

Chapter One

“IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER” MEN, FATHERHOOD AND PUBLIC POLICY

**by
Ian Shirley**

Fathers and fatherhood are back on the policy agenda. Over the past two decades questions have been raised within New Zealand and comparative countries as to the status of men and the rights and responsibilities of fatherhood. Such questions arise at a time when fathers have become increasingly marginalised, especially within the context of the home. As the role of breadwinner and provider has changed, so men find themselves de-skilled in the day-to-day activities of fatherhood. Whereas women were excluded from the paid workforce for much of this century, as the century comes to a close it is men who are confronting exclusion from the family and at the same time having to deal with contradictory interpretations of their gender and sexuality.

The ambivalence experienced by males in their relations with others, notably partners and children, has been exacerbated by the way in which men are both perceived and portrayed. It is an experience that is all too familiar to women who have been subjected to sexual stereotypes throughout the course of western civilisation leaving them vulnerable to abuse and (as recent studies reveal) victims within their neighbourhoods and homes. Today, men are experiencing a different type of vulnerability that stems, on the surface at least, from two dominant stereotypes. The first is a negative stereotype of men as dysfunctional lovers, violent partners, and either absent or abusive fathers. Since we know so little about the intimate behaviour of men, the abusive image in particular becomes a window through which we see all males and thereby define their attributes as fathers. It is a debilitating stereotype that has led to even greater ambivalence among men especially in forging closer relationships with children. The second stereotype is that of the ‘male icon’ described by Paul Callister as ‘super dads’.

Climbers who spend months overseas, yachties who are away for long periods from their families, rugby players who consistently tour the country and the world, businessmen who wheel and deal on a global basis, working long hours in the process, and... politicians and child development experts who promote family values, but nevertheless spend very little time with their own children (Callister, 1998).

These are the men that are frequently portrayed as role models, providing expert comment on various aspects of New Zealand life, from broadloom carpets to toffee pops, and from leadership to fathering. These ‘super dads’ set unrealistic objectives for

the majority of men in that they represent an exclusive club dominated by sportsmen in receipt of professional salaries that are far beyond the disposable incomes of most New Zealand males. 'Super dads' neither reflect the wide spectrum of interests or activities in which men are engaged, nor the realities experienced by New Zealand men on a day-to-day basis, as they try to balance domestic and employment responsibilities. Both stereotypes distort the image of men in that they fail to capture the diversity and richness of different cultural traditions, different family and household forms, and vastly different experiences of life. If there is a 'norm', a 'typical' male or an 'average' father, then 'dead beat dads' and 'super dads' are clearly deviations.

FAMILY, STATE AND MARKET

Despite the fact that they represent simplistic interpretations of our individual and collective lives (and thereby emphasise symptoms rather than underlying causes) stereotypes do draw attention to the broader set of institutions, policies and practices that provide the context in which men (and fathers in particular) are being reexamined. At the heart of this reassessment lie the broad configurations of family, state, and market, with the most significant policy implications evident in the changing relations between these different spheres of activity.

To understand why the roles and responsibilities of fatherhood are being revisited, it is important to see the demographic and policy changes that have occurred over the past few decades within the context of changing patterns of development. For the purposes of this exercise we can broadly distinguish between two social formations or periods. The first, which is equated with the post-war period through to the 1970s, has been referred to as the 'wage earners welfare state', whereas the more recent emphasis on neo-liberalism (from the late 1970s to the present day) is attributed to the advance of the New Right and the state led programme of economic rationalisation – in Oliver's terminology, 'the end of the interventionist state?' (Oliver, 1988). These labels can be assigned to contrasting forms of welfare and to alternative models of economic and social development.

THE WAGE EARNERS WELFARE STATE

Although the 'wage earners welfare state' is traditionally associated with the post world war two period, the origins of this distinctive model of development can be traced back to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act (1894) and the concept of a basic minimum wage. In the early twentieth century, New Zealand commentators wrote of a 'theory of fair wages... sufficient to give the worker a decent living according to the colonial standard (Le Rossignol and Stewart, 1910:239). Since the average 'worker' of the time was male and since 'normal' needs encompassed domestic responsibilities, the 'fair wage' was soon defined as a family wage sufficient to support a wife and two or three children. With the election of the first Labour Government in 1935, the family wage was enshrined in legislation. Government established base wage rates for adult male workers to enable a man 'to maintain a wife and three children in a fair and reasonable standard of comfort' (Woods, 1963).

The provision of a family wage based on male employment led to a distinctive set of arrangements that established New Zealand as one of the leading welfare states of the post-war period. In contrast to those European and Scandinavian countries that based their welfare states on extensive systems of income maintenance and social insurance, New Zealand used wage regulation as the primary instrument of social protection. Although the wage fixing system was the cornerstone of New Zealand's welfare state arrangements these measures were extended and developed over a period of almost eighty years. In the 1930s, the policies of the first Labour Government placed primary emphasis on the concept of insulation: insulation of the domestic economy through protective measures such as tariffs, import licences, and controls on immigration so that employers could provide the requisite number of jobs; and insulation of the family wage by means of price stabilisation and by linking wages to prevailing economic conditions through the rulings of the arbitration court.

If the regulation of wages was the cornerstone of New Zealand's welfare state arrangements, then a second fundamental element was full employment. Conceived as the 'fulcrum of the welfare state' (Rosenberg, 1997) in the post-war period, the employment of every able-bodied male represented an historic compromise forged in response to the 1920s depression when measured unemployment rose to 12% of the labour force. It was the combination of male employment and wage regulation that ensured a high standard of living for the majority of the population with those 'outside' the waged majority protected by a selective benefit system. Whereas west Europeans concentrated on consolidating and extending their social insurance and income maintenance schemes, New Zealand relied heavily on the labour market with supplements to the family wage in the form of a national health service, access to free primary and secondary education, a state housing programme for those who could not afford a home of their own, and a comprehensive, although largely selective, system of social benefits.

Home ownership was particularly significant, both as a stabilising influence and as a central element in a family's economic and social security. Within the context of the family wage, it attached a 'man' firmly to a job, to a piece of land, and to a social group; it established a base for 'his' family, and so to a network of neighbourhood institutions, such as church, school, and voluntary society (Oliver, 1978). In national terms, the high wage rates, made possible by the relative affluence of the country, led to high levels of private home ownership, with mortgage repayments serving in effect as a major form of retirement security.

By any standards, the level of welfare achieved in the immediate post-war period was exceedingly high. The increasing affluence of the population was reflected in New Zealand's consistent rating among the top five of the world's wealthiest nations. The country was socially and politically stable and for over thirty years maintained a remarkable record of full employment, a record that was not equalled anywhere else in the world (Shirley et al., 1990). Of course there were limitations to New Zealand's welfare state arrangements. The gendered construction of the family and the labour market neither recognised the significance of unpaid work nor the rights of women in

the paid work-force. While it may have attached a man firmly to a job, a piece of land, and a social group, it defined women and children in accordance with their 'family roles' and 'responsibilities'. The labour market, rather than the family or the state, was the mechanism through which resources were distributed. Within this market, men were the primary income earners with overall responsibility for 'their dependants'. It was a relationship, defined in law, which was based on three important assumptions:

- i. That male employment was a primary economic and social goal aimed at ensuring the income security of the household.
- ii. That men required a 'fair wage' in order to maintain a family in a reasonable standard of comfort; and
- iii. That the role of women was primarily prescribed by their marital status and by the nurturing requirements of motherhood. As a consequence, the level of remuneration for labour market participation was a secondary (and indeed undesirable) consideration.

Setting aside these limitations of familial dependency (reinforced, it should be said, by male and female alike) the family wage ensured a high degree of economic and social security. Today, much of that security is gone. Although changes to the family wage were inevitable, given the high level of domestic insulation and protection afforded both the family and the economy in the post-war period, the extreme shifts in public policy that have occurred over the past two decades have significantly altered the parameters of the welfare state and with it New Zealand's distinctive approach to economic and social development. In the course of these changing patterns of development, the broad configurations of family, state, and market have been altered and these factors have had major implications for men as 'providers' and for the allocation of domestic responsibilities within the home.

CHANGING PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT

The conditions that changed the form of development in New Zealand had both global and domestic origins. In the international context, New Zealand's economic vulnerability prompted a market-driven programme of diversification that widened the base of the economy and altered the country's trading relationships. In the domestic sphere women became increasingly involved in the paid workforce, and the family actively exploited the increasing liberalisation of the market, both as producers and consumers. These trends were evident long before the programme of economic rationalisation was introduced in the mid-1980s (Saville-Smith et al., 1994). What was distinctive about this earlier period of liberalisation, both in terms of domestic and economic relations, was the way in which the 'historic compromise' forged in the post-war period was maintained. Employment continued to be the New Zealand government's primary economic and social objective, and when frictional unemployment occurred in the 1970s, the state became actively involved in expanding employment opportunities and in providing temporary training and employment programmes for those out of work. Similarly, when the value of the family wage declined, women entered the paid work-force in order to supplement household

income. At the same time considerable pressure was applied to government in order to maintain the country's standard of living with the thinking behind this strategy articulated by the Royal Commission on Social Security in its 1972 report emphasising the importance of work in securing economic and social security.

At one level, changes in the configuration of family, state, and market were both inevitable and easily understood. Many countries went through similar adjustments, although there is little doubt that no other country adopted such an extreme agenda as did New Zealand. Over the past decade and a half the regulatory structure that operated throughout most of the post-war period was almost completely dismantled. Interest rate controls were removed and restrictions were lifted on the flow of money into and out of New Zealand. The economy was opened up to competition from imports and foreign companies were given greater access to the New Zealand market. Agricultural subsidies were phased out, and the protective shield was removed from manufacturing. Government departments were reorganised along commercial lines and then selectively privatised. At the same time monetary and fiscal policies were tightened in order to reduce inflation.

In the early phase of economic liberalisation the emphasis in public policy was on economic restructuring, using social policy to maintain existing levels of social protection. The underlying philosophy, as espoused by The Treasury (1984 and 1987), attacked the assumptions, as well as the mechanisms, on which the post-war consensus had been built. Social factors were artificially separated from economic policy, as a residual role was prescribed for the state in facilitating the process of restructuring and in 'targeting' assistance to individuals in 'exceptional' circumstances. Unemployment was treated as an 'adjustment problem' with one of the major impediments to employment being identified as the lack of labour market flexibility.

During the more recent phase of liberalisation, the same commercial principals and practices employed in the economic sphere were extended to social policy. These initiatives included the commercialisation of health, user pays in education, market rentals in state housing, individual bargaining in employment, the dismantling of the award system, a reduction in benefit levels, and the targeting of social assistance. Both the process by which the programme of economic liberalisation was implemented and the overall impact of these reforms have been examined by a wide range of studies and while there is some evidence of success as a consequence of the microeconomic reforms, the comparative evidence suggests that in terms of outcomes, New Zealand's economic and social programmes have failed (Castles et al., 1996; Podder and Chatterjee, 1998; Dalziel, 1999). For some individuals the changing relations between family, state, and market have provided new freedoms and new opportunities. Others have experienced a significant decline in income and in their standard of living. Whereas the family wage ensured that the majority of New Zealanders in the immediate post-war period were able to enjoy a standard of living much like the rest of the community (and in that sense they participated in and belonged to society), the new environment of the 1990s has effectively disenfranchised a significant sector of the population. The parameters of the welfare state have changed and in the process the

family wage has been replaced by an incoherent set of policies that neither recognise the demographic patterns of family today, nor provide an effective framework for the maintenance of family and national well-being.

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE CHANGING PATTERNS OF FAMILY LIFE

When the demographic patterns of recent years are combined with the radical shifts that have taken place in public policy, we are confronted with a form of national development that has significant implications for family life. In demographic terms the New Zealand pattern broadly resembles changes taking place in comparative western societies, although there are obvious differences too, especially in this country's accommodation of Maori and Pakeha, as well as Asian and Pacific Island traditions. The key features of changing family patterns in New Zealand include:

- major shifts in household type with non-parenting couples becoming more significant
- an increase in sole-parent families and a decrease in two-parent households
- a significant rise in the number of children born ex-nuptially, especially to couples in mid-childbearing ages
- a decline in the rate of formally registered marriages, yet when combined with cohabitation, the number of partnerships has remained relatively stable
- a trend toward later marriage and later childbearing, and
- a decline in the average family size with the declining rate of fertility for Maori being rapid since the 1960s

These demographic changes have a significant impact on policy formation, yet it is a relationship that has not always been well understood. One example stems from the extravagant claims made by groups such as the Committee for the International Year of the Family which reported in 1994 that 25% of New Zealand families (and 25% of the entire population) lived in sole-parent families. These claims received wide coverage in the popular media and prompted a great deal of invective against 'solo-mothers'. Neither statistic was correct: only 2% of adult males, 7% of adult females, and 15% of children were living in sole-parent households at the time of the report. Moreover, the report treated sole-parent households as static families or units whereas the evidence shows that sole-parenthood is a transitory state, in and out of which people (mainly women) move as partnerships are dissolved and new families are formed.

Similarly, the National Government's proposal in 1991 to make the 'core family' responsible for the social, emotional, and financial needs of its members was not based on demographic realities. The goal was to promote individual "self reliance while throw[ing] off the burden of welfare" (Shipley et al., 1991). It was based "on the 'norm' of the nuclear family, with specific variations to recognise situations where that type of family [had] not formed or [had] broken down" (Angus and Gray, 1995). Treasury advanced this concept as a means of devising a comprehensive targeted regime that would have been a cheaper option for government (Prebble et al., 1991) but the policy model had no empirical substance or credibility and was eventually

abandoned. The point to be stressed is, that the major policy changes of the past decade and a half required sound policy models based on accurate data, but in many cases these were not available, or if available, they were not consulted. In this policy vacuum, imported ideologies took over from the pragmatic concerns of a country in transition and in such an environment it is not difficult to understand how the focus in family policy shifted from the underlying causes to centre on symptoms and stereotypes.

ECONOMIC RATIONALISATION AND THE NEW ZEALAND FAMILY

The radical shift that has occurred in public policy since the mid-1980s has had major implications for New Zealand families. In general terms, the disinflationary programme (combining sustained fiscal deficits and a tight monetary policy) forced up domestic interest rates; higher interest rates in turn attracted considerable injections of foreign capital. Pressures generated by foreign investors seeking New Zealand dollars forced up the exchange rate, which meant that it was more profitable to import than to export. These policies directed the spending flow away from production and into speculation. As it became more difficult to compete in the international marketplace, firms reduced production and employment, and the economy moved into a deep recession (Shirley et al, 1990).

The cumulative impact of these policies resulted in severe damage to the tradeable sector. Profits, employment, and investment were all affected, and at the same time export growth sharply diminished. In the farming sector production levels dropped, confidence declined, and many farmers who had borrowed unwisely for expansion during the years of government subsidies and high land values found themselves operating uneconomic units. There was also a substantial change in New Zealand's industrial pattern with labour-intensive industries, such as clothing and furniture, suffering large declines in exports, while imports were allowed into a depressed domestic market. Factory closures in these industries produced a significant increase in unemployment, with investment in New Zealand manufacturing falling by almost 50% between 1985 and 1989. The restructuring of the state sector alone added at least 40,000 people to the pool of unemployed, while major employment areas such as forestry and manufacturing declined by 67% and 21% respectively. Within 18 months of implementing the programme of economic liberalisation, unemployment trebled, and by 1991 registered unemployment represented 11% of the total labour force. Long-term unemployment became a serious social problem and because of the segmented nature of the labour market, the social problem had racial overtones. An estimated 20% of the Maori working-age population lost their jobs in the two years from March 1987 to March 1989. Two years later the unemployment rate for non-Maori aged 15-24 years was nearly 20% - for Maori it was approaching 40%.

Exclusion from the paid workforce placed increasing pressure on immediate and extended families. Where households were unable to support or sustain this dependency, the state became the primary means of income support. As a consequence, government faced increasing levels of welfare expenditure. In 1981 (apart from national superannuation and the family benefit) almost 115,000 people were receiving a welfare benefit. By 1985 that figure more than doubled, and by 1992 it had almost

trebled. To illustrate the increasing reliance of families on some form of government assistance, Department of Social Welfare figures reveal that in 1985, 8% of working age people were in receipt of a benefit. By 1996, the percentage had risen to 21% of working age people, or 400,000 individuals. In 1985, 12% of children were living in households receiving a benefit – by 1996, 30% of children were in government assisted households. The figures for Maori reveal even greater disparities. In 1996 Maori were more than twice as likely as non-Maori to be reliant on government benefits as their main source of income. Despite a government policy objective aimed at closing the socio-economic gaps between Maori and non-Maori, recent evidence confirms that the disparities are widening (Te Puni Kokiri, 1998). When these broad trends are combined with negative social indicators in health, education, income, and housing, the social pattern that emerges is that of a society that has incurred a substantial social deficit. It is a deficit characterised by:

- sharp divisions between household incomes that seriously disadvantage families with children
- labour market segmentation leading to ‘work-rich’ and ‘work-poor’ families (see Callister, 1998)
- high rates of unemployment especially in working class neighbourhoods and among Maori and Pacific Island populations
- a significant increase in relative poverty irrespective of the measures being used
- a resurgence of preventable childhood diseases associated with factors such as social deprivation and over-crowding
- educational disparities, especially in terms of high school qualifications where the ratio between Maori and non-Maori is 3:1, and
- contrasting areas of the country where the socio-economic distinctions between ‘affluent’ and ‘deprived’ neighbourhoods have become sharply differentiated.

The cumulative effect of this ‘deficit’ and the social formation from which it has evolved, is a society in which the relations between family, state, and market have radically altered. In the early decades of the post-war period the family wage established a pattern of familial and working life which reinforced the dependency of women and children on male employment. The ‘male wage earners’ welfare state was characterised by ‘full employment’ and by the maintenance of a household income that included the state provision of education and health services, a high level of private home ownership, and a selective system of benefits for those outside the labour market. When these provisions began to decline, the state became increasingly involved in protecting the family’s welfare through sometimes contradictory measures including the promotion of equal employment opportunities, the care and protection of children, and increasing state expenditure on social assistance for those excluded from the labour market. With the advent of economic rationalisation, the unfettered market became the major reference point for family, as well as national, wellbeing. In the transition from

one form of development to another, a significant sector of the population was effectively disenfranchised and thus it is not surprising that the need to establish a new pattern of domestic compensation has become one of the major challenges facing New Zealand society at the turn of the century.

MEN AND FATHERHOOD

Although the economic and social security of families (especially families with children) is back on the policy agenda, the changing roles and responsibilities of men has yet to be accorded the priority it deserves. Some measure of the distance that needs to be traveled can be gauged by reference to the women's movement. Irrespective of our individual assessments of the women's movement, there is no denying that feminist literature and research assessing the contribution of women in production, reproduction, and community life, has greatly enhanced the diverse contributions of women while also promoting alternative definitions of womanhood. A comparable literature is not yet available on men and manhood. Although there are some who will no doubt suggest that history is dominated by men, 'his story' (especially in policy terms) has been driven by patriarchal stereotypes drawn from dominant cultures and traditions. The cause of fatherhood is most likely to be advanced by research and literature that examines the diversity of men and the realities of their public and private lives. Whereas the women's movement has successfully focussed on translating personal troubles into public issues, the private worlds of men remain largely hidden. Until these private domains are explored, little progress is likely to be made in advancing the cause of fatherhood.

The same is true of the public sphere where the current profile of men belongs to a period of time in which male and female roles were clearly differentiated. Although work patterns continue to be a major determinant in the lives of men, the nature of work has changed as has the structure of the labour market. The participation rate for men in paid employment is declining, although for some in the labour force there has been an intensification of work leading to longer working hours and a widening division between households and work. Despite the rhetoric of 'family friendly workplaces', the reality of longer working hours and a noticeable decline in the universal supplements to the family wage, confirms recent evidence suggesting that major impediments remain to the fusion of work and family responsibilities (Firkin and Shirley, forthcoming).

The impediments to achieving a better balance between the employment and domestic spheres, stem from a complex range of factors that have both public and private origins. In the 'private' sphere, there has been an increasing involvement of New Zealand fathers in the upbringing of their children, although some evidence suggests a preference for the more interesting tasks such as taking children on outings, rather than performing mundane activities like feeding and bathing. Men are much less likely to be involved in domestic work except for repairs to the home. Such preferences are clearly conditioned by the resilience of 'male' and 'female' roles and by the cultural attitudes accompanying these prescriptions. The de-skilling of fatherhood is in part an artefact of this conditioning process.

There are also structural impediments to the way in which men perceive the roles and responsibilities of fatherhood. The security and stability of male employment has been significantly changed over the past few decades and the role of 'provider' has been further undermined by a general contraction in the duration of our working lives. The evidence of increasing polarisation between 'work rich' and 'work poor' households presents a major challenge, not only for those households who are excluded from paid work, but also for society in terms of social protection. Despite its obvious limitations, one of the achievements of the 'wage earners welfare state' was the way in which it promoted a high degree of economic security and social inclusion. Today, that security has diminished. Thus, one of the challenges facing New Zealand society on the eve of the new millennium is to construct a new social contract - a contract that promotes the social participation of all sectors of society and in the process duly recognises the richness and diversity of our social and cultural lives.

REFERENCES

- Angus, J., and D. Gray (1995) A Department of Social Welfare Policy Perspective on Rights and Responsibilities, in *Rights and Responsibilities*, Papers from the International Year of the Family Symposium, Wellington, 79-84.
- Bollard, A. and R. Buckle (1987) eds., *Economic Liberalisation in New Zealand*, Wellington, Allen and Unwin.
- Boston, J., P. Dalziel, S. St John (1999) eds. *Redesigning the Welfare State in New Zealand: Problems, Policies, Prospects*, Auckland, Oxford University Press.
- Callister, P. (1998) "Work-Rich" and "Work-Poor" Individuals and Families: Changes in the Distribution of Paid Work from 1986 to 1996, in *Social Policy Journal Of New Zealand*, Issue 10, June, 101-121.
- Callister, P. (1999) Iron John or Ironing John? The Changing Lives of New Zealand Fathers, in S. Birks and P. Callister (editors) *Perspectives on Fathering*, Issues Paper No.4, Palmerston North, Centre for Public Policy Evaluation, 23- 40.
- Castles, F. (1985) *The Working Class and Welfare: Reflections on the Political Development of the Welfare State in Australia and New Zealand 1890-1980*, Wellington, Allen and Unwin
- Castles, F. and I. Shirley (1996) Labour and Social Policy: Gravediggers or Refurbishers of the Welfare State, in F. Castles, R. Gerritsen, J. Vowles (editors) *The Great Experiment: Labour Parties and Public Policy Transformation in Australia and New Zealand*, Auckland, Auckland University Press.
- Dalziel, P. (1999) *New Zealand's Economic Reform Programme was a Failure*, a paper comparing the reform programmes of New Zealand and Australia.
- Davies, L. and N. Jackson (1993) *Women's Labour Force Participation in New Zealand: The Past 100 Years*, Wellington, Social Policy Agency.
- Easton, B. (1996) Income Distribution, in B. Silverstone, A. Bollard, R. Lattimore, (editors) *A Study of Economic Reform: The Case of New Zealand*, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Firkin, P. and I. Shirley (forthcoming) *Transitions: an examination of work histories and labour market transitions*, Labour Market Dynamics and Economic Participation, Massey University
- Le Rossignol, J. and W. Stewart (1910) *State Socialism in New Zealand*, London, George G. Harrap.
- Oliver, W. (1978) An Uneasy Retrospect, in I. Wards (editor) *Thirteen Facets*, Wellington, Government Printer, 41-65

- Oliver, W. (1988) Social Policy in New Zealand, in *Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy*, Vol. 1, Wellington, RCSP, 3-45.
- Podder, N. and S. Chatterjee (1998) *Sharing the National Cake in Post Reform New Zealand: Income Inequality Trends in Terms of Income Sources*, A paper presented to the Annual Conference of the New Zealand Association of Economists, Wellington, September
- Pool, I. (1992) The New Zealand Family: Structural Changes in the Context of Shifts in Societal Values, in *New Zealand Population Review*, 18 (1 and 2) 69-86
- Prebble, M. et al (1991) *Report of the Change Team on Targeting Social Assistance*, Wellington, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.
- Rosenberg, W. (1977) Full Employment: The Fulcrum of Social Welfare, in A. Trlin (editor) *Social Welfare and New Zealand Society*, Wellington, Methuen, 45-60.
- Saville-Smith, K. et al (1994) *Bringing Home the Bacon: The Changing Relationship Between Family, State and Market in New Zealand in the 1980s*, Family and Societal Change Report No.3, Wellington, New Zealand Institute for Social Research and Development Ltd.
- Shipley, J. et al (1991) *Social Assistance: Welfare that Works*, Wellington, Government Printer
- Shirley, I. (1990) New Zealand: The Advance of the New Right, in I. Taylor (editor) *The Social Effects of Free Market Policies: An International Text*, London and New York Harvester and Wheatsheaf, 350-390.
- Shirley, I. (1993) *Experiments in the New Zealand Laboratory*, a paper presented at the Conference on Comparative Research on the Welfare State in Transition, Oxford University, September.
- Shirley, I., B. Easton, C. Briar, S. Chatterjee (1990) *Unemployment in New Zealand*, Palmerston North, Dunmore Press.
- Shirley, I., P. Koopman-Boyden, I. Pool, S. St John (1997) Family Change and Family Policies: New Zealand, in S. Kamerman and A. Kahn (editors) *Family Change and Family Policies in Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 207-304.
- Shirley, I., J. Brook, R. Cremer, P. Dewe, C. Eichbaum, D. Rauniyar, P. Spoonley (1997) *Labour Market Dynamics and Economic Participation: Hawkes Bay General Report*, Palmerston North, Massey University.
- Stephens, R. and J. Bradshaw (1996) The Generosity of New Zealand's Assistance to Families with Dependent Children, in *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 4 (July) 53-75.

Te Puni Kokiri (1998) *Progress Towards Closing Social and Economic Gaps Between Maori and Non-Maori*, A Report to the Minister of Maori Affairs, Wellington, Ministry of Maori Development

Treasury, The (1984) *Economic Management*, Post-Election Briefing to the Incoming Government, Wellington, New Zealand Treasury.

Treasury, The (1987) *Government Management*, Post-Election Briefing to the Incoming Government, Wellington, New Zealand Treasury.

Whitwell, J. (1989) *Monetary Policy: An Anti-Inflationary or an Anti-Employment Strategy?* A background paper prepared for the Social Policy Research Centre, Palmerston North, Massey University.

Woods, N. (1963) *Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration in New Zealand*, Wellington, Government Printer.

This paper draws from two major studies:

- The research programme on *Labour Market Dynamics and Economic Participation*, which is funded by the New Zealand Foundation for Research, Science and Technology and located at Massey University.
- The New Zealand Family Study of which Ian Shirley was the co-author with Peggy Koopman-Boyden, Ian Pool and Susan St John.