal shifts, led to greater acceptance and legitimacy of the role of women farmers (2-37Q, off-farm worker).
While the values in Table 6.3 do not show an enormous variance between how network members see themselves and how they think others see them, qualitative data from the Farm Women Questionnaire and in-depth interviews indicates that changes in ontological narratives and their performance in everyday life are not occurring fast enough for most members. The two quotes below from CVWiA members illustrate the underlying assumptions regarding farm women decision making abilities amongst the rural service industry.

My dad left me a share of a block of land. So [I had] to find an agent who would sell it. And the men treated me like I didn't exist. I was really stunned. In the end we sold it through a women agent. Even then, her husband took over the role of the selling as an agent. He made some comment and I said, you know, you don’t realise the only reason we're selling through your agency is because your wife treated me as a real person. It was really a very strange experience for me (6-143I, primary caregiver).

[The] Bank manager we had was a chauvinistic pig. Paul and I walked in and he shook Paul’s hand. And Paul introduced me and he just ignored me. And I thought ahhh - and that was just about having a bank overdraft. Something simple, like we weren't asking for millions, but I was really offended by that. I had all the paper work. I knew all the paper work. And he looked at Paul when I was speaking to him, and I really did not like it at all. Some people are just so rude. They come here and they just want to speak to Paul. Or they say, is Paul here, or I need to speak to Paul. And I say I know exactly what you're here for. I know how to answer you. He's down there. And I've had a couple of people say; I'll wait till he gets back (6-153I, farmer).

So even though network members consider that the rural service industry places much less importance upon the farmer identity than they themselves do, there is a distinct discontent amongst these women that their decision making abilities and rights as equal partners are undervalued. Farm women’s own challenges to their visibility in the agri-industry is starting to make some impact upon hegemonic ontological narratives, but as this NWD farmer comments in an interview, this impact is not yet enough.

The banks are finally starting to wake up. I mean we all knew that women had a huge input on the finances, but they are starting to wake up. And we saw a big shift towards marketing actually to the woman. Cause they realise whoever the decision maker may be on farms, the women, whether its always recognised or not, do play a big part. I used to think I could give a presentation to agricultural sales reps and make them triple their money, but I'm not going to do that because they are so chauvinistic. There is just this total lack of realising a woman's decision...
making ability and the role that she did play even then. Advertising still comes, albeit not very often, still addressed to Mr. Farmer. But I can remember in the last 6 years [that a company] did a mail drop to Mr. Farmer, and you do get a bit fed up and just let it go, but I thought no, so I wrote the marketing manager a letter and told him what I thought of his advertising. And he wrote back extremely apologetic, he said he’d received a number of letters about it and he knew that, as I pointed out, if I wrote one letter, there’s probably about 50 people that would have but couldn’t be bothered. I think the message is getting through, albeit extremely slow. (8-210I, farmer).

This lack of importance placed upon farm women’s decision making abilities as farmers is also extended into the agri-industry arena. The industry actor identity is of high importance to the members of OFWN, CVWiA and NWD, yet there is a feeling amongst these women that this identity is not valued by external groups. The members of these three networks wish to have more influence in agri-industry, and in particular, gain recognition for their concerns about the impact of economic and social policies on the farm family and family farm. How these women feel mainstream farming organisations value the industry actor identity, in particular, is important in the negotiation and contestation of hegemonic identities. In interviews two OFWN members related incidents where, what they felt was the true nature of the mainstream farming organisations’ attitudes to farm women as decision makers, were revealed.

I’d love to be able to say yes [its better], and say that its so much easier, but I go to the meetings, and its when you go to the milk meeting or the corn producers’ meeting and there's two women in the room. There's a lot [of women] that are really active in doing the farm work, and they are not at the farm meetings. So the other men do not see that the women are not there that should be, voting on issues that affect their families and their careers. But we still do not see women at the meetings. I was asked by the municipal government to come in and talk [about farm drains]. I thought it was very good to be recognised for that. Half way through the meeting the Deputy Reeve said “oh well we don't have the clerk here to be taking the minutes, Diana, could you take the minutes?” And I bit my tongue. And one of the men afterwards said, “God, I thought for sure you were going to blow.” And I said “well, it was the first meeting and I decided not to make an issue of it”; but if the second meeting came up and I was asked I would say well I've taken my turn, somebody else take your turn. I didn't want to come out with “well if there's a broom here I'll sweep the floor while we're at the meeting too.” I didn't say that. Because I was the only woman at the meeting, was why I asked to be taking.... Really secretarial skills aren't my best skills. But anyway, so I don't know that it’s changed a great deal. (2-136I, farmer).

J: One of the directors on the OFA he was telling me about a joke that was going around. What do you tell a woman with two black eyes?
DS: I don't know.
J: Obviously, nothing, obviously she's already been told.
DS: And that's a really funny joke.
J: They all laughed. He went on and on about all these jokes at the OFA.
And when you go to these hospitality rooms and then that’s when the true personalities come out and I sit there and ohhh. You always had the feeling they had no use for women, and that group has no use for women. It is clear - a woman’s place is in the home. (2-21I, farmer’s wife).

These anecdotes relate the depth of feeling farm women have about not being valued as *industry actors*, decision makers and *farmers*. To continue to resist the dominant identities of women as *farm helpers* and *carers* is to challenge the ontological narratives that support the attitudes encountered by these women. Members of OFWN, CVWiA and NWD place high importance on themselves as *carers*, and feel that this is valued by external groups as well, but they also feel that the other service identities are given more importance by others. These women also place great importance on two of the occupational identities, *farmer* and *industry actor*, but see that these identities are not valued and acknowledged by others as important in constructing identity for farm women.

The spaces these organisations create allow for farm women to generate a feeling of support and validity in their expression of these alternative identities. Whether it be through an email network, internet website, informal kitchen meetings, farm walks or providing support for a fellow member in a male-dominated context, these spaces legitimise particular narrative identities. In contrast to Shortall’s (2001) work which argues that women’s farming organisations reinforce gender divisions and do not question men as farmers and their political power, this study demonstrates that newer networks have a role to play in creating spaces from which farm women can develop the leadership, knowledge and empowerment to participate in mainstream farming organisations, and to create a public agenda which includes social issues surrounding farm women, the farm family and family farm.

The following interview comment from an OFWN farmer illustrates the challenge arising from resisting ontological narratives that support the hegemonic nature of service identities for farm women.
A lot of the farm women [of OFWN] were not raised on the farm, and I think they came with a different point of view. They didn't have some of the baggage of this is what my mother did, and this is what is expected of me, those hidden unspoken messages of what women's role is. I didn't have that, and many other women didn't either, and so that is why we were struggling with it, cause we had some education and careers and weren't quite as mouldable or in some way ready to step into what others were to define for us. We wanted to be there and define it for ourselves. We became aware of ourselves, who we were, and what we were, and there didn't seem to be a place for us. If you have the definition of a farmer and asked someone to close their eyes and what is a farmer? What typically comes to mind is a man in rubber boots and coveralls, and with a straw hat or something. None of which is really typical or appropriate. Certainly the women didn't come to mind. So we just didn't seem to fit and with women talking about farming, wanting to be involved in that, it was still seen as a helper role, that it wasn't a profession for you. There was either WI, and then there was the farming organisations, and if you wanted to be a female farmer it was like you were a round peg and there was only square holes and you didn't know quite where to fit. So I think we have struggled to try and find out a definition of who we were and what we were doing. (2-136I, farmer).

Her comments highlight the dominance of certain ontological narratives that placed women as carers and farm helpers and men as farmers, and the challenge by women of the newer networks of these narratives. This performance of the identities of farmer and industry actor challenges and renegotiates the dominant identities for farm women. While members of RWNZ and PCW seek more recognition for occupational identities for farm women, they are less active in challenging hegemonic ontological narratives than members of the these three networks. Members of OFWN, CVWiA and NWD construct narrative identities for themselves which are often at odds with those constructed by external groups.

6.3.4 Narrative Identities and Wider Ontological Narratives

Throughout Section 6.3 a link has been demonstrated between whether members of an organisation recognise and act upon certain narrative identities and how the members consider external groups value these narrative identities. Furthermore, it demonstrates that the amount of difference, or gap, between narrative identities constructed by a farm woman and the perceived construction of narrative identities by these external groups, is indicative of maintenance of, or challenge to, hegemonic identities for farm women.
The members of the Federated Women’s Institutes of Ontario and the Country Women’s Association of Victoria feel that external groups construct narrative identities for farm women in much similar ways as they themselves do, placing the most importance on the service identities. They consider that the ontological narratives circulating in these external groups are very much the same ones that circulate in the spaces provided for members by FWIO and CWAV, and which are utilised by these farm women to inform and construct narrative identities for themselves.

Members of Rural Women New Zealand and Positively Clutha Women belong to competitive organisations, and as such they are more challenging of hegemonic identities for farm women. Members agree with the ways in which external groups construct service identities for farm women; however there is less agreement with regard to the importance of occupational identities. Members of both organisations consider that less importance is placed upon the farmer identity, RWNZ members feel similarly about the industry actor identity, and PCW members feel likewise about the off-farm worker identity, reflecting the spaces these organisations create. These farm women construct narrative identities for themselves which are, in part, in contest with the ontological narratives they see circulating in the farming community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations. These two organisations construct spaces that members draw upon to challenge hegemonic identities for farm women. However while these spaces are made ‘available’ for members, challenge is not overtly encouraged as in OFWN, CVWiA and NWD. As such, while members of RWNZ and PCW see differences between how they construct narrative identities for themselves and how others do, there is only a partial challenge to hegemonic identities for farm women.

The Ontario Farm Women’s Network and Central Victoria Women in Agriculture are social movements, the Network for Women in Dairying a network of individual resistance, and by the nature of these organisational types, members conflict with societal norms, challenging and renegotiating the boundaries put in place by social practices, relations and institutions. While they place a high importance on the carer identity, their manifestation of this identity is different from dominant constructions. They challenge the placement of the family farm in the arena of home and
community, rather than in agri-industry. They also feel that the ontological narratives informing external groups place too much importance upon the service identities of farm helper and community worker. Their expression of the farmer and industry actor identities challenge and resist the ontological narratives circulating in the farming community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations, which place less importance on these identities than the women themselves do. As such the differences between how these farm women construct identities for themselves and how they consider others do so, indicate a challenge and resistance to hegemonic identities for farm women.

6.4 Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that there is a link between established organisations maintaining dominant identities for farm women, and newer networks challenging dominant identities for farm women. However, there is a stronger link between organisational type and maintenance of, or challenge to, dominant identities. In Chapters Four and Five analyses of organisational collective identity and organisational type indicated the types of spaces organisations create for the recognition and performance of specific narrative identities. These spaces allow the circulation of particular ontological narratives, and encourage the maintenance or challenge of these ontological narratives. For example, the strong focus on craft, drama and music within the CWAV is in direct contrast with the agri-industry focused spaces of OFWN that created Let Us Introduce Ourselves- A Directory of Ontario Farm Women (1992) and which brought rural domestic violence to the attention of mainstream farming organisations and government agencies.

Section 6.2 demonstrated the link between organisational collective identity and organisational type with certain narrative identities. Rural Women New Zealand has a collective identity which is not only different from the other two established organisations, the Federated Women’s Institute of Ontario and the Country Women’s Association of Victoria, but also more dynamic in meeting the changing needs of farm women. As such, while FWIO and CWAV members continue to place great importance on the service identities only, RWNZ members, as well as recognising
these service identities, also place more importance on the *farmer* and *industry actor* identities, reflecting the organisation’s focus on farming and agri-industry. These differences are also reflected in organisational type, FWIO and CWAV being co-operative organisations, and RWNZ a competitive organisation. So while FWIO and CWAV members seek to maintain the dominance of the service identities, RWNZ members challenge this in part by seeking additional recognition of occupational identities. This contrasts with previous literature, particularly work by Teather (1996a, 1996b) and Carbert (1995), which suggests that the established organisations maintain dominant identities for farm women, whereas RWNZ, formed in a similar relational setting as FWIO and CWAV, now promotes a different focus, one which begins to assert spaces for alternative identities.

Differences between organisational collective identity and type are also apparent, not only from the established organisations, but also amongst the newer networks. Members of all the newer networks place high importance on the *carer* and *farmer* identities, but there is variance with regard to the remaining identities. The Ontario Farm Women’s Network and Central Victoria Women in Agriculture network have a similar collective identity and organisational type (social movement) and the focus of the networks is on farm women, the family farm and farm family. As such the members also place importance on the *farm helper* and *industry actor* identities. The ways in which the members construct these identities and that of *carer* and *farmer*, in light of this organisational focus, challenges the traditional constructions and recognition of these identities. This supports the work of Liepins (1998b, 1999) and Mackenzie (1992, 1994), which argues that these newer networks create spaces for the articulation of discourses that legitimise alternative identities for farm women.

Analysis of the Network for Women in Dairying and Positively Clutha Women and the spaces they create for the recognition of farm women identities makes a new contribution to literature on farming women’s organisations. These two networks differ not only from each other, but also from OFWN and CVWiA. The collective identity of PCW is closer to the established organisations while NWD’s is at the most extreme. This is reflected in the spaces they create for members’ recognition of identities.
The Network for Women in Dairying is classified as a network of individual resistance, and constructs spaces for members to recognise the farmer and industry actor identities. Members place high importance on these two identities, and as such seek to challenge dominant identities for farm women. In this way they are very similar to OFWN and CVWiA members, but the network does not seek to construct spaces for the carer identity, and qualitative data from NWD respondents did not highlight a challenge to how this identity is viewed by others.

Positively Clutha Women has a different collective identity and organisational type than the other three networks, and this is reflected in the identities of importance to the members. Importance placed upon the service identities is similar to that of the other networks, but just as PCW’s collective identity does not reflect a focus on agri-industry, so too do members place less importance on the industry actor identity. Instead they place a much greater importance upon an off-farm worker identity than any of the other case study organisations. As a competitive organisation, PCW is perhaps a younger and place-specific version of RWNZ. Members place similar importance on four of the identities, with the established organisation members placing more importance upon community worker, and the newer network members on off-farm worker.

Differences such as the generational one between RWNZ and PCW, both competitive organisations, are apparent between all the established organisations and newer networks. In each of the three countries, farm women’s lifecourses have followed similar patterns, with members of the established organisations, for example, undertaking community work, and those of the newer networks emphasising their farmer identity, or undertaking off-farm work. This highlights the influence of contemporary ruralities in creating, or responding to, generational differences in the lifecourses of these farm women, and highlights the role of farming women’s organisations in enabling the availability of spaces to express certain identities. Organisations that are providing spaces for farm women to perform the identities of farmer, industry actor and off-farm worker challenge ontological narratives which support hegemonic service identities for farm women.
Section 6.3 demonstrates how members of particular organisations agree or disagree with external groups in constructing narrative identities for farm women. This section argues that the degree of difference between these constructions indicates maintenance of, or a challenge to, ontological narratives and the hegemonic identities they support for farm women. The case study organisations were analysed by organisational type, members being asked to indicate the importance they felt the farming community, rural service industry and mainstream farming organisations placed upon the six identities.

This section demonstrated that not only are generational differences between the members of the organisations crucial in the perceptions of importance placed by external groups on identities for farm women, but also vital are the recognition of a particular serialised condition, and the resulting membership of an organisation with a certain organisational type. Along the continuum of co-operative, competitive, social movement and individual resistance, there was increasingly more conflict between the narrative identities the members constructed and expressed for themselves, and the ontological narratives seen as informing these external groups in their construction of identities for farm women. An increasing difference in the importance placed upon identities for farm women indicate a corresponding challenge to dominant service identities that are supported by the ontological narratives informing these external groups.

Analysis in Section 6.2 and 6.3 has highlighted differences and similarities not only between, and amongst, the established organisations and newer networks, their collective identities and organisational types, but also between countries, and indeed between Waikato and Otago within New Zealand. The service identities of carer and farm helper dominate in all three countries. However, in the Waikato the farm helper identity is not dominant amongst NWD members, reflecting the dominance of the dairying industry in this region that in recent generations has encouraged increased participation by farm women.59

---

59 This was confirmed in an interview with a RWNZ Otago member. She commented that in dairying, because there are younger women making the business work, doing the actual accounts, and doing budgeting, its much more a true partnership than in a lot of traditional sheep and beef farming [in Otago] (RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999).
Canadian respondents place slightly more emphasis on the service identities than the Australian and New Zealand women. However, regardless of this, the Australian organisations construct similar spaces to those constructed by the Canadian organisations (FWIO and CWAV, OFWN and CVWiA). New Zealand farm women, in comparison to the others, place more importance on the occupational identities, in particular, *industry actor*. This may be a reflection of the recent formation and associated vigour of the New Zealand networks, and the name and focus change undertaken by RWNZ. It may also show a decrease in political action by members of CVWiA and OFWN as the dynamism associated with recent formation fades.

This chapter has enabled an understanding of the narrative identities that farm women members of certain organisations consider important for themselves. By comparing these self-constructions of identity with those of external groups (such as mainstream farming organisations, the rural service industry, and the farming community) it is possible to ascertain if farming women’s organisations are creating spaces and strategic bases for negotiating hegemonic identities for farm women. Of the service identities, the *carer* identity remains dominant amongst almost all members of the organisations. *Farm helper* is very important amongst the established organisations, and some of the newer networks. While the established organisations construct collective identities for themselves that include community work, members of those organisations rate *community worker* as of average importance and comparable with the newer network members.

Of the occupational identities, *off-farm worker* is the least important, only of high importance to members of PCW. This is in contrast to research undertaken in the mid 1990s which indicated an increase in farm women’s off-farm work (Alston, 1994, 1995b; Gibson et al, 1990; Shaw, 1993; Taylor & Little, 1995), and in particular the statement by a New Zealand study which claims that the "continual reference back to the 'farm' as the basis for definition may be less and less relevant in terms of the developing recognition of the multiple roles of women..." (Rivers, 1992: 2). Empirical research in Ontario and Australia also indicates that off-farm employment is increasing in these areas, but most importantly that it is undertaken predominantly for financial reasons, as opposed to specifically wishing to develop an off-farm career (Lim-Applegate et al., 2002; Weersink et al., 1998). These studies indicate that for
farm women of the newer networks, as well as those of the established organisations, off-farm work, while perhaps a necessity, is not an essential part to constructing their identities as farm women.

For the members of these farming women's organisations, excepting FWIO and CWAV, the identities of farmer and industry actor, and their performance, are very important in how they construct themselves as farm women. OFWN, CVWiA, NWD, and to a lesser extent, PCW and RWNZ create spaces within their organisations for alternative ontological narratives to circulate and be acted upon, which in turn allow and encourage a challenge to hegemonic identities for farm women. The collective action of these farm women is influenced by the collective identity of their organisations, and the spaces created for the recognition of certain narrative identities. Chapter Seven examines this performance of collective action, by analysing the leadership undertaken by members of the case study organisations.
Chapter Seven: Negotiating Identity Through Leadership: A Form of Collective Action

7.1 Introduction

Chapter Six examined the narrative identities recognised and expressed by farm women, linking the recognition of particular identities with certain organisations. It showed that the strategic spaces and structural bases created by organisations allow the circulation of broader ontological narratives about rurality that encourage or deter particular identities. This chapter examines the performance of this collective action that is a result of the spaces created by organisations (determined by organisational collective identity) and the narrative identities expressed by members.

Leadership, as a form of collective action, provides a tangible lens through which to answer the final question of this research: does the collective action of farming women's organisations maintain or challenge hegemonic identities for farm women? This chapter argues that the different case study organisations construct spaces that encourage particular types of leadership. It further argues that while all leadership is a form of political action, leadership performed in the context of agri-industry is more likely to challenge the social meanings, practices, and institutions that construct ruralities supporting traditional domestic identities for farm women.

Chapter Two has argued the importance of considering farm women’s leadership both in the community, and in farm and agri-industry arena. This thesis responds to and recognises a feminist reconceptualisation of political action which contends that action in everyday life is political (Morgen and Bookman, 1988; Phillips, 1998; Thornham, 2000). For farm women, everyday life includes experiences in the farm, community and agri-industry. Therefore, their experiences of leadership options may influence hegemonic identities for farm women, either maintaining or challenging these identities. Recognising that “identity is interpreted through political action…, [and that] the attributes of actors are defined almost entirely by … action itself” (Routledge, 1997: 362), Chapters Four and Five have argued that particular organisations have specific collective identities which in turn influence the narrative identities of members and their collective action. Through these various collective
identities, and their articulation in certain activities of the organisations, certain spaces for action are created by the organisations. It is within these spaces that the capacity for particular types of leadership are recognised and acted upon (Valocchi, 2001).

Section 7.2 examines how leadership manifests in the case study organisations, and contends that certain organisations support particular forms of leadership amongst members. The section argues that certain collective / political actions are linked with specific identities. These actions may either maintain or challenge dominant identities and forms of leadership, and this is shown by a prevalence of particular forms of leadership amongst members of the different organisations.

Section 7.3 examines how members of each organisation think farm women are identified as leaders in community or agri-industry within the wider narratives surrounding their everyday actions. The section considers the implications of their positioning with regard to these wider ontological narratives, i.e. demonstrating how leadership helps to maintain or challenge farm women’s identity. This contributes to Section 7.4, which contends that leadership in a masculinised context of agri-industry is more likely to be resisted. It further argues that when met with resistance, leadership is more likely to be of a challenging nature (Ridgeway, 2001; Routledge, 1997).

Finally, this chapter argues that established organisations are more likely to assert leadership in the feminised context of community, and for newer networks to support leadership in the masculinised agri-industry context. The chapter closes by questioning if leadership in the feminised context of community challenges gendered stereotypes regarding farm women; and claiming that leadership in a traditionally male gendered space (agri-industry) challenges the ontological narratives which surround and form ideas of what farm women ought to be.

---

60 As classified in Section 2.5.1.
7.2 Organisational Spaces for Leadership

Organisations create spaces in which members can politicise and practise, through leadership, certain identities (Valocchi, 2001). However, the expression of these identities depends upon the circulation of ontological narratives within these organisational spaces. The types of spaces for leadership created by farming women's organisations are affected by a number of factors, for example, the structure of the organisation, its raison d’être and objectives, and indeed the interests and experiences members share in common. This is evident when comparing the established organisations and the newer networks in this research. While there are exceptions, predominantly the older organisations tend to promote and provide spaces for leadership in the feminised context of community, and the newer networks focus increasingly on the masculinised context of farm and agri-industry.

The spaces and strategies for leadership created by organisations differ between the two generational types. The established organisations provide their members with training that largely concentrates upon formal meeting procedures and public speaking. For instance, at branch meetings office bearers learn the procedures that are also practised at higher levels in the organisation (CWAV Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999; FWIO Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999). Expanding upon this, RWNZ, also provides what it refers to as the “Wellington Experience” during which newly elected office holders travel to New Zealand’s capital and are introduced to central government’s political workings (RWNZ Otago Organisational Interview, pers. com., 1999). Several RWNZ interviewees mentioned this as a valuable training and confidence boosting experience. However, amongst established organisations overall, leadership training is more traditional and community-based.

In comparison to this more formalised leadership training, the newer networks have an approach that supports leadership but does not formally provide training. Instead, the members of these networks see themselves as mentors, a catalyst for farm women to lead in organisations external to their networks. There is a notion that leadership will be a “natural progression […] as women […] appreciate the skills that they develop” (PCW Key Informant Interview, pers. comm., 1998), and women will develop the confidence and knowledge to participate in farm and agri-industry leadership
positions. The following sections examine these types of leadership amongst the case study organisations, focusing on the opportunities to lead, both internal and external to these organisations.

7.2.1 Opportunities to Lead – Case Study Organisations and External Organisations

The opportunities for farm women to lead both in their own organisations, and in other community and farm oriented organisations, vary between the established organisations and the newer networks. The respondents’ understanding of leadership also varies between the two clusters of organisations. Members of the established organisations associate leadership largely with administrative roles, while newer network members consider leadership in relation to mentoring and precipitating change. This section examines the leadership differences between the members of the two clusters of case study organisations, drawing upon data from the Farm Women’s Questionnaire and the in-depth interviews.

Members of the established organisations are highly likely to hold leadership positions in their own organisations. As shown in Figure 7.1, 90-96% of survey respondents from FWIO, CAV and RWNZ held such positions (ranging from branch to national levels). In contrast, members of the newer networks were less likely to hold such leadership positions. Figure 7.1 records that 44-67% of women from OFWN, CVWiA, PCW and NWD held these positions. Established organisations members have more opportunity to lead within their own organisations due to multi-levelled hierarchies, a strong focus on meeting procedure, and a lobbying style that concentrates on ratification of proposals. The newer networks are more flat-structured, operate on a collective basis, and thus have less defined leadership positions. There is a strong expectation that members of the established organisations will undertake leadership within the organisation, and as one farmer’s wife from RWNZ Waikato noted, progression up the hierarchy is encouraged:

A lot of the older women would encourage you to take part and to take on a position like treasurer or secretary… and when you became familiar with it, you gained confidence… I think I was treasurer for the branch and then I was president twice at branch level, and then I went on to provincial level. I was treasurer for five years, and then I became provincial president as well (7-206I, farmer’s wife).
While this progression through the ranks of the older organisations is encouraged, many members clearly stated that there was a certain way of doing things, and older women imposed this formality. A younger CWAV member, who also belongs to newer network, CVWiA, explains that the women at the peak of the organisational structure are set in their ways and resist change:

> These old ladies down there [in Melbourne] they just live and breathe CWA, they really do. And they're not --- they don't want to change. Everything has to be done as it always was (6-153I, farmer).

Members of both established organisations and newer networks have commented on the power of “old girls’ networks” that can exist in these hierarchical structures, with a RWNZ Otago member explaining that this can be a deterrent to potential younger members:

> J: If you were getting anyone else coming through, they wouldn't get their ideas considered. Because a lot of them were a lot older and I think that's half the problem, and they can't see maybe what younger ones have good ideas. They almost had it worked out who was going to be president, secretary - no chance if you had a thought for someone else. DS: So sort of like an old girls’ club?

---

61 Within FWIO, CWAV and the two RWNZ regions these positions range from committee member to president, and are from branch to provincial/state/national levels.
J: Really, in a way. And you just sort of felt what's going to happen when they go? There'll be no one (3-57, farmer’s wife).

Younger farm women find the idea of “no meetings, no structures [which] you have to work your way through, or bat against” (8-210I, farmer) as appealing. Leadership in the newer networks is supported, but is seen as an action external to the network structure.

These differences in leadership expectations stem not only from structural aspects, but is also a result of the objectives of the organisations. The leadership style encouraged in established organisations focuses on the running of the organisation and reflects their service and community-oriented nature. In contrast, leadership in the newer networks is encouraged in external organisations and structures, predominantly in farm and agri-industry, and the style of leadership is much different from that of the administrative, formalised leadership of the established organisations.

To illustrate how these foci affect leadership, it is noticeable that members of established organisations talk of leadership in terms of administrative positions held in their organisation, and how that has given them confidence in other service clubs in the community. In broader terms they talk of the actions they, as part of an established organisation, have taken to provide for their rural community. Leaders from RWNZ and FWIO illustrate this point:

[RWNZ] spearheads getting things done in the community up there… I suppose you could call it community maintenance of property, buildings… (3-92I, farmer / off farm worker).

…at executive level [RWNZ act as] watchdog for rural communities really (3-86I, farmer / off farm worker).

Learn to do by doing. And I think that is exactly what WI does do. Somebody has got to do it, and you’ve got to take your turn and the WI has played a very active role in the community (1-39I, retired).

The value of the WI is that if you do have a community problem it is a basis from which to start to solve this problem, cause a lot of legislation has come out of lobbying by the Institute over the years I guess (1-12, farm manager).

In contrast to this strong community focus, members of newer network focus on supporting individual leadership in agri-industry. One leader from NWD explained:
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If one woman from the network feels okay about going to a meeting and asking a question and she would never have done that before, that’s just as much an achievement as women becoming directors in the industry. Those people probably already have a lot of skills and confidence, but knowing that the group is behind them and supporting them, they will perhaps think more seriously about standing than perhaps what they would have otherwise (8-210I, farmer).

This notion of network support, different from the structures of the established organisations, is expanded upon by a NWD member:

I would like to think that with the network… that those who want to progress beyond the farm gate will be able to with the support of the women in the network…. They are pretty much an island [and we need] to get that support out there for women who are wanting to go beyond the farm gate. Instead of having to do it on your own, and have to fight against this old boys’ network all the time (8-180I, farmer).

An OFWN member exemplifies this notion of leadership external to, and supported by, the network, commenting on her own leadership in agri-industry:

I'm appointed now from the Federal Agriculture minister to the Farm Debt Mediation Appeal Board, and I would hope that I was there because of my involvement, being a farm women and being very involved in the farming community, and what we have spoken out about with OFWN. I am on the local Federation of Agriculture, an elected position there, and I am also elected to be on the provincial board of the OFA. I'm on the Cultivation Authority Board. So I am now infiltrating them. I have no designs of ever being in the leadership position at the top. No designs of being president or on the executive. Where I see that I can make change, I will be on that committee. But I know that I can make change, so that's where I will be, in those effective areas. Certainly with OFWN and CFWN, and being on their boards I really have learned - part of my skill has been to be able to network with people effectively. I had learned through OFWN, some fundraising and specifically project writing skills (2-136I, farmer).

Members of both established organisations and newer networks refer to acting and leading. However, the focus of that action differs, with leadership in the older organisations being community driven, and that of the networks focusing on individual participation in the masculinised context of agri-industry (as will be shown in later in Sections 7.2.2 and 7.3). Opportunities to lead in external organisations are taken up by farm women from all the case study organisations; however, there is evidence (expanded upon in Section 7.2.2), that an organisation’s collective identity,
and the narrative identities favoured by members, play a determining part in the context in which leadership is undertaken.

Respondents to the Farm Women’s Questionnaire were asked to list the other farming organisations / networks to which they belonged, and these were clustered into seven types of organisations in addition to the case study organisations:

- **community organisations**, such as church, scouting, senior citizens, Lions, and museum groups;
- **other established organisations for women**, such as Country Women’s Institute, Catholic Women’s League, Business and Professional Women, National Council of Women, Associated Country Women of the World;
- **other farm women organisations**, such as Foundation for Australian Women in Agriculture, Women for the Survival of Agriculture, Women in Grains, Women for Rural Economic Development;
- **mainstream farming organisations**, such as Ontario Federation of Agriculture, Christian Federated Farmers of Ontario, Victoria Farmers’ Federation, Federated Farmers;
- **other farming organisations**, such as Farm Implements Board, discussion/monitor farms, Graze-L, Landcare, Farm Safety Council, Ontario Cattleman’s Association, Jersey New Zealand;
- **producer organisations**, such as Ontario Pork, United Dairymenfarms of Victoria, New Zealand Meat Board; and
- **youth farming organisations**, such as 4H, Young Farmers Clubs of New Zealand, Young Farmers (Australia), Junior Women’s Institute of Ontario, Country Girls.

The percentages of members of the case study organisations who belong to these other organisations are shown in Figure 7.2. Also inclusively shown on each bar is the subsequent percentage of those members who hold a leadership position in one of these other organisations.

As shown in Figure 7.2 membership of **community organisations** is evenly distributed between the established organisations and the newer networks, however members of
the older organisations are more likely to have a leadership role at local, provincial/state and national levels, whereas with newer network members leadership is more often at a local level. More importance is placed upon this community leadership by established organisations members, with interviewees focusing on this community involvement, reflecting the community/service objectives of their organisations. When asked about their leadership positions, replies were often similar to that made by a RWNZ member:

I work for the rural community. I think it is very important especially in isolated areas. I think we need to look after the generations coming (7-21II, retired).

The reasoning for belonging to these community organisations is to strengthen the rural community as a whole, and many established organisations members indicated this. While the data show networkers belong to community organisations, their involvement at a leadership level is not as heavy as their older counterparts, who often lamented the lack of involvement by younger farm women.

Involvement in other established women’s organisations is unlikely (see Figure 7.2), but is stronger in New Zealand than the other two countries. This is particularly so in the New Zealand networks, with leadership at a local level also being extremely likely. Similarly, membership of youth farming organisations is more likely in New Zealand, with all respondents having had a leadership position, predominantly at local levels (see Figure 7.2). For the older women of the established organisations this membership was in the Junior Women’s Institute of Ontario or Country Girls (NZ), which have a more domestic, community function, as opposed to 4-H (Ontario) and Young Farmers (NZ) membership for networkers.

---

62 While 4.2 looked at the wider contexts and the differences and similarities between the three countries, an explanation for this phenomenon is not provided. This highlights that further research is required to explain these differences.
Figure 7.2: Farming Women’s Organisations’ Members who are involved in Community Organisations, Other Established Women’s Organisations, Other Farm Women’s Organisations and Youth Farming Organisations
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Figure 7.2 cont.: Farming Women’s Organisations’ Members who are involved in Mainstream Farming Organisations, Other Farming Organisations, and Producer Organisations.
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Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, q40.
Members of the newer networks are more likely to belong to other farming women’s organisations than to community or established women’s organisations, particularly in Canada and Australia (see Figure 7.2). Leadership in these organisations is also strong, with provincial and state level positions, such as president and co-ordinator, held in Canada and Australia. Leadership in these other farming women’s organisations is closely linked with the case study networks, as is illustrated by comments from CVWiA and OFWN members:

Through AWiA and the support women give women, we have made tremendous inroads to all areas of government, business and community. It’s an avenue for issues to be discussed, evaluated, formulated and lobbied for (6-152Q, farmer).

I was involved in the early years before these organisations existed… I think that my involvement in the general community is directly the result of the things I learned through working to get the farm women’s organisations started. As a matter of fact my current involvement seems minor in terms of energies and time needed in earlier struggles. My community has benefits from those years when being a farm woman on any farm organisation was not only unique but demanded more of women in their efforts to establish their credibility and knowledge. (2-140Q, unpaid farm worker, off farm worker).

Networkers have found that leadership learnt in other farming women’s organisations has been beneficial in their taking up leadership in mainstream farming organisations, and an OFWN member’s comments on the development of her leadership skills:

[Women for the Survival of Agriculture] was a stepping stone to enter into male dominated organisations and feeling competent to take part in them. A lot of our members went on to different organisations and they became presidents of them for the first time in history (2-42Q, farmer).

This leadership undertaken in other farming women’s organisations has extended into similar positions in mainstream farming organisations, with CVWiA and OFWN members holding more leadership positions in comparison to all other case study organisation members (see Figure 7.2). While leadership was mostly at a local level, some members had held committee members positions at provincial/state level. Amongst the established organisations, CWAV members stood out as holding no leadership positions; and while the members of the three remaining organisations did hold some local leadership positions, FWIO members’ involvement in the two
Ontario mainstream farming organisations greatly reflected a government requirement to belong to one of these organisations for tax purposes.

Newer networks members have a much higher membership and subsequent leadership in *other farming organisations*, ranging from local to provincial / state (president) level (see Figure 7.2). Of the established organisations, members of the two RWNZ case studies have the higher participation, although mostly at a local level, and still considerably lower than newer networks members. In contrast, leadership in *producer organisations* is low overall (see Figure 7.2). It is stronger amongst network members, apart from CVWiA. OFWN and NWD membership in these organisations is held at a local leadership level, and while PCW has a lower leadership presence, it is at a national level. Of the established organisations, FWIO and RWNZ Waikato members hold mostly local leadership positions, with one Waikato member a national councillor for a producer group.

Respondents’ involvement in other farm related organisations are reflective of their membership of the case study organisations. Members of the newer networks are more likely to hold leadership positions in organisations that may be placed in the masculine context of farm and agri-industry, i.e. *mainstream farming organisations, farming and producer groups* (see Figure 7.3); and their involvement in *youth farming organisations* is oriented towards occupational aspects of farming. Their leadership in *other farming women’s organisations* indicates a challenge to masculinised forms of leadership in agri-industry, in that their focus stems from a farm family concern and not just economic. The exception to this is PCW, whose members are more likely to hold leadership in feminised organisations, such as *community organisations*, and *other established women’s organisations*, reflecting PCW’s organisations type as a competitive organisation, similar to RWNZ.

Overall, Farm Women Questionnaire data for leadership in other organisations showed that while members of the newer networks are involved in *community organisations*, this is not to such an extent as established organisations members, although their leadership in these organisations is as great. Members of established
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63 This is substantiated by anecdotal evidence such as the quote from this FWIO member: “basically we joined the OFA so we can get our taxes back” (1-30I, farmer’s wife).
organisations are strongly focused on their own organisation, and thus their leadership in other organisations is low in comparison with newer networks members. Their leadership in organisations placed in a masculine context is low, and while their leadership in those organisations which may be placed in a feminised context of service and community (community and other established women’s organisations) is higher, it is only slightly more than that of their newer networks counterparts. In keeping with this, their involvement in youth farming organisations has focused on organisations that are ‘feeders’ to the established organisations. Figure 7.3 shows the external leadership positions held by members of each case study organisation, comparing leadership in a feminised context (community and other established women’s organisations) and a masculinised context (mainstream farming organisations, other farming and producer organisations).

It highlights that in general members of the newer networks undertake more external leadership, and more leadership in a masculinised context. But more importantly, it also supports this thesis’ argument that RWNZ and PCW are exceptions to the binary notion of established organisations and newer networks, with higher and lower participation, respectively, in agri-industry reflecting the spaces created by these organisations.

**Figure 7.3: Members' Leadership in Other Organisations by Feminised or Masculinised Contexts**

---

Youth Farming Organisations were excluded from this particular analysis as the category encompasses both predominantly male and female groups.
Farm women’s involvement, and leadership positions, in these organisations external to the case study organisations, is indicative of collective identities which may be thematically associated with either the established organisations or the newer networks. Involvement in feminised community organisations and other established women’s organisations is predominately the domain of the women of the established organisations. While the newer network members are likely to be involved in these feminised contexts, they are more involved, and hold more leadership positions, in the masculinised contexts of mainstream farming organisations, farm and producer organisations, indicating an increased challenge to traditional leadership roles for farm women. Leadership within the case study organisations is also reflective of collective identity. The members of the established organisations are more likely to hold leadership positions in their own organisations (FWIO, CWAV and RWNZ), illustrating not only the hierarchical and formalised nature of these organisations, but also the creation of spaces from which members can act for change in their serialised condition, e.g. isolation, perceived need for voluntary work in the community. In contrast, the members of the newer networks are more likely to hold leadership positions external to their organisation (OFWN, CVWiA, PCW and NWD), indicative of collective identities that seek to challenge ontological narratives that traditionally limit farm women involvement in these wider farming organisations.

7.2.2 Organisational Spaces Encouraging Community and Industry Oriented Leadership

This section demonstrates that the spaces created by the organisations have steered subsequent leadership in farming organisations external to the case study organisations. It argues that organisational type and collective identity create an atmosphere where a particular type of leadership is more encouraged. Leadership skills gained within established organisations are more useful as a member of a rural community, promoting traditional service identities, whereas members of the newer networks are encouraged to expand their leadership skills into more farming and occupational arenas.

Respondents were asked in both the Farm Women Questionnaire and in in-depth interviews how, and if, their organisation had helped them as leaders in the community or agri-industry. Overwhelmingly members of the established
organisations considered their organisation as concentrating upon leadership in community context. A RWNZ Waikato member describes how this community focus extends from local branch to national conference level:

[Its more useful] probably as a community thing. Getting to know your neighbours. Getting to know their needs, where you can help them… things come up at conference where you have to discuss the needs of people (7-220I, farmer).

A FWIO and a RWNZ member, respectively, comment upon specific strategies that have helped develop community leadership skills:

Women have learned leadership skills, how to present their ideas to small groups, speak out about issues, send resolutions on to higher levels and to change the ‘rules’. WI has been responsible for many changes – home economics… in public schools… (1-20Q, retired).

[RWNZ] can have a very good influence on the districts you live in. [As a member you can] lead… your district in raising money for good causes [by] filling in [and] producing submissions… (3-107Q, farmer’s wife).

Established organisations’ collective identities as service and community oriented reflect members’ proclivity to practise their leadership skills in their community. This RWNZ Waikato members explains how she has utilised the leadership skills RWNZ has given her:

Every opportunity has been made available to me… from being a member to being president was a tremendous growth in me which set me up to be more involved in other organisations and become involved in leadership roles. It developed my sense of caring and charity works (7-220Q, farmer).

This strong focus on leadership in community resulted in many established organisation members commenting that the organisations did not actively encourage involvement and leadership in agri-industry matters from within the organisations, and thus the focus was more on community matters. This is illustrated across all three established organisations by these comments from members:

We are interested, intensely interested in education and welfare of rural families, and health – intensely. And that is something that perhaps [RWNZ] does better then Federated Farmers. And [so] we may leave the more dairy board and deregulation and all that more to the Federated Farmers… (3-69I, farmer’s wife).
You’re encouraged [by FWIO] to work on projects and concerns that are in your local community. That is still encouraged, that’s strongly encouraged. You’ll find that a very important thing across the WI (1-29, off farm worker).

[At CWAV] you can’t sit and talk to a lot of women about farming. We had an issue the other night. We were talking about de-regulation. And one of the women had had no idea what she was actually saying. She had heard her husband talking briefly. But she hadn't done any groundwork; she didn't know where she was coming from. And I thought I don't know if there's anyone else in this room that knows what it really means. And that's what it's like, they have want to make decisions about it, but have no idea about the farming industry (6-153, farmer).

In contrast to the community-oriented leadership of the older organisations, newer networks members saw their leadership skills being utilised in the masculinised context of agri-industry and that this was encouraged by their organisation. Many members envisage their networks as promoting change amongst members as well as male dominated farming organisations. In the case of CVWiA and NWD, members noted:

This organisation has been a pivotal network for CHANGE [her emphasis]... we have seen women change from shy ‘farmer’s wife’ to members of commodity boards, members of industry policy watchdogs, scholarship winners, leadership participants, willing to arrange / delegate / evaluate (6-141Q, farmer).

I would like [NWD] to help them and mentor them, to be able to get on their feet in a room that might have six or seven hundred farmers, maybe 95% of men and be able to say what they think, be able to debate an issue with rigour, and also stand for positions of responsibility in the industry (NWD Key Informant Interview 2, pers. com., 1998).

This change extends to members themselves, encouraging the adoption of new identities, by encouraging certain directions for leadership:

OFWN has helped make clear our ‘job description’; where we are seen or heard in our industry’ clarified where we should direct our energies for changes we needed to make. It is an uphill battle for this professionalisation which tends to wear our energies but OFWN has definitely helped mould this identity (2-136Q, farmer).

In addition to this strong focus on leadership in agri-industry, the newer networks also encourage leadership that focuses on social aspects, and the following quote about
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65 This respondent is a member of both CWAV and CVWiA.
leadership illustrates the Canadian and Australian networks’ farm women and farm family objectives:

OFWN has contributed to the credibility and legitimacy of farm women. They can more easily participate politically (government appointments and as candidates on commodity and general farming organisations) and OFWN’s projects have contributed to larger discussions on childcare and the environment. Farm women are running for office on other groups (Ontario Federation of Agriculture, commodity associations) and winning seats. (2-37Q, off farm worker).

These data indicate that there is a clear difference between the established organisations and the newer networks in the types of leadership encouraged amongst members. There is a distinct indication in the established organisations that members are more focused on community and service-oriented leadership, reflecting the collective identities of these organisations, and that the leadership skills learnt are helpful as farm women with a community focus as opposed to a farm industry focus. Newer networks members’ leadership exemplifies the farm and agri-industry collective identity, with encouragement focusing on change and participation mostly in a masculinised context. A number of the quotes above have touched on the importance of the organisations in driving the focus of leadership; and their role in creating spaces for leadership is an important factor in effecting resistance and challenge (Routledge, 1997). The following section expands upon this, discussing the importance of creating spaces and opportunities for realising potential and leading from the farm women’s point of view.

### 7.2.3 Importance of Organisations in Creating Spaces for Leadership

The spaces for leadership created by established organisations are substantially different from those created by the newer networks and reflect the organisational types and collective identities of the organisations themselves. The established organisations are considered by members to create more formalised spaces for leadership, whereas the newer networks members celebrate the informal and individualised spaces created for leadership (Atwell, 1995; Kenny, 1994).

---

66 These formalised spaces are influenced not only by the hierarchical structure of the established organisations, but also by their high specialisation illustrated by regular meetings, rules and procedures.
Most members of the established organisations had leadership positions within their organisation, reflecting the formalised and hierarchical nature of the older organisations. Members described undertaking a number of positions at branch level, progressing through the structure to undertake positions at provincial or state levels. This progression through the ranks creates a formalised space for leadership, conveying to members a sense of professionalism. Training was indicated to be important in preparing for these leadership positions. This comment from an FWIO member shows the spaces that this organisation creates to support this type of leadership. Through this type of account we see that the workshop environment is a supportive learning space where leadership training is gained.

It's incredible how much I have learnt, because I sure was nervous. I would never conduct a meeting…. But they have workshops, if you decide to become secretary or president in the branch. They conduct … leadership training for presidents and three other of the officers. So if you are in one of these district offices, …or someone who is working towards that position, you go [to a] whole day’s workshop [about] what presidents do, and how you run meetings and how you conduct things. …And district representatives hold workshops for all their branch officers. So it soon filters down… so you get professional teaching… the training in that was invaluable (1-29I, off farm worker).

Linked with this formality and sense of professionalism, is the provision of hierarchical spaces for leadership. The spatial scales of the organisation convey the hierarchy of activity and authority and the members see working through positions at the various levels of an organisation as providing them with ongoing leadership skills:

I worked up through WI as president of the branch, and I was District president and then I was moved up to Area. I stayed on the executive for about 5 years and I got off. And I ran a couple of times for the Provincial board and lost out both times… But it certainly helped me grow. I had to stand in front of 100 people and talk. I had to conduct a meeting. So, it gave me a lot of skills (2-14I, farmer’s wife).

More importantly, members’ progression through the ranks provides them with a sense of endorsement that those at national or provincial level are asserting the concerns of the grassroots branch members. A RWNZ member outlines her leadership at the higher levels of the organisation, and her subsequent sense of validation:
[I’ve held] all the offices at branch, and provincial. I’ve been provincial secretary [and] president, and involved in conferences and AGMs. It enabled me to meet all the delegates and everybody right throughout New Zealand. And just being in with Council, you got to know all the councillors. And I think it was probably the best thing that could have happened to me, because it gave me, immediately, a wider look at what [RWNZ] means to New Zealand women, because we have such a strong access to government. Our voice is recognised as rural women, as rural not just women, but a rural spokesperson. And I’ve been involved right through (3-98I, retired farmer’s wife).

There are, however, negative aspects to this hierarchy and the subsequent leadership positions that must be filled, particularly as members age, and their interest in the organisation becomes more social rather than based upon lobbying for change and undertaking leadership positions. RWNZ members were more likely to comment on this conflict of interest, a reflection of the organisation’s competitive organisational type, as opposed to FWIO and CWAV’s co-operative status. Comments from two RWNZ members were typical of this sentiment:

Some members would like to be [more concerned about rural policy at branch level] but overall you tend to find that you’ve got one or two people that would like to do that, but the others aren’t really interested. I mean its bad enough getting people to take office bearing positions, because they just haven’t got the time, or they’re really not interested. If it doesn’t affect you personally it’s a bit hard to get the women keen or fired up about it (3-92I, farmer).

I despair of the women around here! It’s a social club. They’re really interested in the speaker and the social thing afterwards, [but]… they never really discuss the remits and the interesting stuff that we get. Its always tabled. I put the most interesting stuff on the table and nobody picks it up (3-129I, farmer’s wife).

This conflict between social and lobbying aside, members of established organisations consider that these spaces for leadership created by their organisations are recognised spaces that give their leadership efforts a sense of validity and worth:

It just opens up the whole organisation and you realise how closely they work with parliament… in trying to make things better for rural communities…. And your voice is listened to, and I think that makes you realise that [although] sometimes you think [the issues] have got shoved in the bottom drawer, … they aren’t – they’ve all gone through (3-68I, farmer’s wife).
The spaces for leadership created by established organisations are very formalised and hierarchical, reflecting notions of ‘pinnacle leadership’ or ‘elite spaces’, spaces which are permeated with this sense of authority (Liepins, 1998b). They provide members with a particular type of leadership, one which is institutionalised as opposed to individual. Members feel that their leadership is supported by a huge grassroots-based organisation, however this does not necessarily encourage individual leadership such as is apparent in the newer networks; and as argued in Chapters Four and Five, this can considerably slow action.

In contrast to the very structured nature of the established organisations leadership, the newer networks members advocate the informal and individualistic leadership spaces created by their organisations. Rather than teaching members formalised meeting and resolution procedure, the newer networks seek to provide members with information that helps them to act as leaders. The spaces they create are more informal and at times are more flexible and accessible, for example, farms walks and email discussions, and enable the fast and immediate flow and exchange of information. This provision of information is highlighted by members of all four networks, and is seen as an important strategic space for upgrading women’s leadership skills. An OFWN member, who also argues that along with this information, the support of the network is also vital in acting upon new leadership skills, expands upon this point:

They give you information to work with, and if you take the time to read their bulletins, and if you take the time to go to their net, then you come armed with the expertise, not just with what you see on your own farm, but what you get from other farm women. I think the network is important, so that we have a rural voice. If we don’t have that network, we do not have a voice for that group (2-31, farmer / primary caregiver).

Most importantly, newer networks have created spaces for the recognition for farm women as leaders in agri-industry, acting as a stepping stone to wider involvement in agri-industry. This is exemplified by the strong numbers of newer networks members in leadership positions in male dominated agri industry organisations. Spaces for leadership have been opened up by initiatives such as OFWN’s *Let Us Introduce Yourselves* (1992) booklet detailing members’ skills and capabilities and marketed to the agri-industry. In the case of NWD, members belong to many other agri-industry
groups, acting as discussion group co-ordinators, supplier representatives, and who contribute the knowledge gained by networking with others to the information distributed amongst the network. An OFWN member argues that the recognition that such strategies and networking has created has meant that members’ leadership in agri-industry is more than just nominal, but active and challenging:

If there is a woman that has been appointed to a board, a farm woman, it may just happen that she is a WI member. It is not because she is a WI member of a dynamic agricultural committee, that she would be [on that board]. And I’m appointed [by] the Federal Agriculture minister to the Farm Debt Mediation Appeal Board, and I would hope that I was there because of my involvement, being a farm woman and being very involved in the farming community, and what we have spoken about with OFWN (2-136I, farmer).

A strong sense of organisational backing is still sensed by network members, even though there is a more informal basis for creating spaces and strategies for leadership amongst members. The ways in which leadership is acted out, or undertaken, is different between the two types of organisations, reflecting the very different natures of the established organisations and the newer networks. Formal leadership reflects the structured and hierarchal nature of the established organisations; informality and individual leadership parallels the more organic and action driven natures of the newer networks.

7.2.4 Spaces for Enhancing Leadership in Other Contexts

As well as occupying different spaces of leadership, farm women are also likely to seek the development of their leadership skills differently in other contexts, depending on their organisational membership. Respondents were asked if other farming or rural organisations had contributed to their leadership skills. This section highlights particular themes derived from the responses that parallel organisational collective identities determined in Chapters Four and Five, suggesting that the external spaces in which members develop their leadership skills are situated in similar ways, with regard to community or agri-industry arenas, as the spaces their own organisations create. Few members of the established organisations felt that involvement in other organisations had developed their leadership skills; and those that did listed community organisations. Any exceptions to this theme were likely to occur amongst
members of RWNZ. One member outlined her involvement in farm-based leadership training and organisations:


This agri-industry-based training outlined above was uncommon amongst members of FWIO and CWAV; however, it was frequent amongst members of the newer networks. The exception to this were PCW members, who were more likely than other network members to participate in “organisations that have nothing to do with farming, [but are however] mainly women dominant and provide untold opportunities for women to gain leadership… skills” (4-99Q, farmer/ off farm worker). Farm women from the three other networks were often involved in farm-based leadership training stemming from their involvement in farming and producer organisations. However, they too mention other community and women dominant organisations as sites of leadership training. Quotes from members of these three networks (OFWN, CVWiA and NWD) exemplify this multi-faceted nature of their leadership development:

[I have done an] Advanced Agricultural Leadership Program. [I was] vice chair of the Farm practices Protection Board [and they] have provided training. I co-ordinate three major agricultural awareness activities locally for over 2000 students and 3500 general public. [I am the] chair of membership and marketing committee for an agriculture-based non-profit organisation, which enhanced my skills… (2-26Q, farmer).

[I have attended] pastoral and general conferences of the Victorian Farmers’ Federation. Served as State president of the Grassland Society, and as State President of the Soil Conservation Association. [I have also

\(^7\) The Kellogg Rural Leadership Programme, which has been running since 1979, aims to further the leadership skills of participants or to give them the skills required to become good leaders. The programme begins with a 10 day residential course. Participants then undertake a research project related to rural New Zealand. The third phase of the course includes spending three days in Wellington presenting the projects, and interviewing prominent industry and rural leaders. Source: website http://www.employmentmatters.net.nz/story.asp?id=439 July 2002.
been an office bearer in CWA and local community groups (6-174Q, farmer).

Being involved in all sorts of organisations (not necessarily farming / rural) and taking a role (secretary / treasurer / committee / chairperson) has given me these [leadership] skills. [This has been] reinforced by Kellogg Rural Leadership. I’ve held leadership positions and learnt skills in Plunket, kindergarten, school PTAs, local CWI committee, NZDG “committee man”, LIC liaison, district councillor, local rural support group, conservation board member, farm environment award trust member and judge, stream care group (8-201Q, off farm worker) [edited].

These quotes, in particular the last one, demonstrate the range of avenues where members of newer networks learn and exercise leadership skills, in both community and agri-industry. This contrast with established organisations members is further demonstrated by the dominance of more formal leadership training. Respondents were asked if they had undertaken any of the following training courses: rural leadership, management, community leadership, employment-based, or on job training. Very few had undertaken such training, but those that had overwhelmingly belonged to the newer networks, in particular OFWN and NWD.

In summary, the data has indicated that the external spaces (other organisations) for developing leadership skills favoured by members of FWIO, CWAV, and, to a lesser extent, RWNZ, parallel the spaces their organisations create for leadership. These spaces are predominantly in the feminised context of community. In contrast, the members of OFWN, CVWiA, NWD and, to a lesser extent, PCW, favour external spaces for the enhancing of leadership skills that co-exist with the network-created spaces in the masculinised context of agri-industry.

Overall, Section 7.2 has shown that certain organisations support particular forms of leadership amongst members through the spaces they create. Valocchi (2001) contends that organisations create spaces in which members can politicise and practise certain identities. This section has demonstrated that these spaces are determined by organisational collective identity. It has also shown that there is a link between forms of leadership and the contexts within which they are performed, and the spaces created that support the expression of certain identities. It is from within
these spaces that farm women may maintain or challenge dominant identities for farm women.

It was shown in Section 7.2.1 that members’ conception of leadership reflected organisational collective identity. Members of the established organisations envisaged leadership as administrative and formalised reflecting the ‘pinnacle’ leadership that supports these hierarchical organisations. In contrast, members of the newer networks saw leadership as mentoring others and advancing change, and as informal and relatively unstructured, once again reflecting the collective nature of the networks’ collective identities. This section also examined how members performed leadership in practice. The members of the established organisations predominantly held leadership positions in their own organisations, and any external leadership was mostly in the feminised context of community. The exception to this was RWNZ whose participation in agri-industry was slightly higher. The collective identity of the newer networks does not lend itself to a plethora of leadership positions within the organisations, and members prefer the informality and collective nature of the networks. The newer networks create spaces to support individual leadership, mainly in agri-industry. This is reflected in their high involvement in external organisations. Their leadership in the feminised context of community is similar to that of the established organisations’ members, and was particularly prominent amongst PCW members. However, they are much more likely to hold leadership positions in the masculinised context of agri-industry, excepting PCW members, whose leadership in this context is similar to that of RWNZ members.

Section 7.2.2 argued that the spaces created by the organisations has steered other leadership in external groups. The data showed that certain types of organisations create an atmosphere where particular types of leadership are encouraged. Thus, the collective identities of the established organisations create spaces that encourage leadership in community groups; and similarly the collective identities of the newer networks create spaces encouraging leadership in agri-industry. Section 7.2.3 continued to develop this argument, by examining the spaces that the organisations create for the development of leadership, contending that the organisations’ collective identities influence the construction of these spaces. This section demonstrated that the established organisations create more formalised spaces, encouraging a
hierarchical and administrative type of leadership; and that the newer networks informal and flexible spaces encourage an organic and action driven leadership. Finally, Section 7.2.4 argued that farm women’s development of their leadership skills in external groups parallels the spaces created by the farming women's organisations to which they belong. It showed that the members of the established organisations, with the partial exception of RWNZ, had no real development of leadership skills in external groups, apart from community groups. Newer networks members, except for those of PCW sought and underwent leadership training stemming from agri-industry organisations.

Throughout Section 7.2, it has been demonstrated that there is a clear link between members’ conceptualisation of leadership, the spaces created by the organisations for its performance, the contexts within which leadership positions are held, and the collective identities of the organisations. While generational differences between the organisations are visible, organisational type plays a predominant role in placing these organisations on a continuum of leadership (Yoder, 2001). FWIO and CWAV members practise their leadership with reactive communality (Carli, 2001; Eagly and Johannsen-Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001; Yoder, 2001), formally, mainly in their own organisations, and externally in a feminised context of community. Towards the other end of the continuum, OFWN, CVWiA and NWD members practise their leadership with agentic competence (Carli, 2001; Eagly and Johannsen-Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001; Yoder, 2001), and predominantly in external organisations placed in a masculinised context of agri-industry.

Section 7.3 continues to build this argument, considering farm women’s engagement with ontological narratives, and how this impacts on their participation in leadership in the farming community and industry. Section 7.4 concludes this chapter by focusing on the maintaining or challenging nature of leadership (as a form of collective action) on dominant identities for farm women.
7.3 Engaging with Ontological Narratives: Impact of Wider Narratives in Performing Leadership

The ontological narratives that circulate amongst rural social practices, relations and institutions provide frameworks for constructing certain ways of seeing and understanding farm women in leadership positions. How these ontological narratives contribute to the construction of farm women’s own narrative identities and subsequent collective action through leadership differs amongst the case study organisations. This section identifies organisational themes that indicate that members of the newer networks are more likely to challenge or resist traditional service-based leadership in the community by acting in the masculinised context of farm and agri-industry. In doing so it draws upon data from the Farm Women Questionnaire, in-depth interviews and internet websites.

Section 7.3.1 examines contemporary ruralities with regard to leadership in both community and agri-industry, illustrating that wider ontological narratives have supported leadership in feminised contexts. Section 7.3.2 analyses organisational themes with regard to leadership constraints perceived and recognised by farm women, concluding that there is a strong need for farming women's organisations to provide spaces where farm women can practise leadership skills, enabling confidence in overcoming leadership deterrents, and thereby challenge the dominant ontological narratives influencing the construction of identities for farm women. These ontological narratives which circulate in, and inform, rural social practices, relations and institutions position farm women as leaders in the community as opposed to agri-industry. As outlined in Chapter Two (Section 2.5.2), previous research on farm women’s leadership has indicated that their leadership is marginalised, under-represented and secondary to men’s leadership (Alston, 2000; Pini, 2002; Sachs, 1996; Wells, 1998).

7.3.1 Leadership in the Wider Context: Feminised and Masculinised Contexts

Social practices, relations and institutions perceptible in the rural communities in which the members of the case study organisations enact their everyday life, are similar in that there is support for certain identities for farm women and the leadership they undertake in these institutions. Community leadership supports and thereby
maintains wider ontological narratives; with leadership in farm and agri-industry challenging these hegemonic discourses. As contended in Chapter Two, female leadership which is undertaken in a traditionally masculine space challenges the ontological narratives which surround farm women (Eagly and Johannsen-Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001). Societal expectations presuppose that men will behave with agentic competence and that women will act communally (Carli, 2001: 726); therefore women who choose to act agentially are much more likely to challenge traditional ruralities and their practices, relations and institutions.

As outlined in Chapter Two, there has been little research on farm women’s leadership roles in the community (see for examples of this research: Alston, 2000; Sachs, 1996; Wells, 1998). However, what previous research exists does indicate that this community leadership, and the associated power, plays a very important function in maintaining dominant discourses regarding farm women (Little, 2002); one which places farm women in a traditional and feminised service context. Research on farm women's leadership has focused on their involvement in mainstream farming organisations and organisations such as commodity boards. The remainder of this section examines data obtained from publications commissioned by government departments and the websites of a number of mainstream farming organisations, illustrating the contemporary position of women in agri-industry. Tables D.1-D.3 in Appendix D illustrate the participation of women in a variety of agricultural producer, commodity, marketing and policy-making bodies.

Ontario, Canada

Nieman, working for the Canadian Agricultural and Rural Restructuring Group, undertook a survey in 1989 which showed that only 8.5% of 331 executive positions on marketing boards/commissions and commodity associations were held by women (1996: 1). Table D.1 shows current statistics for a number of those organisations. From the statistics available, it is hard to make an actual comparison between the individual organisations surveyed in 1989, and the organisations in Table D.1. Analysis shows that women’s leadership participation may have increased by approximately 4%. However, the figures in Table D.1 indicate a marked gulf between women’s participation in mainstream farming organisations and their contribution to
the farming industry, and this is indicated by the sense of isolation expressed by one OFWN member:

DS: Are there many other women that go to these [mainstream] meetings?
B: oh sometimes I'm the only one, sometimes there's two or three others. And about 6-10-15-20 men. But that doesn't bother me. The problem is, in most of these [committees] that I'm on, or have been on, the women that are there are there as paid bureaucrats, and the thing that bugs me most of all is that I am the only unpaid person attending that meeting. And that meeting, the full expenses for that meeting are coming out of my food budget on the farm (2-16I, farmer).

Her final comments indicate a lack of farm women who are involved in leadership positions in agri-industry in Ontario. However, comments from another OFWN member demonstrate improvement over the last decade:

Even though the OFA still plays old boys games, more women are joining. I tried the Federation 10 years ago and left. Today I have been successful in elections against some men and I think I have gained respect with my work for farm women and families and business in general (2-136Q, farmer).

Victoria, Australia

In 1995, the Australian Federal Government made a commitment to increase the level of participation of women on agricultural boards from 6% to 50% by the year 2000 (Grace, 1997: 41). A 1998 government publication stated that women occupied less than 20% of paid management and boards of management positions in the agricultural sector (SCARM, 1998: 2). Table D.2 collates statistics available from a number of specifically Victorian-based organisations and some larger Australian-wide boards and councils. It appears that in Victoria, and in Australia generally, the level of leadership participation by farm women in mainstream farming organisations has not increased to the levels desired by the Federal Government. As with Ontario, it is difficult to make an accurate comparison between years, as participation levels for particular organisations are not available. However, leadership by farm women is still below 20% as in 1998, and far below the desired 50% level for 2000. Farm women from both CVWiA and CWAV commented on the mainstream farming organisations encouraging dual membership to farming couples, but even so say this will not outweigh discrimination against, and harassment of, women in these organisations. Two Victorian farm women recount their experiences in the VFF and UDV:
After many years of treating women as invisible farmers the VFF at first grudgingly, now generally, accept women who step forward. They do not necessarily help/invite women to step forward in the first place (6-141Q, farmer).

One time I said what my understanding of the speaker's views were in plain English as others appeared to be confused. The speaker said I had understood him correctly - I never agreed with him, just wanted to know if I'd understood his interpretation. Other men attending, attacked my husband verbally of my speaking - he in turn was annoyed - so I never went again 5-154Q, farmer’s wife).

*Otago and Waikato, New Zealand*

In 1993, there were 23 producer and agricultural boards in New Zealand. 176 members, of whom only 12% were women, controlled these boards. Most of the boards had no women members and the highest number of women in any one organisation was four (Rivers et al., 1997: 35). The figures in Table D.3 indicate that this has improved only slightly to approximately 15%. In a minority of these boards, the percentage of women has increased over recent years, but in others it has remained at a level that does not adequately reflect women’s contribution, or it has decreased as in the case of the Agriculture Industry Training Organisation, a farm-training group. Some of these boards still have no women in leadership positions, or those that are present are by virtue of government appointment. This was reiterated by a founding members of NWD, an elected director of a producer organisation, who commented that she was one of a select few elected women in agri-industry, and that the numbers were decreasing rather than rising (NWD Key Informant Interview, pers. com., 1998). Although women are involved on a voluntary basis at lower levels, the decision making and lobbying in these mainstream organisations is still dominated by men (8-210Q, farmer).

A comparison between the contribution of farm women established by previous research analysed in Chapter Two and the statistics presented above, indicates that in all three countries the leadership positions of women in agri-industry and policy making organisations do not accurately reflect their contribution to the industry. Farm women’s leadership, whether in the community or the agri-industry, appears to be undervalued or disproportionate to the contribution they make to farming and farming communities. This thesis argues that although farm women’s leadership in agri-
industry is unequal to their contribution, their collective action may challenge traditional ruralities, which place farm women’s leadership in the feminised context of community. There is however, based on the continuum of leadership (reactive communality – agentic competence) (Yoder, 2001), a wide variance of that challenge. The established organisations are less likely to challenge farm women positioning in this feminised context, whereas the newer networks are more likely to do so.

These challenges are met with resistance as the social practices, relations and institutions that construct contemporary ruralities are renegotiated by farm women. Constraints, such as credibility, often perceived as placed upon women seeking leadership positions are expanded upon in Section 7.3.2. It is argued that members of the newer networks are overall substantially more likely to perceive and recognise constraints or deterrents towards either themselves or other farm women participating in mainstream farming organisations in a leadership position.

7.3.2 Deterrents Perceived and Recognised
Attitudes and practices prevailing in mainstream farming organisations have often been perceived as deterring farm women from participating at leadership levels (Alston, 2000). The following section examines the deterrents perceived by respondents either for themselves or for other farm women, which help to reinforce and maintain gendered identities for farm women (Shortall, 1999). Organisational themes are apparent and in line with leadership positions and identities already identified in this chapter. Members of the newer networks are more perceptive and challenging of deterrents that maintain traditional leadership roles for farm women. The one established organisation that is more aware of these deterrents than its counterparts is RWNZ, reflecting its different collective identity and the recognition of occupational as well as service identities by members. Organisational, personal and attitudinal deterrents, extracted from the Farm Women’s Questionnaire, are analysed, with more detail provided in Matrix 7.1.

Organisational deterrents were much more readily recognised by members of the newer networks, the exception being OFWN. Location, formality and timing of meetings were perceived as deterring both respondents and other farm women. While most felt that women were encouraged to participate and lead in farming
organisations, a small number of newer networks members considered that farm women’s opinions were often ignored, citing a fellow farm woman’s experience:

One of my friends goes to United Dairyfarmers of Victoria meetings and things like that, but she’s just got really frustrated by it. She says she feels like a Peter in a Pumpkin, [that] nobody wants to listen to what a woman’s got to say. So she backed right off (6–153I, farmer).

This type of deterrent is linked to a lack of confidence by farm women that their opinion is informed and knowledgeable. Whereas very few respondents saw this as a deterrent for themselves, during interviews it was apparent that most women had experienced a lack of confidence that had hampered their involvement in mainstream farming organisations. While mostly newer networks members considered that relevant experience was helpful in leadership positions, a strong majority of all respondents indicated that knowledge and competence increased comfort levels in leadership positions. Two FWIO members relate their experiences, highlighting the need for mentoring and organisational support:

I must admit I was afraid to ask my question publicly. And I wished afterwards that I had and so did [the speaker]. I asked the question afterwards. [But] every time you go to one, and especially if its predominantly men that are there, you get more confident about raising an issue that’s personal to you and you also feel more confident in understanding what is thrown back at you (1-12I, farm manager / off farm worker).

I was more confident in talking than if I had been the only woman on the Farm Implement Board. I think I would have been inclined to say less. I think you are intimidated and it was a new thing for me (2–14I, farmer’s wife).  

A lack of confidence may also be not so much internalised, but this may be forced upon farm women, due to attitudes prevailing in meetings, such as one farm woman’s experience related below:

I’ve been to the factory meetings, and you’d have to be very brave to stand up at one of those. They absolutely ridicule new speakers when they get up… so let alone someone not very confident getting up and making a bit of a fool of themselves. They’d put you down so quickly (7–208I, farmer).

68 Respondent 2-14 also belonged to FWIO and had higher participation in that organisation than OFWN.
Matrix 7.1: Perceived deterrents to participating in mainstream farming/industry organisations for respondents and other farm women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Deterrents</th>
<th>Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues not relevant</td>
<td>Minority thought issues not relevant for self and other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of meetings</td>
<td>Only approximately half of PCW and NWD members thought the location of meetings was a deterrent for themselves, and 71% of NWD considered this a deterrent for other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of meetings</td>
<td>Only approximately half of PCW and NWD members thought the time of meetings was a deterrent for themselves, and 71% of NWD considered this a deterrent for other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings too formal</td>
<td>Not a deterrent for members; but this was considered a deterrent for other farm women by half of CVWIA and NWD members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women not encouraged</td>
<td>Majority felt they were encouraged. However half of NWD members were concerned other farm women might not feel encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner is member</td>
<td>Majority felt that their partner already being a member was not a deterrent for themselves, although half of NWD members felt this was for other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No individual voting rights</td>
<td>Not a deterrent for selves or other farm women.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Deterrents</th>
<th>Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of childcare</td>
<td>Not a deterrent for selves; however, FWIO, OFWN, PCW, and more so, NWD members felt this was a deterrent for other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel arrangements and/or distance</td>
<td>Approximately half of OFWN, PCW, CWAV and NWD members considered travel a deterrent for themselves. Half of OFWN and CVWIA and most NWD members felt this was a deterrent to other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Constraints</td>
<td>Most felt this was not a deterrent for themselves or other farm women. However, almost half of OFWN and PCW members consider relevant for themselves and similarly half of OFWN and NWD saw it as a deterrent for other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>Majority felt that lack of time was a deterrent both for themselves and other farm women, particularly NWD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td>Mostly not seen as a deterrent for selves or other farm women. Half of CVWIA and most of NWD did see it as a deterrent for others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commitments</td>
<td>Half of OFWN, RWNZ and PCW, and a majority of NWD members saw this as a deterrent for themselves and other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relevancy</td>
<td>Not see as a deterrent except by half of NWD members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudinal Deterrents</th>
<th>Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Boys attitude</td>
<td>Members of the established organisations did not see this as deterrent for themselves or other farm women. CVWIA did not see it as a deterrent for themselves, and PCW felt it did not deter other farm women. A majority of NWD members considered it a deterrent for themselves and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism/discrimination</td>
<td>None thought that sexism was a barrier for themselves. However, half of CVWIA and NWD members felt it was for other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from partner</td>
<td>Majority felt that their partners supported them. There was an increased awareness that this may not be so for all farm women, particularly amongst RWNZ and NWD members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from family</td>
<td>Majority felt that their family supported them, though there was an awareness amongst RWNZ and NWD that this may be a deterrent for other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from actual organisation</td>
<td>A strong majority felt that the organisation supported them and other farm women, however half of NWD members felt this may be a deterrent for others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other women</td>
<td>Strong majority felt that other women supported them, although there was an increased awareness amongst members of RWNZ, OFWN and NWD that this was not so for all farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from community</td>
<td>Strong majority felt that community supported them and other farm women, however, a majority of NWD members considered it a deterrent for other farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally feel not a role for women</td>
<td>Not many felt that leadership was not a role for them, however there was increased awareness across all respondents that this was not the case for all farm women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>Strong majority of respondents interested, but once again increased awareness that other farm women may not be interested, particularly RWNZ and NWD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, Q49-50.
Attitudinal deterrents are predominantly recognised by newer networks’ members, in particular NWD, with respondents contending that a strong sense of self esteem is required to continue in the face of some of these attitudes. RWNZ stands out as the only established organisation whose members substantially recognise attitudes that deter women from leadership positions in farming organisations. Many women described coming up against the Old Boys’ attitude and sexism. A NWD respondent outlines a fellow member’s battle to lead a mainstream farming organisation, touching on traditional masculine attitudes:

You know, [my friend] struck it. She always wears skirts, when she would have been better off wearing trousers. Why was she wearing a skirt? And here she is being a female. Why can she not be a director, being a feminine female? Cause we have a lot to offer. But no, it gets back down to we've got to look like the men. If a woman is attractive then the men will say oh yeah how did she get there? Who's ladder did she climb? Or who did she hop into bed with? All these innuendoes. And you might say well you're not going to take any notice, but after a wee while they must wear them down. They have to wear people down if you are getting those innuendoes all the time. What would happen? They would turn around and say how the hell did you get there. Instead of for her brain, her intelligence, her ideas and her thoughts, it’s more the use of the body, because it’s this male attitude. I'm not saying its all the time but it does happen unfortunately. I believe in women being women. They have an important contribution to make, and that they don't have to change themselves to be effective or to make changes (8-180I, farmer).

This male expectation that women should act like men, is also acknowledged by an OFWN member, commenting on other women’s success in male dominated contexts:

[Farm women don’t have any influence in the OFA] unless you can wear the pants and act like a man. If you can be dubbed an honorary male you can get somewhere. [and if you don't want to play their games] you're a weeping woman. They call us weeping women (2-16I, farmer / off farm worker).

Battling male attitudes to women’s position in farming organisations is further personalised by this the same respondent:

Probably the big thing I've learned when I go in with a lot of men, is to shut up, because they don't want to hear the women's point of view usually, unless they specifically ask for it. I remember a meeting one time, and they said they wanted to have a brainstorming session. My understanding of a brainstorming session is that everybody just throws out the ideas. They put them down on paper, they do all the things with them that they have to do - categorise them, throw out the bad, develop the good, work on it. They weren't doing a brainstorming session at all! I realised that - shut up! It was an environmental [committee] - an off
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They did not want opinions period. And now, from there on, when I go to a male meeting, a male dominated meeting I always make sure everybody knows I'm there by seconding the minutes, for the approval of the minutes. I make one statement in the middle. I make one statement at the end. I write out the statement and try to have my question that I ask less than 20 words, and I don't contribute other than that coz they don't want to hear it (2-16I, farmer / off farm worker).

Although most established organisations members did not see an "Old Boys’ attitude" or sexism as deterrents, a RWNZ member says it is apparent, although other men usually temper sexist attitudes:

I think because I was a little bit older I was more comfortable with them, and … I can imagine that some of the women would feel uncomfortable. Because some of the men can make scathing remarks, personal remarks and there’s not need for them. But I think the other men usually put them down pretty good. It is… it can be quite nerve wracking to try and ask questions… nobody likes to feel a fool (7-190I, farmer / farmer’s wife).

The majority of respondents feeling that their partners, families, community and organisations supported them in these roles demonstrates increasing recognition of the right for women to participate in leadership positions in farming organisations. However, amongst all respondents, but particularly those in the newer networks and RWNZ there was an increased awareness that this may not be so for all farm women. In addition, support from other members and other women are considered, by newer networks members, as crucial to successful leadership. Teamed with an across the board recognition that not all farm women feel that it is their right to lead in farming organisations, this highlights the need for farming women’s organisations to provide space for women to develop leadership skills and confidence to lead in a masculine agri-industry context which impacts on all aspects of the family farm. The newer networks and RWNZ members are more likely to recognise these organisational, attitudinal and personal deterrents for farm women, thus recognising the challenge to ontological narratives inherent in farm women leading in mainstream farming organisations.

7.4 Leadership: Challenging or Maintaining?

This chapter has sought to show that members of the case study organisations lead in different ways, and that they also contrast in their view of their rights to lead in
certain contexts. It has shown that members of the established organisations are more likely to act and lead in ways which express communality, whereas newer network members will lead with agentic competence (Yoder, 2001). The exceptions to this are RWNZ and PCW members, who occupy the middle ground, with a more even distribution between the two ends of the continuum of leadership (see Chapter Two; Yoder, 2001). Drawing upon leadership theory analysed in Chapter Two, this section argues that leadership in the masculinised context of agri-industry is more likely than feminised leadership to challenge the traditional social practices, relations and institutions that construct ruralities that predominantly recognise service identities for farm women. Further to this contention, members of newer networks are more likely than those of established organisations to lead in this masculine context.

As shown in Chapter Two, leadership research argues that leadership is gendered and as such supports leadership styles for men and women (Bartunek et al., 2000; Carli, 2001; Eagly and Johannsen–Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001; Yoder, 2001). Social practices hold that men lead with agentic competence, acting assertive, dominant, confident and competitive; whereas women lead with reactive communality, compromising, considering the welfare of others, acting helpful and nurturing (Carli, 2001; Eagly and Johannsen–Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001). Thereby, it may be contended that women who choose to act with agentic competence are more likely to challenge traditional notions of rurality. Arguing that ontological narratives support the performance of these gendered attributes, this thesis contends that farm women who act with agentic competence in a masculine context will encounter resistance as their action is perceived to violate the ontological narratives which surround and form ideas of what farm women ought to be.

Following Ridgeway’s argument, that women’s leadership constitutes a “battleground for the maintenance or change of our gender system” (2001: 652) this thesis claims that leadership in the masculinised context of agri-industry is more challenging to the ruralities which sustain traditional service identities for farm women than leadership in a feminised context of community. The spaces created by the organisations for leadership differ. The established organisations are more structured and formalised, and action, and subsequent change, is slow because of the style of leadership produced from this environment. Through these spaces the established organisations
also encourage members to hold leadership positions in the feminised context of community. In contrast the leadership in the newer networks is mentored on an individual basis, and mostly occurs in external, mainstream organisations in the masculinised context of agri-industry.

Leadership, and the subsequent collective action, by members of established organisations and newer networks differ, and this results in a difference in the effects that action has on ruralities that support traditional identities for farm women. For example, an interview comment from a FWIO member highlights the lack of challenge apparent in that organisation’s leadership and collective action:

I’ve never been involved where there was a real necessity for action [original emphasis]. You know, they are more general issues that aren’t going to be solved in any hurry, but they wanted governments to know how they felt (1-3I, volunteer).

This recognition, internal to FWIO, of a maintenance of social practices, is also acknowledged externally by more challenging OFWN members. One OFWN member compares the two organisations collective action styles, and the way leadership is enacted:

[FWIO] don’t get into the issues in the same way. They don’t get into the lobbying and the argumentative type thing in any situation that we would go to. They might get into something that somebody was doing research for them, and they might find out some issues that way. And they would do it in a completely different way. We sort of go at it like a bull in a china shop! They go through the layers up and the layers down – six weeks later we’re finished, six years later they’re still on the go about it [original emphasis] (216I, farmer / off farm worker).

FWIO’s collective action is contrasted with OFWN’s; this member making the contrast between reactive and agentic action. These assessments of FWIO and OFWN’s collective action are indicative of many of the other case study organisations and their members, the exceptions being RWNZ and PCW, whose members span the two ends of a collective action/leadership continuum.

While members of the newer networks are more likely to lead in mainstream farming organisations, and recognise the constraints of the old boys’ network, there is also a comprehension that some established organisation members participating in a masculine context do not highlight the concerns held by these networkers regarding
the family farm and farm family. By not bringing into this masculine context these social concerns, some networkers feel that challenge of ontological narratives is lacking:

Definitely, some are playing the boys’ game. Some of them have seen that it is the old boys’ club, this is the way that it is done, and in order for women to be there they play the game, and its just becomes the old women’s club. So, we definitely do see that, and that doesn’t create real change. It gives them something and it may give their organisation something, but it doesn’t create a real change (2-136I, farmer).

This OFWN member compares this style of leadership in mainstream farming organisations with her own style of leadership and power, one based on empowerment from her network, where she challenges the way things are done, and acts with agentic competence:

I’m much more of a team player. I know I have leadership, but I don’t direct it, at least I try not to. I was once told from Ottawa that I was a very powerful woman, and it bothered me immensely to be called that. Because power to me has never had a really positive meaning. So it really bothered me that I would be termed a powerful woman, you know, I’m not a Xena. I really had to struggle with that, and I even talked to some of the people in Ottawa about that - some bureaucrats, and said why would you say that? Why is that seen as that? Because to me, as I saw it, it was a negative word, it was pushy and aggressive, you know, greedy and getting a private agenda. And I had all the negative connotations of the definition of power. And they said no they saw it more as I would ask questions where other people would be afraid to ask questions. And some of the questions I asked went to the quick of it. And so even though everybody else wanted to know, they knew that it was protocol not to ask. And I asked in such a way as to almost out of naiveté, or I hate to think as myself as naïve, but just as a genuine concern or interest, and I’m not a confronting personality. I don’t try to put anybody else on the defensive when I ask the question. It’s almost where angels fear to tread. But at least it uncovers things, and gets things going. And I think what I have learned through that process was that I would prefer not to be called a powerful person, but an empowering person [my emphasis] (2-136I, farmer).

This member’s concern over being seen as powerful, and the example she cites, illustrate the success of the types of spaces the newer networks create for the empowerment of farm women. It also illustrates the challenge in acting with agentic competence. To act with agentic competence as a woman in a masculine context is not only theoretically a challenge to gendered notions of leadership, but also a reality for farm women. Members of OFWN, CVWiA and NWD, and some members of PCW and RWNZ hold leadership positions in organisations that operate in the
masculine context of agri-industry. Not only do they hold these positions, but also they act with agentic competence in such a way that challenges traditional identities for farm women. The function of farm women organisations, to empower members with the skills that enable this type of collective action, is a very important one (Valocchi, 2001).

Challenges to notions of rurality that inform identities for farm women are more likely to come from members of the newer networks as opposed to established organisations’ members. These challenges by women’s leadership to traditional identities range from establishing credibility in the masculinised context of agri-industry, to bringing ‘family issues’ from the home into the farm industry arena. The following quotes highlight the occurrence of such challenges made and met by network members. Farm women leading in a non-traditional position can often meet resistance from community members:

I think that from [some women’s] perspective its something they wouldn’t do. And they just ask you strange things... what’s it like going to a meeting with all those men? Well, what’s the difference if you’re male or female?... you do get things at times from people who don’t understand or wouldn’t do it themselves (8-203I, farmer).

Further to women moving into non-traditional leadership positions, an OFWN member talks of her network’s focus on the farm family, and through one of its programmes, its attempts to move family issues once privatised within the home and community into the masculine context of mainstream farming organisations:

There is a high level of abuse in rural Ontario and the male groups still accept it, and cover it up. A friend of mine was at a male organisation convention and the women/abuse jokes going around were terrible... An all-women’s group can force the issue and put a dent in all forms of abuse against women and children in rural Ontario. We do this through our CAPRO69 programme. The other groups don’t have understandings in certain areas such as childcare and safety on the farm. So the issues have been kept buried (2-21Q, farmer’s wife).

A NWD member comments that women, she included, have to work hard to achieve credibility in agri-industry, linking this to their multiplicity of roles:

---

69 CAPRO is the Community Abuse Awareness Project operated by OFWN from 1995-1998 in Ontario.
I couldn’t work to the full extent that they wanted me to work, because I had other priorities in my life. We are also mums, we’re also wives, we have a lot of other responsibilities. We have a multiplicity of roles, and whereas men, they do, but not to the same degree. And I don’t think there are a lot of situations that allow for that multiplicity of roles. There are a lot of women that need to prove themselves in a very male world. Otherwise, if we don’t be like men, we lose credibility in the male sector. And that’s a real problem (8-180I, farmer).

Her comments highlight not only the conflict between identities, but also the need to establish credibility as an actor leading in a non-feminised/social context (Eagly and Karau, 1991, cited in Ridgeway, 2001: 647). The resistance met by farm women who lead with agentic competence in a masculinised context, and seek to challenge the dominant social practices, relations and institutions circulating in that context, challenge and resist the dominance of traditional identities for farm women.

The predominance of newer networks members undertaking leadership positions in mainstream farming organisations is related to the spaces which these networks provide for their members. Although networkers are more likely to lead in a masculine context, their organisations provide spaces that are not masculinely hierarchical (Yoder, 2001), yet encourage skills and attributes which equip them for leading and acting in this environment. In contrast, established organisations provide feminised spaces where there is emulation of male organisational values, but in a service oriented context; one that encourages attributes of reactive communality. While established organisations parallel their masculine counterparts, newer networks create alternative feminised spaces, which are communal, as opposed to, hierarchical, yet are agentic, and act in a masculine context, challenging male dominance in agri-industry, and thus challenging the ontological narratives supporting traditional ruralities.

7.5 Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that, within the case study organisations, members of established organisations are more likely to act/lead in the feminised context of community, and members of newer networks to act/lead in the masculinised context of agri-industry. This suggests that the different case study organisations, both
depending upon, and influencing, the contexts in which their members act (Valocchi, 2001), create spaces that support particular identities. Organisational collective identity is linked to particular ways and places of acting. Supporting service identities encourages members to act in the sphere of home and community, thus maintaining ruralities that support hegemonic identities for farm women. Supporting occupational identities encourages members to act in the sphere of farm and agri-industry, thus challenging ruralities that support hegemonic identities for farm women.

Section 7.2 argued that the creation of organisational spaces for leadership is strongly linked to the collective identity of an organisation and the narrative identities of the farm women members. It asserted that established organisations create feminised spaces for leadership, that newer networks are increasingly focusing on male dominated spaces, and that this reflection of organisational collective identity occurs in the way in which leadership is conceptualised, and its practice. Internally, established organisations leadership spaces are formalised, hierarchical and community driven; whereas newer networks predominantly emphasise mentoring and change through empowering members’ participation in agri-industry. Complementing these internal manifestations of leadership are the ways in which members’ leadership external to the case study organisations is encouraged and undertaken. Established organisation members are more likely to centre their leadership in community groups, while newer network members concentrate their leadership in farming organisations. The internal spaces for leadership mirror the collective identity of each organisation, and these are paralleled by the external spaces in which particular farm women lead. This was translated onto a continuum of leadership (Yoder, 2001), one extreme, characterised by reactive communality in a feminised context of community, and the other extreme characterised by agentic competence in a masculinised context of agri-industry.

Section 7.3 asserted that traditional ontological narratives support farm women’s leadership in feminised contexts (Eagly and Karau, 1991, cited in Ridgeway, 2001: 647), and that farm women organisations are important spaces for challenging these ontological narratives (Valocchi, 2001). However, in providing spaces for leadership, the newer networks and RWNZ are much more likely than FWIO and CWAV to encourage challenge. While the majority of respondents saw few deterrents to their
own leadership, and thereby accepting their position as leaders (recognised or not), members of the newer networks and RWNZ were more aware of organisational, attitudinal and personal deterrents for farm women in general. This reflects their stronger likelihood of participating and leading in male dominated farming organisations, and of challenging the ontological narratives pervading these spaces which envision farm women as non-agentic leaders (Bartunek et al., 2000; Carli, 2001; Eagly and Johannsen-Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001; Yoder, 2001).

Drawing together the argument strands from the previous two sections, Section 7.4 argued that leadership by farm women in the masculine context of agri-industry is more challenging to the traditional service identities for farm women and the ruralities which are supported by existing ontological narratives. Members of FWIO and CWAV, in particular, are encouraged by their organisations to act in feminised contexts, leading with reactive communality. In contrast to this, OFWN, CVWiA and NWD members act with agentic competence and in a masculine context, challenging ontological narratives. Occupying the middle ground are members of PCW and RWNZ, who, in general, maintain a more binary leadership focus, straddling both feminised and masculinised contexts, mirroring the members’ narrative identities and the organisations’ collective identities.

This chapter has argued that organisational type and collective identity has a strong influence upon the leadership undertaken by members. It asserts that reactive and communal leadership in the feminised context of community maintains traditional identities for farm women, whereas agentic leadership in a masculinised agri-industry context meets resistance, and therefore challenges the social practices, relations and institutions that construct ruralities supporting hegemonic service identities for farm women. The following and final chapter combines notions of organisational collective identity, service and occupational identities for farm women, and collective action through leadership to argue that farm women’s organisations have an important function in (re)constructing identities for farm women.
Chapter Eight: Conclusion

This thesis argues that farming women's organisations create spaces for farm women to recognise and perform multiple identities. Farm women in Western rural societies still remain ‘othered’ in farming and agri-industry (Brandth, 2002; Pini, 2002; Saugeres, 2002a, 2002b). Popular discourses and narratives informing (and circulating within) ruralities in these societies give little support to farm women identifying as farmers and industry actors. This thesis has sought to establish the types of spaces and strategic bases that support these identities. In doing so, it has examined the contexts within which these organisations were formed and currently operate, and the collective identity and organisational type they and others construct for them. In addition to this it has examined the narrative identities performed and leadership undertaken by members of these organisations. In doing so, this thesis has established that the practices and spaces created by farming women's organisations contribute to the construction of farm women’s identities.

The study explored the degree to which some organisations maintain hegemonic identities for farm women, while others challenge them. Chapter Two established an analytical framework for the analysis of farming women's organisations, while Chapter Three provided the methodological framework for answering the research questions. This chapter synthesises the findings and arguments presented in Chapters Four to Seven (Section 8.1). Then follows an account of the contributions this study brings to the debates on identity, organisational collectivity and leadership as a form of political action (Section 8.2). Finally, the chapter concludes by discussing the limitations constraining this study and recommendations for further research (Section 8.3).

8.1 Summary of Findings

By investigating the range of farming women's organisations (from long-established to newer network-based groups), this thesis focused on the maintenance or
reconstruction of identities for farm women and sought to answer four research questions:

1. What are the contexts within which farming women’s organisations operate?
2. What hegemonic and alternative identities do farming women’s organisations make available to their farm women members?
3. What hegemonic and alternative identities are recognised by farm women?
4. How are hegemonic identities maintained or challenged by the collective action of these organisations’ farm women members?

The first question concerns the contexts within which farming women's organisations operate, and was addressed in Chapter Four. Recognising that these organisations may be fluid and dynamic entities, this chapter examined the historical and contemporary contexts that help determine the nature and collective identity of each organisation. Social, economic and political practices, relations and institutions circulating when each organisation was formed were established as highly influential in determining an initial collective identity. The formative forces of the established organisations are comparable. All three established organisations were formed in the early 20th Century at a time when first wave feminism was influential in women’s participation in public life (Carbert, 1995), encouraging farm women to combat isolation and poor access to services. In a similar, way the formation of the newer networks is comparable. The four newer networks formed as a follow-on from urbanised feminism in the 1970s (Carbert, 1995), and focus on political and economic issues for farm women (Alston, 1995b, 2000; Taylor and Little, 1995). These newer networks have reacted to the unrecognised potential and contribution of women as farmers and leaders in agri-industry. Common practico-inert structures (such as the predominance of family farming, gendered patterns of ownership, labour and inheritance patterns, and male dominated farming organisations) have combined with particular historical and contemporary social practices to create certain gender-coded conditions and spaces for farm women. However, more importantly, they have led to the recognition of serialised conditions (Young, 1994) by farm women which are reflected in the collective identity of each organisation.
The hegemonic and alternative identities acknowledged by farming women's organisations is the focus of the second question, and this was investigated through the analysis of collective identity and organisational type in Chapters Four and Five. Employing Melucci’s (1996) dimensions of collective identity, Chapter Four identified and examined the internal dimensions of collective identity; formation, structure and membership requisites and incentives; as well as establishing the importance of organisational type in this analysis. External dimensions were examined in Chapter Five, establishing the importance of members as allies, other farm women as competitors and adversaries, and the media as an apparatus of social control (Melucci, 1996). Chapter Five concluded by classifying a collective identity for each organisation, considering both internal and external dimensions and organisational type. FWIO and CWAV as co-operative organisations were placed at one end of a continuum, characterised as formalised, hierarchical organisations which focus predominately on the service arena of home and community. At the other end of the continuum were social movements, OFWN and CVWiA, and individual resistance network, NWD, characterised as informal, organic networks that focus predominantly on the farm and agri-industry arena. Occupying the middle ground were RWNZ and PCW, each positioned towards their established organisations or newer networks cohort in terms of formality, structure and arena of focus. The external dimensions reflected these internalised collective identities. This construction of collective identity in particular highlighted the dynamic nature of identity. RWNZ was presented as an organisation with a currently fluid and dynamic identity, and CVWiA / AwiA and OFWN both experienced peaks and troughs in their identities and resulting actions. This emphasises that even though the collective identities of the organisations are clustered around traditional or alternative meanings of femininity, the mutuality of collective identity and collective action ensure that the farming women's organisations and the identities associated with them do have dynamic character. However, we can also see that identity can become rigid, as in the case of FWIO and CWAV whose members have become resistant to change in what they perceived to be a way to preserve the coherence of the organisations (Melucci, 1996: 75). From the data and contentions presented in these chapters it was argued that collective identity influences the types of spaces which farming women's organisations create for their members, thus influencing the identities recognised by farm women and collective action performed.
The third question, what hegemonic and alternative identities are recognised by farm women, was addressed in Chapter Six. This chapter demonstrated that the spaces created by farming women's organisations for the acknowledgement of hegemonic and alternative identities influence the identities recognised and performed by members. Members of particular organisations give importance to certain identities. Members of the established organisations predominantly placed more importance upon the service identities, with RWNZ members also placing importance upon the farmer and industry actor identities. Newer networks members placed varying importance upon the six identities. PCW member placed importance upon carer, farmer and off-farm worker identities, while NWD members considered farmer and industry actor to be of high importance. Members of OFWN and CVWiA placed importance upon not only the farmer and industry actor identities, but also that of carer. This was also reinforced by the analysis of the differences between the importance farm women placed on particular identities and the importance they felt external groups placed on these identities. In answer to this research question, the chapter concluded by arguing that there is a strong link between the collective identities of organisations, ontological narratives informing ruralities, and narrative identities of farm women. For example, the collective identity of FWIO is of an organisation which focuses upon the service arena of home and community, creating spaces and structural bases for members within this arena. Hegemonic ontological narratives informing ruralities predominant during the formation of this organisation, and indeed for most of its duration, position farm women as carers, farm helpers and community workers. It is these three service identities that are the predominant narrative identities recognised by members of this organisation.

Chapter Seven addressed the fourth research question regarding how the collective action of farm women maintains or challenges hegemonic identities. This was investigated through the manifestation of leadership. By examining leadership undertaken by farm women in the feminised context of community and the masculinised context of agri-industry, it was established that members of particular organisations are likely to undertake certain types of leadership. For example, members of FWIO and CWAV were more likely to act within this feminised context, members of OFWN, CVWiA and NWD within a masculinised context, and members
of RWNZ and PCW within both. It was argued that the arena or context where that leadership is performed determines the challenging or maintaining nature of that action. The chapter also contended that the ways in which farm women view their own positioning in relation to ontological narratives also indicates an acceptance of, or resistance to, those ontological narratives. Newer networks members, and to a lesser extent, those of RWNZ, were more likely to acknowledge deterrents to farm women’s participation in the masculinised context of agri-industry.

From this exploration of the research questions, Figure 8.1 develops the original analytical framework presented in Chapter Two. In Figure 8.1, the specific findings of the thesis are portrayed. The diagram and the arguments within this thesis show that farming women's organisations have a major role in maintaining or challenging identities for farm women. The social practices, meanings and institutions supporting particular ruralities are influenced by, as well as shape, farming women's organisations (see blue ‘rurality segment’ of Figure 8.1). This thesis has demonstrated, predominantly in Chapter Four (Section 4.2), but also in Chapters Six and Seven, that the public, cultural and institutional narratives informing, and supported by, both historical and contemporary notions of rurality are similar in New Zealand, Australia and Canada. These ontological narratives are interlinked with the ruralities circulating in each of the case study areas, and these generally either support or deter certain identities for farm women. The diagram demonstrates that narratives situating and contextualising farm women’s everyday lives, such as their positioning as farm helpers, their portrayal in the media, and their invisibility in social and economic policy, inform ruralities that support the service identities of 

*carer, farm helper* and *community worker*, while deterring the occupational identities of *farmer, off-farm worker* and *industry actor*.
Figure 8.1: Function of farming women’s organisations in the (re)construction of identity

Public, Cultural and Institutional Narratives (Lay, Popular, Professional Discourses)
- Influence Recognition of, and Reaction to, Serialised Conditions
  - Public (Lay) - everyday experiences and imaginations. E.g. isolation, maternal feminism, women as farm helpers
  - Cultural (Popular) - art, literature, media. E.g. discourses of women as helpers and carers, good works in the community
  - Institutional (Professional) - government and industry policy makers, farming organisations. E.g. ‘old boys’ club, women invisible in social and economic policy
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Chapter Six has demonstrated that certain identities are recognised and performed by members of particular organisations. Members of the established organisations are more likely to recognise and perform service-based identities, such as carer, farm helper and community worker (see green segments of Figure 8.1); whereas newer networks members, while placing importance upon the carer identity, also recognise and perform the occupational-based identities of farmer, industry actor, and to a lesser extent, off-farm worker (see violet segments of Figure 8.1). It is here that Young’s (1994) notion of seriality may be considered. While all farm women may be recognised as a series, recognisable by the practico-inert objects and structures they have in common, there still remains a choice regarding the ways in which some women choose to associate with some identities and the resulting collective action, or not. Farm women engage with certain farming women's organisations for different reasons, recognising that these organisations mobilise and focus upon certain identities. This process of recognising oneself as part of a specific group, rather than a general series, encourages farm women to join an organisation which reflects the identities that they themselves consider important. Hence this thesis argues that farm women who place greater importance upon the service identities join established organisations for farm women. In contrast, farm women who recognise and perform occupational identities are more likely to join newer networks for farm women.

As indicated in Figure 8.1, while farm women’s recognition of certain identities influences their decision to join a particular type of organisation, the actual collective identity of an organisation and the spaces it creates for recognition of identities and collective action, in turn influence farm women’s identities. Chapters Four and Five have shown that internal and external dimensions create a collective identity for organisations (see black segment of Figure 8.1 and corresponding green and violet segments). The nature of that collective identity, by attracting and influencing narrative identities of members, in turn influences collective action. In Chapter Four an analysis was undertaken which allowed an organisational type for each organisation to be determined. This classification of organisational type has enabled a broader analysis of organisations, their collective identity and the spaces they create for the recognition of narrative identities and performance of collective action. So while previous research has tended to place farming women's organisations as either
consensual established organisations or resisting newer networks, this analysis recognises that organisations may be placed, according to collective action, upon a continuum between the two extremes.

This thesis has argued that collective identity and organisational type determine the collective action of an organisation and its members. Chapter Seven has focused on leadership as a form of collective action, one which is influenced by both the narrative identities which farm women recognise for themselves, and by the ontological narratives informing notions of rurality. It is argued that members of established organisations mainly undertake leadership in the feminised service sphere of home and community, and that members of the newer networks lead in the masculine sphere of agri-industry (see green service sphere and violet agri-industry sphere in Figure 8.1). However, there is recognition that organisational type is more of a determinative in the spaces where leadership occurs. So just as there is an overlap between the service and agri-industry spheres, so too is there an overlap between the two types of organisations (established organisations and newer networks) with regard to leadership as communal or agentic (Yoder, 2001). By examining the deterrents experienced by members of each organisation, Chapter Seven has also argued that farm women who lead with agentic competence in the masculinised context of agri-industry are more likely to be aware of deterrents to their leadership, indicating, by the very nature of their leadership, a challenge to the ontological narratives informing ideas of gender within notions of rurality.

In conclusion, this thesis contends that farming women’s organisations do have a substantial role in constructing or reconstructing farm women identities. Established organisations exhibit a collective identity that is service oriented, and members predominately identify with service identities. The spaces and practices created by these organisations determine that action in the form of leadership is mostly undertaken in a feminised service-oriented context of community, thereby reinforcing and maintaining farm women’s traditional domestic and service-based identities. In contrast, newer networks exhibit a collective identity that is not only service oriented but occupational-oriented, and members predominately identify with both service and
occupational identities. Leadership is predominantly undertaken in the masculinised occupational context of agri-industry, resisting and challenging farm women’s traditional domestic and service-based identities.

There are, however, exceptions to this established organisation/newer network model, indicated by organisational type. Established organisations, FWIO and CWAV, are co-operative organisations. In Melucci’s (1996) terms, their action does not seek to breach the system’s limits and they act consensually regarding society’s norms. This is reflected in a collective identity which is service-based, narrative identities recognised by members that are service oriented, and leadership which is communally reactive and based in the feminised context of home and community. Newer networks, OFWN, CVWiA as social movements, and NWD as a network of individual resistance, seek to breach the system’s limits, and challenge societal norms. Their collective identity and the narrative identities recognised by members are both service and occupationally based. However, leadership is agentic, based in the masculinised sphere of agri-industry and challenging of ontological narratives which deter these alternative identities for farm women. The established organisation, RWNZ, and newer network, PCW, are the exceptions to the binary established organisation/newer network model, inhabiting the middle ground, sometimes challenging, sometimes maintaining hegemonic identities for farm women. The collective identities of these two organisations overlap the service and agri-industry spheres to a greater extent that the other three newer networks. The narrative identities recognised by members are both service and occupational-based. RWNZ members recognise occupational identities to a much greater extent that the other two established organisations, and PCW members place less importance on occupational identities than the other three newer networks. As Chapter Seven highlighted, PCW leadership is consequently occurring in both spheres, and is at times communal and at others, agentic.

While identifying farming women's organisations as either established organisations or newer networks is indicative of the internal and external dimensions of collective

---

70 PCW members do however place greater importance on the *off-farm worker* identity than members of any other organisation.
identity, determining organisational type is much more important to an analysis of the maintenance of, or challenge to, the hegemonic identities for farm women. Placing an organisation along a continuum of consensus and resistance helps to determine the spaces that an organisation may create for the recognition of narrative identities, and the performance of collective action. This continuum, illustrated at the base of Figure 8.1, is indicative of organisational type, but is also constructed by characteristics contributing to collective identity and the spaces created for, and enactment of, collective action, such as structure, formation objectives, membership characteristics and incentives, identities constructed by others, the predominant narrative identities recognised by farm women, the context within which leadership is undertaken, and the agency or communality of that leadership. The significance of this contention of a continuum for farming women's organisations influences both the fields of social and rural geography, but also makes important contributions to the theories informing this thesis. The following section addresses these contributions.

8.2 Contributions to Academic Debate

This thesis has involved an investigation of the identities and actions of women who belong to farming women's organisations, and how identities and action can negotiate ontological narratives that inform notions of rurality. The conceptual contributions of this study to social and rural geography, sociology and gender studies may be categorised into three themes. The first relates to identity, in particular the multiplicity and performance of identities by farm women, challenging assumptions about pluri-activity, and adding to debates on identity and action. Second, the thesis contributes to the body of work on organisational collectivity. Not only does this study contribute to work on farming women's organisations, but also adapts new social movement theory to a variety of organisations, and organisational theory to not-for-profit organisations. The third contribution to academic debate is in the analysis of farm women’s leadership in both the community and agri-industry, and on a conceptual basis this thesis applies contemporary leadership theory to women leading in not-for-profit organisations.
8.2.1 Identity

This thesis has demonstrated that farm women recognise and actively express a multiplicity of identities. It has argued that in their expression of these identities farm women, through the strategic spaces provided by their organisations, may maintain or challenge the hegemonic nature of some of these identities. In doing so, this thesis suggests three emphases for our future thinking about identity, especially in rural studies. The first concerns the multiplicity of farm women’s identities, the second challenges assumptions of pluriactivity, and the third adds to the debate on identity as a social and cultural construction, and its political performance.

Previous studies of farm women have highlighted the many identities for farm women (for example, Alston, 1995b; Anderson, 1993a; Gasson, 1980; Hughes, 1997a; Little, 1987; Liepins, 1995; Lyson, 1990; Mackenzie, 1992; Shaw, 1993; Taylor and Little, 1995). This current work adds to this empirical evidence on the multiplicity of identities for farm women in Western rural societies, particularly in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. It has highlighted six identities from this literature: *carer, farm helper, community worker, farmer, off-farm worker* and *industry actor*. In analysing the importance of these identities to respondents from three countries (and including how they think others value these identities) it was demonstrated that there are comparisons and contrasts to be made across the case study countries and the contexts within which these identities are hegemonic or alternative. These comparisons and contrasts have highlighted the ways in which lifecourse and generational differences influence the expression of certain identities in particular relational settings.

However, this study goes beyond this existing body of work by demonstrating the importance of organisational spaces in the recognition and expression of hegemonic and alternative identities. Section 4.2 demonstrated that the case study organisations emerged from comparative contexts existing at the time of their formation, i.e. established organisations in the early 20th century, and the newer networks in the latter part of that century. However, although formational and structural influences were similar amongst each cohort, the spaces created for the recognition and performance of identities were more variable. Chapter Six demonstrated that these spaces
influenced the expression of identities by members of these organisations. For example, amongst the established organisations, the identities recognised by RWNZ members varied, in part, from the traditional identities acknowledged by the members of FWIO and CWAV. Whilst members of the Canadian and Australian established organisations recognised the hegemonic service identities, RWNZ members, in addition to these, also acknowledged the importance of the alternative farmer and industry actor identities. The spaces created by RWNZ differed from those of FWIO and CWAV and subsequently members performed different identities that reflected these strategic spaces.

While confirming the multiplicity of identities for farm women, this thesis also queries the importance of pluriactivity to farm women. Previous research has indicated the increase in off-farm employment by women (Alston, 1994, 1995b; Gibson et al, 1990; Rivers, 1992; Shaw, 1993; Taylor & Little, 1995), and while there is an acknowledgement that this pluriactivity is often undertaken as a means of survival for the family farm (Gasson and Errington, 1993), there is an overwhelming feeling that an off-farm career is increasingly important to farm women. But, this thesis has shown that very little importance is placed upon this identity by farm women, except those of PCW. This lack of importance reflects the spaces created by the organisations. Indeed, the respondents considered that ontological narratives circulating within rural societies and informing ‘others’ (such as mainstream farming organisations, the rural service industry and the farming community) placed more importance on this off-farm identity than they themselves did.

This thesis adds to the debate on the construction of identities by demonstrating that identities are not only social and cultural constructions, but that identities are also a political performance. Through the recognition of certain serialised conditions (Young, 1994) these farm women have formed and joined collective groups which allow the politicisation of certain identities in a particular time and place. This thesis has not only documented the politicisation of certain identities in particular organisations, but has also applied a feminist reconceptualisation of political action to
this performance. In doing so, it has acknowledged farm women’s politicisation of identities not only in agri-industry, but also in the community.

This politicisation of certain identities reflects the strategic spaces and structural bases created by farming women's organisations. The study of these organisational spaces adds to work by Liepins (1995, 1998c, 1999, and writing as Panelli, 2002) on AWiA’s creation of political spaces for the performance of alternative identities, and Mackenzie’s (1992, 1994) study of the OFWN’s creation of a reverse discourse which allowed farm women to resist hegemonic positionings in farming. It does so not only by confirming the continuation of this action and investigating its influence on the politicisation of alternative identities, but also by investigating the formation of similar networks in New Zealand that seek to challenge hegemonic identities for farm women. Parallel to Teather’s (1996a, 1996b) work, this thesis examines farming women's organisations in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. It updates her work by including two newer networks in New Zealand. However, it extends Teather’s findings, and that of Carbert (1995) in Canada, to consider the spaces created by the organisations and how these have encouraged the performance of certain identities. Teather and Carbert’s work suggests that the identities recognised by farm women parallel a binary of farming women's organisations; that members of established organisations recognise and perform service identities, while members of the newer networks acknowledge and express occupational identities.

This study has highlighted the ways in which identities are contextualised within different ruralities, not only by undertaking fieldwork in three countries, but also by investigating both established organisations and newer networks existing within, and informed by, these ruralities. The spaces created by each of the organisations reflect this contextualisation, rather than a binary notion of older and newer organisations. Hence, we see some themes emerging based on this binary of established organisations and newer networks, but there are also exceptional cases based on collective identity, including organisational type (this is discussed further in Section 8.2.2). The members of the established organisations predominantly politicise the service identities of *carer, farm helper* and in particular *community worker*, with
members of RWNZ also seeking to politicise the *farmer* and *industry actor* identities. In contrast, the members of the newer networks seek to politicise a wider range of identities, not only in the context of agri-industry i.e. *farmer* and *industry actor*, but to also draw *carer* into this arena, bringing issues associated with this identity into the business of farming. PCW members also seek to politicise the *off-farm worker* identity by seeking recognition of the importance of this, in their everyday lives, to the farm business.

These themes established in the thesis are based upon the collective identity of the organisations, of which organisational type plays an influential part. The following section addresses contributions to debates about organisational collectivity.

### 8.2.2 Organisational Collectivity

This thesis has examined the collective identities of the case study organisations and the ways in which collective identities influence the strategic spaces these organisations create for farm women to recognise and perform certain identities. In doing so it has utilised aspects of organisational theory (Atwater, 1995; Burrell and Hearn, 1989; Butler and Wilson, 1990; Foy, 1985; Kenny, 1994) and new social movement theory (Melucci, 1996; Painter, 1995) and applied these to women-only organisations. In doing so it has added to the body of work on organisational collectivity in four ways. First, it has applied organisational theory to not-for-profit organisations. Second, it has provided insights into women-only organisations. Third, it has applied new social movement theory to organisations that are not necessarily social movements, and moreover investigated the spaces where collective action takes place. Finally, it challenges a binary of farming women's organisations by arguing for a continuum of organisations based on collective identity, in particular, organisational type.

An investigation of organisational theory indicated a lack of application to not-for-profit organisations. As detailed in Chapter Two, there has been little critical attention to farming women's organisations by organisational scholars (Wells, 1998), and Kenny (1994), while providing a basis for analysing community-based organisations,
is very critical of much of the literature on organisational structure which focuses on corporate, profit-based organisations. The established organisations of this study follow the traditional hierarchical structures of many corporate organisations, but their formation is not based on profit, rather their collective identities are as community organisations for farm women. Therefore an appropriate framework for analysis was required and developed from existing literature on organisational structure. The resulting investigation starts to fill a lacuna regarding not-for-profit farm women’s organisations and their structures and motivations.

This thesis also provides insights into women-only organisations and their gendered nature. Most gender analyses of organisations are of mixed-gender organisations operating in a male dominated environment (McDowell and Court, 1994; Massey, 1996); investigating how this influences and determines the social relations and practices within the organisation, particularly with regard to leadership. Studies of new social movements have not sufficiently considered issues of gendered/feminist politics. Indeed Melucci’s (1996) definition of politics is so formalised as to discount the ‘political’ in the performance of everyday life (Vahabzadeh, 2001), thus ignoring dimensions such as the gendered relations of the day to day practices of society. In the current study the established organisations are an example of women-only organisations that complement male-dominated mainstream farming organisations. They developed formalised hierarchical structures that mirrored the male organisations, and their formation and resulting membership incentives provide a feminised version of these mainstream farming organisations. With the increasing exception of RWNZ these established organisations are gendered in such a way that they complement the functions of the male farming organisations. In contrast, the newer networks are gendered organisations that challenge the male dominance of farm and agri-industry. They are structured in such a way that their gendered nature, as women’s networks, neither reflects the structures of the established organisations for farm women nor the male-dominated farming organisations. As women-only networks they seek to provide ‘stepping stone spaces’ for women to gain confidence in acting in the masculinised context of farm and agri-industry, and challenged the gendered nature of this context. Rural studies on farm women’s leadership (Alston, 2000; Alston and Wilkinson, 1998; Pini, 2002; Shortall, 1994, 2001) have examined
the lack of women in mainstream farming organisations, but have not investigated the spaces and strategic bases that farming women's organisations create to enable (or not) this leadership.

In this analysis of collective identity and collective action and the part they play in organisations’ construction of spaces for the recognition and performance of identities by members, Chapters Four and Five apply new social movement theory to organisations that are not necessarily social movements. This has not previously been undertaken in relation to farming women's organisations, and so extends previous work (for example, Carbert, 1995; Teather, 1996a, 1996b) on the collective identities of old and new farming women's organisations. Thereby, it encompasses the construction of these collective identities by external dimensions, such as allies (members), adversaries and competitors (other farm women), and apparatus of social control (media). By applying new social movement theory it acknowledges the symbiotic nature of the relationship between collective identity and collective action, and how this may influence and adapt the spaces created by farming women's organisations. In doing so, this study is an extension, not only of these previous comparative studies, but also ones that have investigated single organisations (Liepins, 1996a, 1998a, 1999; Mackenzie, 1992, 1994; Teather, 1992, 1994a). By comparing the collective identity and collective action of farming women's organisations in three countries, this study has shown that farm women are not a homogenous group, and although their serialised condition in these countries may be similar, the expression of organisational collectivity, and the politicisation of that collectivity, reflects the different experiences and contexts of farm women.

The application of Melucci’s (1996) concept of organisational type and the internal and external dimensions of collective identity are useful for understanding collective action and its maintenance of, or challenge to, society’s norms. However, an understanding of the strategic spaces (institutional, social and physical) within which collective action takes place is required. This thesis extends Melucci’s understanding of collective action by also analysing the spaces within which the action takes place. For example, established organisations FWIO, CWAV and RWNZ have similar
collective identities, but the spaces within which they seek to promote sustainable rural communities for instance differ, with RWNZ members positioning their action increasingly in the arena of agri-industry. RWNZ and PCW are both categorised as competitive organisations, however the spaces they create for their members differ, and this is reflected in the identities that are of importance to members.

By using Melucci’s (1996) analysis of new social movements, in particular the concept of organisational type, this study has classified farming women's organisations according to action and the maintenance/challenge of hegemonic identities for farm women. Previous research (in particular comparative studies of old and new organisations (Carbert, 1995; Teather, 1996a, 1996b)) has indicated a binary model of established organisations and newer networks. However, this study extends upon this research by indicating a broader spectrum of organisations for farm women, based on an analysis of collective identity, organisational type and the spaces within which collective action occurs. While it is acknowledged that the binary of established organisations and newer networks is a basic indicator of collective identity, placing organisations along a continuum of consensus and resistance, as shown at the bottom of Figure 8.1, enables a better analysis of each organisation’s performance in either maintaining or challenging hegemonic identities for farm women.

The spaces that are created by farming women's organisations for the recognition and performance of certain identities result from collective identity and organisational type. It is within these spaces that leadership as a form of collective action is developed and determined. The following section looks at the contribution this thesis can make to current leadership studies.

8.2.3 Leadership

This thesis, in particular Chapter Seven, has focused on leadership as a form of collective action, and as such it is conceptualised as a political performance of identity. It has contributed to current leadership theory and added specifically to the debate on farm women’s leadership and the function of farming women's organisations in this political action.
This study contributes to current leadership theory that focuses, in particular, upon women (Carli, 2001; Eagly and Johannsen-Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001; Yoder, 2001). It applies contemporary theory to women leading in not-for-profit organisations, particularly in a feminised context, as opposed to women leading in profit-based organisations that are male dominated. By examining leadership in these organisations, it has added to theories about female and male organisations. As exemplified by the established organisations (and shown in Chapter Seven), these women-only organisations can mirror male hierarchical structures but not emulate the agentic leadership style, instead acting with reactive communality, compromising, considering the welfare of others, and acting helpful or nurturing, in a feminised context (Carli, 2001; Eagly and Johannsen-Schmidt, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001; Yoder, 2001). Newer networks are examples of alternative female organisations, which, structured differently to male organisations, strive to act agentially in masculine contexts, acting assertively, and with confidence, and challenging male dominance and meeting resistance. This confirms this gendered notion of leadership style, confirming that traditional styles of leadership for women are non-challenging, whereas women who act with agentic competence challenge traditional social practices, relations and institutions.

This research has investigated the informal leadership of farm women, and examined the ways in which that leadership maintains or challenges gendered assumptions about farm women. In doing so it responds to Parry’s (1998) claim that the focus of research on leadership should be on the social influence process rather than formalised leadership that he states has been the focus of mainstream research. The informal leadership of the members of these farming women's organisations undoubtedly shapes the social processes of everyday life, making it possible to influence beliefs and attitudes of both women and men in the farming community and agri-industry. However, in contrast to Parry (1998), this social influence is not necessarily about change. Predominantly, the leadership of the members of the established organisations (particularly FWIO and CWA) maintains traditional social practices.

By considering leadership in the community as well as agri-industry, this thesis also contributes to the body of work on farm women’s leadership (for example, Alston, 2000; Alston and Wilkinson, 1998; Hughes, 1997b; Little, 1997; Pini, 2002; Sachs,
1996; Shortall, 1992; Teather, 1994b; Wells, 1998). By teaming this with leadership theories about leading communally or with agentic competence, this thesis is able to link particular organisational types and their collective identities with specific styles of leadership. More importantly it analyses the spaces farming women organisations provide for farm women to lead both in community and agri-industry, recognising that farming women organisations have an important function in determining how farm women maintain or challenge traditional identities for farm women. It challenges previous assumptions that there is a binary of farming women's organisations and that the resulting action is only in the sphere of community or agri-industry, rather than a possibility of action in both spheres.

This thesis also lays the ground for further dialogue with Shortall’s (2001) work which argues that women’s farming organisations reinforce gender divisions within agriculture, and consequently do not call into question men’s political power as farmers. This study has argued that newer networks provide spaces for farm women to gain leadership skills and knowledge to confidently act as farmers and industry actors. OFWN, CVWiA and NWD construct spaces that achieve this. Their objectives are based on information provision, and mentoring and empowering farm women to act in an agri-industry sphere that is a masculinised context. It has been demonstrated that these strategic spaces construct stepping-stones for women to act with agentic competence in a masculinised context, challenging the male dominance of these mainstream organisations, and seeking to reset the agenda to include women and their issues. The continuing success of these newer networks, and the importance of these organisations is identified as an opportunity for further research in the following section.

8.3 Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research

This thesis has investigated the strategic spaces created by farming women's organisations, both established and network-based, in Australia, Canada and New Zealand. As such it has contributed to a number of fields and bodies of literature and research on farm women, identity, organisational collectivity and leadership.
However, practical limitations have been placed upon the depth of research and the methodology due to the breadth of the study. The following section outlines these constraints and also recommends areas for further research.

This study investigated eight farming women's organisations in the Otago and Waikato regions of New Zealand, the state of Victoria in Australia, and the province of Ontario in Canada, and as such included responses from almost 250 respondents, including members and organisation representatives. This three-country study, and the resources required to undertake such a broad investigation, placed limits upon data collection methods and the amount of time spent in the field. As discussed in Chapter Three this resulted in a heavy reliance on particular methods. A comprehensive survey and a smaller number of in-depth interviews were undertaken, rather than the development of more intensive ethnographical and participatory methods previously used by the likes of Whatmore and Liepins in their Ph.D. theses (Liepins, 1996a; Whatmore, 1988). This would have allowed a more intensive investigation of the operational basis of the organisations, particularly in Australia and Canada, and also would have allowed for the development of increased trust between the established organisations and myself in those two countries. It would also have allowed for a greater analysis of the links between organisations' identities and the wider position of women in society. More time in the field would have allowed for a more in-depth analysis of leadership and its challenge to hegemonic identities for farm women, particularly in the case of the New Zealand networks, PCW and NWD, which were only formed at the time this study began. This also limited response from members, particularly those of NWD.

This thesis has drawn upon Young’s (1994) concept of seriality that suggests that groups arise in response to a serialised condition, in the case of this study, being farm women with certain identities. Young (1994) further suggests that upon coming together in recognition of this serialised condition, some groups develop further, institutionalising and creating particular decision making structures. However, these collective groups after acting in recognition of their serialised condition may disperse back into seriality and disband as a collective. This study has investigated the
formation of collective groups in reaction to a serialised condition and determined the maintaining or challenging nature of the strategic spaces these organisations have created at the time of the fieldwork. Recognising that these organisations and the farm women who help construct their collective identities are dynamic, there is a need for further research. Will the newer networks disperse back into seriality, or will they exist as long as the established organisations to become established organisations themselves? Will the established organisations survive by virtue of their creation of spaces for recognised serialised conditions?

Further to this, it is important to continue to develop a continuum of farming women's organisations based on collective identity and organisational type. Hence, not only it is important to undertake further research of established organisations and newer networks and the sustainability of these organisations, but also the success of organisations with different organisational types must be analysed. For example, the sustainability and success of RWNZ may differ from that of FWIO and CWAV, based on an analysis of RWNZ as a competitive organisation that is more challenging than the other two established organisations.

This thesis has provided an overview which allows an analysis of the important part that farming women's organisations play in creating spaces from which farm women may reconstruct their identity, and from which their action may maintain or challenge the ontological narratives informing notions of rurality in Australia, Canada and New Zealand. This highlights the need for future action research that helps farming women's organisations further their political, community and industry goals.

The need for this research has been highlighted at the recent 3rd International Women in Agriculture Conference in October 2002. Amongst the recommendations arising from this conference were the following: the need to improve rural women’s access to, and control over, productive resources; the need for increased participation in decision making in agricultural, recognising that women’s organisations play a major role in the achievement of this; the need for women farmers to be given the respect and support their male counterparts receive; and finally, the need for women’s
participation to be developed through groups such as farming organisations and local action groups (Salce, pers. com., 2002). This thesis has confirmed the function of farming women’s organisations in helping to achieve these recommendations, and future research on the continuing success of both established organisations and newer networks in (re)constructing farm women identities can continue to evaluate the variety of collective action these organisations can perform for different farm women and their interests.
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Appendix A: Methodology

A.1 Ethical Approval

ETHICAL APPROVAL AT DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL OF A
PROPOSAL INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

Notes:

1. This form should only be used for proposals which are Category B as defined in the policy document “Policy on ethical practices in research and teaching involving human participants”, and which may therefore be properly considered and approved at departmental level;

2. A separate form should be completed for each teaching or research proposal which involves human participants and for which ethical approval has been considered or given at Departmental level;

3. The completed form, together with copies of any Information Sheet or Consent Form, should be returned to the Deputy Academic Registrar, Secretary of the Ethics Committee, Registry, as soon as possible after the proposal has been considered.

4. This form is also available electronically in Macintosh Word 5 format from the “Public Out” folder of the Macintosh called “Bill Purdie” in the “Registry” Appletalk zone. The document is entitled “ReportSheet”.

NAME OF DEPARTMENT: Geography

TITLE OF PROJECT: Farm Women's Support Networks and Effective Identity (Re)Construction

PROJECTED START DATE OF PROJECT: Ph.D. commenced 16.2.98.
   NZ questionnaire and interviews planned for Dec '98 - Mar '99,
   Canada questionnaire and interviews planned for May -June '99,
   Australia questionnaire and interviews planned for Sep-Oct '99.

STAFF MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR PROJECT:
   Ms Deirdre Shaw (Ph.D. candidate)
   Dr Ruth Liepins (supervisor)

NAMES OF OTHER PARTICIPATING STAFF:
   Ph.D. panel - Dr Richard Welch
   Prof. Peter Holland

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: Please give a very brief summary (approx. 200 words) of the nature of the proposal:-

The proposed research will focus on farm women's organisations and networks, and the part they play in maintaining and/or reconstructing farm women's identities. Attention will be given to the effect of these organisations and networks on farm women's participation in leadership, decisionmaking and policy making opportunities.

Organisations will be studied in New Zealand, Australia and Canada where parallel trends have emerged in the way new networks are being established alongside older organisations.

The proposed fieldwork includes:
structured interviews with administrators of farming organisations and networks in the three areas;
- a questionnaire to be completed by farm women associated with farming organisations in case study areas of New Zealand; Victoria, Australia; and Ontario, Canada;
- semi-structured interviews with farm women who are in leadership positions in these organisations and networks.

For each of these activities, draft examples of correspondence and data collection instruments are attached at the end of this document.

DETAILS OF ETHICAL ISSUES INVOLVED: Please give details of any ethical issues which are identified during the consideration of the proposal and the way in which these issues were dealt with or resolved:

- The proposed questionnaire and interviews involve human subjects. Questionnaires and interviews will be conducted only with organisations, networks and farm women who volunteer to participate in the study. The research will be described in correspondence inviting participation. At this time issues of anonymity and confidentiality will also be explained. Consent forms will be used to formalise participants' voluntary involvement in interviews.

- For the purposes of arranging interviews it will be necessary to gather personal names and contact details. However, this information will not appear in any written material in relation to this study, ie anonymity will be assured and maintained. This information will be stored securely during the course of the research period, and then destroyed appropriately, subject to University policy at that time.

List of Attachments

Attachment 1 Structured Interviews with Farming Organisations (Draft)
Attachment 2 Questionnaire for Farm Women (Draft)
Attachment 3 Semi-structured Interviews with Farm Women Leaders (Draft)

ACTION TAKEN

☐ Approved by Head of Department ☐ Approved by Departmental Committee
☐ Approved by University Ethics Committee ☐ Referred to another Ethics Committee

Please specify: ..........................................................................................................................

DATE OF CONSIDERATION: ...........................................

Signed (Head of Department): ...........................................
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A.2 Letter to Organisations

Dear

My name is Deirdre Shaw and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Geography at the University of Otago, New Zealand. My research focuses on farm women's organisations and networks and the part they play in the construction of farm women's identities. I am undertaking research in Otago and the Waikato in New Zealand; Victoria in Australia; and in Ontario, Canada.

I would like to invite your organisation / network to take part in this research. I am seeking basic data about your organisation at this stage and with your permission will recontact you on my arrival in Canada in early May. This would be to finalise an interview to discuss the questions outlined in the schedule which is enclosed; and to ascertain if some of your members may be interested in taking part in my research.

My intention is to contact farming women's organisations / networks in Ontario, such as yourselves, and undertake an interview based on the schedule attached, as mentioned in this letter. The next step will be to survey farm women who are members of your organisation / network with your approval, anonymously if appropriate; and then to interview a small number of women who are in leadership positions in your organisation / network.

Any personal information gathered in these questionnaires would remain anonymous and confidential. Neither your names nor any information identifying you will be included in written accounts of this research. However, factual data will be linked to each organisation or network.

I have faxed this letter in the hope of being able to arrange a meeting for <month> with you now. If I have not heard from you during the next fortnight I will contact you by email or fax to arrange an interview time. A hard copy of this letter and the schedule follows by mail.

I would be most grateful if you would take part in the research. I will be based in the Department of Geography at <name of University>, in <months>. But prior to this please do not hesitate to contact my supervisor, Dr Ruth Liepins, or myself, if you have any queries or concerns regarding the interview or the research in general.
Yours sincerely

Deirdre Shaw

Contact Details

Deirdre Shaw
Department of Geography
P O Box 56
Dunedin
New Zealand
Ph 64 3 4795374
Fax 64 3 4799037
Email edge@xtra.co.nz

Dr Ruth Liepins
Department of Geography
P O Box 56
Dunedin
New Zealand
Ph 64 3 4798784
Fax 64 3 4799037
Email rl@perth.otago.ac.nz
A.3 Letter to Farm Women

<date>

<name>
<address>
<address>
<address>

Dear <name>

My name is Deirdre Shaw and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Geography at the University of Otago. My research focuses on rural women's organisations and networks and the part they play in the construction of farm women's identities. I am also interested in how these organisations and networks affect women's participation in leadership, policy and decision making opportunities.

I would like to invite you to take part in this research. I am conducting a survey of farm women in particular case study areas, and have received your name either through a farming organisation or network (<name of organisation>) who felt you may be interested in taking part in this research.

Any personal information gathered in these questionnaires would remain anonymous and confidential. Neither your names nor any information identifying you will be included in written accounts of this research. However, factual data will be linked to organisations or networks.

I would be most grateful if you would take part by completing the survey and returning it in the envelope provided by the end of <month>. Please do not hesitate to contact my supervisor, Dr Ruth Liepins, or myself, if you have any queries or concerns regarding the interview or the research in general.

Yours sincerely

Deirdre Shaw

Contact Details

Deirdre Shaw
Department of Geography
P O Box 56
Dunedin
Ph 03 4795374
Fax 03 4799037
Email dedge@xtra.co.nz

Dr Ruth Liepins
Department of Geography
P O Box 56
Dunedin
Ph 03 4798784
Fax 03 4799037
A.4 Letter to Non-Interviewee

<date>

<name>
<address>
<address>
<address>

Dear <name>

Thank you for taking the time to complete and return my questionnaire, and more particularly to volunteer for an interview. Due to research criteria, I have decided not to undertake an in-depth interview with you. However, if you have any other information that you consider to be valuable, you may contact me by email or at the postal address below.

Please remain assured that even though you have included you name on the questionnaire, any personal information gathered in these questionnaires will still remain anonymous and confidential. Neither your names nor any information identifying you will be included in written accounts of this research.

Once again, thank you for your participation, and I’m sorry that I will not get to meet you in person. Please do not hesitate to contact my supervisor, Dr Ruth Liepins, or myself, if you have any queries or concerns regarding the research in general.

Yours sincerely

Deirdre Shaw

Contact Details

Deirdre Shaw
Department of Geography
P O Box 56
Dunedin
Ph 03 4795374
Fax 03 4799037
Email dedge@xtra.co.nz

Dr Ruth Liepins
Department of Geography
P O Box 56
Dunedin
Ph 03 4798784
Fax 03 4799037
A.5 Consent Form for Interviewees

CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEWEES

I have read the letter explaining this study, and have had an opportunity to discuss it with the interviewer and/or research supervisor. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:

1. Information gathered from the interviews will be used only for the purposes of research.

2. Interviews will be stored and analysed in ways, which maintain anonymity and privacy of participants.

3. My participation in the interviews is entirely voluntary.

4. Interviews will involve an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions, which will be asked, will depend on the ways in which the interview develops.

5. If I begin to feel uncomfortable during an interview I may decline to answer any particular question.

6. I may end the interview at any time and/or withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.

7. The results of the project may be published but my anonymity will be preserved.

I agree to take part in this project.

................................. ................................
Signature of participant Date

Interviewer: Deirdre Shaw .................................
A.6 Farming Women’s Organisations Interview Schedule

This interview schedule is a list of questions around which an interview will be based. Please feel free to prepare answers. If you have any concerns understanding any of the questions, feel free to ask these during the interview.

Section A: Contact Data

1. Name of organisation/network:

2. Contact address for organisation/network:

3. Phone number:

4. Fax number:

5. Email address:

6. Website address:

7. What is your position in the organisation/network:

Section B: Structural Data

8. What is the organisational structure of your organisation/network? (levels of leadership, regional)
9. What means of communication do you use to keep your members/clients up to date with your organisation/network’s actions and issues? On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the most important and 5 being least important, please complete the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Communication</th>
<th>Most 1/2/3/4/5 least important</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter – national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter – regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings – local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings – regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings – national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Membership Data

10. Please complete the following table regarding your total membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 40 yrs</td>
<td>40 yrs or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of membership</td>
<td>Less than 10 yrs</td>
<td>10 yrs or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What is your total membership? _______________________

12. Is this increasing, decreasing or stable in comparison with 10 years ago?
   - [ ] increase   - [ ] decrease   - [ ] stable   - [ ] not applicable

13. Is this increasing, decreasing or stable in comparison with 20 years ago?
   - [ ] increase   - [ ] decrease   - [ ] stable   - [ ] not applicable
14. Please identify the groups of women who are the major users of the services of your organisation / network, either as members or clients. Please rank on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being a major user, and 5 a minor user.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Major user 1/2/3/4/5 Minor user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger farm women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger women in rural towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in paid workforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What are the five most important services your organisation / network provides for these groups of farm women?

a.  

b.  

c.  

d.  

e.
16. Below is a list of possible identities for farm women. On a scale of 1 to 6 please rate how important your organisation / network considers that identity for farm women in general, to farming? 1 being very important and 6 being of no importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm helper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community / volunteer worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. As above, how important your organisation / network considers that identity for your members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm helper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community / volunteer worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Formation Data

18. Why was the organisation / network formed?

19. What needs among your membership were originally perceived that led to the formation of your organisation / network?

---

1 By industry actor I mean a farm woman who is interested in the farming industry eg policy, representation.
20. If your organisation/network has been established for more than 10 years, are these perceived needs still relevant?
☐ yes ☐ not entirely ☐ no ☐ not applicable

21. If necessary, how has your organisation/network adapted to meet new needs?

Section E: Intentions and Actions

22. What is the organisation/network’s stated aims and objectives, or mission statement?

23. What strategies does your organisation/network utilise to meet these objectives or mission?

24. What do you see as your organisation/network’s role in farming?
25. Which characteristics or functions from the list below best describes your organisation / network? Tick as many as you like.

- Combat isolation
- Social support network
- Personal growth
- Creating agricultural awareness
- National lobby group
- Skills provider
- Farm issues focus
- Other (specify) ____________________________________________

- Industry focus
- Provision of community facilities
- Creating stronger voice for farm women
- Service provider
- Community interaction
- Promoting equality for farm women
- Networking for business

**Section F: Collective Action**

26. Below is a list of characteristics which may describe actions of organisations / networks. Please indicate which characteristics are relevant to your organisation / network; and of those ones which are relevant, please indicate their importance on a scale of 1 to 5. 1 being very important and 5 being of no importance. Some of these characteristics may seem extreme and radical, but if you consider that your organisation / network displays these characteristics in a less radical manner, please give them thought. Any comments arising from these characteristics may be written overleaf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Relevant?</th>
<th>Importance if yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solidarity</strong> – recognising others as part of the same social group, common feeling amongst individuals which may define them as a group</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance of System's Limits</strong> – maintaining or not challenging the status quo of society’s structures</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consensus</strong> – agreeing with the procedures or status quo about the distribution of society’s social and economic resources</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregation</strong> – members do not recognise themselves as part of the same social group, but will act collectively in reaction to an adverse event eg economic downturn</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breaching of System’s Limits</strong> – challenging social norms and the legitimacy of society’s structures</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict</strong> – seeking control / more access to society’s social and economic resources which have previously been denied</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Please write any comments arising from Q26, or any other comments, here:

Thank you for taking part in this research.
## A.7 Questionnaire for Farm Women (New Zealand version)

### Section A: Personal Profile

1. What is your age?  
   - [ ] <21  
   - [ ] 21-30  
   - [ ] 31-40  
   - [ ] 41-50  
   - [ ] 51-60  
   - [ ] 61+  

2. What is your marital status?  
   - [ ] married  
   - [ ] single  
   - [ ] de facto  
   - [ ] divorced/separated  
   - [ ] widowed  
   - [ ] other  

3. How many dependent children do you have?  
   - [ ] none  
   - [ ] 1-2  
   - [ ] 3-4  
   - [ ] 5 or more  
   (if none please go to Q9)  

   4. Who is the primary caregiver for your children?  
      - [ ] self  
      - [ ] partner  
      - [ ] shared equally  
      - [ ] other  

   5. How many of your children are preschoolers?  
      - [ ] none  
      - [ ] 1-2  
      - [ ] 3-4  
      - [ ] 5 or more  

   6. How many of your children are primary school aged?  
      - [ ] none  
      - [ ] 1-2  
      - [ ] 3-4  
      - [ ] 5 or more  

   7. Do you use childcare?  
      - [ ] no  
      - [ ] yes  
      - [ ] not applicable (please go to Q9)  

   8. If yes, how often?  
      - [ ] less than one day/evening a week  
      - [ ] 1-2 days/evenings per week  
      - [ ] 3-4 days/evenings per week  
      - [ ] 5 or more days/evenings per week  

   9. What is your main occupation?  
      - [ ] farmer  
      - [ ] primary caregiver  
      - [ ] farmer’s wife  
      - [ ] farm manager  
      - [ ] sharefarmer  
      - [ ] paid farm worker  
      - [ ] unpaid farm worker  
      - [ ] work off farm _____________ specify  
      - [ ] other _____________ specify  

  10. If you have a spouse/partner what is their main occupation?  
      - [ ] farmer  
      - [ ] primary caregiver  
      - [ ] farm manager  
      - [ ] sharefarmer  
      - [ ] paid farm worker  
      - [ ] unpaid farm worker  
      - [ ] not applicable  
      - [ ] works off farm _____________ specify  
      - [ ] other _____________ specify  

  11. What is your highest level of education?  
      - [ ] primary school  
      - [ ] 1-3 years of secondary school  
      - [ ] 4-5 years of secondary school  
      - [ ] apprenticeship/polytechnic  
      - [ ] university  
      - [ ] other ______________________ (specify)
12. What types of additional educational/training courses have you taken in the past ten years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
<th>Total hours spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>51+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy / Business Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural / Land Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development / Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Skills eg First Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you have access to the Internet and email?

☐ no  ☐ yes (please go to Q16)

14. If you do not have access, do you know how to use Internet and email?

☐ no  ☐ yes

15. If you do not have access, would you like to have access to these means of communication?

☐ no  ☐ yes
Section B: Farm Enterprise and Roles  If you do not live on a farm please tick this box □ and continue at Question 24.

16. What type of farm do you live on?
☐ dairy ☐ sheep/beef ☐ deer ☐ pig
☐ cropping ☐ horticultural ☐ poultry ☐ viticulture
☐ mixed _____________ specify ☐ other ___________ specify

17. What is the ownership structure of the farm?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

18. How many other on-farm workers are there, apart from yourself and spouse/partner (if applicable)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Non-related Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (over 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (over 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What types of activities do you and your spouse/partner (if applicable) spend your time on in a typical week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock Maintenance</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticultural Maintenance</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Work</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Records Management</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with Rural Service Industry and Professional Services</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Communications</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Farmwork</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm Paid Work</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of Other Dependents</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Voluntary Work</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. What influence do you have on decision making in the following areas? Based on a scale from 1 to 6, 1 being sole decision and 6 being no influence. (Please tick the appropriate box.)

a. Production levels
b. Major purchases
c. Farm safety
d. Major investments
e. Financial management
f. Environmental management
g. Day to day management
h. Employment management

21. Do you consider that you should have more influence in the decision making?
☐ no ☐ yes

22. If you answered yes to Q21, what do you consider the three most important reasons why you should have more influence?

a. ______________________________
b. ______________________________
c. ______________________________

23. If you answered yes to Q21, what do you consider are the three major reasons you don't have more influence?

a. ______________________________
b. ______________________________
c. ______________________________

24. Below is a list of possible roles of women on farms. On a scale of 1-6 please indicate how important you consider that role as a farm woman to farming. 1 being the most important, and 6 being of no importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm helper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/volunteer worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry focussed²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² By industry focussed I mean a farm woman who is interested in farming industry activities, eg policy, representation.
25. As above, how important do you think the **farming community** considers each of these roles for farm women?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/volunteer worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. As above, how important do you think the **Rural Service Industry** considers each of these roles for farm women? (By Rural Service Industry I mean stock agents, vets, banks, etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/volunteer worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. As above, how important do you think **Women’s Division Federated Farmers** (Now Rural Women NZ) considers each of these roles for farm women?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/volunteer worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. As above, how important do you think **Federated Farmers** considers each of these roles for farm women?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/volunteer worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. As above, how important do you think the farming organisation/network you are most involved with considers each of these roles for farm women?
Name of organisation/network: ______________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm helper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/volunteer worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Thinking about the many 'hats' that you or other farm women may wear in your dealings with family, the farm, in the community, industry and society, how do you see yourself/others as a farm woman?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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Section C: Farming/Rural Organisations / Networks

Section C1

31. Does anyone in the family, based on the farm, belong to a farming/rural organisation/network?
   - □ no
   - □ yes (specify below)

32. If yes, who belongs?
   - □ self
   - □ spouse/partner
   - □ self & spouse/partner
   - □ other family member
   - □ other ___________________ (specify)

33. What farming/rural organisations/networks do you belong to, or have belonged to? Please list below:
   a. ___________________________________________________________________
   b. ___________________________________________________________________
   c. ___________________________________________________________________
   d. ___________________________________________________________________

Section C2

For each organisation/network please answer the following section. For organisation/network A please answer Q33-46 below. For organisation/network B please use the blue questions attached, and similarly the yellow for organisation/network C and purple for organisation/network D.

Organisation a:

34. Name of organisation/network:
   ________________________________________________________________

35. Are you currently a member of this organisation/network?
   - □ no
   - □ yes

36. Have long is/was your membership of this organisation/network?
   - □ <1yr
   - □ 1-5yrs
   - □ 6-10yrs
   - □ 11-15yrs
   - □ 16-20yrs
   - □ 21+yrs

37. Do/did you have individual voting rights in this organisation/network?
   - □ no
   - □ yes
   - □ not applicable

38. Does/did your spouse/partner belong to this organisation/network?
   - □ no
   - □ yes
39. At what level of this organisation / network are/were you mostly involved?

☐ local ☐ provincial
☐ regional ☐ national
☐ international ☐ other ___________________ (specify)

40. Do/did you have a leadership or decisionmaking role in the organisation / network?

☐ no ☐ yes

41. If yes, what is/was that leadership or decisionmaking role?

☐ committee member ☐ treasurer
☐ secretary ☐ board member
☐ chairperson ☐ CEO/director
☐ president ☐ coordinator
☐ other ___________________ (specify)

42. At what level is/was this leadership or decisionmaking role?

☐ local ☐ provincial
☐ regional ☐ national
☐ international ☐ other ___________________ (specify)

43. What are/were your reasons for joining this organisation / network? Please list.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

44. If you no longer belong to this organisation / network, what were your reasons for leaving? If you felt that the organisation / network was no longer meeting your needs please explain.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
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45. What do/did you consider this organisation / network has/had to offer you as a farm woman?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

46. Do you consider this organisation / network to be suitable for all farm women?  
☐ no    ☐ yes

47. Please explain your answer in Q46.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

48. Thinking about the comments you made in Q30, do you think that this farming organisation / network has helped shape this farm women identity that you identified? Please comment.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
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Section C3

The following questions do not relate to any particular organisation / network. Please answer them in relation to farming/rural organisations / networks in general.

49. Have you ever encountered any deterrents to participating in mainstream farming/industry organisations; and are you aware of any deterrents to participation in mainstream farming / industry organisations for farm women (not just yourself)? Please tick as appropriate below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Deterrents</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Farm Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues not relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings too formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women not encouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner is member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No individual voting rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Deterrents</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Farm Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel arrangements and /or distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relevancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudinal Deterrents</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Farm Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Boys attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism/discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from actual organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally feel not a role for women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Do you have any comments you would like to make about these deterrents?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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Section D: Leadership and Decisionmaking

51. What would make you feel comfortable in taking on a leadership role in a farming/rural organisation / network? Tick as many as required.

☐ Knowledge of issues/area
☐ Competence in a leadership role
☐ Relevant experience
☐ Commitment to the issues
☐ Self-esteem
☐ Support and encouragement from other members
☐ Support and encouragement from other women
☐ Other ___________________________________________ specify

52. What training have you undertaken in the past ten years which has helped you in leadership and decisionmaking roles?

☐ Rural leadership course
☐ Management course
☐ Community leadership course
☐ Employment based course
☐ On the job training
☐ Other (specify)_________________
☐ None

53. What other activities or participation in farming/rural organisations / networks have given you leadership and decisionmaking skills? Please list.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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Section E: Farming/Rural Women's Organisations / Networks

54. What do you consider to be the role of the Women’s Division Federated Farmers?
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

55. Does WDFF meet your needs?
☐ yes ☐ no

56. Please explain your answer in Q55.
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

57. Do you consider that WDFF is meeting the needs of most farm women presently?
☐ yes ☐ no

58. Please explain your answer to Q57.
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
Research has shown that a new type of organisation for farm women is emerging in some Western countries. These "networks" are varied, but some common characteristics are: organisational structure based on teamwork; identification of farm women's issues; information resourcing and dissemination favourable to farm women; mentoring and support for the development of farm women.

59. Would this type organisation/network appeal to you as a farm woman?

☐ yes ☐ no ☐ not applicable

60. Please explain your answer to Q59.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

61. Do you have any other comments you would like to make?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Section F: Contact Details

The completion of this section is voluntary. Any information that identifies you will not appear in any written material in relation to this study, i.e. anonymity will be assured and maintained. This information will be secured safely during the course of the research period, and then destroyed appropriately, subject to University of Otago, New Zealand, policy at that time.

I will be undertaking a selection of interview in which I will discuss with respondents some of the issues in this questionnaire in more depth, and if you would like to be considered please complete the details below. This page will be detached from the rest of the questionnaire.

Name:

Address:

Phone Number:

Fax Number:

Email Address:

Thank you for taking part in this research. Please return this questionnaire in the envelope provided to Deirdre Shaw, Department of Geography, University of Otago, P O Box 56, Dunedin.
A.8 Farm Women Interview Schedule (Waikato version)

Organisation #: Name: Date:
Participant #: Phone #: Time:
Taped / Not Taped Consent Form Signed

Location Details:

**Standard Questions:**
- Discuss their involvement with farming – past and/or current?
- How have they seen farm women’s roles change?
- Has this change been visible and recognised by farming community, RSI, general society?
- How has the farm women’s organisation they belong to helped them re leadership and as a member of the farming community?
- How do you think the farming community and the RSI envisage WDFF? What sort of public image do they have?
- How do you think the farming community and the RSI envisage NWD? What sort of public image do they have?
- Do you think that RWNZ’s activities challenge the image of a farm woman as a housewife, a farm helper and as a community worker? In what way, and what alternative image do they present?
- Do you think that NWD’s activities challenge the image of a farm woman as a housewife, a farm helper and as a community worker? In what way, and what alternative image do they present?

**Specific Questions Arising From Comments In Questionnaire:**
A.9 Membership Demographics:

**Figure A.1: Age of Respondents by Organisation**

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, question 1.

**Figure A.2: Marital Status of Respondents by Organisation**

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, question 2.
Figure A.3: Respondents with Dependent Children by Organisation

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, question 3.

Figure A.4: Primary Caregiver to Dependents by Organisation

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, question 4.
Figure A.5: Members’ Occupation by Organisation

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, question 9.

Figure A.6: Members’ Partners’ Occupation

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, question 10.
Figure A.7: Educational Attainment of Members by Organisation

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, question 11.

Figure A.8: Members’ Access to Internet by Organisation

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, question 13.
Figure A.9: Ownership Structures of Members’ Farm Property by Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Members Ownership of Farm Property (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FWIO</td>
<td>Equal Partnership with Spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWNZ WAIKATO</td>
<td>Other Equal Family Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVWIA</td>
<td>Unequal Partnership with Spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWAV</td>
<td>Owned by Spouse only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCW</td>
<td>Owned by Parents in law / Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWNZ OTAGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWIO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Farm Women Questionnaire, question 17.
Appendix B: Internalised Collective Identity

B.1 Organisational Objectives

Box B.1: FWIO Objectives

...an organisation for personal growth and community action. The objectives at all levels are:
(a) To assist and encourage women to become more knowledgeable and responsible citizens;
(b) to promote and develop good family life skills;
(c) to help discover, stimulate and develop leadership;
(d) to help identify and resolve needs in the community


Box B.2: Informal Objectives of FWIO

- Fun and friendship – personal growth
- Initiate programs to strengthen family
- Recording local history
- Influencing through resolutions, briefs and letters
- Improving health, nutrition and safety in the home
- Instructing through leadership workshops
- Instructing through craft and food demonstrations – creativity
- Identify and act on local, national and global issues – community involvement
- Travel
- Letter friends
- Scholarships

Source: FWIO, undated a; FWIO, undated b.
Box B.3: CWAV Objectives

1. To improve conditions by community service more especially as they affect the welfare of women and children. The other objects of the Association are subject to and ancillary to this main purpose of the Association.
2. To arrest drift from rural areas.
3. To establish Branches of the Association.
4. To organise and support schemes for the benefit of members and for community welfare.
5. To promote friendship amongst members of the Association and sister organisations, and to welcome and take a kindly interest in all newcomers in every district.
6. To encourage members and their families to develop personal skills.
7. To interest members in the proper development of their district, local town and state, so that industrial development progresses with good living conditions.
8. To encourage members to work for the protection of the environment.
10. To encourage members to take an intelligent interest in the workings of Government at Local, State and Federal level.
11. To publish magazines, pamphlets and other memoranda for the purpose of circulating to members of the Association and the community of Victoria, reports of the activities of the Association, articles of general interest including articles on Craft, Home Sciences, matters of national and international interest or generally of interest to the public.
12. To award scholarships, bursaries and other similar educational grants.
13. To co-operate or affiliate with any other Association having similar objects; and to become a member with other State Associations of the Country Women’s Association of Australia and to be represented as such member by representatives or delegates.
14. The income and property of the Association… shall be applied solely towards the promotion of the objects of the Association… [abridged].

Source: CWAV, 1999a.

Box B.4: Informal Objectives of CWAV

- Friendship and goodwill
- Personal growth
- Pursuit of social issues – standard of living for women; women’s viewpoint
- Discovery of talents – choral; drama; craft
- Learning new skills – leadership
- Networking
- Fulfilment
- Community service

Source: CWAV, undated a.
Box B.5: RWNZ Perceived Needs of Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Social contact</td>
<td>• Social contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Home nursing and housekeeping service</td>
<td>• Leadership training and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to libraries</td>
<td>• Retaining current services in health, education, technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assistance and training for mothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First aid training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health and educational services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Box B.6: RWNZ Objectives

- To better the conditions of families living in New Zealand and to strengthen rural communities in New Zealand.
- To encourage stewardship of the land.
- To promote national and international understanding.
- To be loyal subjects of the Sovereign of New Zealand.
- To carry out, promote and assist in such acts and purposes which... are deemed charitable.
- In pursuance of the objects of WDFF:
  - To assist in the provision of home care.
  - To assist in the provision and promotion of welfare and education.
  - To raise finance for such acts and purposes... deemed to be charitable, ... conduct fundraising campaigns and solicit, receive and enlist financial support and assistance...
  - To promote the establishment of committees to carry out on a voluntary basis the Objectives of WDFF.
  - To carry out, promote and assist in the provision of financial support for the relief of any person from the effects of natural disasters.
  - To carry out any other lawful act for the fulfilment of the Objects. (abridged)

Source: WDFF, undated a.
### Box B.7: OFWN Objectives

1. To secure social, legal and economic equality for farm women in Ontario.
2. To support and strengthen the family farm and the farm family.
3. To increase farm women’s representation on commodity agencies, boards and commissions and to increase the number of women on government-appointed agri-food bodies.
4. To build alliances with the larger community (similar organisations, societies and individuals) in Ontario and Canada to provide a forum for discussion of issues; to provide mutual support; and to secure public support of OFWN objectives.
5. To provide a forum for farm women to participate in issues of importance to women farmers, farm families and the family farm business.


### Box B.8: AWiA Objectives

- uniting and raising the profile of Women in Agriculture;
- addressing rural and agricultural inequalities;
- working to ensure the survival of agriculture for future generations;
- securing local, regional, national and international recognition; and
- achieving the status of a political and economic force.

Source: Website (http://www.awia.org.au)

### Box B.9: CVWiA Objectives

- to raise the confidence, community activity and industry support of rural women in some way to agriculture;
- to support these women to take actions they see as required, either individually, or in a small group, or as a whole group;
- to provide a growing network for women to step into leadership roles, board representation or any other community / industry / political sphere;
- raising our own levels of education, awareness and ability to present opinions on a wide range of rural issues

Source: CVWiA, undated a.
Box B.10: NWD Objectives

- To share information and identify major issues for women involved in dairying in New Zealand;
- To draw on women’s knowledge, experience and understanding of the dairy industry;
- To inform women of dairy industry issues that have direct impact on them and their families;
- To support women by providing an electronic mailing list where their opinion and contribution is valued;
- To create better understanding between women of different backgrounds and situations; and
- To recognise women’s vital contribution in agriculture and rural communities in New Zealand.


Box B.11: PCW Research Findings and Recommendations

**Findings**
- Need for business respect of rural women
- Need for training to develop skills
- Recognition of busy lifestyle when providing training
- Need for networking, support and mentoring

**Recommendations**
- Promote diversity & value of women’s roles
- Co-ordinate training seminars
- Develop a community communication strategy
- Encourage communication by networking & mentoring


Box B.12: PCW Aims

- Organise and facilitate programmes that address these needs as identified in the research document "Goals and Issues".
- Positively promote both the women themselves and the work of opportunity providers.
- Source funding and sponsorship to achieve these aims.
- Liase with existing women’s groups and community agencies to support them in addressing identified women’s needs.

Source: RWRC, undated.
B.2 Organisational Structures

Figure B.1: Structure of Federated Women’s Institute of Ontario

Table B.1: FWIO Hierarchical Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past president</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Curator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Co-Ordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolutions Convener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to next level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positions at each</td>
<td>18 (+VP)</td>
<td>14 (+VP)</td>
<td>12 (+VP)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.2: Structure of Country Women’s Association of Victoria

**c10445 Members**

- **464 Branches**
  - Rural and outer–urban, provide member activities

- **49 Groups**
  - President co-ordinates activities and disseminates information, handicrafts, music, drama, outings

**CWA of Victoria - State Council**

- State President, 11 Senior Office Bearers, 1 Committee Chairman, 8 Members of Honour, 49 Group Presidents

**CWA of Australia (National)**

**ACWW (Global)**

## Table B.2: CWAV Hierarchical Positions and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State President</strong></td>
<td>No job description, but should be: knowledgeable, humble and ask for advice. Delegate to Dep. St. Pres. Attend State meetings Ceremonial duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy State President</strong></td>
<td>Support and represent St. Pres. Attend State meetings Checks minutes and correspondence Ceremonial duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Vice Presidents</strong></td>
<td>Attend state meetings Organise hospitality Represent St. Pres. Committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group President</strong></td>
<td>Organise Music &amp; Drama Festivals, Exhibitions Advocate at State level Attend State Council, 2 Group conferences and AGM Branch visits Communicate motions to State Council Encourage enthusiasm and promote benefits of CWA Choose Grp. Sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Secretary</strong></td>
<td>Personal support to Grp. Pres. Minutes and correspondence Feedback to Grp. Pres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branch President</strong></td>
<td>Plan meeting programmes Disseminate information from Group and State Responsible for meeting procedure To maintain dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branch Secretary</strong></td>
<td>Monthly agenda Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branch Treasurer</strong></td>
<td>Accounts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.3: Structure of Rural Women New Zealand

Members
1324 Waikato  1225 Otago

Branches
74 Waikato  43 Otago

Provincial
6 Waikato  11 Otago

Regions
7 (NZ)

RWNZ National Council
9 Executive

Regional Consultative Groups
7 Waikato
7 Otago

Regional Development Officers

Administration Staff

Portfolio Convenors & Rapid Response Teams

Access Homehealth Board

ACWW (Global)

Table B.3: OFWN Executive Committee and Directors Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Brief Description of Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>Conduct all affairs of organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>General supervision and delegation of some duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Presidents</td>
<td>Perform delegated duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Maintain records and notices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>Budget, discuss vital affairs, conduct urgent affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter Editor</td>
<td>Production of newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFWN Director</td>
<td>Represent OFWN and act as agent of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFA Director</td>
<td>Represent OFWN and act as agent of communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OFWN, 1996.

Figure B.4: Structure of Ontario Farm Women’s Network
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Figure B.5: Structure of Positively Clutha Women

Rural Women of Clutha District

- c 300 clients

PCW Committee

Core of 8-13 members – one of which must be a Director of CADB

Associated members

Clutha Agricultural Development Board


Figure B.6: Structure of Australian Women in Agriculture

c600 members based in individual and autonomous groups and networks

- e.g. Central Victorian WiA 55 members

AWiA Board of Management (National)

- President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer,
- 7 other Board Members responsible for media, training and development, policy, publications and membership development
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**Figure B.7: Structure of Network for Women in Dairying**

Initial nucleus of members who organise annual Conference

Network for Women in Dairying

c130 members on email network

**C O M M U N I C A T I O N F L O W**


**B.3 Organisational Membership Characteristics and Incentives**

**Table B.4: FWIO Membership Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 40 years</td>
<td>40 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Membership</td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>10 years of more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Table B.5: FWIO Users of Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Major user 1/2/3/4/5 Minor user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger farm women</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger women in rural towns</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in paid workforce</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.6: FWIO Most Important Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Workshops, leadership, fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>Through community action, education, resource material, workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship / Support</td>
<td>Moral, travel, at home, across Canada and internationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Provincial, national, international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>In the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering with other organisations</td>
<td>Breast Screening, Osteoporosis, Phonebusters Scheme, Health/Nutrition, Scholarships, History research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying</td>
<td>For change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table B.7: CWAV Membership Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 40 years</td>
<td>40 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Membership</td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>10 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†50% of members over 70 years of age.

Table B.8: CWAV Users of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Major User 1/2/3/4/5 Minor User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger farm women</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger women in rural towns</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in paid workforce</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.9: CWAV Most Important Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Companionship</td>
<td>Care, respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden skills</td>
<td>Crafts, home industries, public speaking, music and drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Law, domestic violence, farm safety, environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues</td>
<td>Voice to government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Box B.13: CWAV Annual Events

- Annual meeting of State Presidents
- Quiet Achiever Award
- Leadership information day
- CWA Sunday
- Song in costume festival
- Residential craft school
- Group president leadership school
- Show catering for Sheep show
- Group August conferences
- Royal Agricultural Society dinner
- Choral and drama festival
- Branch leadership school
- Craft leaders’ school
- Club fair


Table B.10: RWNZ Membership Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 40 years</td>
<td>40 years or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Membership</td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table B.11: RWNZ Users of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Major User 1/2/3/4/5</th>
<th>Minor User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger farm women</td>
<td>3 Otago</td>
<td>5 Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td>1 Otago</td>
<td>1 Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger women in rural towns</td>
<td>4 Otago</td>
<td>1 Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td>2 Otago</td>
<td>2 Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>3 Otago</td>
<td>4 Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>2 Otago</td>
<td>1 Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in paid workforce</td>
<td>5 Otago</td>
<td>4 Waikato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Box B.14: RWNZ Most Important Services

- Social contact
- Lobbying for rural community sustainability
- Personal growth and development through skill learning
- Homecare and personal care services
- Continuing education
- Networking and providing information


Table B.12: OFWN Membership Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2% (associates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1% (associates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 40 years</td>
<td>40 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Membership</td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>10 years of more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.13: OFWN Users of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Major user</th>
<th>1/2/3/4/5</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger farm women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger women in rural towns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>2†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>2†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in paid workforce</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – men re: Covering Assets</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Re: childcare and abuse issues

Table B.14: OFWN Most Important Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Being able to talk with other farm women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying</td>
<td>Government contact to lobby for benefits of farm women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Social Issues</td>
<td>Dealing with issues like family concerns of the farm – social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Farm Family</td>
<td>Supporting the farm family above the corporate notion of farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Educating children and the general public about farming in all its aspects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table B.15: CVWiA Membership Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 40 years</td>
<td>40 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Membership</td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>10 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.16: CVWiA Users of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Major User 1/2/3/4/5 Minor User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger farm women</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger women in rural towns</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in paid workforce</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Box B.15: CVWiA Joining Incentives

- an increasing network of support, learning and friendship for you;
- an informal structure of linking with people who have similar interests and concerns as you;
- a range of activities that you may be involved in, as you choose;
- a chance to 'do something' that matters – at all levels, from local family to the policies of Australian agriculture;
- a chance to support women who step from comfort zones to 'make a difference'

Source: CVWiA, undated b.

Box B.16: CVWiA Most Important Services

- Networking
- Practical demonstrations
- Support
- Mentoring
- Leadership


Table B.17: PCW Membership Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 40 years</td>
<td>40 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Membership</td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>10 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.18: PCW Users of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Major User 1/2/3/4/5 Minor User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger farm women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger women in rural towns</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in paid workforce</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Box B.17: PCW Most Important Services

- Awareness of opportunities
- Co-ordination of services / service providers
- Seminars
- Communication network for events, groups and ideas
- Celebration of Rural Women’s Week


Box B.18: PCW Events

- Projecting a Positive Image
- Time & Stress Management
- Business Growth
- Communication
- Training opportunities – Computer and Internet
- Tourism and Farm Diversification
- Rural Women’s Week
- Women’s Farm Field Days
- Leadership
- Combined events with CWI & RWNZ
- Lunches, dinners, parades and competitions


Table B.19: NWD Membership Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 40 years</td>
<td>40 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not recorded*</td>
<td>Not recorded*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Membership</td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>10 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* All members are actively involved in farming or the agri-industry
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Table B.20: NWD Users of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Major User 1/2/3/4/5</th>
<th>Minor User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger farm women</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older farm women</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger women in rural towns</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older women in rural towns</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in paid workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Box B.19: NWD Email Discussion Topics

- Introductions & farming backgrounds
- Milk food industry
- Climate
- Media – portrayal of women & success stories
- Family commitments – childcare, safety
- Science & technology innovations
- Day to day farm management
- Issues facing rural communities
- Financial issues – farm & industry
- Dairy Co politics – mergers, meetings
- Conferences
- Globalisation
- Animal health – homeopathy, diseases, rearing
- Employment issues
- Rural Service Industry – attitudes, services
- Stock management
- Personal health
- Breeding & Mating


Box B.20: NWD Most Important Services

- Email networking
- Information sharing
- Network conference
- Mentoring
- Profile within industry politics

Source: NWD Email, pers. comm., 2001.
B.4 Organisational Characteristics of Collective Action

Box B.21: Characteristics of FWIO

- Combat isolation
- Social support network
- Personal growth
- Lobby group
- Skills provider
- Creating stronger voice for all women
- Service provider
- Community interaction
- Promoting equality for all women


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>Important 1 – 5 Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of System Limits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching of System Limits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Box B.22: Characteristics of CWAV

- Combat isolation
- Social support network
- Personal growth
- National lobby group
- Skills provider
- Provision of community facilities
- Creating stronger voice for all rural women
- Service provider
- Community interaction

### Table B.22: Characteristics of Collective Action of CWAV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>Important 1 – 5 Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of System’s Limits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching of System’s Limits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Box B.23: Characteristics of RWNZ

- Combat isolation
- Social support network
- Personal growth
- Creating agricultural awareness
- National lobby group
- Skills provider
- Farm issues focus
- Creating stronger voice for farm women (Otago only)
- Service provider
- Community interaction
- Industry focus
- Promoting equality for farm women
- Networking for business (Otago only)
- Provision of community services


### Table B.23: Characteristics of Collective Action of RWNZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>Important 1 – 5 Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 Otago 2 Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of System’s Limits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 Otago 5 Waikato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching of System’s Limits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 Otago 1 Waikato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box B.24: Characteristics of OFWN

- Personal growth
- Creating agricultural awareness
- National lobby group
- Skills provider
- Creating stronger voice for *farm* women
- Promoting equality for *farm* women
- Networking for support of concerns – publicity


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>Important 1 – 5 Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of System Limits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching of System Limits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Box B.25: Characteristics of CVWiA

- Combat *attitudinal* isolation
- Social support network
- Personal growth
- National and state lobby group
- Skills provider
- Creating stronger voice for *farm* women
- Education provider – *farm* safety, health
- Agricultural boards interaction
- Creating agricultural awareness
- *Farm* issues focus
- Industry focus
- Promoting equality for *farm* women
- Networking for business

### Table B.25: Characteristics of Collective Action of CVWiA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>Important 1 – 5 Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of System’s Limits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching of System’s Limits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Box B.26: Characteristics of PCW

- Combat isolation
- Social support network
- Personal growth
- Skills provider
- Farm issues focus
- Creating stronger voice for farm women
- Community interaction
- Promoting equality for farm women


### Table B.26: Characteristics of Collective Action of PCW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>Important 1 – 5 Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of System’s Limits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching of System’s Limits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box B.27: Characteristics / Functions of NWD

- Combat isolation
- Social support network
- Personal growth
- Creating agricultural awareness
- Skills provider
- Farm issues focus
- Industry focus
- Creating stronger voice for farm women
- Networking for business
- Promoting equality for farm women


Table B.27: Characteristics of Collective Action of NWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>Important 1 – 5 Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of System’s Limits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching of System’s Limits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix C: Media Analysis


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Identities / Image</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Letter to editor re FWIO recycling award</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td>• &quot;efforts through education, demonstration, advocacy&quot; – FWIO PR Officer 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Craft and baking bazaars (3) • Supporting another organisation encouraging women to vote • Graphic of a TV celebrity being given a FWIO mug</td>
<td>• Domestic • Community • -</td>
<td>• &quot; said he’s an honorary member of the institute&quot; CBC radio host 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Identities / Image</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1988 | 6             | • WI volunteer work  
• WI achievements  
• WI launch daycare for women working on farms (photo: 2 women with tractor)  
• WI conference, membership down  
• WI conference on waste management  
• WI scholarships for rural youth | • Carer  
• Carer  
• Carer  
• Farm helper  
• Community  
• Community  
• Community  
• Community | • “motivating force within their community” – Journalist 1  
• “A lot of farm wives can do the job better than hired help anyway” – Local farmer 2 |
| 1991 | 4             | • Recycling award  
• Appointment to environmental advisory board  
• Letter to register WI condemnation of Gulf War. History of WI support during other wars.  
• WI commitment to environment / household practices | • Community  
• Community  
• Community  
• Community  
• Community  
• Carer  
• Domestic | • “The 20000 members of the FWIO…” FWIO letter 3 |
| 1998/99 | 5 | • Royal Agricultural Winter fair Queen  
• WI week proposal  
• FWIO involvement in agriculture. Awards for domestic practices and farming (photo: older women)  
• Rural volunteer awards  
• FWIO Award recipients | • Traditional  
• Community  
• Carer  
• Farm helper  
• Community  
• Farmer  
• Carer  
• Community  
• Community | • "The FWIO is an agriculturally based organisation" -Journalist 4  
• "important institution in the rural community across Ontario"- Ontario MPP 5  
• "Sylvia is noted for her delicious Chelsea buns"- Future Leaders Think Tank participant 6 |

### Table C.3: CWAV Articles in the *Bendigo Advertiser* 1990, 1994, 1998/99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1990      | 30            | • CWA News (25 articles) craft, flowers, competitions, branch activities / social, domestic  
• CWA branch closes – service to women / charity  
• CWA Conference – social  
• CWA picnic  
• CWA Conference – older members helping younger members cope with rural life  
• CWA Conference opened by State President, but article discusses competitions not her speech or resolutions | • Carer  
• Community  
• Community  
• Community  
• Social  
• Photos of older ladies drinking tea / coffee  
• Social  
• See Plate 5.1  
• Community  
• Domestic | “CWA members take time for refreshments”  – Headline 1 |
| 1994      | 25            | • CWA News (17 articles) craft, social activities, community work, donations, domestic  
• Craft trophy  
• CWA leadership – new Group President  
• CWA / ACWW celebrations  
• CWA Branch celebration – new president  
• Melbourne Cup lunch / Branch news  
• Birthday celebration  
• Group president urges members to be active in community – handcrafts and home industries  
• CWA conference – competitions – crafts, show entries | • Domestic  
• Carer  
• Community  
• Social  
• Domestic  
• Domestic  
• Carer  
• Community  
• Domestic  
• Carer  
• Domestic | “a pretty bread and butter plate”  – CWAV report 2  
“the roll call… seeks a household hint… the competition… a wooden spoon novelty”  – CWAV report 3  
“Our Families, Our Future”  – Conference theme 4 |
| 1998/99   | 18            | • CWA News (18 articles)– crafts, domestic, social, rural health | • Carer  
• Community  
• Domestic  
• Photos of older women and crafts | “…held its May meeting…. commencing with crochet”  E.g. of start of CWAV news 5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Roading Action by CWA</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td>• “We have heard the voices of our women” - National CWA President 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA environmental theme</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA seeking new younger members due to ageing membership. Lists State resolutions</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA Conference – roading, railways, water rates issues, public speaking contest and concert</td>
<td>• Ageing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA recognise rural women’s unpaid work – not radical action but due consideration</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Carer</td>
<td>“should think about the issue” - National CWA President 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Farm helper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Photos of older women</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>• CWA backs Year of the Family – focus on concern, tolerance and understanding</td>
<td>• Carer</td>
<td>“uphold our concept and values of family life” – CWAV State President 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA craft school</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA Conference, domestic violence speaker – need to make visible in community</td>
<td>• Domestic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA Speaks – why CWA came about, historical introduction</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA Club Fair - fundraising event in Melbourne</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA Speaks – study grants</td>
<td>• Social</td>
<td>“To speak with authority on and command attention to, matters of public interest connected with community affairs” – CWAV State President 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA Speaks – study grants</td>
<td>• Photos of older women, catering and singing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA Speaks – study grants</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA Speaks – study grants</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Biographical article on OBE recipient and politically active woman farmer who makes reference to CWAV</td>
<td>• Domestic</td>
<td>“very elderly ladies in their 40s” 5 - OBE recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA and AWiA views on dairy deregulation. CWA concerns are social and community oriented</td>
<td>• Ageing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA golden jubilee / CWA accommodation. History of caring for rural women and families</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• National President promoting computer skills, change to professionalism needed</td>
<td>• Industry actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• National President promoting computer skills, change to professionalism needed</td>
<td>• Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• National President promoting computer skills, change to professionalism needed</td>
<td>• Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• National President promoting computer skills, change to professionalism needed</td>
<td>• Photo of 4 members – older women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• National President promoting computer skills, change to professionalism needed</td>
<td>• Move from domestic skills to computer skills to be of continued service to community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• National President promoting computer skills, change to professionalism needed</td>
<td>• See Plate 5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Media Analysis

#### Appendix C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CWA member rewarded for voluntary work, discusses advantages of belonging to CWAV</td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td>• “[her causes are] farm safety programs, domestic violence and celebrating our cultural diversity” – journalist re CWA National President 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1992 | 3             | • Rural lobby for women | • Community
• Lobby group | • “A key lobby group for rural women, WDFF has pledged to monitor government legislation which affects women in country communities”– Journalist 1 |
|      |               | | • Community
• Industry | • “national issues such as rural education and health” – Journalist 2 |
|      |               | • Future of rural support group | | |
| 1994 | 5             | • WDFF service honoured | • Domestic
• Community
• Catering
• Photo of older member with cake | • “…being recognised as a key stakeholder in rural communities”– WDFF President 3 |
|      |               | • Women honoured at WDFF luncheon | • Community
• Community
• Lobby group
• Decision makers | |
|      |               | • WDF claims key role | • Lobby group
• Community
• Farm helper
• Community | |
|      |               | • Rural women push lobby | | |
|      |               | • WDFF Homecare service | | |
| 1999 | 10            | • Rural strategies (article starts with comments from Federated Farmers) | • Community
• Lobby group | • “…the WDFF works to promote rural communities and the welfare of rural families, and provides community service and development according to local needs… the organisation today means far more than tea and scones…”– WDFF President 4 |
<p>|      |               | • WDFF name change | • Lobby for rural community | |
|      |               | • GE Food – Govt. Minister talking at WDFF conference | • Industry | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      |              | • Name change for lobbyists | • Lobby group  
|      |              | • Name change | • Social issues  
|      |              | • Women’s group keeps rural roots | • Lobby group  
|      |              | • WDFF elect president | • Community  
|      |              | • New name for WDFF | • Photo of name changers  
|      |              | • Beyond the tea and scones | • None  
|      |              | • RWNZ support Ministry of Rural Affairs | • Rural as small towns not just farms  
|      |              |                     | • Deny tea and scones arm of Federated Farmers  
|      |              |                     | • Social  
|      |              |                     | • Community  
|      |              |                     | • Political  
|      |              |                     | • Farmers  
|      |              |                     | • Off-farm workers  
|      |              |                     | • Photo of three members (see Plate 5.3)  
|      |              |                     | • Community  
|      |              |                     | • Political  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>• WDFF lobby MPs&lt;br&gt;• WDFF rural force&lt;br&gt;• Work of women recognised – QSM recipient&lt;br&gt;• WDFF conference</td>
<td>• Community&lt;br&gt;• Rural lobby&lt;br&gt;• Political&lt;br&gt;• Community&lt;br&gt;• Photo of older women&lt;br&gt;• Community&lt;br&gt;• Community</td>
<td>• “We accept the need for change and want to. Possibly the best thing would be an infusion of young members…” – WDFF Representative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Sustaining rural communities conference&lt;br&gt;• Rural maternity services</td>
<td>• Community&lt;br&gt;• Community&lt;br&gt;• Lobby group</td>
<td>• “strengthen networks and develop resources” – conference organiser 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>• Seminar for women – personal motivation and business strategies&lt;br&gt;• Skills workshop for rural women – business skills, farm consultant&lt;br&gt;• WDFF and CWI in TV documentary about women&lt;br&gt;• WDFF member service recognised – QSM recipient&lt;br&gt;• Computers help rural isolation – new WDFF president&lt;br&gt;• Rural Women’s Week – running sessions on craft and domestic skills, and speechmaking&lt;br&gt;• WDFF conference GM topic&lt;br&gt;• MP talks at WDFF conference&lt;br&gt;• Rural women offered business skills workshop, facilitator farm consultant&lt;br&gt;• WDFF festival of talent – domestic and craft skills, music and speech&lt;br&gt;• WDFF member turns 101</td>
<td>• Farmer&lt;br&gt;• Industry&lt;br&gt;• Farmer&lt;br&gt;• Domestic&lt;br&gt;• Community&lt;br&gt;• Social&lt;br&gt;• Community&lt;br&gt;• Farmers&lt;br&gt;• Off-farm workers&lt;br&gt;• Craft&lt;br&gt;• Domestic&lt;br&gt;• Community&lt;br&gt;• Industry&lt;br&gt;• Community&lt;br&gt;• Farmer&lt;br&gt;• Domestic&lt;br&gt;• Carer&lt;br&gt;• Community&lt;br&gt;• Domestic&lt;br&gt;• Carer&lt;br&gt;• Craft</td>
<td>• “Traditionally, WDFF has been seen as the scone making distaff side of Federated Farmers, even though it had a separate constitution and its own focus on community work” – WDFF National President 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table C.7: RWNZ Articles in *The New Zealand Farmer*, 1992, 1994, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1992 | 5            | • Homecare  
• Rural service honours for member  
• Rural postal services (2 articles)  
• Rural service honour for member |
|      |              | • Community  
• Community  
• Community  
• Lobby group  
• Community |
|      |              | • “WDFF looked into the issue of urban centres subsidising rural areas…” – WDFF member 1 |
| 1994 | 14           | • Homecare  
• Rural women protest  
• Domestic violence (2 articles)  
• Rural education  
• Rural health (2 articles)  
• Rural health  
• Rural women different viewpoint  
• Rural health equity  
• Loss of rural services (2 articles)  
• Rural maternity services  
• Seeking higher profile for rural women  
• Suffrage award for WDFF member |
|      |              | • Community  
• Photo of older woman  
• Community  
• Community  
• Community  
• National lobby  
• Community  
• Community  
• Community  
• Community  
• Social issues  
• Community  
• Diversity of roles  
• Community  
• Lobby group  
• Community  
• Community  
• Lack of leaders  
|      |              | • “Two years ago the WDFF applied its collective wisdom to empowering its women…” - Journalist 2 |
|      |              | • “A man will view an issue solely from an economic or political point of view… women are aware of these, but also look at the people and social issues behind it, and how it affects women and families.” – WDFF National President 3 |
|      |              | • “The need for the voice and values of rural women to have a higher profile in the corridors of power has never been so urgent… while both WDFF and CWI have given sterling service to their communities over the years, they had not been a source of women candidates for office or school boards or local government or Parliament.” - National Council of Women President 4 |
| 1999 | 0            | - | - | - |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Identities / Image</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-Childcare in farm communities-</td>
<td>- Carer - Farmer -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-President of OFWN interview re farm women’s movement- -Farm women count in survey – OFWN lobby to include farm women in census- -Childcare for farm women- -OFWN lobby for financial relief for farm families- -OFWN conference- -Farm women already volunteered to death: conference- -Call for action from agricultural conference- -Action to save family farms- -Women have a role in agriculture as policy players and partners on farm-</td>
<td>- Farmer - Carer - Off-farm career - Farmer - Off-farm career - Farmer - Industry actor - Farmer - Call for action from agricultural conference - Women have a role in agriculture as policy players and partners on farm</td>
<td>- “struggle between loyalty to traditional roles and making women equal partners in farming families” -OFWN President 1 - “why can’t we be farmers in our own right” -OFWN member 2 - “women fighting for the survival of the family farm are challenging…” -Journalist 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>● Farm Women conference</td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td>“says she doesn’t want the network to be so structured that it becomes a burden.”- OFWN delegate 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Formation of OFWN – support and information for farm women</td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Structure of OFWN</td>
<td>● Industry actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● “Activist” talks about farm women’s group</td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Childcare needed for farm women</td>
<td>● Industry actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Carer</td>
<td>“when there are two partners working on that farm, however you divide your job duties, the wife is usually the principle caretaker of the children.”- OFWN President 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Off-farm career</td>
<td>“The groups do not truly represent the farm community and they may lack sensitivity to the impact decisions will have on farm women” University of Guelph researchers 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>● OFWN resolution for rural daycare</td>
<td>● Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Farm women face three leadership barriers – findings of OFWN’s</td>
<td>● Industry actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breaking Barriers</td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Off-farm career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Community worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Off-farm career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Industry actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Off-farm career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>● OFA refuses to help OFWN and their focus on rural social issues</td>
<td>● Farm family</td>
<td>“There is a need for more information, more research, and more communications on rural social issues, or what she describes as ‘the soft issues’ that strengthen the family farm and the family” 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Women’s group maps its future with survey to farm women</td>
<td>● Family farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Survey of 800 women probes farm family awareness</td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Off-farm career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Industry actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1994   | 4             | • AWiA promoting new image for farm women – removing farmer’s wife tag through recognition for invisible partner  
• Mary Salce – Farmer leader for women. Portrayed as active, political and challenging  
• Farm women hit out – AWiA maligned for incorrect comments re women’s involvement in mainstream farm organisations  
• Rise of AWiA as a political and socio-economic force | • Women as political agents  
• Farmer  
• Industry actor  
• Women as political agents  
• Farmer  
• Industry actor  
• See Plate 5.5  
• Industry actor  
• Farmer  
• Industry actor  
• Photo of a mix of younger and older women | • “I always felt there weren’t enough women and then I realised they weren’t there because they weren’t comfortable being there for all sorts of reasons.” – woman farmer and industry leader 1  
• “I believe the growth reflects the needs of the women at the grassroots of agriculture” – AWiA President 2 |
| 1998/99| 5             | • Training needs of rural women – article refers to AWiA  
• Dairy deregulation – concern for industry by AWiA  
• Rural women consultation and decisionmaking – AWiA president chair of Regional Women’s Advisory Council  
• New leader for AWiA – discusses aims of network and also CWAV. AWiA promoted as young, active network, while CWAV established in serving women but needs image change.  
• CVWiA associated ‘Knickers Fund’ | • Farmer  
• Off-farm career  
• Industry actor  
• Industry actor  
• Action  
• Industry actor  
• Women as leaders / political force  
• Farmer  
• Off-farm career  
• Industry actor | • “women… believe deregulation will affect dairying families” – woman farmer and industry leader 3  
• “[AWiA] includes agricultural scientists, journalists, researchers, marketers, agribusiness and farmers” – AWiA President 4 |
### Table C.11: AWiA / CVWiA Articles in the *Bendigo Advertiser*, 1990, 1994, 1998/99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Farming Diary – Women in Agriculture photo competition</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>- Farming Diary – CVWiA meeting (4 articles)</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table C.12: PCW Articles in the *Otago Daily Times*, 1992, 1994, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Identities / Images</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>- Fieldday for women – NZ’s first monitor farm fieldday for women</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>&quot;the venue was a woolshed and there was a crèche… the topics… included lamb production, hogget lambing, dipping residues, the Australian greenfly and stresses in the home.&quot; – Journalist 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Women stepping out</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>&quot;recognising women played a valuable role in rural Clutha, often working in equal partnership on the land or in their own jobs.&quot; – PCW Coordinator 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Seminar encourages women to step out</td>
<td>Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Activities for Rural Women’s Week</td>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rural Women’s Week to celebrate diverse talents</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Week dedicated to rural women</td>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 100s of women revel in celebration – Rural Women’s Week</td>
<td>Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Diversity of roles</td>
<td>Off-farm worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity of roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo of young women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farm helper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity of roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D: Leadership Participation by Women in Mainstream Farming Organisations

Table D.1: Leadership participation by women in Ontario mainstream agricultural organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Cattleman’s Association</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers’ Association</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Farmers of Ontario</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Pork</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Federated Farmers Association</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Agricultural Training Institute</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>20% †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Farmers Association</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


† 1 each nominated by OFWN (chair), FWIO, and Ontario Grape Growers’ Marketing Board.

Table D.2: Leadership participation by women in Australian mainstream agricultural organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Executive (year and % of women)</th>
<th>Board of Directors (year and % of women)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Wheat Board</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2000 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork Council Australia</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2000 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool Council Australia</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2000 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Farmers Federation</td>
<td>2000 0%</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Dairy Farmers of Victoria</td>
<td>1999-2000 0%</td>
<td>1999-2000 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFF Chicken</td>
<td>2000 0%</td>
<td>2000 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFF Flowers</td>
<td>2000 0%</td>
<td>2000 Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D.3: Leadership participation by women in New Zealand mainstream agricultural organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Executive until 1992 (% of women)</th>
<th>Board of Directors (year and % of women)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federated Farmers National Council</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1999 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Farmers Provincial Presidents</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1998-99 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Farmers Dairy Council</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1989-91 1991-92 1998-99 2.5% 5% 6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Farmers Meat Council</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1989-92 1998-99 (incl.Wool) 3% 9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Farmers Arable / Grains Council</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Until 1999 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Dairy Board</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2000 7.5% (appointed only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Wool Board</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2000 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Meat Board</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2000 7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple and Pear Marketing Board / ENZA</td>
<td>0% elected</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Industry Training Organisation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1993 2000 20% 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>