



Kent Academic Repository

Close, Paul (1976) *The Social Situations of Unmarried Mothers*. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis, University of Kent.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/94277/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.22024/UniKent/01.02.94277>

This document version

UNSPECIFIED

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives)

Additional information

This thesis has been digitised by EThOS, the British Library digitisation service, for purposes of preservation and dissemination. It was uploaded to KAR on 25 April 2022 in order to hold its content and record within University of Kent systems. It is available Open Access using a Creative Commons Attribution, Non-commercial, No Derivatives (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>) licence so that the thesis and its author, can benefit from opportunities for increased readership and citation. This was done in line with University of Kent policies (<https://www.kent.ac.uk/is/strategy/docs/Kent%20Open%20Access%20policy.pdf>). If you ...

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

THE SOCIAL SITUATIONS
OF UNMARRIED MOTHERS

Paul Close

A thesis submitted for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology,
University of Kent, 1976

Preface

The study of which this thesis is a report, was an exploration of the social situations - that is, the social relationships and social lives - of young unmarried mothers. It was inspired by an interest in the concept and nature of poverty, and although not intended as a 'poverty study', it may contribute to a solution of the problems surrounding these issues. I set out with the belief, encouraged by 'common knowledge' and supported by the writings of various social commentators, including sociologists, on the subject, that unmarried mothers in our society are deviants and therefore stigmatized. I had gained the impression that unmarried mothers would attract widespread disapproval, censure, hostility and rejection from others, and that as a result they would suffer relatively high degrees of social isolation with the detrimental consequences that would have for their social lives. I expected that whatever their level of economic resources, say, they would probably be 'deprived', in the sense that their social situations would be 'abnormal'.

However, there was a dearth of firm information which could be used to draw conclusions on these matters. Therefore I decided to investigate the social situations of young unmarried mothers with the aim of throwing some light on what these are like and why, and with this in mind I decided to carry out intensive interviews with a small sample of carefully selected young unmarried mothers and, for comparative purposes, with a similar sample of young widowed mothers. But I gradually formed the opinion as a result of, first of all, the available literature and data on the topic and, secondly, the information I began to gather during interviews, that my original ideas were perhaps largely mistaken. The possibility emerged that young unmarried mothers do not necessarily

suffer high degrees of social isolation, nor abnormally restricted social lives, and that if and when they do, it is not necessarily a result of the responses of others to their marital status. On the contrary, it appeared possible that if and when young unmarried mothers do suffer these things, it is simply because of their own responses. Consequently, the focus of my attention shifted, and I became particularly interested in the nature and consequences of the meanings which unmarried mothers themselves attach to their marital status. On these grounds, coupled with the fact that I had found it impossible to locate the number of young widowed mothers I had wanted to interview, I decided to concentrate on interviews with the unmarried mothers and on a detailed analysis of the information I would gather from a proportion of these. The following is a report of my findings, and it indicates that common knowledge and the available literature on the topic of unmarried motherhood are suspect. Of course, no firm conclusions can be drawn on the basis of my study. But it was, after all, only exploratory and it does point to possible conclusions and to hypotheses to be tested by further research.

*

I wish to thank the many people who have given me help and advice during the carrying out and presentation of my study. I am particularly grateful to Dr. Derek Allcorn, Dennis Marsden, Sandy, the mothers I interviewed and, of course, Caroline.

CONTENTS

Chapter One	Introduction	1
Chapter Two	The Meanings of Unmarried Motherhood to Unmarried Mothers	50
Chapter Three	Family	102
Chapter Four	Fathers and Boyfriends	145
Chapter Five	Friends	192
Chapter Six	Social Relationships	228
Chapter Seven	Social Lives	284
Chapter Eight	Conclusions	335
	Afterword	363
	Notes	365
	Bibliography	389

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

It is a popular view amongst contemporary students of poverty that the latter should be regarded as a relative notion. Peter Townsend is one of the best-known and influential of these ^{1.}, and he suggests:

that needs which are unmet can be defined satisfactorily only in terms relative to the society in which they are found or expressed. Distinctions hitherto made between 'absolute' and 'relative' poverty, or between 'basic' and 'cultural' needs are argued to be unreal on analysis. Needs which are believed to be absolute or basic can be shown to be relative. Poverty must be regarded as a general form of relative deprivation which is the effect of a maldistribution of resources. 2.

In other words, according to Townsend, people should be regarded as being in poverty if they are, in an 'objective' sense, 'relatively deprived' ^{3.}, or, that is, if they are "excluded from participation in common social activities and enjoyments" ^{4.}. The sort of 'activities' or 'needs' which Townsend has in mind include "having /a/ summer holiday away from home /.../ staying overnight with relatives and friends /.../ having them to stay /.../ holding a birthday party /.../ having a meal or snack with friends at home or outside the home" ^{5.}. They are broad in scope and include what may be described as 'leisure activities'. Townsend tells us that a research team investigating poverty in the United Kingdom has been experimenting with a 'deprivation index' based on a list of activities of this kind ^{6.}.

This approach to the definition and study of poverty appears to me to face a number of fundamental problems. One of these concerns compiling a satisfactory list of 'needs' by which 'relative deprivation' and, therefore, poverty may be detected. In this context we may note how Townsend has criticised ^{7.} the operational definition of poverty used by Seeborn Rowntree and G.R. Lavers in their study of poverty in

York in 1950 ¹. As Ken Coates and Richard Silburn put it:

Townsend /.../ challenged the validity of Rowntree's minutely calculated subsistence scales, from which he deduced his poverty line. Townsend argued that the list of items deemed to be 'necessary expenditure' was too narrow, and urged a more realistic appraisal of 'necessaries' /.../. He /also/ suggested that the calculations of essential expenditure should not be based upon the prejudices of research workers or other experts who claim to know how other people's money should be spent, but on actual spending patterns of working class groups /.../. Thus 'due regard must be paid to the conventions sanctioning membership of the community' ².

The problem is, however, which 'community' should be taken as a reference for a list of 'necessaries'. The poor themselves cannot be taken because they are not yet known, and, in any case, will be deprived of everything on the list. The problem which remains is, then, how to decide on a 'reference group' and a list of 'needs' which is not based upon the prejudices of researchers. Perhaps the only solution is to refer to the poor's (and therefore everybody's ?) own reference groups, and feelings of deprivation. Perhaps the only solution, in other words, is to investigate 'relative deprivation' in the subjective sense ³, and therefore to investigate the way people themselves define their situation.

Townsend says about the national survey of poverty to which he refers:

We assume that the deprivation index will not be correlated uniformly with total resources at the lower levels and that there will be a 'threshold' of resources below which deprivation will be marked ⁴.

Townsend and his colleagues have been interested in measuring the economic resources of those studied because in their view the poor is " that section of the population whose resources are so depressed from the mean as to be deprived of enjoying the benefits of participating in the activities which are customary to that society" ⁵. The implication of this is either that all people who are found to be 'deprived' are assumed to be so because of a lack of economic resources, or that only those people who are thought to be 'deprived' because of a lack of economic resources should be counted as poor.

It is possible, however, that some people will be 'deprived' but not, at least simply, because of a lack of economic resources. An individual may be excluded from participation in 'activities' because, for example, of the (lack of) prestige he enjoys. If he is black in South Africa, for instance, no matter what his economic resources he is likely to be 'deprived' (depending on how this is judged, of course) because of the 'social exclusion' he suffers at the hands of those who are white ¹. Another fundamental problem which faces those who adopt the approach to the definition and study of poverty suggested by Townsend is, therefore, that of deciding on whether or not people who are 'deprived' because of, say, a lack of prestige should be regarded as being in poverty ². Whatever they decide in this respect, they face the problem of discovering why people are 'deprived'. They will need to solve this problem in order to discover either whether people are in poverty or, alternatively, why they are in poverty ³.

The literature and studies suggest that some types of family and individual are more likely than others to have relatively few economic resources and, as a result, to be 'deprived', and therefore in poverty. As Ken Coates and Richard Silburn put it,

it is striking that /whatever the/ definition/.../ there is a very considerable measure of agreement as to the principal causes of poverty. The relative importance of these causes has changed from time to time as circumstances have altered, and different pieces of research reveal marginal differences from one situation to another, but the headings listed by Rowntree as the immediate causes of poverty in his first study of York in 1901, are almost identical with Abel-Smith and Townsend's 1965 classification ⁴.

According to Abel-Smith and Townsend ⁵ 'fatherless families' are more likely than many other types of family to have relatively few economic resources. About 10 per cent, or 750,000, of those they found to be in poverty, that is in families with incomes less than 140 per cent of National Assistance Board scale rates, were members of fatherless families. Margaret Wynn estimates that in the United

Kingdom there are about 500,000 fatherless families, with approximately 750,000 dependent children ¹. It appears, therefore, that according to Townsend about 60 per cent of the members of fatherless families compared with only about 14 per cent of the population in general were in poverty in 1960.

Dennis Marsden in his Mothers Alone tells us that:

fatherless families are likely to be poor. They lack a man's wage and alternative incomes from social security payments or allowances from children's fathers often prove inadequate; while unsupported mothers tend to have only a limited earning power because they have children to care for and wage rates for women are depressed. ².

At the same time, however, there are different types of fatherless families, and it seems that these are not equally likely to have relatively few economic resources. Marsden, who carried out a study of fatherless families in receipt of national assistance, says:

there are comparatively few widows dependent on assistance /therefore/ little can be said about them in the present book. However, they remain important in what follows as the only group among the fatherless to have achieved public recognition as deserving; they have pensions and, except for widows drawing assistance, the earnings rule on these pensions has been completely waived. Their living standards may therefore be used as a reference with which to compare other fatherless families. If, as often proves the case, the widows are not the most needy in such comparisons, the inference is not that they are well off /.../ but that the other families are even poorer. ³.

Marsden found that even amongst his sample of informants, mothers of different marital status tended to have different incomes. He found that the average widowed mother had a total income slightly larger than the average for all the mothers, and that unmarried mothers were slightly worse off than average ⁴. Marsden goes on to suggest that this difference, at least in part, can be "accounted for by the National Assistance Board regulations which permitted widowed mothers to keep /part/ of the child's allowance" ⁵. However, he adds, "this is not the whole reason" ⁶. In part, the difference was due to the way N.A.B. officers used powers, officially described as 'discretionary' ⁷, which enabled them to affect the value of an

allowance and even whether or not assistance was awarded. The officers were allowed, for example, to reduce or withhold an allowance where mothers were 'cohabiting'. However, Marsden says, "suspicion of cohabitation fell upon mothers unevenly depending on their age, marital status, and mode of life" ¹. Unmarried mothers and young women generally were thought more likely to cohabit than older women, including most widows, for instance. Consequently, the difference in income between mothers of different marital status amongst Marsden's informants was to an extent because "widows never suffered deductions by the National Assistance Board for suspected cohabitation /whereas the/ mothers whose dependent children were illegitimate /were given/ unfavourable assessments of the size of their allowance" ². In other words, the allowances of unmarried mothers and divorced and separated mothers with young illegitimate children were more likely to be reduced for suspected cohabitation ³. Marsden came to the conclusion that "the suspicion of discrimination against unmarried mothers must stand" ⁴.

Because N.A.B. officers used their 'discretionary powers' in assessing the allowance of Marsden's informants to favour widowed mothers and disfavour unmarried mothers, it is possible that the former would have been less likely than the latter to be 'deprived'. In addition, however, this difference in treatment brings to mind the possibility that even amongst widowed mothers and unmarried mothers with the same income, whatever the source, the former will be less likely than the latter to be 'deprived'. In other words, it brings to mind the possibility that a widowed mother is less likely to be unable to participate in 'activities' because of 'social exclusion'.

Much of the available literature together with the commonly held beliefs on unmarried motherhood would appear to support this expectation. These sources, that is, suggest that the unmarried

mother is a deviant in our society, ¹. and, as Erving Goffman puts it, "deviants /.../ are likely on occasions to find themselves as stigmatised individuals" ²., when they will be "disqualified from full social acceptance" ³.. According to Goffman:

In all /.../ instances of stigma /.../ the same sociological features are found: an individual who might have been received easily in ordinary social intercourse possesses a trait that can obtrude itself upon attention and turn those of us who he meets away from him /.../. The attitudes we normals have towards a person with a stigma are well known /.../ we believe the person with a stigma is not quite human. On this assumption we exercise varieties of discrimination, through which we effectively, if often, unthinkingly, reduce his life chances. 4.

Although widowhood, especially young widowhood, may carry a stigma ⁵., it does not do so as much as or, at least, with such severe consequences as, unmarried motherhood. According to Bronislaw Malinowski:

In all human societies /.../ the woman has to be married before she is legitimately allowed to conceive. Roughly speaking, the unmarried mother is under a ban, a fatherless child is a bastard /.../. Let us put it in more precise and abstract terms. Among the conditions which define conceptions as a sociologically legitimate fact there is one of fundamental importance. The most moral and legal rule concerning the physiological side of kinship is that no child should be brought into the world without a man - and one man at that - assuming the role of sociological father, that is guardian and protector, the male link between the child and the rest of the community.

I think that this generalisation amounts to a universal sociological law and as such I have called it /.../ the Principle of Legitimacy. 6.

In a similar way, Shirley Foster Hartley claims that "virtually all societies distinguish between legitimacy and illegitimacy of birth and apply sanctions to the parents and in many cases to the children of the latter" ⁷.. William Goode supports the claim that the 'principle of legitimacy' is a universal sociological law ⁸., but suggests that Malinowski gives too little emphasis to the real foundation on which it rests. According to Goode "the principle in fact rests primarily on the function of status placement, not that of locating a father as 'protector' /.../. Violation of the

norm creates some status ambiguity with respect to the child, the parents and the two kin lines" ¹. At least Goode agrees with Malinowski that the rule is not based on the social disapproval of pre-marital or extra-marital sexual activity. "Marriage /.../ is not primarily the legitimation of sex, but the legitimation of parenthood" ². According to Malinowski:

Broadly speaking, it may be said that freedom of sexual intercourse though not universally is yet generally prevalent in human societies. Freedom of conception outside of marriage is, however, never allowed, or at least in extremely few communities and under very exceptional circumstances. ³.

In this context we may note George Murdock's claim that in 250 societies which he studied, 70 per cent allowed extra-marital sexual intercourse, but none allowed birth outside of marriage. ⁴. Clark Vincent notes that in the United States and other Western Industrial societies there are contrasts, if not contradictions, in attitudes concerning illicit sexual behaviour. These, he suggests, "are evident in the social practices by which we inadvertently encourage, if not implicitly condone, the cause (illicit coition) and explicitly ensure the result (illicit pregnancy)" ⁵. Thus, according to Albert Ellis, "the same girl whose sex habits may be tolerantly viewed by friends, associates and lovers while her stomach remains appropriately flattened may be in for the severest kind of censure once she begins to stock up on maternity dresses" ⁶. In a similar way, Leontine Young suggests that:

we are perhaps less shocked by the fact of extra-marital relations, but we object violently to their tangible confirmation by the advent of an out-of-wedlock child. In fact if one observes public opinion today, one can hardly escape the conclusion that it is not so much the extra-marital relationship to which we object as the fact of the baby /.../. One may at least partially explain this reaction by the fact that while extra-legal sexual relations are disapproved they may remain hidden and hence ignored: they may conform outwardly to the accepted standards and present no open challenge to the community. An out-of-wedlock child on the other hand cannot be ignored and becomes seemingly an open threat to the security of the legal family. ⁷.

Here Young appears to be suggesting that the unmarried mother is stigmatised because she has violated a rule prohibiting extra-marital sexual intercourse, albeit that she alone is stigmatised because of this. Vincent, despite his suggestion referred to on the previous page, appears also to account for the stigma attached to unmarried motherhood in terms of sexual deviation. He notes that "the 'principle of legitimacy' or the traditional pattern of pre-marital chastity and marital fidelity, is maintained by censuring the unmarried mother principally. Since it is she whose evident sexual misbehaviour overtly threatens the mores supporting legitimacy. It is she whose behaviour is censured, as an object lesson, to prevent these mores from dying out in the conscience of society". In this way he accounts for "the traditional double standard/in our society which/ effects a harsher judgement of the female than of the male". 1.

Whilst the unmarried mother, rather than the unmarried father, is censured, the degree to which she is censured, we are led to believe, varies according to her type. Kingsley Davis, after noting that there are five possible forms of illegitimacy ², such that not all illegitimate births occur to unmarried females, suggests that illegitimacy as a result of "simple fornication" includes four subtypes which differ considerably in the amount of social disapproval directed at them ³. These four subtypes are:

- (1) the case in which the sexual relation between the mother and the father is transient, unaccompanied by any form of durable or friendly social contact, as in promiscuity and casual prostitution, (2) the case in which there is a liaison, a continued relationship between the father and the mother, but no intention of matrimony, (3) the case in which the couple live together and pose before the community as married. And (4) the case in which illegitimacy occurs before betrothal. 4.

According to Davis, illegitimacy "is condemned or tolerated in different degrees according as its specific forms are distinct from or near to the family norm" ⁵, and therefore "simple illegitimacy"

of subtype (1) "is apt to be strenuously disapproved" ¹., and more so than the other types. In other words, an unmarried mother will be less severely censured if, for example, she is known to be engaged to marry the father of her child.

Clark Vincent also notes that there are different attitudes towards various groups of unwed mothers ².. He suggests that censure is strong in the case of unmarried mothers whose "babies do not serve a social function" ³.. In the United States, for example,

the white unwed mothers, whose illicit pregnancies provide the means by which childless couples can have families, are not considered so great a social problem as the Negro unwed mothers, whose children are not in demand for adoption and may need financial support. ⁴.

This raises the question 'for whom is the Negro unmarried mother a greater social problem and the target of more censure in the United States?'. The answer is unlikely to be 'the Negro population'.

The latter, despite Malinowski's suggestion with regard to the 'principle of legitimacy', may even go so far as to look on any unmarried mother with very little, if any, disapproval. According to Robert Roberts:

the large differences in the rate with which the phenomena /of illegitimacy/ occurs in various cultural and sub-cultural groups has led one group of social scientists to question that illegitimacy is always a social problem or an indication of deviation.

Instead they argue from a position of cultural relativism which claims that /.../ various cultural groups may not have norms opposed to illegitimacy. Thus, whereas one culture may hold strongly to the norm of legitimacy, and maintain strong negative sanctions against those who violate the norm, other cultures may have counter-norms which either positively sanction or show an absence of any norm about the phenomena /.../.

Within complex societies such as the United States, they maintain that subcultures exist which have norms about marriage and the family which are different from those held by the majority culture. They explain the high illegitimacy rates of the lower economic classes and certain ethnic minorities on the basis that these groups hold counter norms which either positively sanction unwed motherhood, or treat it as a morally neutral issue. ⁵

As Hartley notes, recorded illegitimacy varies among societies from 0.0 to over 76.0 per cent of all births ¹. According to Goode recorded illegitimacy rates are, or have been, relatively high in three areas; North Western Europe, industrialised sub-Saharan Africa, and the New World from Tierra del Fuego to the non-white Southern population of the United States. The non-white population of the Southern States in the United States had rates of twenty to thirty per cent in 1957 ². However, in the face of these figures Goode remains a 'cultural absolutist', and points out that Malinowski suggested that "the norm would always be found, not that the members of a society would obey it under specific conditions" ³. In other words, Goode asserts, even where there is a high rate of illegitimacy (and of consensual unions) it will be found that "the norm exists, since, in fact, marriage is the ideal and those who violate it suffer penalties" ⁴.

At the same time, Goode admits the possibility that there is a variation in 'commitment' to the norm. Thus, after proposing that the principle has to do with 'status placement', he says:

Consequently commitment to the norm of legitimacy will be greater among the strata or kin lines which enjoy a higher prestige, or in which concerns with the kin relations is higher. Although in general this concern is more marked in the upper strata, in every stratum there will be some family lines which possess 'traditions', pride, a sense of kin identity, and so on. Illegitimacy rates can be expected to be higher among the lower strata in all societies. Correlatively, to the extent that a given society possesses a high proportion of lower strata families who are concerned little or not at all with their lineage, that society will exhibit a higher total rate of illegitimacy than it would have if the population were lower.

Given a high rate of illegitimacy /.../ the actual amount of stigma suffered by the average illegitimate child /and presumably its mother/ cannot be great relative to the legitimate children in the same strata and neighbourhood. 5.

In other words, Goode's reformulation of the principle of legitimacy leads him to expect, or allows him to account for, firstly, a greater 'commitment' to a norm which proscribes unmarried

motherhood and secondly, a lower rate of illegitimacy in higher social strata. He is led to expect, or is allowed to account for, more severe censure of illegitimacy within higher social strata ¹.

Jane Collier Kronick similarly suggests that:

the greater threat of pregnancy or any violation of societal norms to the family status among middle-class families results in a higher incidence of rejection of the girl by her family. The absence of status open to threat may well result in less rejection of the girl in the lower social classes. 2.

Amongst writers with differing opinions as to how and why people are committed to the principle of legitimacy there appears to be a generally held belief that there is a variation in commitment and, relatedly, in the rate of illegitimacy between and within societies. However, of course, whether or not a birth is illegitimate, and therefore how it is responded to, will depend on the definition of the latter. This definition may vary, and consequently so may the rate of illegitimacy ³. What is more, apart from being a variation in definition there may be a conflict of definitions. There may, for example, be an 'official' definition which differs from, or even exists without, a prevailing informal definition. In other words there may be no commitment to the formal rule and, therefore, no censure of officially labelled mothers of illegitimate children. There may, on the other hand, be commitment to another rule which defines legitimacy, such that those who break it are severely punished. The official statistics on illegitimate births are about births which have occurred in violation of official rules and, therefore, may provide little or no indication as to the actual rate of illegitimacy in the sense of the rate of births which are informally defined as illegitimate and which are informally censured.

Official statistics may even be of little value in drawing conclusions about commitment to the official rules. In his *Sociological Analysis and the Variable*, Herbert Blumer examines critically "the

scheme of sociological analysis which seeks to reduce human group behaviour to variables and their relations" ¹., and in this context refers to what may appear to be a fairly clean-cut variable relation, namely that between a birth control program and the birth rate of a given people. After "viewing the program of birth control in terms of how it enters into the lives of the people", and discovering that "we need to note many things" ²., he says:

a similar picture is given in the case of the other variable - the birth rate. A birth rate of a people seems to be a very simple and unitary matter. Yet, in terms of what it expresses and stands for in group activity it is exceedingly complex and diversified. We need consider only the variety of social factors that impinge on and affect the sex act, even though the sex act is only one of the activities that set the birth rate. The self-conceptions held by men and by women, the conceptions of family life, the values placed on children, accessibility of men and women to each other, physical arrangements in the home, the sanctions given by established institutions, the code of manliness, the pressures from relatives and neighbours, the ideas of what is proper, convenient and tolerable in the sex act - these are a few of the operating factors in the experience of the group that play upon the sex act. They suffice to indicate something of the complex body of actual experience and practice that is represented in and expressed by birth rate of a human group. 3.

There are many factors which have a bearing on a birth rate, and this is perhaps especially so in the particular case of an illegitimate birth rate. In a similar way to Blumer, Hartley points out that the statistics on illegitimacy:

cannot be used as an index of the prevalence of extra-marital relationships in any country. Whether these lead to conceptions depends on many factors - the girl's fertility, how careful she is not to have an unwanted child (which may be influenced by the stigma, or the strength of the legitimacy norm in her country) and also, what methods of birth control are available. In countries where efficient contraceptives are widely used, and/or abortion legalised, premarital relations may be common, and yet the illegitimacy rate low. 4.

Thus, Hartley points to marriage and abortion as possible 'circumventing factors', that is, practices which may mean that some extramarital conceptions do not result in extramarital births, and which may therefore be represented in and expressed by an illegitimate

birth rate. The extent to which contraceptive techniques, abortion, and legitimating marriage are used may vary between and within societies, and therefore, as a result of this alone, the illegitimacy rate may vary. According to Kronick "the incidence of illegitimacy is higher in the lower socio-economic classes, in part because of differential access to and use of contraceptive knowledge and differential use of abortion and forced marriage" ¹•. The greater use made of these practices by the higher social strata is not simply the result of greater access to them. Kronick suggests that:

Pregnancy out of wedlock presents problems both in terms of immediate necessity for adequate medical care and, particularly for the middle-classes in terms of the maintenance of secrecy. It is clearly established that different groups of people deal with these problems in different ways. The flight to the anonymity of the metropolis is employed (together with adoption of the child, or abortion, or compulsory marriage) by the higher social classes. Furthermore, these same techniques have been employed by generations of upper and middle-class women. 2.

A greater commitment by the middle class to the principle of legitimacy might lead middle class females to make greater use of contraceptive techniques in an attempt to avoid becoming illicitly pregnant, and, if they do conceive, to make greater use of practices to avoid giving birth to an illegitimate child or to avoid being recognised as having given birth to an illegitimate child. In this way, a greater commitment by the middle class to the principle of legitimacy would have a bearing on the illegitimacy rate and beyond this on the statistics on the latter. In this context we may refer to comments by Virginia Wimperis on the findings of a study that most of the mothers of illegitimate children in a Midland town belonged to the working class.

She says,

If a woman leaves her home town to have a child and refuses to give her home address to the registrar in the town of its birth, the registrar has no option but to register it in his own town. As we have noted, some districts of London and many attractive coastal towns have illegitimate birth

rates well above average. This may be one of the contributory reasons, for women of /the middle/ classes have more money, more education, more experience of the world and perhaps a more widely scattered set of friends and relatives to turn to in time of need /.../. If one of these /women/ is expecting an illegitimate child she is much more likely than, say, a factory worker to want to escape and have her child quietly in some locality where she is unknown; she is also more likely to be able to arrange this. 1.

Clark Vincent carried out a study in Alameda County, California, of unmarried mothers who had just given birth ^{2.}, and discovered that the higher the educational attainment of the unwed mother, the more likely that she had come from outside of the state to have her baby in Alameda county. The lower her educational attainment, the more likely she was to have had her baby in the county in which she normally resided. Vincent was led to conclude that studies of unmarried mothers "which rely on agency and institutional samples tend to miss the unwed mother who is presumably in an educational and financial position to travel to another state in order to have her baby delivered in the secrecy of a doctor's private practice" ^{3.}. It is perhaps not only these studies which tend to miss unmarried mothers in this way. In the United States, according to Roberts:

fourteen states do not record illegitimate births in their vital statistics. The states which do not record such births /.../ provide havens for unmarried mothers who have the resources to leave their home communities in an effort to disguise the illegitimate status of their children. 4.

Many illegitimate births, particularly those occurring to females in the middle class, in the United States, are not recorded as such and are therefore missed in the statistics. It is perhaps not only in this way that the statistics on illegitimacy become inaccurate. The statistics on illegitimacy are likely to be inaccurate because their accuracy, as Illsley and Gill point out, is

ultimately dependent upon the accuracy of the statements made by the persons reporting the birth to the local Registrar's office /.../. Informants may deliberately or inadvertently make false statements about their date of marriage, their marital status, or the paternity of the child, which results in the registration of a child as legitimate whose actual status is illegitimate. There is no reason to suppose that errors of the registration procedure occur in the opposite direction (i.e. recording legitimate births as illegitimate) and official statistics are likely to be an under - rather than an over - estimate of the incidence of illegitimacy. 1.

In this context, Illsley and Gill refer to illegitimate births which occur to married females, and note that many if not most of such births are unlikely to be identified as illegitimate by the husband, the registration procedure, or even the mother ². Also, however, according to Roberts, "many unwed mothers consciously conceal their unmarried status when they record the child's birth". Roberts notes that "the women who have the economic and social resources to effect such a concealment are likely to be older, better educated, middle-class members of the white races" ³. At the same time, according to Hartley, "it should be noted that social attitudes toward illegitimacy govern the amount of concealment which may be practiced and hence the accuracy of the basic figures" ⁴. It is possible, in other words, that even in places where illegitimate births are recorded some will not be represented in the statistics, and that this will be especially so with regard to those births which occur to middle class females, "in large part because of their greater ability to manipulate the social structure to their advantage" ⁵, and in part because of the greater commitment by the middle class to the principle of legitimacy.

Just as there are inaccuracies and biases in the statistics on illegitimacy, there are similar faults in the statistics on other social phenomena ⁶. In the context of a discussion of the biases in the statistics on suicide, Jack Douglas notes that:

all students have known that there are many attempts to hide suicide and all students of suicide have likewise assumed that many cases are successful /.../. When sociologists have considered the question /.../ it has been clear to most of them that there are differences in the attempt to hide suicide which must vary to some degree with respect to certain systematic group differences. Probably most sociologists have, especially, felt that there are differences in the severity of moral judgements on suicide which vary significantly from one group to another. 1.

Douglas suggests in this context that there is a good deal of evidence that there has been a consistent difference between the 'upper classes' and 'lower classes'. 2. That is,

it seems likely that the degree of moral condemnation for committing a negatively evaluated act such as suicide will vary /.../ according to the status position of the individual committing the act. There is a good deal of evidence that the relation between status and condemnation for committing the negatively evaluated action /.../ is U-functional. The lower-status and the higher-status individuals seem less concerned with conforming (and with being seen as conforming) than do the middle-status individuals /.../. Indeed, there appears to be strong class differences in both ability and willingness of individuals to manipulate information-giving phenomena in such a way as to produce desired choices (of, for example, categorisation of the cause of death) by other individuals. Specifically, it is hypothesised that the ability and willingness to control the communication process varies directly with increasing social status. 3.

In other words, Douglas is led to expect that there will be certain systematic biases in the official statistics on suicide such that, for example, they are more inaccurate with regard to suicides within the middle class than within the working class. This is because he expects the "rate of attempted concealment of suicide /to/ vary directly with the degree of (self-estimated) potential loss to the suicide's social self (and to the suicide's significant others) involved in having the death categorised as a suicide" 4., and consequently that "the rate of attempted concealment will vary directly with the negative moral judgement associated with the act of suicide and with the degree of negative sanctions believed to be imposed for violation of the moral judgements" 5.. Here, Douglas emphasises the point that whether or not an individual

attempts to conceal a suicide will depend on his beliefs about the consequences of it not being concealed. It is his beliefs about how others would respond to a suicide rather than how they would actually respond which affects whether or not he attempts to conceal it. It is beliefs about commitment to a norm against suicide, therefore, rather than this commitment itself which affect and are reflected in the statistics on suicide ¹. In a similar way, whether or not a girl attempts to avoid illegitimacy, or, if that fails, to avoid having an illicit conception or birth recognised will depend on her beliefs about commitment to the principle of legitimacy rather than this commitment itself. The relationship between these beliefs and this commitment is problematic. The former may accurately reflect the latter, but they may not. On these grounds alone, the statistics on illegitimacy (as well as on any practice which has a bearing on these) cannot be taken as an accurate guide to commitment to the official rule by which legitimacy is defined. Discovery, or at least confirmation, of this commitment requires independent evidence. However, there appears to be very little reliable evidence of this kind.

Sociologists, amongst others, often make assertions about the responses of people to illegitimacy. According to Kingsley Davis, for example:

legal controls form only a framework of social life /.../. Were it solely a matter of law, illegitimacy would constitute no great hardship for bastards and their mothers. But legal disabilities are sustained and supplemented by attitudes that enter into the texture of everyday life, colouring in countless ways the subjective feelings of the unfortunates. These attitudes attack the mother even before confinement because she and her family and friends all feel moral horror at the idea of unwed pregnancy. In scarcely any other way can a woman lose her status so completely. She reads her disgrace in the expression of others, and feels it in her own conscience. 2.

Davis, however, does not provide any evidence in support of these

claims. In a similar way, Leontine Young suggests that:

for ages past the girl who bore a child outside the limits of wedlock has been the target and frequently the victim of public attitudes and emotions. While these public attitudes have varied from one historical period to another and from one culture to another, there is, taken as a whole, an amazing and rather appalling consistency in the way she and her child have been condemned by society. In certain periods and in certain cultures she has been punished by death and her child doomed to disgrace and ostracism. Even today this practice may be found in some countries. In others she has been branded as a moral outcast and both she and her child have been compelled to live lives of social and economic degradation in hopeless and endless expiation. 1.

Pinchbeck agrees that "in some communities social censure demands the death or severe punishment of the mother, while the child is almost certain to be destroyed" ², and I. Schapera provides evidence in support of this claim from his study of the BaKxatla baxaKxfela, a Bantu tribe belonging to the SothTswana cluster, in the Bechuanaland Protectorate ³. His study led him to the conclusion that the

intimate association between marriage and the right to bear children is as true of the South African Bantu as it is of other peoples /.../. All the Southern Bantu agree in demanding that an unmarried girl must not become pregnant. Should she do so she is penalised /.../. The penalties enacted vary widely, but the most common usage is that /.../ the girl and her child, where it is allowed to live, both suffer social degradation and other indignities. In no case is premarital pregnancy found to occur without coming under the ban of the community. 4.

At the same time when Shapera carried out his study the Bantu were not as strict as they used to be. He notes that "the old standards have changed, and the sanctions which used to prevail have largely broken down. It is no longer so serious an offence as it was for an unmarried girl to have a child, and correspondingly, the treatment meted out to her has grown less severe" ⁵.

However, apart from the findings of anthropologists with regard to this and similar societies, the evidence is either scanty and confusing, such as that provided by Herscovits and Herscovits ⁶. on the one hand and Goode ⁷. on the other with regard to the Caribbean,

or non-existent, as in the case of 'Western society' where, according to Pinchbeck, at least in "some sections /.../ the stigma attached to illegitimacy is so strong that mother and child are both socially unacceptable" ¹. The absence of firm evidence, however, does not prevent Vincent from saying about Western society that there has been a "gross historical trend in social attitudes and public policy concerning illegitimacy". He claims that there has been "a gradual change from the child to the mother /.../ as the target of censure" ². In line with this, Pochin states that "few people arouse more confused reactions in society than the single girl who gives birth to a child /.../. Such a woman makes her neighbours feel uncomfortable /.../. They may feel guilty and then their reaction is hatred, fear and rejection" ³, but does so without evidence. In a similar way, Wimperis claims that the unmarried mother has a "difficult struggle" to find somewhere to live, for example, because "many landladies do not want /.../ a young mother who is suspected of being unmarried" ⁴. Wimperis says:

these difficulties may be shared by others, especially widows and deserted wives with young children, but few young mothers are so entirely forlorn as some of the unmarried - so cut-off from family and friends and from the neighbours who would normally lend a hand in times of trouble. 5.

The assumptions here are that the members of our society are committed to the formal rule which defines legitimacy and therefore that they censure females who violate it by socially excluding them, with the result that the latter suffer a relatively high degree of social isolation and a reduction in their life-chances. In accordance with this view L.G. Reeder and S.J. Reeder set out, in the early nineteen sixties, to "test the general hypothesis that unwed/mothers/ would be more socially isolated than wed" ⁶ mothers. They explain this hypothesis by, first of all, suggesting that "in societies for which we have information available, childbirth outside marriage is not approved" ⁷, and then going on to say:

when one considers the social impact of this condition in terms of the status ambiguity of mother and child and consequent social and personal repercussions, we may perceive the woman who bears a child out of wedlock as set apart or isolated in a variety of ways from both her socially acceptable sisters and society in general. Hence it becomes germane to consider the phenomena of social isolation as it relates to the illegitimately pregnant woman. 1.

They took as indicators of their respondents' 'objective isolation' the following three variables: (1) participation in organised activities and voluntary associations; (2) participation in informal activities; and (3) number of valued friends ². They then went on to find, first of all, that "there were no appreciable differences among the groups of women" they studied with regard to the first variable. In other words, "irrespective of legitimacy this population did not participate in voluntary associations" ³. In order to locate their informants in terms of the second variable they asked them whether they had any spare time activities, what they were, and how much time they spent on them each week. Then the data they collected were examined along two dimensions: first, whether the activities were usually done alone, in groups, or both about equally; second, whether the activities were predominantly passive, e.g. spectator, or involved active participation. They reported that their findings in this respect were "a bit surprising", because "a high proportion of the total sample /had/ no such activities and, moreover, /.../ more of the wed women /.../ than the unwed women denied involvement in them" ⁴. In addition, they found that a larger proportion of the married mothers participated in these activities alone, and that the two types of mother were similarly placed on the dimension of passive versus active kinds of informal participation.

In a similar way the questions they asked relating to their third indicator "yielded interesting but somewhat unexpected results /.../. Contrary to expectations /they/ found that a greater percentage of

wed women had no valued friends; /and that/ conversely, a greater percentage of unwed women had at least a few friends whom they classified as 'valued' "¹". They came to the conclusion that:

with respect to the indicators of objective isolation /used/, we were not able to support our working hypothesis that unwed /mothers/ would be more isolated than wed /mothers/. 2.

Of course, their findings are only as good as their definition and operationalisation of the concept of 'social isolation', their choice of sample, and so on. Apart from this, however, if they had found, correctly, that unmarried mothers are socially isolated, or at least more so than married mothers, would this necessarily be the outcome, in whole or even in part, of social exclusion due to people's commitment to the legitimacy rule? This finding would not in itself provide the answer to this question, and Reeder and Reeder provide no independent evidence for their assumption in this respect. Therefore, in more general terms, the question remains: 'to what extent and in what ways are the activities of unmarried mothers directly affected, or limited, by the responses of others to their unmarried motherhood?'.

Dennis Marsden in his *Mothers Alone*, reports on the social participation and the social life³ of his sample of unmarried, widowed, divorced and separated mothers. He says:

relatively few mothers went out frequently. Less than a third went to pubs at all /for example/. In fact sixty nine mothers, 60 per cent, had not been out in the evening during the last fortnight, which probably meant they never went out in the evening at all, for those who went out at all had a regular outing. Only seven mothers had been out more than twice in the evening in the previous fortnight, approximately one fifth had been out twice, and another fifth once. 4.

Marsden, in accordance with the findings of Reeder and Reeder, suggests that "although these figures are low they do not differ markedly from comparable working-class marriages", but then adds, "it appears significant that mothers found it difficult to say whether they were

kept in by lack of money or by their social situation - the lack of somewhere to go and someone to go with" ¹•. Here Marsden is referring to the point that the pattern of participation in activities which made up the social life of his informants would have been dependent not simply on their financial situation but also on their social situation, or, that is, on their social relationships. Then, despite his suggestion that their social lives were similar to those of comparable working class mothers who were not 'alone', he claims that the particular marital statuses of his informants had consequences for their social relationships and thereby their social lives. That is, since becoming 'mothers alone' they had developed "new relationships with kin and community" ²•, which had had an effect on their social lives. Marsden reports:

at least one in five of the mothers appeared to have no outside friends whatsoever, and for a further proportion social life was severely restricted /.../. It was not just that mothers needed to make special efforts to start up new relationships. They must work hard even to keep those friends they formerly had. 3.

Marsden suggests that his informants' social relationships were affected by the responses of others to their marital statuses. Thus, he reports that "some mothers were estranged from their parents and indeed most of their relatives /.../. Unhappy relationships which preceded illegitimate births and broken marriages had seldom been healed by the mother's changed situation" ⁴•. In the case of separated wives, for example, "even women who thought that they had got good relations with their kin had discovered that the bond would not withstand the social stigma when they separated from their husbands". That is, "some relatives preferred not to be closely involved in any social embarrassment /and therefore/ avoided the mother" ⁵•. In a similar way, Marsden reports that "a majority spoke of changes in their relationships with friends and neighbours, who seem to stigmatise the family in some way, tending to isolate it", and then adds that "in their complaints, mothers could be seen

to be coming to terms with their own feelings. Unmarried mothers felt they were regarded as sexually loose, and widows that they were pitied, and cast a blight on any society they were in" ¹. With regard to this last point, Marsden notes that in the particular case of unmarried mothers:

the stigma was felt most by the older women. The younger mothers seemed much less worried, less given to self-blame and a sense of sin against society, although this might not be a change in the climate of public opinion so much as a lack of the long years of experience bringing up illegitimate children which the older women had been through. 2.

It is his informants' feelings, as described by him, to which Marsden refers for evidence in support of his suggestions about how, because of their marital statuses, they were stigmatised and treated by others. According to Marsden:

feelings of ostracism and a sense of stigma have stemmed in part from self-doubt, yet it looked as though the mothers' perceptions were also firmly grounded in real changes in the behaviour of others towards them. 3.

However, Marsden does not refer to any independent evidence in support of this conclusion, and therefore his suggestions about the responses of others to the marital statuses of his informants depend solely on the reports of his informants ⁴. His suggestions in these respects must, therefore, remain tentative. What is more, Marsden's account of the feelings of his informants points to an alternative, though not necessarily exclusive, way by which the marital statuses of his informants could have had consequences for their social relationships and social lives. According to Marsden, his informants said:

they went round less in the evenings to see relatives, and if they did go out it was not the same. A separated wife said, 'sometimes my sister, her husband works in a night club, and she'll say "Now come up. We've got a turn on and some bingo and you'll enjoy yourself". But when I go I always feel the odd one out'. Far from enjoying themselves on such occasions, the ex-wives were all too aware of the empty place at the table. Without a man the mother no longer fitted into the pattern of behaviour in the family, nor could new patterns easily evolve". 5.

The feelings of separated wives or unmarried mothers may have consequences for their social relationships and social lives because of their affect on their treatment of, and contact with, others. They may avoid contact with others because of their feelings about what they believe they would experience during such contact. Their beliefs in this respect may be informed by previous experience during such contacts. This may include experiences of the responses of others to their marital status. Thus, Marsden investigated his informants' "relationship with men" ¹ and discovered that:

the few mothers who had been dancing or who had otherwise met men socially outside the home, in a pub or at bingo, all said that a change came over the man when he found out their marital status, so that after a while they learnt to keep it a secret or at least a matter of doubt /.../. There was a feeling that in courtship, the divorced, the separated and unmarried women must be extra careful or the man would take advantage of her. ²

In other words, the experience of, say, unmarried mothers may lead them to believe "that so much stigma /is/ attached to their position, that men they /might/ meet would have an unfavourable attitude, seeing them as actively looking for a partner outside of marriage" ³. Consequently they might try to keep their marital status from men, and, in an attempt to do this, to avoid the latter. That is, it is possible that an unmarried mother will try to keep her marital status from, and try to avoid others on the basis of her beliefs, as informed by her experience, about the way she would be treated otherwise ⁴. In this way also, therefore, the responses of others to her marital status may have a bearing on her social relationships and social life. At the same time, however, it appears possible in the light of our discussion of what might be represented in the statistics on illegitimacy, that an unmarried mother may try to keep her marital status from others simply on the basis of the beliefs she acquired before she became an unmarried mother. In other words, it is possible that an unmarried mother will try to keep her

marital status from and avoid others in an attempt to avoid the responses she believes she would experience otherwise, without having had any experience of the ways in which others actually respond¹.

She may be successful in keeping her marital status from others, but, at the same time, she may become, at least more, socially isolated. In this way she may become socially isolated with the consequences this may have for her social life and the satisfaction of her 'needs', not because of 'social exclusion', or the responses of others to her marital status, but because of 'self-exclusion', or her own response to her marital status. Moreover, it is conceivable that because of her own response to her marital status, she may become socially isolated and unable to satisfy her 'needs' even though she would not have done so simply because of the responses of others. She may be mistaken in her beliefs. Furthermore, she may not discover this, and there is an absence of firm evidence about the way unmarried mothers are treated, to which she might refer for guidance.

Jean Pochin discusses the responses of unmarried mothers themselves to their marital status, and suggests that for many unmarried mothers:

the first signs of pregnancy mean dismay and panic. Many look back to the first weeks as the worst part of the ordeal, when certainty grows as day follows day, but no one else in the world knows about it.

For many girls, the first few weeks involve almost intolerable strain, leading sometimes to thoughts of suicide. Anxiety about whom to tell, and how, is mixed with black remorse and dread of public opinion /.../. Many girls say they have a feeling of unreality, a nightmare quality which sometimes persists until they are able to resume normal life again. As the months pass some mothers-to-be slip into the state of contentment that accompanies a wanted pregnancy, but in many others the anxiety mounts from one crisis to another /.../. Under such circumstances it is natural enough that she should manifest guilt, panic, suspicion and denial, which may not be a noticeable part of her normal make-up at all. 1.

Underlying the responses of unmarried mothers are their beliefs about the responses of other people. According to Pochin, she may have the "feeling that she is a worthless creature whom no one will want to marry and everyone will look down upon"². These beliefs will affect her treatment of others and her perception, and therefore her experience, of the way others treat her. Pochin suggests that:

besides being extremely painful /these beliefs/ can have a corrosive effect, flattening hope and paralysing effort. What is the use of picking up the threads of life again if you're no good to anybody?

Fear of public opinion is still a burden to most unmarried mothers. They demand the censure and scorn of their neighbours, and often see slights where none is intended. 'Everyone I meet says "good morning" to my stomach'. Very few girls are able to realise that they are projecting their own guilt feelings on to their friends. 3.

However, they may not experience the responses from others they have been led by their pre-pregnancy experience to expect. According to Pochin, if they do not keep it from others:

whatever their social background, almost every mother /.../ is agreeably surprised by the warmth of her welcome when she first returns from hospital or Mother and Baby Home. Neighbours call with small presents and ask to see the child. 4.

On the other hand, it is conceivable that an unmarried mother may not discover that her beliefs about the response of others are mistaken, because on the basis of these beliefs she may have tried successfully to keep her marital status from others.

To sum up, as well as, or apart from, the way others respond to an unmarried mother's marital status, the way she herself responds

may have important and even crucial consequences for her social relationships and social life. Or, to put it another way, the meaning which an unmarried mother attaches to her marital status, as well as or apart from the meanings others attach, may have important consequences ¹. However, little is known about these meanings. They are represented in the official statistics on illegitimacy, but these statistics do not provide any firm evidence in support of any conclusions about them. Douglas says about the statistics on suicide:

almost all previous sociological works on suicide have used data (official statistics) on suicide which were inadequate for the theoretical purpose of these works; they implicitly assumed that these statistics reliably represented one thing, while actually these statistics represent many things (or better, are the end product of many complicated social processes) and should not be assumed to represent even these reliably. 2.

A similar statement about the statistics on illegitimacy and, what is more, about the social situations of unmarried mothers, would be appropriate. The social relationships and social lives of unmarried mothers depend, first of all, on their opportunities in these respects and, therefore, on such matters as their economic resources; how others treat them; how others respond to their marital status; the meanings which others attach to their marital status, and, secondly, on how they make use of their opportunities, and therefore on, for instance, the meanings they themselves attach to their marital status. Thus, an adequate account of the social situation of unmarried mothers, and, therefore, a solution to the problem of whether or not, and if so why, they are 'deprived' and in poverty, requires an investigation, not only of their economic resources and of how they are treated by others, but also of their activities viewed as 'meaningful actions'. According to Max Weber:

We shall call 'action' (Handeln) any human attitude or activity (Verhalten) (no matter whether involving external or internal acts, failure to act or passive acquiescence) if and in so far as the actor or actors associate a subjective meaning (Sinn) with it. 3.

He then suggests that "for sociology /.../ the object of cognition is the subjective meaning-complex of action" ¹. In other words, as Douglas says, "Max Weber defined social action in terms of the subjective meanings of activities to social actors involved and /.../ he defined sociology as that science concerned with the study of social interaction" ².

Douglas agrees with Weber's view of sociology, and suggests that in studying social phenomena we should begin as far as possible with a study of real 'world phenomena', above all with a study of the meanings of these phenomena to the social participants ³. Thus, he says about his approach to the study of suicide:

I definitely shall not be much concerned with arguing from general propositions about the nature of social systems, the nature of social actions, the nature of social meanings etc., down to the specific, concrete details of suicidal meanings. I shall, however, be concerned with certain ideas concerning the general dimensions of suicidal meanings and of the general properties of suicidal processes. In fact, my whole method of analysing social meaning leads us to try to see the general in the particular and the particular in the general; and certainly one of the fundamental ideas of this ("Zirkel in Verstehen") method is that the particulars are frequently comprehensible only in terms of the general context in which they occur, so that one must have some idea of the general context in order to understand the particular. (We might call this the principle of the contextual determination of meaning). And this general context is not something that is necessarily part of the meanings available to the social actors themselves: they may be, and almost certainly are most of the time, quite unaware of such general dimensions as we shall be considering. But it is of the greatest importance that these fundamental dimensions of suicidal meanings are intended to be directly relatable to concrete, observable suicidal phenomena in this culture. (Some of these are arrived at by a process of logical abstraction, but it would seem clear that 'intuitive' creation has been more important as the method by which the ideas have been first obtained). The statements, cries, actions, and whatever other real-world phenomena one can come up with are the data that one must use to study and analyse meanings; and in the initial stages some of these phenomena must necessarily be the experiences and observations of the sociological observers themselves. 4.

Douglas recommends the sociologist in obtaining the 'inside story' of events as the actor himself sees it, to use data communicated to him by the actor in conjunction with his "everyday experiences and 'cultural knowledge' " ⁵. He suggests the use of the latter as a

source of information because, first of all,

The simple, obvious fact is that there are not yet any scientific means of measuring meaning. One simply has to rely upon his own vast experience in his culture to understand the meanings of the phenomena he observes within a given realm of experience. 1.

Secondly, there is the matter of the availability of information.

Douglas notes about his approach to the study of social phenomena:

the ideal /.../ is to go from what people say and do in the real-world situations upward toward an analysis of the patterns that can be found in their actions and the meanings of their statements and behaviour; then, only when the problems of these levels of investigation have been solved, to proceed to develop theories of the social meanings. Moreover, it is a strong expectation lying behind this particular approach that the situation of suicidal actions for the real-world participants will be social in nature; that is, that the meanings will be determined by the actual processes of meaningful social interaction in the situation in which the suicidal actions occur. This does not mean that information on non-situated meanings is not relevant. Clearly, such information is important. There are probably stable patterns of meanings of such phenomena /.../. 2.

However, information on 'non-situated' meanings cannot be taken as a reliable guide to 'situated' meanings. This may be a problem because information of the former type may be all that is available or obtainable. As Douglas says about suicide:

It is not so terribly difficult for sociologists /.../ to study cases of suicidal actions after the fact of such actions /.../. To study the processes of such actions under these circumstances it is necessary to use interview methods involving reconstructions of events that were very confusing, unusual, etc. 3.

Not only do interviews yield 'non-situated' meanings, but also

the various interview relationships are themselves socially defined (or meaningful) and, as socially meaningful relationships, they themselves are fundamental determinants of the nature of communications that will take place within their province /.../. At this time there is little that is actually known about such matters. Given this situation, the uninformed and informed experiences of everyday /social/ phenomena had by the student of suicide (or by others who communicate them to him) become a vital check on the information gathered by the case study methods. 4.

Data obtained during interviews with unmarried mothers may be used in conjunction with the 'experience' of the interviewer to draw, albeit tentative, conclusions about the meanings they attach to their marital status ¹. Interviews with unmarried mothers, therefore, if used properly, may be undertaken to collect data to throw light on their social actions and thereby their social situations. I decided that an exploration of the social relationships and social lives of unmarried mothers would be a worthwhile task because, first of all, information about the consequences of unmarried motherhood would be of interest in itself, and, secondly, because of the possible relevance of such information to the study of similar social phenomena as well as to the study of poverty. I decided to carry out such an exploration, and therefore to interview a sample of unmarried mothers ².

I had limited resources, and unmarried mothers themselves would be the best single source of data of relevance to their social situations. By interviewing unmarried mothers I could obtain data which would throw some light on what the social situations of unmarried mothers are like and why. I could obtain information on the social activities of unmarried mothers; on their social actions and the meanings behind these; on their responses to unmarried motherhood; on the opportunities they have with regard to their social relationships and social lives; on their economic resources; on how they are treated by others; and, perhaps, on the meanings other people attach to their marital status. Despite its inadequacies, I would at least be gathering some data on matters about which there is a dearth of firm information and which could be used to guide further research.

Elizabeth Bott introduces her Family and Social Network by noting that:

There is an enormous literature on the family in Western society - a reflection of its importance for the continuation of society and the happiness, and misery, of individuals. The family, we are constantly told, is the backbone of society. But actually not much is known of the relationship between the family and society. There are very few studies of the way families interact with external persons and institutions, and there are not even many studies of families in their natural habitat, the home /.../. The research reported in this book was intended to fill this gap. 1.

Bott decided to carry out a study of 'ordinary families' ². which was similar to my own study of the social situations of unmarried mothers. She explains:

Because of the nature of the problem and the practical and conceptual difficulties involved, the research team were not able to obtain much direct assistance from their own or other workers' previous research experience. We were engaged in an exploratory study. We started with no well-defined hypotheses or interpretations and no ready made methodology and field techniques /.../. Special techniques had to be developed for getting the /.../ necessary types of data /.../. The end result /was/ a peculiar combination of anthropological and case study techniques. 3.

In a similar way, although I set out with beliefs about what my informants would report, I did not have any hypotheses to be tested, and although I began with a technique for gathering data, this was not fully defined or regarded as immutable. As things turned out, these beliefs and this technique underwent changes as my research progressed.

Bott decided to carry out an intensive comparative study of a small number of families ⁴. She explains:

At the beginning we decided to make an intensive study of a small number of families rather than a survey of a large number. This seemed the most appropriate method for an exploratory study. 5.

Bott studied twenty families. Likewise, I began with the aim of carrying out an intensive, comparative study of the social situations of a small number of unmarried mothers. I set myself the task of finding and carrying out 'in depth' interviews with fifteen unmarried mothers, and, for the purpose of comparison, fifteen widowed mothers. ⁶.

In order to facilitate comparison I decided, in a similar way to Bott, to try to select my informants from mothers with certain characteristics. First of all, they were to be less than thirty five, and if possible less than thirty years old. Secondly, they were to have only one child each, who, furthermore, was to be under five years old.

I expected some difficulty in finding the informants I wanted, but I did not expect it to be as difficult as it turned out to be. It proved to be especially difficult to find suitable widowed mothers, although it was also difficult finding unmarried mothers of the type I preferred, and some of the mothers I eventually interviewed were not of this type.

In my search for informants, I sought the assistance first of all of the Director of Social Services for a borough in London. My hope was that through him I would be able to find about half of the informants I wanted, and both he and other members of his department gave me the impression for several months that I would be assisted. As with all those I met whose help I sought in finding informants (that is, as with all 'contacting agencies'), I outlined my research proposal and then described how I wanted them to help me. I suggested they might ask suitable mothers with whom they came into contact if they would like to participate in my study, and then refer me to those who showed an interest in doing so. I pointed out that what I wanted them to do would not take up much of their time or energy, and that I would not be interfering with the relationships they had with the mothers to whom I was referred or breaching, at least without being invited to do so, anyone's privacy.

I emphasised that any information I received from the mothers to whom they referred me would be treated as confidential. I showed them a letter of introduction which they could present to possible informants. This said:

I am a research student at the University of Kent at Canterbury. I am carrying out a private study of the circumstances of fatherless families in this area. I am therefore looking for mothers who are willing to help with what I consider to be a useful piece of research.

Any mother who does participate can be assured that all information received will be treated as strictly confidential. No one other than myself will know about the information given to me by a particular mother - no names will be published or used at all. If you feel sufficiently interested in my study, maybe we could arrange to meet some time to have a chat about it.

I was given the impression that I would receive the assistance I wanted, until, that is, about three and a half months after I first met the Director, when I received the following letter from the Head of Fieldwork Management:

I write to you very sadly to say that unfortunately we have been unable to convince our social workers that the research project in which you are interested is an appropriate use of their time at present. You will know from your contacts with / members of the Department/ that our staff are working extremely hard with a much reduced establishment. I fear that the reaction may be the same in any local authority social services department at the moment, and no doubt our health visitor colleagues in the Health Departments who are suffering less immediate trauma will provide the best field for your research.

I was surprised and disappointed by this refusal of assistance. However, I had not intended to find all my informants through this contacting agency and I had already begun to look to other sources. That is, I had not wanted my informants to be only, or even mainly, ones who had, as Bott puts it, "consulted an outside agency for help with /.../ problems" ¹. In other words, I had not wanted my research to be about 'problem families' ², and, therefore, I had begun to try to find informants through agencies other than those of the 'problem solving' kind. For example, I had approached the Medical Officer of Health for Midtown, a small town in the South of England. He took an interest, and arranged for me to meet the Senior Nursing Officer at the local Maternity and Child Welfare Clinic. She also took an interest, and introduced me to the other health visitors

attached to the clinic, who referred me to two unmarried mothers, about seven months after I had begun my research.

At about the same time I was referred to three unmarried mothers by the Senior Child Care Officer of the Social Services Department in Eastown, which was about twenty miles to the north east of Midtown, and to two more unmarried mothers by a church social worker in Midtown. Also, at about the same time I got in touch with another church social worker who appeared interested in helping me. She mentioned a hostel for unmarried mothers in Westown, about forty miles to the south west of Midtown, and referred me to its principal organisers. In addition, she promised to consider the possibility of referring me to some of her clients. But, she would have to consult her superior, the Organising Secretary for the Diocese. The latter, however, who I then met, refused to allow this social worker to give me any further assistance. At our meeting she questioned the value of the research I proposed. She claimed that it was unnecessary because the social situations of unmarried mothers are already known, at least by social workers such as herself. In addition, she complained that I should have contacted her before I had asked the assistance of her subordinates. The latter, I was told, included the social worker who had already referred me to two unmarried mothers, but who I was informed would not be giving me any further assistance.

By the time of this incident I had arranged a meeting with the organisers of the hostel in Westown, and I became worried that they would also have been persuaded not to help me. When I met them I discovered that the Organising Secretary had let them know of her decision and her reason for taking it. She had told them that she was not going to allow her subordinates to help me, I was surprised to learn, because she was concerned that I would interfere with the relationships her subordinates had with their clients and that I would encroach on the privacy of the latter. However, the

organisers agreed to let me ask the mothers living in the hostel if they would participate in my research, and as a result I obtained five more informants.

After about nine months of searching I had been referred to almost the number of unmarried mothers I had wanted. However, I had not been referred to any widowed mothers. I decided to approach the Department of Health and Social Security, and contacted the Area Manager in Midtown, who seemed interested and offered to consult headquarters about it. A few days later I received a request from headquarters to send them "details of the research, i.e. sponsorship, cost, size of sample, etc", which I did. In response I received the following letter:

Your request for assistance in your research project has been carefully considered but I have to tell you, regretfully, that we are unable to offer you the facilities for which you asked.

I hope you are able, nonetheless, to complete your sample - presumably you have considered a letter or advertisement in the local paper ?

I had a similar response from Cruse Clubs, "the only national organisation working for widows and their children in the British Isles".

Next I got in touch with the Medical Social Worker in the General Hospital in Midtown, and suggested that through the hospital records on mortalities she might be able to refer me to some suitable widowed mothers. She seemed interested in helping me, and offered to consult the Hospital Secretary about it. Then she wrote me the following letter:

When I referred the subject of your request for possible help from us to the Hospital Secretary, he said that under no circumstances does the Hospital disclose names and addresses of patients to outside enquirers, as this is regarded as a breach of confidentiality. The exception could not be made, even for the purpose of research. I am sorry about this for your sake, as I know how keen you are, and how difficult it is proving to find women in a particular category, but I have to stand by the Secretary's decision.

I was surprised by the Secretary's reason for refusing to help me, because I had emphasised that there would be no 'breach of confidentiality'. However, when I got in touch with the social worker to reassure her on the point she simply repeated that she had to abide by the Secretary's decision. I got in touch with the Secretary, and although he offered to reconsider the matter he did not offer to help me. After about thirteen months of searching I had not found one widowed mother to interview.

At the beginning of my search I had considered the possibility of approaching general practitioners, but I had decided against this because I had thought it would be easier to find informants through other agencies. However, in view of my lack of success in finding widowed mothers I eventually wrote to twelve GPs as well as four clergymen in the Midtown area. The GPs were distributed between five separate practices, and I received replies from three of them, each of whom belonged to a different practice. One of these did not share a practice and each of the other two belonged to a practice which included three GPs altogether. I met these three doctors, and each of them seemed interested in helping me. What is more, the two who shared a practice promised to ask their colleagues if they would assist me also. Eventually, one of these doctors referred me to one widowed mother.

I had no replies from any of the clergymen I had written to until after about four months, when one wrote and offered to meet me. He knew of some possible informants who he offered to contact. However, he did not refer me to any of them.

I decided to write to some more GPs whose practices were further afield. I got in touch with five, each of whom belonged to a different practice, and four of whom replied. Eventually one of these referred me to one unmarried mother and one widowed mother, and another referred me to three widowed mothers. After making several visits and

writing several letters to two of these widows without meeting or receiving any replies from them I came to the conclusion that they had probably decided against being interviewed. After about nineteen months of searching, therefore, I had found only three widowed mothers to interview.

I decided to give up trying to find widowed mothers to interview, and to abandon the idea of investigating, for the purpose of comparison, the social situations of a sample of widowed mothers. Apart from the difficulty I had had in tracing the latter, I had come to the conclusion that it would be possible, and, moreover, advantageous - in view of the exploratory nature of my study - to do detailed analyses of, perhaps no more than a few of the social situations of the unmarried mothers I had interviewed. I had interviewed fourteen unmarried mothers altogether (one of whom had been referred to me by another of my informants) and I decided to do detailed analyses of five or six of these.

All the interviews were carried out at the homes of my informants ¹. I began by outlining my research proposal, and then assured them that any information they gave me would be treated as confidential. I began with the intention of interviewing each of my informants on at least two occasions. On the first occasion I would ask 'background' questions using a schedule, and from then on I would carry out interviews which, apart from covering a number of pre-selected areas of interest, would be unstructured and taped.

Elizabeth Bott says about her investigation "increasing field experience helped us to formulate new problems, and the formulation of new problems led us to seek new information, although not always soon enough, unfortunately. On many points the data are incomplete ²."

In a similar way I lost and gained areas of interest, and consequently my data is incomplete. My data are also incomplete because of the way I first set about collecting it. I had begun by assuming that the

questions I intended to ask during the first interview would yield simple answers which could be easily recorded on the schedule. The latter included questions such as 'Are your parents alive?', and I expected my informants to answer this particular question by simply informing me that both of them were alive or that both of them were dead or that only one of them was alive. However, the first of my informants began her reply by saying "My mother's alive, but she might as well not be. I don't see much of her. We don't get on all that well because /.../", and she went on to tell me why she did not get on with her mother. The information she provided me within this answer was of the kind I had planned to seek in the second, and any further, interview I had with her. I managed to record her answer to this question, but she went on to answer other questions in a similar way, and I found it impossible to record these answers completely onto the schedule. What is more, apart from being impossible to prevent her from answering the questions I asked in a way I had not anticipated, I found it increasingly difficult to stick to simply asking questions which were on the schedule. I decided from then on to tape all my interviews with my informants, and to use the schedule as a guide to 'background' information which I would want to obtain at some time and as a way of guiding the conversation towards particular areas of interest, such as 'relationships with parents'. I interviewed the fourteen unmarried mothers over a period of fourteen months, beginning in August, 1971. I interviewed each of them on between one and five occasions, and for between 45 and 150 minutes at a time. I interviewed each of them for between 60 and 305 minutes altogether, although in three cases I did not complete the questioning I had planned. In each of these three cases the informant did not make herself available for interviewing beyond the first occasion. I interviewed each of my other informants for not less than 115 minutes, and on average for about three hours altogether.

Table 1

False name	Number of occasions interviewed	Time interviewed in minutes*	Whether completed
Ann	3**	260	Yes
Betty	1	60	No
Carol	5	245	Yes
Diane	4	205	Yes
Elaine	2	195	Yes
Frances	2	240	Yes
Gillian	1	140	Yes
Hilary	1	120	Yes
Iris	2	165	Yes
Janet	1	115	Yes
Kay	2	95	No
Lesley	2	170	Yes
Marie	3	305	Yes
Nancy	2	70	No

* These times also refer to the length of conversation I taped in each of the cases except in the case of Ann, with whom I carried out my first interview. With Ann I carried out an interview lasting 50 minutes which was not taped.

** In the case of Ann I interviewed her on two occasions in the space of a couple of days, and then interviewed her for a third time four months later. I carried out this third interview as a 'follow up', and I shall refer to it from now on as the 'second' interview I carried out with her.

Table 2

Informant*	Age	Age of child (to nearest month)
Ann**	21 yrs 3 mths	7 months
Elaine	21 yrs 4 mths	27 months
Gillian	20 yrs plus	9 months
Hilary	20 yrs plus	22 months
Iris	22 yrs 5 mths	14 months
Marie	23 yrs	17 months

* I was referred to Ann and Elaine, who were both living in Midtown, by the same social worker; to Marie, who was living in Northtown - about ten miles to the north of Midtown - by a health visitor. Gillian, Hilary and Iris were living in the hostel in Westown.

** At our first interview.

Table 3

Informant	Type of Secondary School	Age when left	Public Examinations before leaving	Further Education Course	Age
Ann	Comprehensive	16	C.S.E., G.C.E. 'O'	G.C.E. 'O' Secretarial	16-19
Elaine	Convent	15	None	G.C.E. 'O' and 'A', and Secretarial	15-18
Gillian	Secondary Modern	15	None	None	---
Hilary	Comprehensive	17	G.C.E. 'O'	Secretarial	17-18
Iris	Secondary Modern	15	None		---
Marie	Technical	16	G.C.E. 'O'	Cookery Demonstration	16-18

I spent over forty one hours interviewing, all but fifty minutes of which were taped. In Table I I summarise the interviews I carried out with each of my informants, and introduce the false names I decided to use for the latter.

I gained the impression that the presence of a tape recorder interfered hardly at all with the conversations I had with my informants, and that to the extent to which it did interfere it was because of my concern that it was working properly. It did not always work properly, and because of a variety of technical irregularities a lot of what I recorded was of poor quality, which made the task of transcribing the tapes impossible to carry out with complete satisfaction, and even more arduous than it would probably have been anyway. I decided to select those informants whose social situations I would look at in detail from amongst those with whom I carried out the more complete and best recorded interviews.

Those of my informants with whom I completed interviews were between twenty and twenty nine years old, and, therefore, within the age limits I had decided to try to impose. On the other hand, four of these had had more than one pregnancy, and three had had more than one illegitimate pregnancy. One of my informants, Janet, had had two illegitimate pregnancies ¹. One, Diane, had had three illegitimate children ², and another, Carol, had had six. The fourth of my informants who had had more than one pregnancy, Frances, had had three legitimate pregnancies ³, during a previous marriage. She had, therefore, had only one illegitimate pregnancy, when she gave birth to twins.

I decided to choose the five or six of my informants whose social situations I could explore in detail from amongst the eight who had had only one illegitimate pregnancy. These eight included the one who had been married. I decided against choosing her. In addition to having been married and having three legitimate children, as well

as her twin illegitimate children, she was by far the eldest of the eight, and she was more or less living with the father of her illegitimate children ¹.

What is more, the interview I carried out with Frances was not satisfactory, or, at least, as satisfactory as those I carried out with a number of my other informants. I decided that of my informants who remained, I had carried out relatively satisfactory interviews with six, and that I could explore the social situations of these in detail ².

Each of these unmarried mothers was between twenty and twenty three years old; each (as far as I knew) had had only one pregnancy; and each had a child who was less than three years old. See Table 2.

Each of my informants had conceived during a period beginning in the second half of 1968 and ending in the first half of 1970, when they were between 18 years and 21 years old ³, and each had been an unmarried mother for between one and a half to three years ⁴.

Two of my informants, Gillian and Iris, had attended Secondary Modern Schools. Each of these had left school when she was fifteen years old, having taken no public examinations, and neither had had any further formal education. Elaine had attended a convent school, which she left, having taken no public examinations, when she was fifteen years old. However, she went on to attend evening classes where she followed a course leading to GCE and secretarial examinations. Ann and Hilary went to Comprehensive Schools. The former left at sixteen after taking GCE and CSE examinations, and then went on to attend courses at a Technical College, which led to GCE and secretarial examinations. The latter, Hilary, left at seventeen after taking GCE examinations, and then went on to follow a secretarial course. The sixth of my informants, Marie, went to a Technical School until she was sixteen. She left after taking GCE examinations, and then went on to attend a course which led to her qualifying as

a 'cookery demonstrator'. The formal education of my informants is summarised in Table 3. Four of my informants, Ann, Elaine, Hilary and Marie, had had some formal education (although not necessarily full time after leaving school) until they were either eighteen or nineteen years old, and, at some time, had taken at least GCE 'O' level examinations. (each had gained at least two GCE 'O' levels). These four had had careers within the system of formal education which were similar to one another, and different to those of Gillian and Iris, who had had similar careers to one another. Three of my informants, Gillian, Hilary and Iris, had jobs at the time of interviewing. These were the three who were living in the hostel in Westown, where it was compulsory for the mothers to have jobs. The other three of my informants were receiving an allowance from the Supplementary Benefit Commission. Of those who were working, Gillian was the housekeeper in the hostel, Hilary was a clerk, and Iris was a manual worker in a factory. Table 4 provides information, first of all, on whether or not my informants had a job at the time of interviewing, and if so, what sort. Secondly, it includes information of the occupation of my informants when they conceived.

When they conceived, four of my informants were clerks, and these plus Marie had occupations which, according to the Registrar General, belong to Social Class III. The odd one out was Gillian, who had a Social Class IV occupation. However, on the basis of the Registrar General's classification of their father's occupation, the Social Class background of my informants are far more diverse than appears from this.

Table 5 includes information on the occupations of my informants' fathers, that is on their fathers' occupations at the time of interviewing in the case of Hilary and Marie, and their fathers' last occupations in the case of Ann, Elaine, Gillian and Iris.

Table 4

Informant	Job when Interviewed		Job when Conceived	
	Title	Social Class*	Title	Social Class*
Ann	None	---	Clerk	IIIN
Elaine	None	---	Clerk	IIIN
Gillian	Housekeeper	IV	Manual Worker in Factory	IV
Hilary	Clerk	IIIN	Clerk	IIIN
Iris	Manual Worker in Factory	IV	Clerk	IIIN
Marie	None	---	Shop Assistant	IIIN**

* According to the Registrar General's classification. The letter 'N' denotes a non-manual category occupation.

** A few days after Marie conceived she began a job as an Air-Stewardess (Social Class IV).

Table 5

Informant	Father's Occupation	
	Title	Social Class*
Ann	Personnel Officer	II
Elaine	Architect	I
Gillian	Forester	IV
Hilary	School Caretaker	IV
Iris	Carpenter	IV
Marie	Public Health Inspector	II

* According to the Registrar General's classification

Table 6

Informant	Employed Yes/No	Net Income (£'s per week)			
		Through Employ- ment or the S.B.C.	From the Father	Other (F.I.S., Buttle)	Total
Ann	No	10.40	None*	1.00	11.40
Elaine	No	7.50	None	1.00	8.50
Gillian	Yes	13.00	None	4.00	17.00
Hilary	Yes	15.00	1.50	1.30	17.80
Iris	Yes	15.70	None	1.75	17.45
Marie	No	6.95	None	0.75	7.70

Informant	Expenditure (£'s per week)			
	Rent or Board	Other: Fuel, Rates	Total	Income Left
Ann	5.25	1.50	6.75	4.65
Elaine	5.00	None	5.00	3.50
Gillian	6.00	0.50***	6.50	10.50
Hilary	6.00	0.50***	6.50	11.30
Iris	6.00	0.50***	6.50	10.95
Marie	None**	None	None	7.70

* Ann occasionally received some money from the father, but had received far less than the £1.50 per week he had agreed to pay and by which her allowance from the S.B.C. had been reduced.

** Marie occasionally paid for household bills, which probably came to no more than a couple of pounds each week.

*** I estimated this amount.

Whatever the demerits of the Registrar General's approach to the classification of occupations and of using this classification to indicate social class, the occupations of the fathers of my informants may be taken as a guide to the social backgrounds of my informants. My informants' social backgrounds may be borne in mind when, later, their social situations as unmarried mothers are analysed and compared.

All of my informants were born in the British Isles. One, Iris, was born in Eire and the rest were born in England. None of them ever went to church. Two of them, Iris and Marie, were agnostic. The former was an ex-Catholic, the latter ex Church of England. Three of them, Ann, Gillian and Hilary, were Church of England, although Ann was thinking about becoming a Quaker. When I asked Elaine what her religion was, she replied, "Protestant, I suppose".

Three of my informants, Gillian, Hilary and Iris, were living in the hostel for unmarried mothers in Westown. Ann was living with a female friend of about the same age in a house on the outskirts of Midtown. Elaine was living in Midtown with her mother. Marie was living in Northtown with her parents and grandmother.

Those three of my informants who were living in the hostel each had a room to herself, where she slept, cooked and ate. In addition, they had use of a common-room, which contained a television, and of a day nursery, where they left their children when out at work. They paid £6 per week rent and nursery fees, which included the cost of food for their children during the day when they were at work. In addition to this they had to pay for gas to heat their rooms.

Ann paid £5.25 per week towards the rent of the house she shared, and between £1.30 and £2.00 per week on rates and fuel.

Elaine gave £5 to her mother as board for herself and her child.

Marie, on the other hand, did not pay a fixed amount to her parents.

She said, "what I do is go out and buy the shopping or something,

or I pay the coal bill or something like this".

Gillian's income ^{1.} amounted to £17 per week. This consisted of £13 through her employment, and £4 as Family Income Supplement (F.I.S.).

Hilary received £17.80 per week. This was made up of £15 through her job, £1.50 from the father of her child, and £1.30 as F.I.S. Iris received £17.45 per week. She received £15.70 through her employment, £1.00 as F.I.S. and £0.75 through the Buttle Trust ^{2.}

Ann had an income of £11.40 per week, which was made up of £10.40 from the S.B.C. ^{3.} and £1.00 from the Buttle Trust.

Elaine was receiving £8.50 per week. That is, £7.50 from the S.B.C. and £1.00 from the Buttle Trust. Marie was receiving £7.70 per week; £6.95 from the S.B.C. and £0.75 from the Buttle Trust ^{4.}

The income and expenditure (on the items mentioned) of my informants is summarised in Table 6.

The 'expenditure' column in the table refers to spending on rent or board, rates and fuel. Four of my informants spent money on fuel. However, of course, the cost of this item will vary with the seasons. We might assume that the amounts in the table refer to the weekly cost of fuel during the autumn.

The 'income left' column refers to income left after expenditure on rent or board, rates and fuel. It will, however, be only approximately correct in the case of each of my informants, and probably more so in the case of some rather than others. However, it gives a guide as to how much my informants had left to spend on other items. The amount of 'income left' spent on other household items varied between my informants. Each of them bought, at least some, clothing and food out of this. However, Elaine and Marie, who lived with, and received help in these respects from their parents perhaps spent relatively little on these items.

At the same time, however, the rent paid by those of my informants who were living in the hostel included nursery fees and, therefore,

covered the cost of some of their children's food. Ann, perhaps, spent more of her 'income left' than any of my other informants on food and clothing, and she probably had least to spend on non-domestic items. In other words, as far as money to spend on 'leisure activities' is concerned, Ann was probably least well off. Elaine was probably better off in this respect, and Marie even more so. Those three of my informants who were living in the hostel and who had jobs, probably had most to spend on leisure activities. If opportunity to participate in 'social activities and enjoyments' depended solely, or even principally, on income, then we would expect that the order of my informants according to decreasing opportunity in this respect would be Hilary, Iris, Gillian, Marie, Elaine and Ann. However, opportunity and, furthermore, the use made of any opportunity, in this respect is not solely, or necessarily primarily, dependent on income. In the next chapter we will begin to explore some of the other factors which have a bearing on their participation in 'social activities and enjoyments'.

CHAPTER TWO
THE MEANINGS OF UNMARRIED MOTHERHOOD
TO UNMARRIED MOTHERS

A few months ago, the following story appeared in the Guardian under the heading 'Girl and new-born baby died alone':

Cathy Charlton, aged 21, died alone in a bed-sitter - her newly-born baby dead beside her. For nine months she had kept her pregnancy a secret.

A Westminster inquest heard yesterday that it was the shame of her pregnancy that killed her. The coroner, Mr. Gavin Thurston, said that she and the baby would have lived if she had had proper medical attention. But it was not until a day before she had the baby that other residents in the house in Kensington, London, realized she was pregnant. Even then they did not ask questions. At the weekend, Miss Charlton, who came to London from Aberystwyth in August, gave birth to her baby girl.

A housekeeper, Mrs. Violet Townsend, aged 51, said she never realized Miss Charlton was pregnant. "It wasn't until Friday when I saw her in the street that I thought she might be. I didn't say anything to her. I had no occasion to go to her room over the weekend".

Mr. William Charlton, a shop-keeper, from Aberystwyth, said he had no idea his daughter was pregnant. She had been at a teachers' training college in Newport, Monmouthshire, and came to London after finishing her course at it.

A verdict of death from natural causes was recorded on Miss Charlton and one of lack of attention at birth on her baby.

This is perhaps an extreme example of what can happen as a result of a girl's own response to her unmarried motherhood. Nevertheless, it highlights the need, when exploring the social situations of unmarried mothers, to investigate the meanings which unmarried mothers themselves attach to their marital status. This chapter is concerned with an investigation of this kind.

An unmarried mother may not have her pregnancy medically confirmed for several months, if at all. To begin with, she may not realize for a long time that she might be pregnant, even when she is suffering from the physical effects of a pregnancy and when she knows what these effects are.

Hilary, for example, went to her doctor because of these effects but without suspecting their cause. That is, she "went to the doctor's so innocently". She "kept being sick every morning /but/ it didn't enter /her/ mind" that she might be pregnant. At the same time, however, an unmarried mother may not have her pregnancy confirmed for a number of weeks, even after having become suspicious. She may be reluctant to have it confirmed. Elaine, for example, was slow to visit her doctor. Then, she said, "I went to the doctor with /a/ friend because I wouldn't go by myself. I was the last one in the surgery. I was saying 'I don't want to go in there'... The doctor came out for me".

At least Elaine had admitted the possibility that she was pregnant and had had it confirmed within about a month of conceiving. An unmarried mother may realize she has the physical effects of a pregnancy but may account for them in an alternative way for several months. Marie, for example, opted for another explanation until about three months after she had conceived. A few days after becoming pregnant, Marie had left home to take up a new job as an air-stewardess. She said, "I moved to London and I got a new job and I started flying. And when my period didn't arrive I just thought it was the circumstances. /So/ the first month went past, and I wasn't really bothered - I didn't think about it. And then it was coming up for the second period and I began to think that this wasn't quite right. And I also began to put on weight very soon". By this time it had occurred to Marie that she had the physical symptoms of a pregnancy. She said "I don't think I suddenly woke up one morning and thought 'Aha, I might be pregnant' - I wasn't that naive. But, I only thought I might be. But I just dismissed it, and said 'No, it /isn't/. It /is/ the environment that /is/ making me late with my periods'". By subscribing to this explanation, she was left with the possibility that, with time, the physical effects would disappear. Eventually, she was left with no alternative but to admit

that she was probably pregnant and to visit her doctor. She said, "I didn't think about /going to the doctor/ until the last moment - I just thought it might go away". However, she said, "by this time I could already feel something - it wasn't just a case of not having periods. I was getting on for three months, and you could actually feel something. But I waited".

Leontine Young in her book *Out of Wedlock*, refers to "the group of girls who do not seek help /from social workers/ until the child is born"¹. She notes that among this group there are "some /who/ have turned their backs upon the whole problem and have refused to make any provisions until the actual advent of the child has forced the situation upon them". Young suggests that "it is as if they had hoped in child-like fashion that the problem would disappear if they ignored it". As an example she mentions "one girl, whose obvious pregnancy had been noted by her employer /but who/ insisted despite a medical diagnosis that she was not pregnant". This girl "had been insulted by her employer's offer of help /and/ resigned from her job as a result"². According to Young, this girl had hoped that she was not pregnant, and as a result had refused to accept that she was. In a similar way, Elaine had hoped that she was not pregnant. When I asked her why she had tried to keep her unmarried motherhood a secret from her family at the beginning of her pregnancy, she replied, "I don't know... I was hoping it was going to go away". She added, however, "I never really thought I was going to have a baby. I was expecting to produce kittens or something. I was quite horrified when I had the baby - it really shattered me. I couldn't believe it". Rather than refusing to accept, or ignoring the fact that she had conceived, Elaine may simply have found it difficult to accept or, that is, to believe, even after giving birth.

In a similar way, Marie may have found it difficult to believe even after she had had it confirmed by her doctor. When she went to her doctor, three months after conceiving, she said "'Look, I just want you to confirm that I am pregnant'. Because /she/ knew by that time that /she/ was". Nevertheless, when the doctor did confirm that she was pregnant, she still "just couldn't believe it". She had found it difficult to believe "because it was the wrong time of the month" when she had had sexual intercourse with the father of her child. What is more, apart from being "the first time /she had/ slept with" the father, despite having had a close relationship with him for about two years, she had not been having anything like "a raving sex life". Marie had found it difficult to believe that she was pregnant because her sex life had not corresponded with what she had imagined led up to an illegitimate birth. Thus, an unmarried mother may find it difficult to believe that she is pregnant because she has difficulty in identifying herself with the type of female she imagines, or has been led to believe, becomes an unmarried mother.

An unmarried mother's image of the typical unmarried mother may have had an influence on those activities which resulted in her pregnancy. It may have had an influence on her behaviour with regard to contraception, for instance. It was because "we didn't have this raving sex life", Marie explained, "that we didn't bother about contraceptives". Elaine and the father of her child had never used a contraceptive device before she conceived, despite having had frequent sexual intercourse. Elaine said, "I suppose I didn't really think about /contraception/ at the time". She added, "I never really thought about it, quite frankly. I don't think you think about it until something happens. Then... 'It's true what they write in books'". She explained, "It didn't click. You know... 'That sort of thing never happens to you'".

In his book *Unmarried Mothers*, Clark Vincent discusses the possibility that the image an unmarried mother had of the type of female who becomes an unmarried mother played a part in her becoming pregnant¹. He describes how, at least in the United States, there is a generally held belief that "only females who /are/ very young, poor, uneducated, or psychologically disturbed" become unmarried mothers. These are the females who are "innocent, ignorant or confused enough to let" themselves become illicitly pregnant. He goes on to suggest:

The selectivity of conventional descriptions /.../ concerning unwed mothers is /.../ consistent with the evil-causes-evil assumption. This assumption provides middle-class parents with ready ammunition in admonishing their daughters that such (bad) factors as poverty, ignorance, and psychological instability cause (bad) illegitimacy. "Only poor, ignorant, and mentally ill girls do become pregnant out of wedlock" is the obverse of "nice girls don't".

This deterrent approach, however, may have a latent function or unintended result for middle class daughters, influencing them so much that they may assume that an illicit pregnancy cannot happen to them, but only to females from the other side of the tracks.

Vincent refers to evidence from his own interviews with unmarried mothers in support of this thesis. He says:

This appeared during my individual interview and counselling sessions with over one hundred unwed mothers. A few young teen-age ones from upper-middle income families expressed considerable disillusionment concerning their parents' teaching that only poor, ignorant, and sick girls became pregnant before marriage. Most indicated that they knew about contraceptives and the elementary facts of reproduction, but did nothing to prevent conception. "It just didn't occur to me that I would get pregnant, so I didn't use anything". "I don't understand, it just didn't happen to other girls in my neighbourhood". "My parents are furious! They say this sort of thing doesn't happen in nice families"

In our society there are perhaps generally held beliefs about the characteristics of unmarried mothers, into which young females are socialized in an attempt to prevent them from becoming unmarried mothers. Ironically, many young females may become unmarried mothers as a result. These beliefs and the use made of them may be said,

following Merton¹, to have the latent function (or dysfunction?) of leading some females to believe that they are immune from unmarried motherhood and therefore to engage in unprotected sexual intercourse. None of my informants had been using any kind of protection when they conceived. As we have noted, Elaine had never used any protection during the frequent intercourse she had had with the father of her child prior to conceiving, although she had started taking 'the pill' soon after giving birth. Iris was the only one of my informants who had taken 'the pill' at any time prior to becoming pregnant. However, in a similar way to Marie, she had engaged in unprotected intercourse when she conceived because, as she explained, it was the first time she had had intercourse with the father. Like Iris, she began taking 'the pill' again, soon after giving birth. Marie and Iris were the only two who had conceived on the first occasion they had had intercourse with the fathers of their children. Both Ann and Gillian had had frequent, but always unprotected, intercourse. Each explained that it had never entered her mind to use some kind of protection. Hilary had also had frequent intercourse with the father of her child, and had on occasions made use of a contraceptive device. However, she said, "sometimes you just don't think of those things. It slips your mind".

The image an unmarried mother has of the typical unmarried mother may not only help us to account for why she conceived and why she may be finding it difficult to believe that she is an unmarried mother; it may also help us to understand why she may be refusing to accept her pregnancy. She may be refusing to accept the label 'unmarried mother' because she does not want to regard herself, or to be regarded by others, as having the characteristics which she has been led to believe are typical of unmarried mothers. This image may then lead her to ignore or deny suggestions that she is pregnant, and to disrupt friendly relations with people who make suggestions of this kind. Alternatively, it may lead an

unmarried mother, if and when she accepts that she is an unmarried mother, to regard herself as different from and superior to the typical unmarried mother, or unmarried mothers in general.

Before learning about her pregnancy, an unmarried mother will have held beliefs about the identity of unmarried mothers; about who they are and why they become illicitly pregnant. Her beliefs in this respect are those of, to use Goffman's term, 'the normal'¹. The formation of these beliefs takes place during one phase of what Goffman refers to as the 'moral career' of a stigmatized person, and they have a bearing on her feelings towards and thereby her relationships with those who possess the same stigma. According to Goffman:

Persons who have a particular stigma tend to have similar learning experiences regarding their plight, and similar changes in conception of self - a similar 'moral career' that is both the cause and effect of commitment to a similar sequence of personal adjustments.²

He refers to four phases of this 'socialization process'. One of these being "that through which the stigmatized person learns and incorporates the standpoint of the normal, acquiring thereby the identity beliefs of the wider society and a general idea of what it would be like to possess a stigma"³. Later on it will be necessary to consider the second aspect of this first phase, that is, the ideas acquired with regard to what it would be like to possess a stigma. For the moment, however, it is worthwhile concentrating on the first aspect, and in this context refer to what Goffman has to say about the second phase of the learning process through which stigmatized persons pass: that is, the phase "through which he learns that he possesses a particular stigma and, this time in detail, the consequences of possessing it". Goffman suggests that:

The timing and interplay of these two initial phases of the moral career form important patterns, establishing the foundation for later development, and providing the means of distinguishing among the moral careers available to the stigmatized⁴.

Goffman goes on to list the possible patterns of socialization¹ which are formed by the timing and interplay of the two initial phases of the moral career, and of these the one which is relevant to the career of the unmarried mother "is illustrated by one who becomes stigmatized late in life, or who learns late in life that he has always been discreditable"². The unmarried mother is one who, therefore, "has thoroughly learned about the normal and stigmatized long before /she/ must see /herself/ as deficient". Consequently, she will "presumably have a special problem in re-identifying /herself/, and a special likelihood of developing disapproval of self"³. Before learning of her pregnancy and that she had become stigmatized, an unmarried mother will have acquired identity standards⁴ by which she differentiates between the normal and the stigmatized, and therefore between herself and the unmarried mother. What is more, when she becomes stigmatized, she carries these standards with her, and, therefore, it is "inevitable that /she/ will feel some ambivalence about /her/ own self". In other words, there will be ambivalence in her "attachment to /her/ stigmatized category"⁵.

In her book *Without a Wedding Ring*, Jean Pochin reports the following:

Carol was as glamorous as a television starlet, charming, ingenious, irresponsible. 'You know', she said as she travelled towards the Mother and Baby Home, 'I used to think that it was only common girls who had babies'⁶.

If Carol carried the identity standards she learnt as a normal past the point when she learnt about her pregnancy and into the second phase of her moral career, she might have found it difficult to re-identify herself, to attach herself to her stigmatized category, and might, therefore, have been reluctant to go to the Mother and Baby Home. When it was put to Marie by social workers during her pregnancy that she might consider living in a Mother and Baby Home followed by a hostel for unmarried mothers and their children, she "rejected those from the word 'go'". When I asked her why she had done this, she replied, "I suppose I'm a

snob. I didn't want to be in with twenty other girls". Marie had found alternative accommodation and she had been determined to do so, whatever difficulties she might have faced. She said, "I think I would have found some way of not going. I think it would upset me so much mentally to have gone to one of those places, I'd have been in a worse state than I was anyway".

Likewise, Hilary had been reluctant to go to a hostel, even though she had eventually accepted the offer of a place in the hostel in which she was living when I interviewed her. This offer was made after Hilary had reluctantly attended an interview with the hostel committee. She said, "When I came down for my interview... On the journey down I was quite fixed in my mind that I wasn't going to come here. I didn't want to". When I asked her why she had felt like this, she replied, "I know I wouldn't fit in with the other girls. So, I came for the interview - I don't suppose I showed much interest, because I wasn't. But when I was here, it wasn't quite how I'd expected it to be and you had to make up your mind there and then - either you come or you don't. And I thought 'If I say no, I don't want to come, what excuse can I make?' I said 'Yes. I'd be quite willing to come here'".

Although Hilary had decided against accepting a place in the hostel because of the other mothers she expected to find there, she had never known another unmarried mother. She said, "I knew of /unmarried mothers/, but I didn't actually come into contact with them. When I asked her how she had looked on unmarried mothers, she replied, "'Silly fools - fancy letting themselves get into that position'. Especially... I think I was fourteen at the time, and a girl in my class fell for a baby at fourteen. I suppose I was a bit disgusted really at that age". She continued, "I didn't come into contact with any, so I suppose I didn't think about it really. Just things you hear - the thoughts go through your mind that 'they must be a bit loose', I suppose". Gillian, who like Hilary was

living in the hostel, had held similar views about unmarried mothers. She said, "I thought they'd probably be... well, if you don't mind me putting it this way, I thought they would be tarts". Again like Hilary, she had been reluctant to live in the hostel, but because she "literally had nowhere to go" and had been "desperate", she had applied for a place.

There was no one whom Gillian had known to be an unmarried mother before she conceived, but afterwards she discovered that she knew a number of girls who had in fact been unmarried mothers. When I asked her if she had known any unmarried mothers, she replied, "No, no. But, afterwards I found out that people I didn't particularly know were unmarried mothers... 'but they are!' Friends, girls that I'd gone to school with, and I'd met in the town and got to know them again". These friends had let Gillian know they were unmarried mothers after they had learnt that she was one. She had thought they were married. That is, she had thought, "'They're unlike me - I don't wear a wedding ring /but/ they wear a wedding ring'". After learning that they were unmarried mothers she had developed a close relationship with one of them. Referring to this girl, Gillian said, "I didn't know she was an unmarried mother, but I am ever so friendly with her now - we go out together". She explained, "/We have/ sort of drawn closer to each other, I suppose really because of the children - we have got something in common".

Goffman mentions how a stigmatized person may "discover that acquaintances he thought were not of his kind really are"¹. He mentions this in the context of what he calls 'back places'. This is one of three possible kinds of places in which an "individual with a secret differentness will find himself during the daily and weekly round"². The other two kinds of places are 'out-of-bounds places' and 'civil places'. Back places are those where "persons of the individual's kind stand exposed and find they need not try to conceal their stigma". This is where the individual "will

be able to be at ease among his fellows"¹, and where he will come across people he knows but who he did not know before to be of his kind.

However, Gillian stood exposed throughout her daily round and had made this kind of discovery, not in some 'back place', but whilst out shopping. The girls she had discovered to be really unmarried mothers, we might conclude, had felt at ease with Gillian on learning that she was of their kind. Goffman suggests that

Regardless of which /.../ pattern the moral career of the stigmatized individual illustrates, the phase of experience during which he learns that he possesses a stigma will be especially interesting for at this time he is likely to be thrown into a new relationship to others who possess the stigma too².

In the case of an unmarried mother, one possibility in this respect, in view of Gillian's experience, is that after becoming stigmatized she will develop close relationships with other unmarried mothers. At the same time, however, the identity standards she acquired before conceiving may affect her feelings towards and thereby her relationships with other unmarried mothers. That is, "the stigmatized individual in our society acquires identity standards which he applies to himself in spite of failing to conform to them"³ and therefore "when the individual first learns who it is that he must now accept as his own, he is likely, at the very least, to feel some ambivalence, for these others will not only be patently stigmatized and thus not like the normal person he knows himself to be, but may also have other attributes with which he finds it difficult to associate himself"⁴.

An unmarried mother may be reluctant to re-identify herself and, like Marie, may reject the suggestion that she might live in a hostel for unmarried mothers. She may decide to avoid all contact with her own kind and thereby may not only develop no close relationships with her own, but also, again like Marie, get to know no other unmarried mothers. Goffman says:

Given the ambivalence built into the individual's attachment to his stigmatized category, it is understandable that oscillations may occur in his support of, identification with, and participation among his own. There will be 'affiliation cycles' through which he comes to accept the special opportunities for in-group participation or comes to reject them after having accepted them before. There will be corresponding oscillations in belief about the nature of own group and the nature of normals /.../ The later phases of the individual's moral career are to be found in these shifts in participation and belief¹.

However, an unmarried mother may have had no participation or contact with her own kind, perhaps because she has successfully tried to avoid them. Consequently, the identity standards she acquired as a normal may have remained unchanged. An unmarried mother's feelings towards her own kind will depend on the identity standards she acquired as a normal and on her experiences during any contact she has had with them since. Depending on her experiences, an unmarried mother may have modified her beliefs about the characteristics of her kind. According to Goffman:

In reviewing his own moral career, the stigmatized individual may single out and retrospectively elaborate experiences which serve for him to account for his coming to the beliefs and practices he now has regarding his own kind and normals. A life event can thus have a double bearing on moral career, first as immediate objective grounds for an actual turning point, and later (and easier to demonstrate) as a means for accounting for a position currently taken. One experience often selected for this latter purpose is that through which the newly stigmatized individual learns that full-fledged members of the group are quite like ordinary human beings².

Hilary and Gillian, who had believed unmarried mothers to be 'loose' and to be 'tarts', had modified their views because of their experience of other unmarried mothers, and in particular because of their experience of each other. Thus, Hilary and Gillian, who as normals had been reluctant to live in the hostel they had come to share, had found each other to be like the ordinary human beings they knew themselves to be. Consequently, Hilary and Gillian had become close friends. They had become such close friends that Hilary was able to say, "I suppose really, the only friend I really value is /Gillian/". In return Gillian said about Hilary, "she is a friend. She is the top friend, I suppose, now. Well, I see her more

often than I see anybody".

No matter how much contact an unmarried mother may have had with her own, the identity standards she acquired as a normal may, nevertheless, remain unchanged. When I asked Elaine to try to explain people's views of unmarried mothers, she replied, "I don't know. Even I... If someone says to me 'She's an unmarried mother', I say 'Is she really?' I do this myself - I find I do". Likewise, although the views of Hilary and Gillian had undergone a change, they still bore some resemblance to those of the normal. The view of Hilary especially was characterised by the kind of ambivalence which has been described by Goffman in the following way:

The stigmatized individual exhibits a tendency to stratify his 'own' according to the degree to which their stigma is apparent and obtrusive. He can then take up in regard to those who are more evidently stigmatized than himself the attitudes the normals take to him. /.../ It is in his affiliation with, or separation from, his more evidently stigmatized fellows, that the individual's oscillation of identification is most sharply marked ¹.

When I asked Hilary to try to account for the way people tended to view unmarried mothers, she said, "I suppose the feeling that... They don't look at the two groups of unmarried mothers. I think they take the attitude that 'they're all sort of... couldn't care less who they go with - sort of the loose type'. They don't consider the unmarried mother who's genuinely come unstuck - perhaps she was going to marry the man but he turned against her. You know the stories you hear about the unmarried girl going with every Tom, Dick or Harry. I think it is unfair of them saying that is what the unmarried girl is like - 'this is the unmarried mother'. And it's just a picture they've formed and they're set in their ways - they're not going to change. They're not going to look at the girl and say 'well, she's a nice girl regardless of what happened'. They're going to sort of bear a grudge. I think so anyway. I know I did towards other people". Whereas for most people all unmarried mothers have "got the same label", for Hilary there were two kinds. In contrast to most people, she had learnt "to try to get to know /an unmarried mother/ and then stick

the label on". She had come across a few unmarried mothers who like herself were atypical in that they were not 'loose' but rather 'ordinary human beings' who had 'come unstuck'. Gillian was another atypical unmarried mother. However, Hilary said, "/Gillian/ and myself, we sort of stick together like glue. We don't have anything to do with the others". Gillian and herself were different from the others in the hostel, or, as she put it, "from the tarts in here". The others were and had been sexually 'loose', which accounted for their pregnancies and suited "their attitude towards everything" else. For instance, and perhaps especially, they did not care about keeping their marital status a secret. In fact, Hilary reported, "they seem so 'big', you know. They say '/I/ have got a child' and '/I/ am an unmarried mother'. And they seem to look at it as though there is nothing to be ashamed of. And they tell everybody. /They are/ sort of easy going. And, well, they are just not my type". Hilary objected strongly to the way they managed information about their marital status. They had the characteristics which are generally held to be typical of and which at the same time stigmatize the unmarried mother. Hilary, who did not have these characteristics, took the stance of the normal towards the others: she viewed and treated them as different and inferior.

Gillian, like Hilary, did not get on very well with the others and least of all with Iris. Iris, in contrast to Gillian and Hilary, had known "quite a lot" of unmarried mothers before conceiving and she had been "quite close friends" with some of these. When I asked her what her view of these mothers had been, she replied, "same as I thought towards me - 'silly bitch'. But they were happy; I was happy - I am happy now, you know". Her view, in other words, had been somewhat similar to Hilary's. However, whereas both Hilary and Gillian had made moral judgements, Iris had not. Iris thought that people look on an unmarried mother as a "loose woman", but unlike Hilary she had never taken this view herself. Iris, therefore, had not had the same reservations as Hilary about going to live

in the hostel. She said, "it seemed the obvious thing to do as I didn't have any place to live". Prior to going to live in the hostel, she said, "I didn't know what I was going to do, you know. I thought I might have him fostered for a bit, and I didn't want to do this. And then I found out about this place, and I was quite relieved. And then I came down for the interview and I thought the room was a bit dingy, but I was so relieved at having a place. And I was luckier than others, so I didn't mind. And I was glad, well, very happy really, that I could go out to work".

Iris's approach to information management was in some ways as Hilary had suggested. She said about other people getting to know that she was an unmarried mother, "I don't really care now - I don't give a damn". At the same time, Iris realized that Hilary regarded her as inferior. When I asked her how she got on with the other mothers in the hostel, she replied, "Well /Gillian/ has upset me a few times; I have upset /Gillian/ a few times. And I dislike /Gillian/ and /Gillian/ dislikes me. I don't like /Hilary/ very much either". Referring to Hilary and Gillian she said, "I just hold them in contempt. I don't bother with them at all". She explained, "Well, /Hilary/ is a snob. I mean, she really is a snob". Hilary's 'snobbishness' showed itself both in the way she treated other unmarried mothers and in her behaviour towards normals. For instance, as Iris pointed out, Hilary referred to herself as 'Mrs.' rather than 'Miss' - as a 'separated mother' rather than as an 'unmarried mother'. Hilary regarded herself as superior and not the 'typical' unmarried mother she regarded Iris to be. She took the stance of the normal and treated Iris and her kind accordingly. She identified with the normal. At the same time she wanted the normal to identify with her and not put her in the same category as Iris and her kind. She did not want to be treated in the way normals treat the latter. This treatment would be unwelcome and undeserving. However, if she presented herself to normals as an unmarried mother, in view of their beliefs about unmarried mothers, she would be

treated like Iris. Therefore she presented herself as a separated mother. Whilst Hilary regarded and treated Iris as inferior in view of her carefree approach to information management, Iris despised Hilary for her sense of superiority, which manifested itself in her behaviour towards others. This behaviour included trying to keep her marital status a secret from normals in order to secure special treatment from them.

Hilary explained, "I use 'Mrs.' to cover up the fact that I am an unmarried mother". She said, "I have never tried to hide the fact that I have got a baby. I mean, I often see people in town, shopping, and they all know, and they all stop and talk to the baby. And I never try to hide the fact that I am the mother". These people "know that I have got a baby", she said, "but they all think that I am married but living apart". She added, "this is how I get round everything. I wouldn't tell anybody by choice". Earlier, reference was made to Goffman's notion of the 'moral career' of a stigmatized person, and to two phases of this 'learning process': "his learning the normal point of view and learning that he is disqualified according to it"¹. These, however, are not the only phases. Goffman says:

Presumably the next phase consists of his learning to cope with the way others treat the kind of person he can be shown to be. A still later phase /.../ is learning to pass ².

A person engages in 'passing' when "by intention or in effect /he/ conceals information about his real social identity, receiving and accepting treatment based on false suppositions concerning himself"³. Passing refers, in other words, to the management, and in particular the concealment, of "undisclosed discrediting information about self". The possibility of passing is open to discreditable persons rather than discredited ones. Goffman distinguishes between these two types by saying:

When there is a discrepancy between an individual's actual social identity and his virtual one, it is possible for this fact to be known to us before we normals contact him,

or to be quite evident when he presents himself before us. He is a discredited person /.../ However, when his differentness is not immediately apparent and is not known to us before hand (or at least known by him to be known by others) /.../ he is a discreditable, not a discredited, person ¹.

If a stigmatized person is discredited, the issue facing him is that of "managing tensions during contacts". If, on the other hand, he is discreditable, the issue facing him is that of "managing information about his failing. To display, or not to display; to tell, or not to tell; to let on, or not to let on; to lie, or not to lie; and in each case to whom, when, and where"². After making this distinction, Goffman points out that "a particular stigmatized individual is likely to have experience of both situations"³. However, whether or not and to what extent he will have the opportunity to pass will depend upon the "known-about-ness"⁴ of his stigma, and this in turn will depend on whether or not it is known before hand or is visible. According to Goffman,

Traditionally, the question of passing has raised the issue of the 'visibility' of a particular stigma, that is, how well or how badly the stigma is adapted to provide means of communicating that the individual possesses it. For example, ex-mental patients and unmarried fathers are similar in that their failing is not readily visible⁵.

The situation of unmarried mothers differs from that of unmarried fathers in this respect. Vincent notes that,

The 'presumption until guilt is proven' provides far less protection for the unwed mother than for the unmarried father. Her guilt is made obvious by a protruding profile - evidence hard to conceal. He bears no outward signs⁶.

The visibility of an individual's stigma, and therefore whether or not and to what extent he has the opportunity to pass, will depend on whether he displays any sign which conveys information about his failing. According to Goffman:

Some signs which convey social information may be frequently and steadily available, and routinely sought and received; these signs may be called 'symbols'⁷.

Signs "which are especially effective in drawing attention to a debasing identity discrepancy, breaking up what would otherwise be a coherent

overall picture with the consequent reduction in our valuation of the individual"¹, are called stigma symbols.

The protruding profile of an unmarried mother is a stigma symbol.

However, this does not mean of course that an unmarried mother will always be discredited, and, therefore, will never have the opportunity to pass. To begin with, an unmarried mother will not always have a protruding profile. She will not have this at the beginning of her unmarried motherhood, even though this will (or, more correctly, may) develop. Also, of course, she will not have this permanently although later her child will be the sign of her failing. Secondly, her 'protruding profile' or her child may not be seen. They may not be displayed. Even though it may become increasingly less likely, an unmarried mother's protruding profile, for instance, may be hidden from view. Furthermore, even if they are seen they may not be recognized. That is, an unmarried mother's protruding profile may not be recognized for what it is. Likewise, her child may be seen but may not be recognized as her child. For instance Gillian said, "actually, I've seen people and they've seen me with /my daughter/ and they say 'oh, are you looking after your sister's baby?' Because they don't believe even now that she's mine".

Even though an unmarried mother may display her 'profile' or her child, and even though they may be recognized for what they are, they will not necessarily act as stigma symbols. That is, they will not necessarily inform others about her failing. Whether or not they do inform will depend on, to use Goffman's phrase, "the decoding capacity of the audience". This capacity, suggests Goffman, "must be specified before one can speak of degree of visibility"². In other words 'degree of visibility' is a measure of the capacity of a stigmatized individual's audiences for decoding the signs of his failing. For example, unless it is known about an unmarried mother that she is unmarried, her pregnancy or her child will

be, at best, only 'unreliable' signs of her failing.

During the early stages after conceiving, unmarried mothers will be in a position to pass with everyone who does not know that they are unmarried mothers. They will pass if they do not tell. As they gradually develop 'protruding profiles' they will be able to pass with those who know they are unmarried only if their profiles (or later their children) are not seen, or at least are not recognized for what they are. They will pass if they conceal their profiles or their children. At the same time, they will be in a position to pass with those who do not know them to be unmarried even if their profiles or their children are seen. They will pass if they keep the fact that they are not married a secret. Unmarried mothers will not have equal opportunity for passing, though most will have some opportunity. They will also differ with regard to how they make use of their opportunity for passing. The extent to which they do pass will then depend on their opportunity in this respect and, connectedly, their approaches to information management.

According to Goffman "it is possible to see that the extent of passing can vary, from momentary and unintended at one extreme to the classic kind of total passing"¹. Some unmarried mothers will pass by intention, others will not, and of those who do pass by intention, some will do so more than others. Amongst my respondents Hilary showed the greatest interest in keeping her unmarried motherhood a secret. When she had the chance to pass she would usually take it, and she had many such chances. Hilary was twenty years old and had lived with her two year old daughter in the hostel in Westown for just over a year. Apart from this, she had lived all her life in London, about thirty miles away. Before applying to the hostel she had been completely unknown in Westown, and the move had therefore provided her with the chance to pass extensively. She had made full use of this opportunity, with the result that hardly anyone in Westown knew that she was an unmarried mother. She said, "a lot of people

don't know the truth, except for a few who have got to know". Those who knew included, she said, "my boss, and the manager where I am working and /hostel/ committee". Apart from the people who had to know, there was, she said, "only one person I told. That was a chap from work". She explained, "I felt I could trust him - well, I can".

Hilary's approach to information management contrasted sharply with Iris's. Iris was twenty two years old and she and her one year old son had lived in the hostel in Westown, like Hilary, for just over a year. She had moved to Westown, again like Hilary, from about thirty miles away. She had never lived closer than thirty miles to Westown, and when she moved there she had had the same opportunity as Hilary for passing. However, at the time of interviewing, Iris did not try to pass and far more people in Westown had learnt about her unmarried motherhood than had learnt about Hilary's. Unlike Hilary she did not present herself as married, she did not refer to herself as 'Mrs.' and she did not wear a 'wedding' ring. She said about calling herself 'Mrs.' or wearing a ring, "it's a bit pointless really. I think it's a bit silly".

Whilst Iris was carefree about others getting to know about her marital status, she by no means 'told everybody' (as Hilary had suggested). She had nothing against telling, but she did not necessarily tell. For example, she attended a weekly folk club, but she had not told any of the people she had met there. At the same time because she had not tried to pass, it was possible that some of them had discovered or had at least become suspicious. She said, "quite a lot of them know, actually, I suppose, that I've got a baby, because I see them in town when I go out shopping and out for walks. You know, I meet them". However, she was not sure that any of them knew. She said, "some of them know, some of them don't - I don't know really. I don't really think about it, whether they know or not". It did not matter if anyone at the folk club knew, but she had no

reason to tell them. On the other hand, she said, "if a fellow asked me out for a date, I'd say 'yes' - I'd go out with him the next date. If I haven't told him, I'd tell him the second date". She would tell someone with whom she had a second date, if he had not already learnt. On the first date she would "never make an excuse", that is, try to pass, but otherwise she would not tell, because at that stage it was "none of his business". She said, "I mean, what's the point of making a big thing out of it?" Whilst Iris would tell a 'boyfriend' on a second date if he had not already learnt, Hilary would never tell. Hilary had had several boyfriends since moving to the hostel, but she had tried, successfully, to pass with each of them. One of these boyfriends was a "chap from work" with whom she "went out for several months"¹.

Despite having a close relationship with Hilary (and a distant one with Iris), Gillian's approach to information management was more like Iris's. Gillian was twenty two years old and had lived with her nine month old daughter in the hostel since shortly after giving birth. Unlike both Hilary and Iris, Gillian had lived in Westown before going to live in the hostel. She had lived with her married sister within two miles of the hostel for several months before giving birth. Moreover, she had moved to her sister's from a village within ten miles, where she had lived all her life.² Unlike Hilary she did not try to keep her unmarried motherhood secret. She did not try to conceal her child, or present herself as a married mother. She did not refer to herself as 'Mrs.' or wear a 'wedding' ring. Referring to her decision not to wear a ring, she said, "Not that I wanted everybody to know. /But/ I thought 'it's no use, I'm not married whether I wear a wedding ring or not'. I thought, 'I'm not ashamed of the fact'". She explained, "/if/ I am ashamed of the fact, that means I am ashamed of /my daughter/, which I'm not".

Whilst Gillian was perhaps more reluctant than Iris to actually tell others about her marital status, she was far less reluctant than Hilary. Thus,

unlike Hilary she would tell boyfriends, for example. At the time of interviewing, she had a steady boyfriend, but in the past she would perhaps meet boyfriends when she and another mother who used to live in the hostel went dancing. These boyfriends would ask, she said, "'where do you live?' They didn't know about /the hostel/, really. And then they said 'can we come upstairs?' And I said, 'no, I'm sorry you can't'. And of course... Well, you've got to tell them sometime or other, so, 'it might as well be now'".

Ann's approach was also more like Iris's than Hilary's. Ann was twenty one years old and was living with her seven month old¹ son and a female friend in a house a couple of miles outside Midtown. She and her friend had moved from Midtown itself a few days before she had given birth. She had lived in Midtown for about five months, after moving from London about seventy miles away. Before moving to Midtown she had always lived in London, and on moving she had as much opportunity for passing as Hilary and Iris had had when they moved to Westown. However, many people had learnt about her unmarried motherhood, and, at the time of interviewing, she hardly ever passed by intent. She said, "I don't mind anyone knowing about me. I've made up my mind as far as that's concerned", "I don't pretend I am married, I don't pretend I am divorced, I don't pretend I am separated. I am an unmarried mother, and if people won't accept me as such... ". For instance, she said, when boyfriends "ask 'what do you do?', I say 'I am occupied as a mother'". At the same time, there were perhaps occasions when Ann would try to pass. She recalled, for example, how she had passed by intent on one occasion in order to get the lease of the house in which she was living. She had an interview with the estate agent after she had been living in a boarding house for several weeks and only a few weeks before she was due to give birth. The estate agent, she said "looked middle-aged, respectable. So I said I was getting married soon. I wouldn't have lied, but we had been looking for some time. If it had been the first we had tried, I'd have probably not said that - I wouldn't

have thought to. But we'd been looking for some time".

Elaine was another of my informants who did not try to pass very often, but who accepted the need to do so on occasions. Elaine was twenty one years old and she had lived with her three year old son and her mother in Midtown for several years. When I asked her if she ever tried to pass, she replied, "Oh, I did once. I went for a drink, so when I met some blokes - you do then. He said, 'what do /you/ do?' and I said, 'well, I don't work'. I just said I was unemployed. And he said 'what do /you/ do during the day?' and I said, 'nothing'. I didn't say anything really. I didn't deny it. I just avoided the subject really". Unlike Iris, Gillian or Ann, Elaine would perhaps try to pass with boyfriends, although in doing so she 'concealed' her child and so, unlike Hilary, did not need to lie. Unlike Hilary, Elaine never presented herself as married, referred to herself as 'Mrs.' or wore a 'wedding' ring.

Marie likewise never referred to herself as 'Mrs.'. On the other hand, she usually wore a ring. Marie, who was twenty three, and her eighteen month old daughter, were living with her parents and surviving grand-parent in Northtown. She had not lived there continuously since conceiving, but she had lived there for several years beforehand. She said about wearing a ring, "the sort of place where /it/ helps is when you are sitting in a clinic or something with all the other mothers. I wouldn't mind telling people, but I wouldn't... you could just imagine what would happen if you sat there. You'd be asked about your husband, and this sort of thing. It's really just to stop a lot of questions". Marie tried to pass on other occasions. She said, "the people I object to telling now is authorities - people like the hospital especially". She was especially interested in trying to pass with nurses at the hospital and wearing a ring helped in this respect.

Marie's approach to information management was closer than any of my other informants to Hilary's. Nevertheless, she was still much less likely to

try to pass and more likely to tell. For example, she would tell anyone with whom she thought there was a chance of developing a close relationship. Referring to such people, she said "I immediately tell them I'm /Marie/ and /my daughter/ - 'I'm not just on my own anymore'. So then people either accept me from the beginning or they don't". As far as boyfriends, in particular, were concerned, she said, "I always tell /them/ before I even know them". She explained, "it's better that, than to let the relationship develop and then have to /tell them/. Anyway it's impossible /to do otherwise/ because if anybody asked me out, I'd have to say, 'I've got to get a babysitter first'. So it's got to come out straightaway".

According to Goffman "because of the great rewards in being considered normal, almost all persons who are in a position to pass will do so on some occasion by intent"¹. The rewards involved stem from "what is often, if vaguely called 'acceptance'"² by normals. However, the reports of my informants suggest that there may be a wide variation in the extent to which people with a particular stigma try to pass. Following Goffman we might suggest that the extent to which an individual passes will depend on the 'rewards' he will enjoy by passing. However, it would be more correct to say that it will depend on the rewards he believes he will, or may, enjoy by passing. To be more precise, it will depend, first of all, on what he believes might be the 'objective' consequences of taking the actions which he believes are open to him, and secondly, on his evaluation of, or feelings about, these consequences. Despite not being accepted and even anticipating not being accepted, a stigmatized individual may not take the opportunity to pass.

Stigmatized individuals may on occasions be required to let their failings be known. We might recall here how Hilary tended to tell people only if they 'had to know'. Goffman notes that there are

important stigmas, such as the ones that prostitutes, thieves, homosexuals, beggars, and drug addicts have, which require the individual to be carefully secret about his failing to one class of persons, the police, while systematically exposing himself to other classes of persons, namely, clients, fellow-members, connections, fences, and the like. Thus, no matter what role tramps assume in the presence of the police, they often have to declare themselves to housewives in order to obtain a free meal ¹.

It is possible that "he who passes will find unanticipated needs to disclose discrediting information about himself, as when the wife of a mental patient goes to collect her husband's unemployment insurance" ².

In other words, the stigmatized may sometimes disclose their identity despite the possible consequences because they need to do so in order to obtain food, clothing, shelter, income, a job, and so on.

In addition, the reports of my informants indicate that the stigmatized may sometimes not try to pass because they feel that others have the right to know, or at least because they believe that the latter will feel this themselves. As Goffman points out:

even when an individual could keep an unapparent stigma secret, he will find that intimate relations with others, ratified in our society by mutual confession of invisible failings, cause him either to admit his situation to the intimate or feel guilty for not doing so ³.

An unmarried mother, for example, may tell because she feels obliged to do so and thereby risk being regarded as unacceptable. In a similar way a stigmatized individual may not pass, despite believing that he may be regarded as unacceptable, because he feels that it is wrong to lie, or at least because he believes that the other person will feel this. Thus, whilst Hilary did not mind lying, Elaine, for example, preferred not to. Elaine did not mind trying to pass, but she preferred not to lie in the process.

It is also possible that the stigmatized will sometimes disclose their identity because they would prefer not to maintain or develop close relationships with people who would not find them acceptable. Marie may have told on occasions with this in mind. A more extreme possibility is that stigmatized individuals may be 'above' passing. As Goffman says:

the stigmatized individual can come to feel that he is above passing, that if he accepts himself and respects himself he will feel no need to conceal his failing /.../. It is here that voluntary disclosure fits into the moral career, a sign of one of its phases ¹.

Individuals who are above passing have, according to Goffman, entered the fifth phase of the moral career of the stigmatized. However, first of all, voluntary disclosure may take place before this phase is reached, and, secondly, it is not necessarily a clear-cut matter as to whether or not a particular individual has reached this stage. Both Iris and Gillian may have been above passing. However, it is possible that given the right reward they would still have tried to pass. Ann claimed to be above passing. She explained, "if people are going to be narrow-minded, I haven't got much time for them I'm afraid". Nevertheless, she had passed, as we have seen, when the reward was the lease of the house in which she was living.

In so far as stigmatized individuals' approaches to information management depend on their beliefs about the consequences of not passing, their approaches will depend on their experience of these consequences. Their approaches may change as a result of their experience. Marie had perhaps not always had the same approach to information management. Whilst she usually wore a 'wedding' ring at the time of interviewing, she had not always done so. Marie said, "I didn't wear it at the beginning. I started wearing it at places like the Social Security and going to the hospital and these sort of things. And it just carried on that I do. It does protect me up to a point".

We have already noted Goffman's suggestion that after a stigmatized individual learns about his failing he enters a phase in his moral career during which he learns 'in detail' the consequences of possessing a particular stigma, and then a phase during which he learns how to cope with the way others treat the kind of person he can be shown to be and also how to pass. However, stigmatized individuals do not necessarily enter the second phase (as described by Goffman) straight away or, even

at all. On learning about his failing a stigmatized individual may have the opportunity to pass extensively or, even, totally. What is more, he may already have the inclination and ability to make use of this opportunity. Consequently, he may learn little or, even, nothing at all about the consequences of possessing his particular stigma.

Just as stigmatized individuals will have acquired 'identity beliefs' during the first phase of their moral career (that is, when they were 'normals'), they will also have acquired beliefs during the same phase about how others treat the kind of person they can be shown to be. Then, just as the identity beliefs they acquired may lead them to view and treat some or even all of their own kind as different and inferior, the beliefs they acquired about the consequences of their failing may make them inclined to try to pass, perhaps as often as possible. The approach to information management which a stigmatized individual adopts on learning about his failing, and thereby the beliefs he acquired as a normal, may have a crucial bearing on his experience of the consequences of his failing, and thereby on the development of his beliefs about the latter. The beliefs he acquired as a normal may also have a bearing on what he learns about the consequences of his failing by way of their affect on his perception of these consequences. According to Goffman, when a stigmatized person reveals his failing to normals "he may perceive, usually quite correctly, that /.../ they do not really 'accept' him and are not ready to make contact with him on equal grounds"¹. A stigmatized person may be led by a perception of this kind to alter his approach to information management in favour of greater passing by intent, but he may have perceived incorrectly. What we perceive, as C. J. Adcock has pointed out in a discussion of the "subjective nature of perception"², is a 'reconstruction of reality' and this reconstruction will depend on our already acquired beliefs about the nature of reality. Therefore, "reality must always be for /anyone/ an assumption" and people may sometimes be led by their

beliefs to assume incorrectly in this respect.

An unmarried mother's approach to information management will depend on her beliefs about the consequences of unmarried motherhood, which will be the outcome of a process that will have begun before she learnt about her pregnancy and which from then on will have involved an interplay between already acquired beliefs, approaches to information management and experience of the consequences of unmarried motherhood. Most of my informants had changed their beliefs about the consequences of unmarried motherhood and also their approaches to information management. Each of my informants, whatever her approach at the time of interviewing, had passed by intent at the beginning of her career as an unmarried mother. For example, although Marie had not begun to wear a ring until after the birth of her child, she had passed by intent beforehand. At the beginning, she said, "having to face people again was a big thing, and telling them. Because I'm still not very good at it". She had been worried about how other people might respond to her marital status and she had been especially worried about her parents' responses. She said, "I was very worried about having to tell my parents". She herself had not told them; someone else eventually did so.

For some time, the only other person who knew about Gillian's pregnancy was the father of her child. She and the father had planned to marry and when she conceived she had hoped that they would still do so. However, the father changed his mind. Then, Gillian said, "when we'd finished... that was it. I didn't want to talk to anybody. Because I thought they /wouldn't/ want to know me - 'they won't want to know me'". Thus, for a time she had tried to pass with more or less everyone, including her family. Iris had also tried to pass extensively to begin with. She said, "I sort of felt 'I must keep it to myself'. I didn't want anybody to know". She had tried to pass with her family and when I asked her why, she replied, "I am a bit of a coward on occasions, I am afraid. There are

just so many of them, you know". Ann had tried to pass to a similar extent. She had also tried to pass with her family, for example. This was, she explained, "because of my mother's attitude". That is, she had been especially worried about her mother's response.

Gillian, Iris and Ann no longer, or at least hardly ever, passed by intent at the time of interviewing. Their approaches to information management had, therefore, undergone a good deal of change. Elaine's approach had changed in a similar direction. She had also tried to pass with her family at the beginning. This was mainly because, she explained, "I didn't want to upset my mother". Furthermore, although she had never referred to herself as 'Mrs.' and although she did not wear a ring at the time of interviewing, she had worn a ring towards the end of her pregnancy. She said, "when I was pregnant I /wore a ring/. But as soon as I had the baby I took it off - a bit crazy really. Because at the ante-natal clinic I wanted to be up with the others. You feel they might look down on you. But I think you have a 'don't care' attitude more - it matters less to you". Whereas Elaine had become less interested in trying to pass, Marie had perhaps become more interested. She had begun wearing a ring at about the stage when Elaine had stopped wearing one.

Judging by the reports of my informants, unmarried mothers in our society are likely to have acquired beliefs as normals which led them to try to pass extensively at the beginning of their careers as unmarried mothers. However, they are likely to try to pass to a lesser extent later on. It is exceptional for an unmarried mother to continue to pass extensively. Marie still tried to pass quite a lot at the time of interviewing, perhaps because of what she had experienced when she had not passed. At least Marie had experienced the responses of quite a few people to her unmarried motherhood. Hilary, on the other hand, had experienced the responses of very few people. She had consistently passed almost totally throughout her career as an unmarried mother, and relatedly, she had more or less

retained the same beliefs about the consequences of unmarried motherhood that she had acquired before she conceived. Hilary said, "I can't really say how people react to unmarried mothers because I have always lied about it. I have always said I am a separated mother really, so what people's actual views are, I can't say. I can't say I have had any bad feeling because of it". Hilary's pre-pregnancy experience had led her to adopt an approach to information management which involved extensive passing and which had, she believed, prevented her from experiencing 'bad feeling'. Thus, she reported how before going to live in the hostel she had lived for a while in a 'guest house' in London and that the other 'guests' were "very nice" to her. "But, there again", she said, "they didn't know I was an unmarried mother. And they used to come to my room to see the baby and I got on well with everybody there". When I asked her if she thought they would have treated her differently if they had known she was an unmarried mother, she replied, "I think so, yes". There is a possibility, however, that in spite of her beliefs, Hilary would not have experienced any 'bad feeling' if she had been known to be an unmarried mother. It is even possible that she was known to be, or at least suspected of being, an unmarried mother. Hilary might have been surprised by the treatment she would have experienced if she had not tried to pass and consequently might have had a different approach to information management at the time of interviewing.

Hilary had experienced responses from a few people¹, and despite her unchanged beliefs, had experienced little 'bad feeling' from them. However, she believed she had experienced the responses she had, because of who had learnt and, conversely, who had not. The responses she had experienced were, or at least could have been, expected in view of whose they were. That she had experienced little 'bad feeling' was understandable given the people whose responses she had experienced. Their responses were not indicative of the sort of response she would have experienced if she had not passed extensively.

An unmarried mother may believe that everyone treats unmarried mothers in the same way. It is possible and perhaps likely, however, that she will believe that people treat unmarried mothers in different ways: that some accept them and that some do not, for instance. To what extent and from whom she expects a particular response will depend on her experience, both before and after she conceived. Her post-conception experience may lead to a modification of the beliefs she held at the beginning of her unmarried motherhood. Whether or not and how her beliefs are modified will depend on who does and who does not learn about her unmarried motherhood and how she is treated by the particular members of these two categories. The extent to which and from whom she expects a particular response may then have a bearing on her approach to information management. It may have a bearing on the extent to which and with whom she tries to pass.

Hilary had kept her unmarried motherhood from her family until she had been pregnant for about eight months, when she told her father. Before then, however, she had told a number of other people. Apart from the father, whom she had told first and with whom she was living, she had told several friends. Three of these friends were ones she had made doing "voluntary nursing and who knew all the way along". She had also told the closest of her friends. Referring to this friend, Hilary said "we used to go everywhere together. And everybody used to say 'you are just like sisters'". However, she had not told all of her friends. She had not told one friend, for instance, until about a year and a half after she had given birth. Referring to this friend, Hilary said "it was only a few months ago that I had the courage to write to her and tell her that I had a baby". In a similar way, although she had told her father about eight months after conceiving, she had not told the rest of her family until a few months before our interview. She said, "/they/ didn't even know I'd got a baby until Easter of this year".

Marie's parents had learnt about her pregnancy within a couple of days of her having had it confirmed. However, by that time, she said, "most of my friends knew I was pregnant, because it happens that the parents are always the last to know". What is more, Marie had not informed her parents herself. The first person Marie had told was a close friend, shortly after she had admitted that she might be pregnant. Marie explained, "/she/ was the first person to know because I'd known her a long time. And she 'phoned up and said 'Guess what, somebody we know /is/ pregnant', and I said - it was six months - 'Guess what, I think I'm nearly three'. And until then I hadn't told anybody". This friend was the first, she explained, "because I didn't know anybody at /the airline company/. We'd all just joined and we'd all just met and you don't go up to somebody you've just met and say 'I might be pregnant'. This was the thing, if I'd been working for the /airline company/ for six months and then it happened, it might have been a different story. But it was all so new and I didn't tell anybody". Soon after she had told her friend, she told one of her flat-mates. This was because, she explained, "she'd been an ex-nurse and I thought perhaps she might have some bright ideas on what to do¹. And she was kind. Actually she came to the doctor's with me". Whilst she told this flat-mate, she did not tell the other three because she "thought /they/ would be terribly shocked and offended". But, she said, the other "girls in the flat all had to be told after I'd been and had it confirmed. Then I was taken into hospital the next day with a suspected miscarriage. And I'm afraid my parents were the next people to hear". Her parents had been told by her flat-mates.

Elaine had not told her family until she had been pregnant for about four months and she told them then only after they had become suspicious. Moreover, like Hilary and Marie, she had already told friends. One of these friends, as we have already noted, had gone to the doctor with her when she had had her pregnancy confirmed. Gillian, however, had gone to the

doctor's without having told anyone that she might be pregnant. Shortly afterwards she had told the father and hoped that he would 'stand by' her. It was only after the father had made it clear that he was not going to do this that she told anyone else. She said, "I told my sister. Well, I had to - those weeks I was a nervous wreck more than anything". She did not tell anyone else for several weeks, then she told the rest of her family.

In a similar way, the only person Ann had told for several weeks was the father of her child. It has already been noted that in keeping it from her family, Ann had been particularly worried about her mother's response. She said "I wanted to /keep it/ from the family because they would have tried to brainwash me into doing what they wanted me to do - or my mother, not my sisters. They would have left me to make my own decisions".

However, about four months after conceiving, she told her family. She had told them before any of the friends she had had. Ann said "my friends didn't know until a couple of months before /my son/ was born, when I actually decided that I was going to keep him". She had thought about having her child adopted and only after she had decided against this had she let her friends know.

Ann had left home when only the father knew about her pregnancy. She had done this as part of an attempt to keep her marital status a secret. In a similar way, Iris had left home without having told any of family, many of her friends and even the father of her child. The first person she had told, she explained "was a lady I used to work with. She was the manageress of the shop I was working in. And I told her because the only person to talk to was her and the manager" of the shop. Apart from this friend and the manager, the only other people she had told before leaving home (when she was about five and a half months into her pregnancy) were the closest of her friends and a social worker. As well as passing with her own family, she had tried to pass with the family of her closest friend, even

though she had had very close relationships with them also. She had had such close relationships with the friend's parents that she referred to them as her "other mother and father"¹. She had not told them until after she had given birth. She said "I didn't tell my 'mother', I just told my friend and said 'I can't tell her, she'll be upset', you know. So she said 'Oh, you must tell her, because she wants to know what is happening to you and why you are living in /Westtown/ and why you haven't come to see them'. So I thought perhaps I'd better. So I sat down and wrote to her one night".

Iris explained not having told the father by saying "when I found out I was pregnant I had already finished with him, you know, I didn't want to go out with him any more. /And/ when I found out I was pregnant, I really, you know, couldn't face him any more. I suppose it affects some people like that. The thought of him sickened me. And I thought, 'well, he might want me to marry him and he might want a claim on his child'. And I thought not. I couldn't bear having him around me all the time. Even if it was only to see his child". At the time of interviewing Iris had still not told, not only a number of the friends she had had, but also her family and the father. As far as she knew, her family and the father still did not know about her unmarried motherhood.

My informants had been more interested at the beginning of their unmarried motherhoods, in passing with some people than with others. Amongst those with whom they had been interested in passing were members of their families, friends, and, in one case, the father. This does not necessarily mean, of course, that they expected to be found unacceptable by, and only by, these people. To begin with, an unmarried mother may not attach the same importance to the responses of different people. She may regard the responses of family and friends, for instance, as most important and may, therefore, be more interested in passing with them². Apart from this, however, it is not necessarily the case that an unmarried mother will be interested in keeping her failing from someone only because she believes

he may find her unacceptable. My informants reported keeping their failing a secret in order to avoid other responses. Iris, for example, had kept it from the father for reasons other than a belief that he would find her unacceptable. Furthermore, she had been reluctant to let her 'mother' and 'father' know for other reasons. She had wanted to pass with them for reasons which were similar to those Elaine had had for wanting to pass with her mother. That is, she had not wanted to 'upset' them. At the same time, however, my informants had expected that they would be found unacceptable by members of their families and by friends¹. If Goffman is to be believed, these expectations should have been justified.

A stigmatized person is one about whom there is information which, if known, is discrediting. This information is 'social information'. It is about his 'actual social identity', or the social category to which he belongs. In trying to pass, therefore, an unmarried mother will be trying to conceal information about her social identity, or the social category to which she belongs. According to Goffman:

Stigma management is an offshoot of something basic in our society, the stereotyping or 'profiling' of our normative expectations regarding conduct and character; stereotyping is classically reserved for customers, orientals, and motorists, that is, persons who fall into very broad categories and who may be passing strangers to us².

We use the social information we have about people to categorize them or as a guide to their character and conduct and therefore as a guide to how we should treat them. According to Goffman:

There is a popular notion that although impersonal contacts between strangers are particularly subject to stereotypical responses, as persons come to be on closer terms with each other, this categoric approach recedes and gradually sympathy, understanding, and a realistic assessment of personal qualities takes place. The area of stigma management, then, might be seen as something that pertains mainly to public life, to contact between strangers or mere acquaintances, to one end of the continuum whose other end is intimacy³.

Goffman suggests that "the idea of such a continuum no doubt has some validity", but that "in spite of /the/ evidence of everyday beliefs about

stigma and familiarity, one must go on to see that familiarity need not reduce contempt"¹. That is, whether we interact with strangers or intimates, we will find that "the fingertips of society have reached bluntly into the contact"². Whether people are strangers or on intimate terms, they will place one another in social categories and have standard expectations about one another's character and conduct³. Their interaction will then depend on the same categorizations and expectations. Thus, a stigmatized individual may find that strangers and intimates respond to the news of his failing by having standard expectations about him and by treating him in the same way. Goffman suggests that there is "much /.../ evidence /.../ that the individual's intimates as well as his strangers will be put off by his stigma"⁴. For example, he says, "the individual's intimates can become just the persons from whom he is most concerned with concealing something shameful"⁵. However, this is not acceptable evidence in support of the suggestion that intimates are put off by an individual's failing. It is simply a statement in support of the idea that there is a 'popular notion' that strangers and 'intimates' categorize and treat stigmatized individuals in similar ways. A stigmatized individual may expect intimates as well as strangers to be put off by his failing. This expectation may be correct; it may not. Whether valid or invalid it may lead the stigmatized individual to try to pass with intimates. If he succeeds in passing he may avoid discovering that his intimates are put off by his failing. On the other hand, he may simply prevent himself from learning that his intimates are not put off. If he does not pass he may discover that his intimates are put off, but he may learn that they are not.

At the time of interviewing, Ann, for example, seemed to believe that people who are 'middle-aged and respectable' are likely to view unmarried mothers as unacceptable. She may have acquired this belief as a normal and as a result of it, may have expected at least some of her family to be put off. What is more, she may have expected her family rather than her friends

to be put off, and therefore may have been more interested in trying to pass with her family than with her friends.

Intimates may be put off by an individual's stigma, or at least an individual may be interested in keeping his failing from some or all of his intimates. Therefore, as Goffman suggests,

instead of thinking of a continuum of relationships, with categoric and concealing treatment at one end and particularistic, open treatment at the other, it might be better to think of various structures in which contact occurs and is stabilized - public streets and their strangers, perfunctory service relations, the workplace, the neighbourhood, the domestic scene - and to see that in each case characteristic discrepancies are likely to occur between virtual and actual social identity,¹ and characteristic efforts are made to manage the situation.

The problem of how to pass, as well as the problem of whether to pass, with someone will depend on who the latter is. As has already been noted, whether or not and how an individual can pass will depend on the personal information others have of him. In other words, not only does an individual's "social identity divide up the world of people and places for him"², his 'personal identity' does this too. As Goffman says,

It is these frames of reference one must apply in studying the daily round of a particular stigmatized person, as he wends his way to and from his place of work, his place of residence, his place of shopping, and the places where he participates in recreation. A key concept here is the daily round, for it is the daily round that links the individual to his several social situations. And one studies the daily round with a special perspective in mind. To the extent that the individual is a discredited person, one looks for the routine cycle of restrictions he faces regarding social acceptance; to the extent that he is discreditable, for the contingencies he faces in managing information about himself³.

Goffman goes on to discuss some of the "common techniques the individual with a secret defect employs in managing crucial information about himself"⁴, and begins with a consideration of the strategy by which signs, that have come to be stigma symbols, are concealed or obliterated. This strategy will probably have to be used when, for example, an unmarried mother wishes to pass with her family.

Perhaps when unmarried mothers have abortions and adoptions they are, in effect, 'obliterating' the signs of their failing. At the same time,

however, abortion and adoption allow unmarried mothers not simply to get rid of the signs of their failing, but also to get rid of, or to at least transform, their failing. By having an abortion or an adoption, an unmarried mother will be transforming herself into an 'ex-unmarried mother who has had either an abortion or an adoption'¹. After asking "how does the stigmatized person respond to his situation?", Goffman goes on to suggest that,

In some cases it will be possible for him to make a direct attempt to correct what he sees as the objective basis of his failing /.../. Where such repair is possible, what often results is not the acquisition of fully normal status, but a transformation of self from someone with a particular blemish into someone with a record of having corrected a particular blemish².

Marie had considered abortion, but had not considered having it medically induced until she visited her doctor to have her pregnancy confirmed. Before visiting her doctor, she said, "I had thought of getting rid of 'it' in any way I can, the old wives' tales things. And if it had happened that way...! I don't think I'd really thought of having an actual abortion itself". Her doctor, however, had suggested having an abortion. Marie said, "I went to the doctor and the doctor said to me 'What do you want to do?' And I said 'I suppose I shall have to have the baby and then decide whether I'm going to keep it?' And he said 'No, do you want an abortion?' And I said 'Oh, well I don't know'. And he sent me to a gynaecologist in Harley Street". She claimed she would not have considered having an 'abortion' if it had not been for this doctor and she was still uncertain when she went to the gynaecologist. However, the visit to Harley Street, she said, "was such a horrible experience, I knew I couldn't go through with it". The gynaecologist, she explained, "gave me a very brutal examination, which frightened the life out of me. It must have been bad because it started off a miscarriage the next morning". She said, "when I woke up the next morning and found out I was starting to miscarry, I thought, well my problems are ended. It was going to happen

naturally. But they didn't". She was taken into hospital where she was "sedated for fortyeight hours to save the baby". I asked her how she had felt about still being pregnant and she replied, "Marvellous! I got real maternal. By the time I got out of hospital I was buying baby wool". This was because, she explained, "by that time my parents knew. And I'd been in touch with my boyfriend and he was quite - not exactly pleased - but I felt he was going to stand by me. And the idea of a baby was rather nice". From then on, she was determined to give birth and she dismissed subsequent suggestions from her parents and the father that she should have an abortion.

Elaine had also visited a gynaecologist about an abortion. However, this was only after her family had learnt about her pregnancy and at her mother's suggestion. She had managed to pass with her family until over four months after conceiving and she had not considered abortion before then, perhaps because of the difficulty she had had in believing that she was really pregnant. Then, she said, "it was a bit late when I told everybody. I was about four or five months pregnant. You can't do much about it then". The gynaecologist had told her that "it was too late to do anything". In response, she said, "I felt a bit pleased, really".

None of my other informants had considered abortion. They had dismissed any suggestions that they should have one. Thus, Ann had never considered it, even though the father had tried to persuade her. She said, "I could have had an abortion. /The father/ would have paid for an abortion".

Referring to when she had her pregnancy confirmed, Gillian said "my first reaction was I wanted to keep it". She had also dismissed the father's suggestion that she should "get rid of it". She thought she would never have an abortion. She explained, "it is not that it doesn't seem right. I don't think I'd really be in such a desperate position".

In a similar way, Iris had never considered an abortion because such

action is "alright if it is necessary, really necessary". She said, "I mean, if it is a matter of life and death of the mother, well, I believe in abortion. But nobody needs to get pregnant, let's face it. And if you're healthy, young and healthy and there are no problems, I don't see why you can't have a child. People can have it adopted afterwards, if you really don't want a child. You can have it adopted afterwards. I mean, there are thousands of people crying out for a child and they can't have one. That is why I don't believe in abortion". Iris had dismissed the suggestions of both the first person she had told about her pregnancy (her friend at work) and her "boss" that she should have an abortion. Likewise, Hilary had dismissed her doctor's suggestion that she might have an abortion. When he suggested it, she said, "I knew there and then that I couldn't possibly part with the child". The father's reaction to the news had been "'get rid of it. Get rid of it'". But, she said, "I refused". She explained, "I've always been the kind of person, that if I get myself into a muddle, I've got to get out of it myself. I've got to fight it out myself. I don't want anybody else to help me. I don't want to take the coward's way out. This is probably the same reason".

As well as never having considered abortion, Hilary had never considered adoption. She said, "it didn't enter my mind at all. I was quite firm I was going to keep it". What is more, no one had suggested she should have the child adopted. Gillian had never considered adoption either, although she had had to dismiss suggestions from one of her aunts that she should. Similarly Iris had never considered adoption¹, although "plenty of people" had suggested she should. For example, she said, "the manager where I was working, he kept on and on at me... ". But, she said, "the more he kept on at me, he made me more determined that I was going to keep it".

Although Ann had not considered abortion, she had considered adoption. She

had left home with the possibility of having an adoption in mind, but had decided in favour of keeping the child a couple of months before giving birth. In doing so, she had resisted her mother's wishes.

Both Elaine and Marie had considered abortion and adoption. Elaine, however, had decided to keep the child shortly before giving birth. She had been influenced by her mother in taking this decision. When I asked her if she had considered adoption, she replied "Well, I had, but my mother wanted me to... She was adopted, and she said 'we are going to keep him'". Elaine said "my mother wanted to keep it more than me. I mean, I wanted to keep it, but I thought 'it's really up to mummy, it's her house'". So, whilst her mother "was all for keeping it", Elaine "wasn't really too sure. But /she/ thought 'I won't mention it'". In other words, Elaine "didn't know what she wanted", and so had simply gone along with her mother's wish. However, by deciding against adoption, she had resisted strong pressure from her brothers and, especially, her sisters in favour of this course of action.

Marie finally decided against adoption only after giving birth. That is, she did not decide "until the birth was over. Not until it was actually there, and it was a person, and it was something to consider". She explained "it's all very well making decisions while you're pregnant, but I don't really think you can hold them out once you've seen the child. You've got to see it and then decide". It had been a difficult decision to make. She said "I thought so much that... It was really bad for weeks and weeks". By deciding to keep the child, she had acted contrary to the suggestions of a number of people, including her parents.

If an unmarried mother does not 'obliterate' the sign of her failing, she may at least try to conceal it. This is perhaps likely to present few or no problems at the beginning of her pregnancy. Nevertheless, she may still feel the need to guard against someone being told by someone else. Thus,

Gillian's visit to the doctor to have her pregnancy confirmed had been made with this need in mind. She said "I didn't go to my own doctor's at home because I knew he'd say something to my dad and I wanted to tell him in my own time". Instead of going to her own doctor she went to her sister's. She said "I didn't tell her the reason why I was going to see him or the reason why I wanted to see a doctor. I just said I wasn't feeling very well and she didn't even suspect or anything".

Unmarried mothers may find it increasingly difficult to conceal their failing. Elaine had managed to pass with her family, including her mother with whom she was living, for over four months, but was then discovered. She said "I went to my /eldest/ sister's for a family lunch, or something. And her best friend's a doctor. And he kept groping all afternoon¹. And my /eldest/ sister took mum into the other room and said 'do you think /Elaine's/ pregnant?' And my mother said 'no, of course not, don't be silly'. And we came home and she said 'do you know what your sister said this afternoon?' And I said 'Oh, well, yes I am'". Elaine's workmates had eventually learnt about her pregnancy in a similar way. She said "I hadn't said anything, /but/ everybody said 'Oh, here comes little mother'. I never told anybody though. They guessed".

Hilary's workmates had guessed also. She said "everybody at work knew, although I didn't tell them. It was quite obvious and I was trying to cover up as well as I could". Nevertheless, she said, "they all knew because I worked up to about eight months and I was quite a size then. They all knew". Her workmates had eventually made their suspicions known. She explained "it was a joke. Somebody said something about being in the club, but didn't mean being pregnant. They were talking about some club at work. And of course, I fell for it really. I turned round and said to the girl 'Oh, I didn't know you were in the club'. She said 'well, I'm not but you are, aren't you?' And I said 'Ssh, don't tell everybody'. But I said it as a joke. It was the truth but I tried to laugh it off".

Hilary had also tried to pass with her father until "in the end /she/ got the feeling that he did suspect what was the matter". This was not, however, until about the time she left work; that is, until about eight months after becoming pregnant. She explained "I hardly showed for about six months. He didn't notice and I used to wear pinafore dresses or those dresses with a high waist and flared". That is, on visits to her father she would wear clothing which she hoped would conceal her protruding profile. Hilary said "I went down to see him every lunch hour when I was working. I had my lunch with him". And, "for the first week /after giving up work/, I think, I continued to do this; go down at lunch times. Then I made out I'd got a cold or something and I wasn't going to work". Hilary had eventually stopped visiting her father, although by that time he had probably guessed that she was pregnant.

Hilary had stopped visiting her father when it was too late. If she had stopped sooner, she might have been more successful than she had been in passing with him. Goffman notes that:

it is to be expected that voluntary maintenance of various types of distance will be employed strategically by those who pass, the discreditable here using much the same devices as the discredited, but for slightly different reasons ¹.

A discreditable individual may, for example, maintain 'physical distance' between himself and those with whom he wishes to pass. For instance, "by staying indoors and not answering the 'phone or door, the discreditable individual can remove himself from most of his contexts in which his disgrace might be established as part of the biography others have of him"². Unmarried mothers may try to pass by maintaining or introducing physical distance between themselves and those who know them to be unmarried, such as family and friends, for example. However, this may take the form of something more than simply staying indoors. Goffman says about the stigmatized:

By residing in a region cut off from one he ordinarily frequents he can introduce a disconnectedness in his biography /perhaps/ intentionally, as in the case of an unmarried pregnant girl going out of state to have her child³.

Elaine had considered action of this kind as part of an attempt to pass. She had wanted to pass with her family and so she decided to leave home, where she was living with her mother. She said "I tried moving into a flat - I sort of moved out for two days. I took everything with me". She added "I learnt I was pregnant about September and I moved into a flat about October, November. I thought I'd better not let mummy know - I was going to all 'hush-hush'. I said 'goodbye' to mummy at the door, and she said 'you will let me know where you are' - I was intending not to tell her. And then I turned up a few hours later. And I came back and sort of crept home. I think this was Friday night and I came back on the Monday morning".

Whereas Elaine had stayed away from home for only a couple of days, Gillian had stayed away for good. When she learnt about her pregnancy, she had been living at home with her father, four sisters and a brother. Shortly afterwards, however, she went to live with another sister, without having told anyone at home about her pregnancy. At least Gillian had told her family she was leaving and where she was going to live and, shortly after leaving, about her pregnancy. Ann had also been living at home with her mother when she learnt about her pregnancy and had also left shortly afterwards. However, apart from not having told any of her family about her pregnancy when she left, she had not told them where she was going either. As has already been noted, she had decided to leave in order to pass with her family, especially her mother, and with her friends. She said "I wanted to move away because if I had decided to have the baby adopted I could go back to a new life". That is, she could have gone back "without anyone knowing". Within a few weeks, however, she had told her family and had decided to keep the child.

When Iris conceived she had been living with one of her sisters, not far from other members of her family. However, she had left home about five and a half months later without having told not only any of her family and

many of her friends, but also the father. About four and a half months after conceiving, Iris had been referred to a social worker who "just took over, really". Iris said "she just asked me questions, you know. And she said 'do you want to stay with your sister?' And I said 'no, definitely not'. And she didn't push it. She said 'we'll have to find you somewhere to live'. So she said 'do you want a living-in job?'. Because I said 'I can carry on working for the moment, of course' - which I did. And that is how she fixed me up with this doctor and his wife. They were looking for someone to help out with the children. And then she fixed me up at the Mother and Baby Home". So, Iris had "just moved out" of her sister's home, without having told any of her family that she was leaving. What is more, she said, "I left, and I just didn't go back. That's it, I haven't seen them in two years". She had had no contact whatsoever with any of her family, most of her friends and the father and for all she knew, none of these had learnt about her unmarried motherhood.

When Iris had first left her sister's she had gone to live only a dozen miles away. She had therefore welcomed the opportunity to move to the hostel in Westown, thirty miles away from her sister's. She explained "If I had stayed up there I would have come into contact with my family, /the father/, you know, everybody really. So down here I just contact people I want to see". She said about her family "I haven't got in touch with them". This was, she explained, "because I am a coward. I just don't want the trouble of explaining". She had considered the possibility of writing to them, but she "couldn't be bothered really". She explained "I've made a new life for myself and that's it. I'm quite happy really. I want to go on, I don't want to go back".

By moving, both Ann and Iris had found it easier to pass with family and friends; that is, with people at home. At the same time, however, they had gone to live where they had the opportunity to pass extensively without having to conceal the fact that they were mothers. Marie had found living

away from home in London whilst she was pregnant an advantage because it had given her this opportunity. She said "I didn't have any bother about my pregnancy because I was in /London/ and I didn't know many people - I didn't get asked any questions or anything there". Similarly, Iris and Ann had had the opportunity for extensive passing simply by keeping their 'unmarried status' a secret. They might have claimed to be separated, divorced or widowed and might have referred to themselves as 'Mrs.'. They might also have worn a 'wedding' ring. The latter would then have functioned as a 'disidentifier'. According to Goffman, 'disidentifiers' are

signs that tend - in fact or in hope - to break up an otherwise coherent picture but in this case in a positive direction desired by the actor.¹

As we have already noted, Ann and Iris, as well as Gillian, had never worn a 'wedding' ring. Neither Ann nor Iris had made full use of the opportunity they had had for passing when they moved to Westown. Hilary, on the other hand, had made much greater use of a similar opportunity. When she was pregnant, like Marie, she was living away from home. Moreover, she had had the advantage of living with the father of her child. From then on she had presented herself as a married mother and had worn a 'wedding' ring. She had eventually gone to live in the hostel, which was thirty miles, and therefore much further, away from home. She had welcomed this move because of the advantages it brought with regard to trying to pass. "And yet", she said, "the disadvantage living here is you only have to say to somebody 'I live at /this address/' and they say 'Oh, that place', you know, this kind of thing". For example, she said "the chap at work, he said to me, 'like a lift home?' and I said 'yes please'. And up to then all he knew was that I lived /on this road/. What number, he didn't know. And then he said 'well, what number do you live at?' And he nearly hit the roof of the car, and he said 'oh no!'"

When Hilary had wanted to pass she had faced the problem of keeping her address a secret. She had faced this problem when trying to pass with

boyfriends. They would, she said, ask "delicate questions, but the only way to get round it is to say 'I'd rather not talk about it if you don't mind'. But later on as you get to know them better, they start to ask these questions again". She had had to cope with the problem of trying to keep boyfriends away from the hostel. She said "/one/ chap I went out with I met him at a dance in town. And I went out with him twice. I said to him 'meet you at such and such a time' /and/ I'd look for him out of /Gillian's/ window. And as I saw him going down, I'd go out". Another boyfriend she had had since going to live in the hostel was the 'chap from work' with whom she had gone out for several months. She would meet him after work. She would "say to him 'I'll meet you at such and such a time outside', because he drove. So he sat in the car" and waited for her. However, she had never taken him home. She explained "I got round this by saying 'I am living with a friend who is looking after the child and if she had any idea that you were married and I was going out with you, it would cause bad feeling and she wouldn't babysit for me".

In order to pass, an unmarried mother may try to conceal her motherhood. On the other hand, she may find it unnecessary to do this. She may simply be required to conceal her 'unmarried status'. In either case, however, trying to pass may involve her in limiting the amount, or at least the type, of contact she has with others. It may, in other words, have consequences for her social relationships and social life. What is more, she may purposefully try to keep social relationships at a distance as part of an attempt to pass. As Goffman says, "by keeping relationships distant /a stigmatized individual/ ensures that time will not have to be spent with the other /.../. The more time that is spent with another the more chance of unanticipated events that disclose secrets"¹. That is, an unmarried mother, for example, may try to avoid close relationships in order to avoid being discovered - this is apart from doing the same thing in order to "avoid the consequent obligation to divulge information".²

Attempting to keep her failing a secret, therefore, may involve an unmarried

mother in cutting down, or even cutting out, social participation with those people with whom she had close relationships, such as members of her family and friends. It may, for instance, involve her in moving to a region far from family and friends, cutting herself off from her established social life and going to live amongst strangers. Moreover, it may involve her in limiting, or avoiding, social participation with others in general. In other words, it may result in a change in her social life.

Goffman's discussion of the techniques which stigmatized individuals use to manage information about their social identity includes a reference to a "final possibility to forgø all others". That is, a stigmatized individual "can voluntarily disclose himself, thereby radically transforming his situation from that of an individual with information to manage to that of an individual with uneasy social situations to manage, from that of a discreditable person to that of a discredited one"¹. This does not necessarily mean, of course, that if he does not disclose himself he will be at ease in 'social situations'. As Goffman points out, "The person with a secret failing /.../ must be alive to the social situation as a scanner of possibilities, and is therefore likely to be alienated from the simpler world in which those around him dwell"². Furthermore, if an individual, on disclosing his identity, faces uneasy situations, he may not do so because of non-acceptance. Apart from the possibility that he will do so as a result of any of a number of responses to his 'failing', he may do so simply as a result of his perception of the responses. He may have anticipated non-acceptance and as a result may mistakenly perceive that he is not accepted.

If an individual does anticipate that he would experience unease in a situation where his social identity is known he may try to avoid that situation. In *Stigma*, Goffman is "specifically concerned with the issue of 'mixed contacts' - the moments when stigmatized and normals are in the

same 'social situation'". But, he notes, "the very anticipation of such contacts can /.../ lead normals and the stigmatized to arrange life to avoid them"¹. However, if an individual does anticipate unease this does not necessarily mean that he would experience this. He may mistakenly anticipate unease in, and consequently unnecessarily avoid, a situation. Moreover, if he successfully avoids the situation he may avoid discovering his mistake. In a similar way, an individual may be led by his acquired beliefs to expect non-acceptance if he discloses his identity and consequently be led into trying to pass when his beliefs are misplaced and therefore misleading. He may not really be stigmatized, but if he successfully passes he may not discover this. He may continue maintaining 'distance' between himself and others unnecessarily. He may make sacrifices with regard to his social relationships and social life through trying to pass when he would have experienced little or no change in his social situation if he had not tried to pass. These possibilities will be explored in relation to unmarried mothers and their social situations in the following chapters.

*

This chapter has been about the nature and consequences of the meanings which unmarried mothers give to their marital status. It began with a consideration of how the beliefs unmarried mothers will have acquired as 'normals', may have played a part in their becoming pregnant and may then have affected their responses to their unmarried motherhood. Because of the image of unmarried mothers they will have acquired as normals, they may find it difficult to believe, or may even refuse to accept, that they are unmarried mothers. The chapter then proceeded to a consideration of how the beliefs unmarried mothers will have acquired about their kind may affect their behaviour towards and thereby their relationships with, other unmarried mothers. The images unmarried mothers have of their own kind may lead them to regard themselves as different from, and superior to, other unmarried mothers, for instance. Unmarried mothers may identify themselves

with 'normals' and take what they regard as the stance of a normal towards their own kind.

Next, we looked at how the beliefs which unmarried mothers will have acquired about the consequences of unmarried motherhood may affect the way they behave towards normals. We considered how these beliefs may affect the way they manage information about their social identity. They may be led to expect that normals will not accept them if they do not manage to keep their marital status a secret and consequently to try to pass, perhaps extensively and even totally.

We saw how the approaches of unmarried mothers to information management differ greatly in terms of the extent to which they involve trying to pass. They range between those which are characterized by 'total' passing at one extreme and those which are characterized by an absence of passing by intent at the other extreme. Unmarried mothers may correspondingly be categorized according to the nature of their approaches. Those who try to pass more or less totally may be referred to as 'passers'; those who never, or at least hardly ever, pass may be called 'non-passers'; those whose approach to information management lies in between these two extremes are 'semi-passers'. At the time of interviewing, perhaps three of my informants (Ann, Iris and Gillian) were non-passers; two (Elaine and Marie) were semi-passers; and one (Hilary) was a passer. However, all of my informants had been passers at the beginning of their careers as unmarried mothers. According to the reports of my informants, it seems that in our society unmarried mothers are likely to have been led by the beliefs they acquired as normals to become passers on learning about their pregnancies, but that with time they are likely to be converted into semi- and even non-passers.

In the next chapter we will begin to investigate why it is (if it is) that in our society unmarried mothers are likely to be, or at least to become, converted non-passers. It was noted earlier, however, that unmarried mothers may come to be 'above' passing; that they come to be of the opinion

that it would be an affront to their dignity to try to pass. Unmarried mothers who are above passing are (at least one type of) 'idealistic' non-passers, as opposed to 'pragmatic' non-passers. The former do not try to pass on principle; the latter do not try to pass simply because they see no practical advantage (and perhaps because they see disadvantages) in doing so. At the time of interviewing, Gillian was perhaps a pragmatic non-passer and perhaps both Ann and Iris were idealistic non-passers. However, it is possible that both of the latter were pragmatists claiming and aspiring to be idealists; or, perhaps another way of saying the same thing, had become idealists only since and because they had found that there is no practical disadvantage in being a non-passer. The consequences for unmarried mothers of not passing will be investigated in the following chapters.

In the final part of this chapter we looked at the techniques which unmarried mothers use in attempting to conceal their actual social identity. We saw how they sometimes maintain and introduce various kinds of 'distance' between themselves and those with whom they wish to pass. They may try to avoid contact with those with whom they have established social relationships and may try to avoid developing close relationships with others. They sometimes use techniques, therefore, which may have deleterious consequences for their social relationships and social lives. All of my informants had made use of techniques of this kind at some time, although at the time of interviewing Hilary, who was a passer, made by far the greatest use of them. How do the social situations of those who make extensive use of these techniques compare with the situations of those who do not and why? In the following chapters an attempt will be made to go some way towards answering this question.

CHAPTER THREE

FAMILY

Towards the end of the last chapter, reference was made to the possible consequences of the meanings which unmarried mothers attach to their marital status for the way they treat other people and thereby for their social situations. This chapter begins a detailed investigation of these in connection with a consideration of the possible consequences of the meanings which other people attach. Attention is paid to the way unmarried mothers are treated by other people¹, within the context of an exploration of their social relationships. First of all in this chapter, the relationships unmarried mothers have within their families are explored.

There is a large body of literature within the area of the family and, especially since the early 1950's, a good deal of research has been carried out². On the other hand, the available information, interpretations and conclusions are various and are often inconsistent and conflicting. Thus, for some writers the family in modern Western society is strong and important, whilst for others it is not, or at least less so than it was not so long ago. For Ronald Fletcher, for example, "the family is, and always has been, the most intimate and the most important of human groups"³. In fact, according to Fletcher, the family has become even more important in recent years. That is,

the modern family fulfills more functions and in a far more detailed manner, than did the family before and during the nineteenth century development of industrialization⁴.



Mary Farmer is of the same opinion. She suggests that the "family continues to perform important functions and has shown its capacity too, to adapt to the rapidly changing needs of industrialization"⁵. This standpoint is contrary to that of, for example, R. M. MacIver⁶ for whom the

family has undergone a decline in so far as it has lost some 'functions'. The family has been left with only its 'essential functions' after being stripped of the 'non-essential' ones it used to perform. MacIver has listed the latter as governmental, religious, educational, economic, health and recreational. These have been transferred to external specialized agencies, leaving the family with only three functions: the stable satisfaction of the sexual needs of adults; the production and rearing of children; and the provision of a home. These 'essential' functions can only be carried out by the family. They are, at least partially, consistent with G. P. Murdock's suggestion that

In the nuclear family or its constituent relationships we /.../ see assembled four functions fundamental to human social life - the sexual, the economic, the reproductive and the educational ¹.

Wherever it exists, the 'nuclear family' performs these four functions and in fact because it performs these functions, it exists in all societies. That is, to quote T. B. Bottomore, "the universality of the nuclear family can be accounted for by the indispensable functions it performs and the difficulty of ensuring the performance of these functions by any other social group"². However, the question has been raised as to whether the family in modern Western society can be attributed with a list of functions of the kind Murdock has suggested. Peter Worsley, for example, argues that evidence on pre- and extra-marital sexual activity indicates that "the sexual function is probably less confined to the family than it was in the recent past"³. He goes on to argue that perhaps evidence on family size and 'illegitimacy rates' indicate that "the reproductive function of the family /.../ may have declined in importance"⁴. As for the economic function, this has been considerably modified. Most importantly in this context, the family is no longer a 'unit of production'. Its economic function is now that of consumption⁵. Finally, "the family is not such a central agency of socialization in our society as it has been at other times and in other societies. Most importantly, specialized

educational institutions have arisen outside of the /family/"¹. The family nevertheless still does a great deal by way of socializing or educating new members of society. This accords with Talcott Parsons' view that it is too crude to simply suggest that the family has lost functions. The family may be seen instead to have become more 'specialized' and even to have gained functions². The family in modern Western society specializes in performing the two functions of child socialization and 'tension management', or of satisfying the psychological needs of adults³. These two functions are performed by the 'nuclear family' in our society which is at the same time 'structurally isolated'. The 'isolation' of the nuclear family or, that is, the decline of the 'extended family' has occurred as the functions of the family have changed to fit in with the demands of industrialization.

Any suggestions about the functions of the family beg many questions. To begin with, at the most basic level, there is the problem of the meaning that is being attached to the term 'function'. Is the term being used to describe activities within the family in that, through their consequences they help satisfy the 'needs' of society, other structural elements, individuals, or whatever?⁴ Or, is it being used in the looser sense to simply describe activities, whatever their consequences?⁵ Fletcher, for example, appears to use it in the latter sense, whereas Parsons is more strict and exclusive.

If the Parsonian approach is adopted, however, there is the problem of discerning and accounting for the functions of the family. In attempting to arrive at a list, for example, there is the danger of using tautological arguments and in attempting to account for the list there is the danger of using only teleological arguments. If the family does perform certain functions, there is then the danger of accounting for its existence and of assuming its universality and inevitability on these grounds. But, what of the possibility of 'functional alternatives' in the form of external

agencies or 'family surrogates'?

Another danger with this approach has to do with seeing 'the family' as only functional. There is perhaps the danger of interpreting all the activities which are carried on within it as 'functional', or at least as only either positive or neutral, with regard to the satisfaction of 'needs'. But what of the possibility that the family in our society is to an extent 'dysfunctional'?

Marxist analyses of the family have attempted to provide critiques in terms of its 'dysfunctions' to individual, class and societal potential¹. Feminists have criticised the family in terms of its 'dysfunctions' to the particular issues of women's potential and liberation. Others have often cited or at least implied ways in which the family is dysfunctional to and within industrial society. Thus, despite Parsons' suggestions of a trend towards the structural isolation of the nuclear family in accordance with the needs of industrialization, it has been argued that strong extended kinship ties are still very much in evidence and perhaps even more so than they were prior to the onset of industrial society. The extended family has therefore survived in the face of, and even to an extent at the expense of, industrialization with its demands for the free movement of labour, for unhindered geographical and social mobility². Connectedly, critics of the functionalist approach to an understanding of social stratification have noted the great influence of family on the location and opportunities of individuals within the system of social inequalities³. These critics have the support of the mass of evidence on the links between family and educational opportunity and advancement⁴, and between family and chances with regard to occupational and social mobility⁵. Finally, a number of modern psychologists have criticised the family in terms of its dysfunctions for the mental and social well-being of individuals⁶.

Whilst there are differing opinions about whether or not, to what extent

and how the family in modern Western society is either functional or dysfunctional, there appears to be general agreement that the family is still highly valued, strong and important. The available evidence indicates that this consensus is well-founded, at least with regard to the elementary family, if not the extended family, and it lends itself to certain conclusions which have significance for an exploration of the relationships of unmarried mothers within their families. First of all, on the subjective level, the members of our society, including females who become illicitly pregnant, are likely to favour having co-operative, cohesive and close relationships with their kin, primary and even secondary. Perhaps William Goode is correct in suggesting that

the intense emotional meaning of family relations for almost all members of society has been observable throughout man's history¹.

They are likely to be concerned about the images, feelings and treatment which they provoke in kin. They are likely to be interested in establishing and maintaining favourable images, perhaps especially if their relationships with kin are already close or if their relationships are perceived as important to the quality of their social situations. The images which their kin have of them are likely to have important consequences for their self-image and for the state of their social relationships and perhaps their social lives.

This brings us on to a second conclusion appertaining to the objective level. The members of our society are likely to have sets of relationships with kin, primary and perhaps secondary², which are characterised by a good deal of contact, activity, co-operation and so on. They are perhaps likely to have sets of relationships with kin which are characterised by a good deal of shared leisure time activity or by activity which contributes to the quality of their social lives.

This is despite MacIver's claims about a decline in the 'recreational function' of the family. Thus, Ronald Fletcher provides

evidence in favour of the suggestion that a good deal of recreational activity or social life is carried on within the family¹. The amount of activity may vary, however, according to social class. According to Goldthorpe and Lockwood² it applies to the manual working-class rather than the non-manual middle-class. Thus, they say about the sample of working-class families they studied, that

despite their affluence and the characteristics of their community setting, /they/ remain in fact largely restricted to working-class styles of sociability, and in the formation of their friendship relations are for the most part neither guided by middle-class norms nor aided by middle-class social skills. To the extent that kinship could not provide the foundation of the social life, these couples turned most readily for support and companionship to those persons who, as it were, formed the next circle of immediate acquaintance - that is, to persons living in the same neighbourhood. Thus, in much the same way as working-class people in more traditional contexts, they would appear to build up their friendship relations largely on the basis of social contacts that are in the first instance 'given'. Actually making friends - through personal choice and initiative - from among persons with whom no structured relationships already exist could not be regarded as at all a typical feature of their way of life³.

In addition, it is likely that the extent to which people's families are important to their social lives varies with age. This is supported by a large body of literature and research data, which suggests that adolescents and young adults rely relatively little on family⁴. However, this is not to say that family are not usually important to the quality of young people's social situations, or an important potential source of companions with whom social activities may be pursued.

Close family relationships may usually be sought, but this does not necessarily mean, of course, that they are always achieved. In her study of the external social relationships of her sample of nuclear families, Elizabeth Bott⁵ paid particular attention to 'relationships with kin'⁶ and she found that many of these were far from 'close'. She classified them into four categories according to their degree of 'social distance'. That is, she labelled them as 'intimate', 'effective', 'non-effective' and 'unfamiliar' "on the basis of two related and overlapping criteria;

intimacy of contact with relatives, and degree of knowledge of them"¹. Bott uses at least one other criterion by which to classify relationships. She notes that, "Separating intimate from effective kin was no easy matter, particularly when kin lived at some distance, but the crucial criterion was the amount of contact combined with the amount of effort people put into making special visits to relatives"². For Bott, therefore,

'intimate' relatives /were/ those with whom there was frequent visiting and mutual aid when necessary. But one important exception to this criterion was allowed: many couples had parents living at some distance so that they could not visit them frequently, but if they visited their parents when possible, wrote to them frequently and spoke of them at length, their parents were included as intimate kin ³.

This approach to the classification of relationships in terms of 'social distance' begs a number of questions. Firstly, how did Bott measure 'amount of effort' put into having contact with relatives and was this done (or, how can it be done) satisfactorily? Secondly, were kin apart from parents who lived at a distance counted as 'intimate' if a good deal of effort was put into having contact with them (and if not, why not)? Thirdly, and more fundamentally, were the criteria used to judge 'social distance' the most appropriate ones to use?

Bott attempted to explain variations in relationships with kin⁴ and eventually came to the conclusion that

behaviour towards kin must be regarded as a complex of several factors operating in combination with one another. Chief among these are: 1. Economic ties among kin, 2. Residence and physical accessibility of kin, 3. Type of genealogical relationship, 4. The connectedness of kinship network, 5. The presence and preferences of 'connecting relatives', 6. Perceived similarities and differences in social status among relatives, 7. Idiosyncratic combinations of conscious and unconscious needs and attitudes⁵.

These interdependent factors had a bearing on the interrelated criteria by which Bott measured the 'social distance' between her informants and their kin. They had a bearing on amount of contact, degree of knowledge and amount of effort put into contact. In her discussion of the bearing which 'type of genealogical relationship' had, she notes that:

although there appeared to be no very clearly formulated universal rules about rights of and obligations to kin such as one finds so frequently in small-scale primitive societies, all families expressed, directly or indirectly the feeling that they had stronger obligations to parents than to any other type of relative. They felt that amicable relations should be kept up with parents even though they did not always like them. In fact some couples were glad that physical separation made frequent contact impossible so that they were able to avoid the awkwardness of open hostility ¹.

In other words, Bott found that because of the genealogical tie involved, all of her informants felt obliged to keep in touch with their parents; She then suggested that because of the resulting amount of effort put into having contact with parents all her informants "were alike in that parents were intimate relatives"². This applies even when informants may have put effort into having contact with parents only because of this tie; even when her informants welcomed a chance to move away from and to restrict contact with their parents.

However, is it acceptable to regard the relationship someone has with someone else as 'close' if the former dislikes the latter and would not put any effort into having contact if it were not for a 'genealogical tie', 'economic tie', or whatever? When classifying an individual's relationships (with kin or anyone else) according to 'social distance', would it not be more appropriate to refer to his own feelings and the amount of effort he puts into having contact because of these, rather than criteria such as 'amount of contact', 'degree of contact' or even 'amount of effort put into having contact'? The latter might best be regarded as indicators of 'social distance'.

Bott herself says about her attempt to classify her informants' relationships with kin, "this typology is arbitrary and does some violence to each couple's own concepts of social distance, but some first approach to standardization was necessary for making comparisons"³. As an alternative approach she might have simply tried to discover how her informants defined their social relationships; how close they felt their relationships

with others were and what they meant by the degrees of social distance they used. She may then have gone on to find that those people with whom her informants had close relationships were ones they liked and ones with whom they tried hard to keep in touch. At the same time, she may have found also that they put in a lot of effort to keep in touch with some people with whom they did not have close relationships but with whom they had economic ties, genealogical ties, and so on. Moreover, her informants may have sometimes tried to avoid contact with people even though, and perhaps because, they had close relationships with them. They may have sometimes tried to avoid contact with people with whom they had close relationships because, for example, they wanted to keep some 'discrediting information' a secret.

In the following analysis the social distance of my informants' relationships with others is judged as far as possible with reference to the way they themselves define them. In the first part of the analysis in this chapter, my informants' relationships with their kin at the time when they conceived are examined. Taking each of my informants in turn¹, we look at such matters as the size of their families - or more precisely the composition of their own and their parents' families of origin²; the geographical distribution of their primary and secondary kin; the contact and the quality of the relationships they had with the members of their families; the responses they expected from and the approaches to information management they adopted in relation to the members of their families on learning about their pregnancies.

1. Ann

When Ann conceived she was living at home with her mother³. She had three sisters, all of whom were older than herself. The youngest of these was married and living within a couple of miles; the next to oldest was living about eighty miles away⁴; the oldest sister was married and living abroad. Apart from these kin, Ann said, "I have got other relatives -

aunts and uncles - but I haven't seen them in six years".

She did not have a close relationship with her mother. When I asked her what the relationship had been like before she conceived, she replied "very remote", and added "/it/ hasn't changed very much at all. We've just never been close". She did not have close relationships with the youngest or the oldest of her sisters either. When I asked her if she got on equally well with each of her three sisters, she replied "No. The /youngest/ and the /oldest/ are very conventional and very - I don't know - boring. I don't get on very well with them". But, she added, "I get on alright with them now, when I don't have to live with them".

A few weeks after having her pregnancy confirmed, Ann left home without having told any member of her family about it. She moved away from her family and went to live in Midtown, about seventy miles from home and a hundred and seventy miles from her next to oldest sister. She wanted to pass with her family and especially her mother, from whom she expected a hostile response. Within a few weeks of leaving, however, she told her family, but remained in Midtown, where she was still living at the time of interviewing.

2. Elaine

Elaine was also living at home with her mother when she conceived¹. She had three sisters and two brothers, all of whom were older than she and all of whom were married. Her oldest and next to oldest sisters were living within about five miles of her, but her other sister and her two brothers were living abroad. Of her other kin, Elaine had only one aunt living within easy visiting distance. Referring firstly to her mother's kin, Elaine said "she has no relations at all", and then to her father's kin, she said "there's just the one /sister in Midtown/. The rest are in Scotland somewhere. We don't really keep in touch with them at all - even when daddy was alive - always very distant. He was close to the one in

/Midtown/". Elaine, on the other hand, had never been close to the aunt who lived nearby. She said "we've never been close, because we've never had much to do with them".

Elaine did not have close relationships with her two oldest sisters before she conceived. They were, she said, "sisterly. But I've always felt that they're more like aunts. But with my /youngest/ sister - we were very close. And they were like that to her"¹. This youngest sister, Elaine said, "was more like me than the other two sisters". The latter, she explained, "are typically English. They've gone to boarding schools. We're the 'lower part of the family' - mummy and I. My sisters have 'gone above' us all, you know. They had a difference of upbringing from me altogether. They went to Cheltenham and finishing schools and all that jazz. They're so different from me". In other words, her two oldest sisters had regarded her as socially inferior. What is more, they had regarded her mother and her youngest sister, with whom she had closer relationships, in a similar way. Referring to when her mother visited her sisters, Elaine said "every time she goes there, she feels sort of 'low'. Mummy went to lunch there a couple of weeks ago - she said she was really glad to leave. She says she can't talk to them at all now - not because of me so much, but just generally; They're sort of different - 'how are the pigs?', you know". Elaine added "it's always been like that - it's a different society somehow".

A few weeks after having her pregnancy confirmed, Elaine left home without having told any of her family about it. She had wanted to pass with her family because, firstly, she had not wanted to upset her mother and, secondly, she had expected hostile responses from her two oldest sisters. A few days after leaving, however, Elaine returned home and a couple of months later her family learnt about her unmarried motherhood. She had lived at home continuously since then.

3. Gillian

Gillian was another of my informants who was living at home when she conceived. That is, she was living with her father, her four younger sisters and her younger brother¹. Her older sister and her older brother, both of whom were married, were living within about ten miles. In addition, her father's parents and siblings were living within a similar distance. Her father's kin, in other words, "were all near, /and/ they were always popping in and chatting". She would see one or more of these "nearly every day"².

Shortly after having her pregnancy confirmed, however, she left home and went to live with her older sister, in Westown. When she left, none of her kin apart from this sister knew about her pregnancy, although a few weeks later she let those at home know. Gillian continued to live with her sister until a few weeks before she gave birth. Then, after a few weeks in a maternity home, she went to live in the hostel in Westown. Since leaving home, her father (along with her younger siblings) had moved house, but by only a few miles and they still lived within about ten miles.

4. Hilary

Hilary conceived at about the time she left home, where she had been living with her father³, and went to live a couple of miles away with the father of her child. She left home, in other words, before learning about her pregnancy. When the father asked her to live with him, she agreed to do so because she "thought 'I'd do anything to get away from my father - the way he is'". She had not got on very well with her father and she wanted to leave because of the way she had been treated by him. Hilary said "he didn't have any idea that I was moving in with anybody else. I just told him I couldn't stand it any more - the way he was getting violent - and that I was getting out of his way. And, he didn't try to stop me".

Hilary's only other kin, her father's two sisters and their children, were living over a hundred miles away. She said "there's no one on my mother's side - she was the only child". She had hardly anything to do with the rest of her family. She said "I didn't have a lot of contact with them really. There was never much love between father and his family. He never has a lot to do with them and he has always said to me 'I don't know what you want to have anything to do with them for'. So really, although we have written at birthdays and Christmas times, there has been no real contact".

Hilary learnt about her pregnancy a few weeks after leaving home. She decided to try to pass with her father because of the response she expected from him and she was successful until the eighth month of her pregnancy despite seeing him several times a week. In addition, she did not let her aunts know about her unmarried motherhood until a few months before our interview, when her daughter was about a year and a half old. By then, she had been living in the hostel in Westown for about a year. She lived with the father until her daughter was about five months old, when he left her. A few weeks later she moved also, and went to live in a 'guest house' for a few more weeks. From there she went to live in the hostel, about thirty miles from her father and a hundred and thirty from her aunts.

5. Iris

Iris was Irish and she had lived with her widowed father in Ireland until he died when she was twelve years old. Then she went to live in England with one of her sisters, with whom she was still living when she conceived. She had nine sisters and two brothers, all of whom were older^{than} she and married. Five of her sisters and her two brothers had emigrated to England and were living within about twenty miles of one another. However, she did not get on very well with any of her family. She explained "they don't approve of me at all, because they are Roman Catholics and I renounced my faith". She did this when she was sixteen years old. Afterwards, she said, "none of them wanted me in their household because I was a bad

influence on their children, because I didn't practice my religion".

Iris left her sister's during the fifth month of her pregnancy. That is, she "just moved out" without having told any member of her family about her pregnancy, or even that she was leaving. Moreover, she had had no contact with any of her family since leaving, and, as far as she knew, her family had still not learnt about her unmarried motherhood. She said, "I left and just didn't bother going back. That's it, I haven't seen them in two years". She didn't think they would have tried to find out what had happened to her. She said, "they didn't bother really. I've often popped to Ireland and I didn't bother to tell anyone in the family. But, of course, they soon heard because I stayed with my sister" in Ireland. Referring to the sister with whom she had lived, she added "we were always fighting, you see, over this religion thing. And she was always telling me to get out anyway". Until a few days after giving birth she lived within a few miles of her sister, but then she went to live about thirty miles away in the hostel in Westown where she was living at the time of our interview.

6. Marie

When Marie conceived she was living at home with her parents and grandmother, in Northtown. Apart from these kin, she had "one distant aunt, uncle and cousin". These members of her family were, she said, "distant in miles and distant in thought too". They were living about two hundred miles away, and, she said, "they're not the sort of people we go to visit. We get a card at Christmas", but that is all. They were not the sort of people she visited because "their daughter went to grammar school, and /Marie/ only went to /technical school/. That sort of reason". Marie had a close relationship with her father, and a closer relationship with him than with her mother. She said, "I'm the only daughter, the only child, and we are close, my father and I. We don't even have to talk sometimes,

we know what each other's thinking".

A few days after conceiving, but several weeks before it occurred to her that she might be pregnant, Marie left home and went to live about seventy miles away in London. Three months later she had her pregnancy confirmed and within a few days of this, her parents learnt about it. She stayed in London until her daughter was about four months old, and then moved to Midtown, about ten miles from Northtown where her parents were living. At the time of interviewing, she was living with her parents again.

My informants had differing 'family backgrounds' and sets of relationships with the members of their families at the time when they conceived. Gillian had a large family and fairly close relationships with most of both her primary and her secondary kin. Marie had a much smaller family and although she had close relationships with her primary kin, she had only distant ones with her secondary kin. Elaine had a slightly larger family than Marie but had close relationships with only some of her primary kin - with her mother and her youngest sister, but not with her other two sisters and her two brothers. Moreover, she did not have close relationships with any other of her kin. Ann had a smaller family than Elaine and a close relationship with only one of her primary kin - that is, with one of her sisters. She did not have close relationships with her other kin, including her other two sisters and her mother. Iris had a large family, but did not have any very close relationships. Hilary had no primary kin apart from her father, with whom her relationship was distant. She also had distant relationships with the other members of her family.

The reports of my informants indicate that the social distance of the relationships which unmarried mothers have with their kin, has a bearing on whether or not they try to pass with them. At the same time, however, this may have a greater influence on how they try to pass with their kin.

As well as investigating her informants' relationships with other people, Elizabeth Bott gathered some information on the latter's relationships amongst themselves. She found that the "external relationships of /the conjugal/ families /she/ studied assumed the form of a network rather than the form of a group"¹, and that "there was considerable variation in the 'connectedness' of /these/ networks"². Bott explains:

By connectedness I mean the extent to which the people known by a family know and meet one another independently of the family. I used the word 'close-knit' to describe a network in which there are many relationships among the component units, and the word 'loose-knit' to describe a network in which there are few such relationships³.

The relationships amongst my informants' kin may similarly be viewed as social networks which varied in terms of connectedness - each was 'close-knit' or 'loose-knit' or 'medium-knit'⁴. The degree of connectedness is a measure of the extent to which my informants' kin 'know and meet one another' independently of my informants. It may, of course, have depended on the social distance (as defined earlier) of the relationships amongst kin. The information I gathered on these matters is very limited, but it indicates that Gillian's family (including her primary and many of her secondary kin) was close-knit. Marie's family, or at least that part of it composed of her primary kin and her grandmother, was also close-knit. Iris's kin in England probably maintained a close-knit network of social relationships amongst themselves, as well as fairly close relationships with those kin who had remained in Ireland. Elaine's family network, at least in the form of her primary kin, was medium-knit - although some of the relationships involved much more contact than others and some were far closer than others. Ann's primary kin were at the most only medium-knit and again some of the relationships involved a lot more contact than others and some were a lot closer than others. Finally, both Hilary and her father, her only primary kin, had very little to do with, and very distant relationships with, her other kin.

On the basis of her data, Bott put forward the following hypothesis:

The degree of segregation in the role-relationship of husband and wife varies directly with the connectedness of the family's social network¹.

She explains:

What seems to happen is this. When many of the people a person knows interact with one another, that is, when the person's network is close-knit, the members of his network tend to reach consensus on norms and they exert consistent informal pressure on one another to conform to the norms, to keep in touch with one another, and, if need be, to help one another. /.../ Rigid segregation of conjugal roles will be possible because each spouse can get help from people outside.

But when most of the people a person knows do not interact with one another, that is, when his network is loose-knit, more variation on norms is likely to develop in the network, and social control and mutual assistance will be more fragmented and less consistent. /.../ Joint organization becomes more necessary for the success of the family as an enterprise².

It might be expected in view of this account that unmarried mothers with close-knit networks will be more inclined than those with loose-knit ones to move away from their families on learning about their pregnancies, particularly when they themselves are not very close with their kin. That is, unmarried mothers will be more inclined to move away when their family network is close-knit because the members will tend to reach consensus on norms, with regard to unmarried motherhood for example, and will exert consistent pressure on one another to conform to these norms. The reports of my informants lend some support to this proposition, even though it is perhaps the social distance of the relationships which unmarried mothers themselves have with kin which is important. At the same time, the information I gathered also indicates that the connectedness of unmarried mothers' family networks may have some bearing on how their relationships with kin develop after their kin have learnt. These developments in the case of my informants are examined in the next part of this chapter.

After having looked at what my informants' relationships with kin were like at the time when they conceived, we go on to examine how they had developed to the time of interviewing. Again taking each of my informants in turn,

we take a look at such matters as if, when and how the members of their families had learnt about their unmarried motherhood; how those members who had learnt had responded; the contact and the quality of the relationships they had had within their families since conceiving.

1. Ann

During the fourth month of her pregnancy, Ann told her family. She wrote to her mother, who responded by saying "'where have I gone wrong? What have I ever done to deserve this?' And all this kind of thing". Her mother said "'we don't want an illegitimate grandson'", and she encouraged Ann to have an adoption. Then, Ann said, "when I finally decided that I wasn't going to do that, I wrote to her and told her and she sort of said 'oh well, you know we can't accept you' and all this - 'you won't be able to come home and see us at all', and things like that". In other words, Ann's mother rejected her.

Her sisters responded in a different way. When Ann wrote to them, "they just wrote and said, 'if you want anything, let us know'". Unlike her mother, her sisters did not encourage her to have an adoption. As far as the question of adoption was concerned, Ann said, "they were very careful not to say anything at all which might influence me". When she decided against adoption they did not reject her as her mother had done and within a few weeks of giving birth, the youngest (and geographically nearest) of her sisters visited her. This was the first time she had seen any of her family since the third month of her pregnancy, when she had left home. However, this visit was followed a few weeks later, by one from her mother. Ann explained that her mother "was shamed into it by the rest of the family wanting to come down". What is more, Ann said, "when my sister came down she brought her parents-in-law rather than my mother, which annoyed my mother no end, because if she thinks she is missing out on something... "

A few weeks later, Ann and her son made the first of several visits to her

mother. By the time of interviewing, her mother's feelings about her unmarried motherhood had changed. She said about her mother "I think she is surprised, actually, that I have managed. She thought, as everybody thought, that I would completely crack up or something. She seems quite surprised that /my son/ is healthy and happy and I don't think she can understand it fully. She has changed her attitude a lot. Most people say it suits me, you know, friends of the family and what have you. Because the last time I went /home/ all this thing about 'mustn't let the neighbours see you', and all this... /the neighbours/ were all saying 'oh, where's /your son/? Bring him over to see us'. And most of them say 'I don't know what it has done for you but it seems to suit you'". Her mother was less interested in passing with the neighbours than she had been. At the same time, however, she was still interested in passing with "her business associates, you see. So there is still not complete acceptance".

2. Elaine

Elaine's family also learnt during the fourth month of her pregnancy. Elaine said about her mother's response "she didn't tell me to get out or anything /but/ it was a bit of a strain for the next few days. She was upset and it was rather difficult then. She was fine afterwards". Her sisters responded in a different way. Elaine said "my mother /told my sisters/. And they wanted me to leave the country - go up to Scotland and have it adopted. And they wanted me to keep it all hush-hush". Her sisters threatened to have nothing to do with her if she did not do as they suggested. Elaine considered adoption, but not leaving home. Moreover, she was encouraged by her mother not to have an adoption. Elaine said about her mother "after the initial shock, she sort of stuck up for me, and she wouldn't have anything to do with my sisters at all. She said /to them/ 'well, just leave us alone'. And they never contacted us".

For several months there was no contact between Elaine and her mother on the one hand and her sisters on the other, but then her sisters got in touch with her mother. This lead to renewed contact between her mother and her sisters, but not between Elaine and her sisters. Her mother would occasionally visit her sisters. Elaine said "the other day my mother went to lunch /at my oldest sister's/. They always used to invite both of us, but now they just invite mummy to lunch". Although her mother was sometimes invited to visit, Elaine was not. Consequently, whereas before her sisters had learnt about her pregnancy she "used to go over for dinner - Sunday dinner - and this sort of thing, Christmas and birthdays", Elaine no longer did so. Furthermore, she no longer saw them at home. She said "if they come to pick mummy up /by car/ they always honk twice across the road. They never come to knock at the door". Her sisters tried to avoid meeting her. They had made several visits to her mother, but on each occasion Elaine was not at home. They had visited her mother about a year before, for example, on the understanding that Elaine would not be there. Elaine said "/my brother/ came to stay with my /youngest/ sister - he's very chummy with my sister. They stayed there and mummy felt she had to do something with the family, all together. So she felt she had to have the family here. So I went out for the night, to stay in a hotel while they came here, because then it was quite bad and they weren't sure about coming here". Her sisters did not know where she had gone. But, she said, "they accepted that I wouldn't be here". When I asked Elaine how she had felt about this, she replied "It upset me, having to go. But then, I'd rather have that than having them stare at me".

Elaine on the one hand and her sisters on the other, tried to avoid having any contact. When I asked how often she saw her sisters, Elaine replied "never". That is, she only saw them when she came across them in the street, out shopping and so on¹. When she and either of her sisters came across one another in this way, however, they did not "acknowledge each

other". Elaine said "we don't even give each other dirty looks now. We just look at each other blankly, like you look at a stranger". The way she was treated by her sisters was different to the way she was treated by the husband of her oldest sister. Referring to her brothers-in-law, she said "one I haven't seen at all since Christmas, sixty-eight - that's /my youngest sister's/ husband. But the other one, I see him in town. He's sort of very hoity-toity. He just gives me a dirty look and walks off. He gives me a real dirty look. My sister doesn't give me a dirty look - she just ignores me. But... I just ignore them now - they just don't bother me".

Elaine came across at least one of her sisters "every few weeks". She described in more detail what happened on one occasion when she came across her youngest sister in a shop. Elaine said "/she/ was in there with a nephew of mine, who I hadn't seen for a couple of years - he must have been about twelve, or something. And she just ignored me and he never recognized me at all. And I thought 'oh God! I'll get away from here'. The first thing I wanted to do was whisk /my son/ away, because I didn't want them to see him. I thought 'what shall I do?' and I thought 'please go'. And she did go. And suddenly /my nephew/ came bursting in the shop and he kept looking at /my son/ out of the corner of his eye. And obviously /my sister/ had said something to him. And he just couldn't take his eyes off /my son/. Yet, before he didn't know us at all". Elaine added "obviously she'd said 'that's your aunt', or something, 'and that's your illegitimate cousin'. I thought that was real strange, real weird". Elaine summed up how she had felt about this incident by saying "I wasn't upset. I was mad, angry".

A few weeks later, Elaine came across this sister again. However, on this occasion, Elaine said, "she came up to me and I cut her cold because of the treatment she's sort of given me, about nine months ago or so. She came up to me and said 'Oh is this /your son/?' And I sort of gave her a cold look and walked off. I was going to say something - I'd planned out

what I was going to say to her if I ever see her. I was sort of dumb-founded and walked off. And since then she hasn't tried to approach me. I think she got the hint then".

Despite the way she had behaved towards her sister on this occasion, Elaine noted that a change had taken place in her relationship with both this and her oldest sister since they had first learnt about her pregnancy. She said "we're sort of less hostile about it now. It's sort of smoothing out a bit". She added "I think probably it will all just sort of slowly get better". Contact had not increased between Elaine and her sisters, but Elaine would occasionally answer the telephone when one of them called her mother. Elaine said "now if they phone up, we're sort of friendly". She added "I should imagine it'll be more normal soon". For example, she said, the other day "I left /my son/ with my mother and I went shopping. And apparently my /youngest/ sister came round and she actually pushed /my son/ down the street - which is absolutely unheard of, because she's a real snob. And she apparently pushed /my son/ down the street in his pram and was quite nice to him, mummy said. I was quite pleased".

At the same time, however, she said about her relationships with her sisters "it'll always be a bit strained". Referring to when her mother visited her sisters Elaine said "they always ask about me: 'what's /Elaine/ doing these days; is she still sitting around doing nothing?' And they're always trying to make trouble for me - in all sorts of ways - little things". In other words, they treated her in a similar way to the way they had before she conceived. Her sisters had always been critical of her life-style. Referring to her pregnancy Elaine said, "I'm sure that /my sisters/ expected it of me. I was the black sheep of the family because I used to go to dances and that, when I was... I was a normal young girl. When I was eighteen they used to think 'Oh, that make-up'. My niece, she's two years younger than me¹, I was always considered to be leading her astray. They used to think I was awful. But they expected me

to do something all the time". The affect of Elaine's pregnancy on her relationships with her sisters was simply to make more distant what had not been close. Her relationships with her sisters would always be distant and probably more distant than they had been before her pregnancy. Whatever changes might take place in the way her sisters treated her, her feelings about the way they had treated her since they had learnt about her pregnancy would ensure this. Elaine said about her sisters, "I don't want to know them at all. They're nothing really to me". She summed up her feelings about the way she had been treated by saying, "I don't mind really. But I wish they weren't so close for me to feel them doing this to me. But I've sort of built a wall up against them now. I have nothing to do with them now".

Elaine said both about her sisters and about her brothers, "really all of them are a bit off about it". That is, she said, "they're all a bit sort of hostile about it really /even though/ it's not so bad now". At the same time, however, her brothers had treated her somewhat differently to the way her sisters had treated her. She said "they send presents and Christmas cards to /my son/". In addition, she had visited her oldest brother shortly before his visit to England. Nevertheless, she said, "even they sort of... They both¹ send me really nice things for /my son/, but previous to that they were writing letters saying 'you should go to Liverpool and have it adopted'". When he visited England, she said, "I only saw him about once when he was here. He was here for about two weeks and I only saw him about once when he popped round one evening. Because he was staying at my sister's and he couldn't really come over without them. So I only saw him once when he came to take mummy out for the day".

Elaine had no other contact with this brother. Her mother exchanged letters with him and occasionally spoke to him on the telephone, but Elaine did not. Likewise, she had no contact with her youngest brother.

She said, "he's a bit strange towards me. He used to write me letters and, before I was pregnant, he was saying 'come on over and live with us, and I'll pay your fare and I'll get you a job' and all this. And as soon as he... Mummy wrote to him and said something or other. And he phoned up about the next day and he said 'are you saying so and so's pregnant?' - a big oo-ah on the telephone. And he kept writing to mother saying I should have it adopted. And now, he and mummy are quite close - he's always writing. He writes about every ten days or so. He's always saying 'is /Elaine/ working yet?' And before, while he wanted me to go out there, now he never suggests anything like that".

Her only other kin with whom she had any contact was the aunt who lived in Midtown. Elaine said about this aunt, "I saw /her/ about a couple of weeks ago. She came round. It's the first time I've seen her in a couple of years". When I asked Elaine why she had not seen this aunt for so long, she replied, "as soon as she found out she sort of... I suppose she felt awkward. Mummy went over there one day and I said to mummy 'well if you want to bring her back I don't mind'. Well, mummy was quite shattered at this. She went 'no, I'm not going to do that'. Because they cut me dead, so I feel they don't want to come here, you know. Mummy was quite amazed. Mummy brought her back and she came in and she said 'are you sure you want her to come in?' She said 'she's very nervous about coming in and seeing you'. And I said 'there's nothing to be nervous about. I'm not going to kill her or anything'. I was just pleasant to her. She was a bit nervous. But we were quite friendly towards each other".

3. Gillian

Gillian did not tell any member of her family about her pregnancy until several weeks after she had had it confirmed, when she told her older sister. She explained, "I told my sister. Well, I had to - those few weeks I was a nervous wreck more than anything". She had become a 'nervous wreck' because of the way the father had treated her. When I

asked Gillian how her sister had responded to the news of her pregnancy, she replied "she was concerned about me. They were both¹ concerned about me and with the father, I suppose, more than anything. Because it wasn't as if I went out with him for just one night or something like that. It was two years. They didn't like the father because of not standing by me. But then, I suppose, my feelings were just the same. Because they saw me when I was carrying - how bad I was". Gillian then went to live with this sister and she left home without having told any of her other kin about her pregnancy.

When she left home her father pleaded with her to stay. Then, when she told him about her pregnancy, he invited her to return home. When I asked her how he had responded to the news, she said "I think I was more of a disappointment to him more than anything. Because he expected me to run the home and that when my mum died. I felt the disappointment in him really". Her father had wanted her to stay at home to help look after it and later he had wanted her to return home despite her pregnancy for the same reason. Gillian said "my dad /still/ wants me back. Before I moved here he wanted me to go home".

Gillian did not accept her father's invitation to return home and she stayed with her sister until shortly before she gave birth, when she went to a Mother and Baby Home. Then, a few weeks after giving birth, she went to live in the hostel. She regretted leaving her sister's "because /she/ fitted in". She said, "I was one of the family, really". Her sister also regretted her leaving, but "it was a case of having to". She explained, "there wasn't enough room, really. She's got one little boy and there's too many. He had a little, tiny room, but because I was staying there, they couldn't have that room". When she left her sister's she went to live first of all in the Mother and Baby Home and then the hostel because she had nowhere else to go. There was no one else in the family, for instance, with whom she could, or a least wanted, to live. She could have gone home,

but she did not want to. This was partly because, she said, "I don't think there is enough room. I've got quite a lot of brothers and sisters at home". But also, she wanted to avoid the treatment she thought she would probably receive from one of her sisters if she went home. When I asked Gillian if she thought that her brother and sisters as well as her father would welcome her home, she replied "I think they would have done. And then afterwards... I think my sister, the one that's at home now, she'd have probably resented me, I think - well, resented the baby. She'd have probably come out with it, because she's a bit like that. It would have come out - 'Oh, you're an unmarried mother', and this lark". Gillian had not directly experienced any hostility from this sister, but she had been told stories during her pregnancy which indicated that she could do so. Therefore, although, Gillian said, "afterwards she couldn't do enough knitting, if I was at home more than likely it would come out". Gillian believed that the relationships she had with her family at home would be best served by not living with them. She said "all the time I'm away it's perfectly alright. But if I was to stay there for any length of time the air would gradually warm up". So by living away from home, she said, "we keep things, well, just as I like them".

She had another reason for not wanting to go back home. She said "I think now I've got independent really". In other words, she valued her independence, though perhaps not wholly for its own sake. She said, "I think me living here, it shows I can live on my own even though I have /my daughter/". She wanted to show that she was able to live apart from her family and yet take care of herself and her daughter. Doubts had been expressed by an aunt about whether she would manage in this respect. Gillian said about this aunt, "she's got very old-fashioned ideas. Everybody else has their own points of view about what they think about unmarried mothers and what they don't. She made hers quite clear. That was, that I'd never be able to manage - to have /my daughter/ adopted and to

go back home. That was her attitude. And the more she said it, the more I was determined that I wouldn't go back home and that I would stay on my own". Gillian responded to her aunt's suggestions by saying "'don't worry, I shan't come knocking on you for help'" and because she had managed, her aunt had changed towards her. Gillian said about her aunt, "since /my daughter's/ been born and she's seen /her/ and what I've done for her, she's completely changed". Nevertheless, Gillian would not visit her aunt "because of what happened in the first place". She said "I've still got that bit of pride more than anything". Her aunt was the only member of her family who had suggested adoption, but she had been led to believe that her other aunts and her uncles had been of the same opinion. That is, in general, "the attitude was to go back home - to have the baby adopted and go back home".

No one else had suggested adoption. However, Gillian said, "my Gran, for instance, she **thinks...** well, that I should have married the father and that was it. Everything should have been... Not everybody in our village should have known, sort of thing". Her father's parents had thought she should marry the father of her child. They were worried about people's responses to her unmarried motherhood. However, she had not married and her unmarried motherhood had become known. Consequently, her grandparents had not fully accepted her. For instance, she said, "they would not consider visiting me". At the same time, she would not consider visiting them so the only contact she had with them was during visits to her father. She said "when I go home for the weekend nearly one or other of them is always there". She went home for the weekend "about once a month" and seeing her father and younger sisters and brother as well as her grandparents was usually confined to such occasions. When I asked her if her younger sisters or brother visited her, she replied "Not very often. Most of them are at work, you see, in the week. But sometimes I bump into them. But I wouldn't say they come round here, no". Her older brother did not

visit her either, and she had less contact with him than any of her other siblings. She said "well, actually, we fell out a bit. /But/ not over /my daughter/. I think it was about three months ago. Whenever I see him he talks to me. But he hasn't got anything against /my daughter/ or gone against me because of /my daughter/. It's just family problems, really". When I asked how he had responded to the news of her pregnancy, she replied "when I was in hospital he was my first visitor. So he's more concerned... not more concerned than anybody, but he was really concerned about me".

Referring to the responses of the members of her family in general, she said "when I used to go home, when I was expecting the child, when they knew, I don't think... well, it's like everybody - they didn't believe it. They didn't think it could be possible - 'not /Gillian/'. That's the impression I got with everybody". She added, "the reaction of everybody I think, was shock that it was me". Her family, among others, had found it difficult to believe that she could be an unmarried mother. Apart from this, however, and perhaps contrary to her expectations, there was little hostility. She had experienced no direct hostility from any of her primary kin, although she had been led to believe that one of her younger sisters was somewhat hostile. The only hostility she had experienced directly had come from an aunt and from her paternal grandparents. These were the only kin with whom her relationship had become strained because of her unmarried motherhood. Moreover, her relationship with her aunt remained strained only because of Gillian's reaction to the hostility she had experienced. This aunt herself was no longer hostile.

4. Hilary

Hilary wrote to her father to tell him about her pregnancy, and then visited him the next day. At this meeting she "felt very uncomfortable". She said "I didn't know what to say at first and he didn't want to talk about it. He didn't want to talk to me either". She felt rejected by her

father and despite living within two miles she had no contact with him until a couple of days after giving birth when she telephoned him from the hospital. She said "he seemed alright. So I went to see him, to take /my daughter/ round. And he made it quite clear that he wouldn't even look at her. So I never tried since". In the two years since that meeting she had seen her father on only one occasion. That was about two months later, when by herself she paid a brief visit to him. She said, "the last time I saw him was the Christmas before last. I just made a flying visit. I just popped along to see him just before Christmas. But it was just five or ten minutes, that's all". At this meeting her father was "very abrupt. He'd speak when he had to". That was the last contact she had had with him, even though she had continued to live within a few miles for about eight months until she went to live in the hostel. She said about her father, "he has definitely made a point of making me feel I have disgraced the family and, well, he just hasn't had anything to do with us at all - almost as if we didn't exist".

Although her father did not learn about her pregnancy until about eight months after she conceived, he was the first member of her family to do so. Furthermore, his response encouraged her to try to pass with the rest of her family. When I asked her why she had not let the rest of her family know, she replied "I suppose it was the attitude my father took - I thought they would all be the same". However, about six months before our interview, and a year and a half after giving birth, she "thought 'well, I'll take a chance. I'll write to them'". So, she said, "I wrote to my cousin. And I told her about the baby. And they all said 'for goodness sake come up and have a holiday'. So I went up for a week. And their attitude is completely different. Their attitude is, I suppose, the same as mine, 'well, it can happen to anybody'". The rest of Hilary's family did not respond in the same way as her father. They had invited her to visit them, which she had done about two months before our interview and she had begun

to exchange letters with one of her cousins. In effect, after informing the rest of her family about her unmarried motherhood, she had had more contact with them and had perhaps drawn closer to them than ever before.

5. Marie

Marie's parents learnt about her pregnancy a couple of days after she had it confirmed. But Marie, who was living in London, seventy miles away, did not tell them. Her flat-mates told them after she had been taken into hospital with a 'suspected miscarriage'. Her parents immediately visited her in hospital and she said "they were worried that I was looking so ill. And they had to carry me downstairs into the car". She added "they wanted me to come straight home and talk things over. And I really wasn't in a fit state of mind to talk things over, because I'd only just admitted it to myself by that time. So I stayed in London". At this meeting, she said, "there was never a big family conference or anything - not at that time. /However/ my mother came up, I think about a week later, and came for lunch". On this occasion, Marie said, "we went through all the business about /who the father was/. 'What shall we do?' and everything else". Her mother thought that she should have the child adopted. Marie said "every time she came up, she'd present me with the difficulties of keeping the baby".

Her parents began visiting her about once a month. But throughout her pregnancy and for several months afterwards, Marie did not visit them in return. Marie gained the impression that her mother, especially, did not want her to do so, at least during her pregnancy. Marie said "it was never said 'you can't come home', but it was accepted that it was better if I stayed away until the baby was born and then, perhaps, if the baby was adopted I could come back and nobody would know". When I asked Marie how she had gained this impression, she replied "from the fact that before, the sort of relationship I had, if I phoned my parents up it would be 'are you coming home this weekend?' or 'when are you coming home next?'. Where-

as after it was always 'oh, we'll come up and see you next month' or whenever it was". I asked her how she had felt about this situation and she replied "I wanted to be on my own during that time /so/ I didn't mind it then. I only minded it when other people pointed it out to me. And towards the end of my pregnancy I suppose I got a bit bitter about it, towards my mother".

Marie also became increasingly unhappy about her mother's attempts to persuade her to have an adoption. Marie said "she really did upset me. Once towards the end, when she knew I was in an emotional state of not knowing what to do - because I said I wouldn't make up my mind until the baby was born - and about a week before the baby was born, /my mother/ came up and said 'whatever you do, Dad and I'll stick behind you'. It was said, but it took an awful lot to say it, it really did". Also, Marie thought, "she didn't really mean it. That's the awful thing". Her mother soon began again to try to persuade her to have an adoption and she continued to do so until Marie's daughter was about two and a half months old, when Marie decided once and for all against adoption.

A couple of months later she went to live only ten miles away in Midtown, but it was not until about six months after giving birth that her parents invited her and her daughter to visit them. Therefore, to begin with, Marie said, "/my parents/ accepted the fact that I was going to keep the baby /but that/ I was still staying in London. We had to do it in stages. First it was the acceptance that I was going to keep /my daughter/. And then next it was the acceptance that I was living in /Midtown/. And when we got over that, it was the acceptance of me coming /home/". The meeting with her parents on her first visit home, however, "was very strained to start off with. The atmosphere was very strained". This was again mainly due to her mother's feelings. Marie said about her mother "I never thought she'd accept /my daughter/ at all. She'd buy her things, but there wasn't any contact". But, she added, "I know she's accepted her now because she

gets cross with her".

When I asked Marie if she could account for her mother's response to her unmarried motherhood she replied "well, she thought I'd got a marvellous job. That I was going to see the world at somebody else's expense, and I suppose like every mother, she had dreams of a beautiful white wedding for her daughter. And I just threw the pattern. I was missing out on this. And also it must have been frightfully embarrassing for her to... well, she thought it was embarrassing to have to tell everybody that she'd got a granddaughter but she hadn't got a son-in-law. And she still finds this a big thing to have to tell people". However, she added, "she is improving now. She will say to people now, 'my daughter and my granddaughter' and make it abundantly clear that there's no son-in-law there. Now it's getting better but it's taken a long time". When I asked Marie if her mother had regarded her as immoral, Marie said "I think if it had been anybody else, they'd done wrong, but I was unlucky. I don't think she condemns me or passes judgement on me. It's just rather unfortunate that it should happen to me". Marie had not been immoral, but unmarried motherhood would mean an end to her career and unwelcome responses from people. Adoption had been the answer, but Marie decided against this. It then took some time for her mother to accept her unmarried motherhood and, consequently, to accept her daughter. "And now of course," Marie said, "it's absolutely wonderful - it's the best thing that could have happened".

Marie's father's response had not been quite the same as her mother's. Marie said "his reaction wasn't so noticeable. It was deeper, I think, than my mother's, much deeper. It always has been. But being a man, he didn't go into floods of tears like my mother did. I saw the reaction with my mother. With my father it was always... I'm the only daughter, the only child and we are very close, my father and I. We don't even have to talk sometimes, we know what each other's thinking. So I never had con-

frontations like I did with my mother". Marie had a closer relationship with her father and this had perhaps led to a different response from him. Shortly after learning about her pregnancy, he visited Marie in London. Marie said "He came for lunch and he was very, very... You could see he was choked, absolutely. And he was so upset that he couldn't even watch a plane go over. His reaction, I think, went on longer. Even now he still brings things up /like/ what I could be doing if I didn't have /my daughter/". I asked Marie if her father had, therefore, not yet accepted her daughter and she replied "No, he absolutely worships her. I think he accepted her right from the moment she was born - perhaps more than my mother did. I used to watch my mother sometimes and she'd be eyeing her when she thought I wasn't looking. Because my father adores children, and it was just a baby - a little girl to him".

Her grandmother's response was also different to her mother's. Marie said about her grandmother "she was pretty good actually considering that she's so old, really. She had to take a heart tablet when she was told and, of course, I didn't see her until I was about eight months pregnant. And I think she felt sorry for me actually. She'd got more compassion at first than I think my mother had for me personally". When I asked Marie if she thought that her grandmother had ever been concerned about the prospect of being known as the great-grandmother of an illegitimate child, Marie replied "no, I don't think she was. In fact she wrote to all those people and told them. To all her friends. It was my mother that couldn't do it. No, she was remarkably good and, of course, she thinks it's marvellous to have a great-granddaughter".

Marie summed up the way she had been treated by her parents and grandmother by saying "they have treated me well. I had a bad patch when I was first pregnant, but considering that was the shock, they've been marvellous in every other way". Her parents had, for example, provided her with somewhere to live a few weeks after she left London. From London she went to live

in a bedsitter in Midtown, but she decided to leave "because /the owner/ turned out very strange". She explained "not just to me. But she used to go round people's rooms while they weren't there". Then, she said, "I'd got nowhere to go, so I came /home/". She stayed with her parents for about six months and then moved back to Midtown where she rented a house. She had looked forward to this move for several months. This was because, she explained, it was to be "my home and all my possessions and things surrounding me. And I wanted to bring /my daughter/ up with mummy and not with mummy, granny and grandpa. I just looked forward to having my own place and having a little bit of independence - independence just to have dinner at half past six or little things like that. Not being regimented". She stayed in Midtown for another six months, but, about three weeks before our interview, went back to live with her parents. She explained "I was almost told to get out on the spot because I complained about the conditions". Then, like the time before, she returned to her parents because she had "got nowhere else to go. It's as simple as that". However, she wanted to leave home and perhaps move back to Midtown again as soon as possible. She said "I mean, if somebody came along, quite honestly, this afternoon and said 'there's a two-bedroomed council flat going in /Midtown/', I would move. It's as simple as that". However, she said, "I should think for the next few months I shall be here. And also, if I want to go to college, quite honestly, I need a built-in babysitter. I would like my independence, I value that more than anything else /and/ I think I will move. I don't think I could be happy living in two people's house. You can't bring up a child with parents and grandparents and great grandparents there. It's very difficult".

*

The sets of relationships which my informants had within their families at the time of interviewing were of various styles and although they all had changed during the period of unmarried motherhood, they had done so in

various ways. Before attempting to draw some conclusions about unmarried mothers' relationships with kin, I will summarize the main points so far.

Iris had had a good deal of contact with a large number of the members of her family, but she no longer had any at all. She had not had very close relationships within her family, but she had lived with a sister and within easy visiting distance of four other sisters and two of her brothers. In addition, she had kept in touch with, and occasionally saw, the rest of her family in Ireland. However, just over four months after conceiving she left her sister's and moved away from her family as part of an attempt to pass with them. She had decided to try to avoid contact with kin and she had successfully done so. Thus, she had had no contact with any member of her family for about eighteen months and she had experienced no responses to her unmarried motherhood from them.

Iris was alone amongst my informants in having no contact at all with kin and in having experienced no responses from them, although Hilary had been having no contact at all until a few months before our interview. She was still not in touch with her father, but she had reestablished some contact with the rest of her family. She had had no contact with her father for over two years - since she had last visited him when her daughter was a few months old. She had had only distant relationships with her father and the rest of her family, but until about the time she conceived, she had been living with her father and had then seen him almost daily for approximately eight months after that. She had tried to pass with him, but eventually he had learnt and as expected he had responded by rejecting her. As a result, she not only lost contact with her father, but also she was encouraged to continue to try to pass with the rest of her family. She had never had either close relationships or much contact with the latter and she expected hostile responses from them also. However, when her daughter was about a year and a half old, she risked letting them know

and they accepted her. Consequently, she had visited them and had begun exchanging letters with one of her cousins. In fact, at the time of interviewing she probably had at least as much contact and probably closer relationships with them than she had ever had before. She would probably have had much more contact if they did not live so far away.

Hilary had quite a lot less contact with her family than Ann had with hers. As well as often exchanging letters and speaking on the telephone with her mother and three sisters, she frequently visited and was visited by them. On the other hand, she had far less contact than she had had before she conceived. Although she had had only one close relationship - with a sister - she had been living with her mother and consequently had been having a great deal of contact with the rest of her family. However, shortly after conceiving, she left home and moved away as part of an attempt to pass with them. She had expected to be rejected, at least by her mother.

Nevertheless, a few weeks later, she let them know and although she was rejected by her mother, the rest of her family accepted her. Contact with her mother ceased but contact with her sisters was maintained and eventually one of them visited her. Moreover, the response of her sisters and the contact they maintained with her led to the reestablishment of contact with, and a gradual change in treatment from, her mother. By the time of interviewing, Ann had been more or less fully accepted by her mother and had more contact with her than with any other member of her family. Contact with her family in general would probably have been greater if she had not been living so far away.

Ann had less contact with her family than Gillian had with hers. However, Gillian had a large number of kin - including her father, brothers and sisters - living within a few miles. At the same time, Gillian had far less contact with kin than she had been having at the time when she conceived. At that time, she had been living at home with her father and her

younger brother and sisters. But a few weeks later she went to live with her older sister, the only member of her family that she had told about her pregnancy. She had wanted to pass with the rest of them because of the responses she expected from them. Nevertheless, within a few weeks she had let them know and was more or less totally accepted. She had experienced hostility from only her grandparents, an aunt and possibly from one of her younger sisters. Her father had invited her to return home, but she had not done so, partly because of the treatment she feared from the younger sister. She eventually went to live in the hostel in Westown, not far from her older sister, whom she continued to see several times a week. She also had quite a lot of contact with her father and younger siblings by way of visits and telephone calls. She had never experienced any direct hostility from her younger sister, and in fact, perhaps the only treatment of this kind she continued to experience, was from her grandparents. The aunt had come to accept her. At the time of interviewing, Gillian had about as much contact with her family as she could have or at least wanted to have.

If Gillian had less contact with her family than Elaine had with hers, it was perhaps only because the latter was living with her mother. She had hardly any contact with the rest of her family, even though her two sisters and an aunt were living close by. These kin, especially her sisters, and perhaps her brothers who were living abroad, had a "social grudge" against her.

On learning about her pregnancy, Elaine had decided to try to pass with her kin because of the responses she had feared from them. Eventually, however, they had learnt and, whereas her mother had accepted her, the rest had not. Consequently, a rift developed between Elaine and her mother on the one hand and, especially, her sisters on the other. Some contact was maintained with her brothers, but not with her sisters. By the time of interviewing, however, this rift had narrowed somewhat. Contact had been

renewed between her mother and her sisters and, although little change had taken place in this respect between Elaine herself and her sisters, there was perhaps less hostility between them. Contact would probably also increase between Elaine and her sisters, but at the same time there would probably always be something of a rift, if only because of Elaine's feelings about the way her sisters had responded initially. Finally, the relationship between Elaine and her aunt would probably develop in a similar direction in accordance with changes in her aunt's treatment.

Like Elaine, Marie was having quite a lot of contact with kin because she was living at home with her parents and her grandmother. She had hardly any contact with the rest of her family, who were living a couple of hundred miles away and with whom she had always had distant relationships. She had left home at about the time she conceived although it was not until later that she had learnt that she had conceived. Then she decided to try to pass with her family because of the responses she had expected from them. However, she was successful in this for only a short time. Her parents, especially her mother, responded with hostility and they discouraged her from visiting them. She had very little contact with her parents until several months after giving birth, when she went to live within a few miles of them. Then, gradually, contact increased as her parents' treatment changed. By the time of interviewing, she was completely accepted by her parents (and her grandmother, who had always done so) and had, in fact, gone back to live with them.

In view of my informants' reports, certain conclusions may be drawn about the nature of unmarried mothers' relationships within their families. To begin with, young females on learning that they are unmarried mothers are likely to expect some, and even a good deal of, hostility or rejection from kin, and whilst they are perhaps more likely to expect these types of responses from distant kin, they may also expect them from those who are

close. They are then likely to be led by the response they expect, to engage in extensive passing by intent. This applies to both distant and close kin, but whereas they are likely to maintain and introduce physical distance between themselves and the former, they are less likely to do so with the latter, at least for very long. Consequently, they are more likely to be successful in passing with distant kin and to have avoided experiencing responses from them. Thus, if all their kin are distant, they may well have no contact with, and may well have experienced no responses from, the members of their families. However, in time they are likely to have experienced the responses of, and to have at least some contact with, kin, both close and distant.

The responses they experience from those kin who learn, are likely to encourage them not to pass by intent with other kin. That is, unmarried mothers are unlikely to experience hostility, or at least rejection, from kin if and when they learn. This applies especially to those who are close, but may also apply to those who are distant.

Rejection or hostility is not only less common than acceptance, but also, when it occurs, is likely to be only temporary. Thus, eventually unmarried mothers are likely to enjoy more or less complete acceptance by their families. The limited extent to which unmarried mothers appear to be rejected by kin, may be taken simply to suggest that kin tend either not to disapprove of, or to suppress their disapproval of, unmarried motherhood. Concomitantly, the temporary nature of most rejection might be taken simply to suggest that kin who do reject, eventually either no longer disapprove or suppress their disapproval. At the same time, however, it is possible that those who reject do not do so, at least simply, because of disapproval.

Goffman, in *Stigma*, refers to

the individual who is related through the social structure to a stigmatized individual - a relationship that leads the wider society to treat both individuals in some respects as one. Thus the loyal spouse of the mental patient, the daughter of

the ex-con, the parent of the cripple, the friend of the blind, the family of the hangman, are all obliged to share some of the discredit of the stigmatized person to whom they are related. One response to this fate is to embrace it and to live within the world of one's stigmatized connection. It should be added that persons who acquire a degree of stigma in this way can themselves have connections who acquire a little of the disease twice-removed. The problems faced by stigmatized persons spread out in waves, but of diminishing intensity ¹.

Those individuals who embrace a stigmatized individual's stigma in this way, may be among the 'wise'. The latter are one sort of individual from whom the stigmatized individual can expect some support². They are

persons who are normal but whose special situation has made them intimately privy to the secret life of the stigmatized individual and sympathetic with it /.../. Wise persons are the marginal men before whom the individual with a fault need feel no shame nor exert self-control, knowing that in spite of his failing he will be seen as an ordinary other³.

There is, however, an alternative to embracing a 'courtesy stigma'⁴. As Goffman notes

the tendency for a stigma to spread from the stigmatized individual to his close connections provides a reason why such relations tend either to be avoided or to be terminated, where existing⁵.

Not only unmarried mothers, but people in general, including kin, will hold beliefs about the consequences of unmarried motherhood. Moreover, people in general may tend to hold similar beliefs in this respect, and may, for instance, tend to believe that both unmarried mothers themselves and others who are 'structurally related' to, or 'connected' with, them will be treated in similar ways. Consequently, just as young females on learning that they are unmarried mothers, are likely to try to pass with kin in order to avoid hostile treatment, those who are related to them, such as (and perhaps especially) kin, may be likely to reject in order to avoid the consequences of a courtesy stigma. This may be done, first of all, so as to prevent others from learning about their association with unmarried motherhood - that is, so as to prevent others from either learning about the unmarried mothers with whom they are related or, at least, that they are related. Goffman, in the context of his discussion of stigma

symbols, refers to the

informing character of the 'with' relationship in our society. To be 'with' someone is to arrive at a social occasion in his company, walk with him down a street, be a member of his party in a restaurant, and so forth. The issue is that in certain circumstances the social identity of those an individual is with can be used as a source of information concerning his own social identity, the assumption being that he is what the others are¹.

When kin reject and try to avoid contact with unmarried mothers, they may be trying to pass with others by keeping their connections secret. Alternatively, if and when kin think that they are known to be related, they may reject so as to dissociate themselves from unmarried motherhood. They may reject to show to others that they disapprove and are therefore not to be given a courtesy stigma. They may do this even when, in fact, they do not disapprove. On the other hand, kin who do disapprove may feel no need to try to dissociate themselves or, therefore, to reject.

Whether or not kin reject may depend solely on their beliefs and feelings about the consequences for themselves of being associated with unmarried motherhood. When they reject, they may simply be trying to avoid being rejected themselves. The reports of my informants suggest that kin are perhaps likely to believe that they will experience rejection if they are associated with unmarried motherhood. Some kin, especially those who are distant, are then perhaps likely to feel a need, on learning about their relationships to unmarried mothers, to reject. At the same time, however, if kin do reject, they are likely to do so only temporarily, perhaps because they are led to change their beliefs about the consequences of association. They are perhaps likely to be persuaded to change their beliefs by kin who have not rejected. That is, those who reject may realize through the existence of those who do not, that the majority of kin accept and that association - both direct and indirect² - does not have the expected consequences. They may then go on to discover for themselves that they have rejected unnecessarily. In other words, 'rejectors' may be converted by the 'acceptors' - who thereby act as 'connecting relatives' - into

acceptors themselves.¹

As unmarried mothers who have been rejected by kin come to be more or less completely accepted, they are likely to increase their contact with their families. If they do not, it may be because, first of all, they have not witnessed or perceived the change in treatment by kin. Alternatively, it may be because they themselves reject kin in response to the way they were treated initially. However, in the absence of these events, they may not increase their contact simply because they are unable to do so. For example, they may be living too far away for more than occasional visits. Moreover, they may be living too far away only because of their own initial response to their unmarried motherhood, in that they were led by their beliefs about its consequences to try to pass with kin by moving away from them. In this way, unmarried mothers may have limited contact with not only those kin who have rejected, but also those who have accepted.

The reports of my informants suggest that if, in the long run, unmarried mothers continue to have considerably less contact with kin than they had before they conceived, it is probably because of their own initial response to their unmarried motherhood, rather than of treatment by kin. It is likely that they will have responded by trying to pass with kin through moving away from them. Consequently, they are probably either able to have only limited contact or are still trying to pass. In the latter case it is possible that they are trying to pass unnecessarily.

It is perhaps likely that unmarried mothers will eventually have a good deal of contact with their kin, will not be 'isolated' from their families and will be in a position to participate with the members of their families in social activities. On the last point, however, it is possible that there will be people other than kin with whom they can share their social life. The next chapter will be concerned with an exploration of unmarried mothers' relationships with two categories of people of this kind - that is, with the fathers of their children and with boyfriends.

CHAPTER FOUR

FATHERS AND BOYFRIENDS

In the first chapter it was noted that whilst a lot has been written about unmarried mothers, there is very little firm evidence about their social situations. The assumptions and assertions about their social relationships and social lives do not have the support of a reliable body of research data. In a similar way there is not much known about the situations of unmarried fathers. In the early nineteen sixties, Clark Vincent noted that in fact "the ratio of studies of the unmarried father to studies of the unwed mother is one to twenty five"¹. Vincent suggests that unmarried fathers are not as big a social problem and consequently not as important a research subject. He explains this in terms of several prevailing 'mores' which serve to define their relatively low status in this respect. The first of these is what he refers to as "the traditional double standard /which/ effects a harsher judgement of the female than of the male for sexual misbehaviour"². The second is the fact that "the 'presumption of innocence until guilt is proven' provides far less protection for the unwed mother than for the unmarried father"³. Thirdly, the 'principle of legitimacy' is maintained by censuring the mother rather than the father "since it is she whose evidence of sexual misbehaviour overtly threatens the mores supporting legitimacy"⁴. Her "behaviour is censured as an object-lesson"⁵. Fourthly, unmarried mothers are a greater financial burden to tax-payers. Finally, "it is easier, and requires far less time and money, to study 'captive' unwed mothers in maternity homes and social agencies, than it would be to study individual unmarried fathers"⁶.

Vincent's comments about the dearth of studies on unmarried fathers were echoed by Vincent Brome in a short article in New Society in the late nineteen sixties⁷. However, the findings of the few available studies raised doubts in his mind about whether the label 'sexual exploiter', which is

commonly applied to unmarried fathers, is justified. He refers to a study by Valerie Hughes in a city which she calls 'Midboro', and notes that

among the 278 cases she examined, the great majority of the children's fathers were either a friend of the mother's or the girl's fiance. A much smaller number came under the heading of casual acquaintances /.../. The idea of unmarried fathers as people living apart from the mothers of their children is heavily qualified by this study. Approximately 70 per cent of the unskilled labourers in the Midboro study were cohabiting stably with the mothers. 40 per cent of the skilled/semi-skilled and 35 per cent of the salaried professional class were cohabiting stably 1.

Brome refers to several other studies which confirm that unmarried mothers tend to have children by fathers with whom they had, and then continue to have, a 'stable' relationship. Often the mother lives with the father and when they do not get married it is perhaps often because the father is already married. Celia Joy's investigation of nearly 5,000 cases discovered that in about 35 per cent of these, the father was already married.^{1*}

Vincent did not gather information on whether the fathers were married, but he did so on their ages and education. He found that "the distribution of age differences seems to approximate to that of husband-wife pairs in the general population"², and that the education of the mothers respective fathers tended to be similar. Therefore, the "traditional concept /.../ that unwed mothers are much younger and less educated than their respective male sex partners"³, that "unwed mothers are impregnated and thereby exploited sexually, by males who are older, better educated and of higher socio-economic status"⁴, is not born out by Vincent's research. This finding then leads him to the conclusion that the term 'sexual exploiter', which is often used to describe unmarried fathers, is an ex-post facto label - a label affixed after impregnation and "usually only when pregnancy without marriage occurs"⁵, to help explain illegitimacy. Vincent says

the significance of /the term/ 'sexual exploiter' is not that it explains the cause of illegitimacy; its significance is that it clarifies the mores from which the label is derived and which it supports. Within the larger normative setting, this ex post facto label serves humane values by mitigating the blame or condemnation of unwed mothers who contribute to the heroic aspect of the traditional role of motherhood by bringing their pregnancies to term. It also sanctions the traditional male role, by censuring males who fail to protect females from shame; and it strengthens cherished family values by condemning the responsible male who leaves a mother unwed and thereby overtly threatening to these values¹.

Vincent points out that the findings in his studies need to be treated with caution because all the data about fathers were gathered from interviews with mothers. He notes in this context that the mothers' claims about the nature of their relationships with the fathers may be misplaced. At best, perhaps, this data provides us with little more than an indication of the mothers' involvement in these relationships. However, there is little additional information. There is next to no research data based on interviews with unmarried fathers themselves and the only alternative sources appear to be the case-work reports of social agencies and the law concerning the rights and duties of unmarried fathers in relation to unmarried mothers and their children.

The legal position of unmarried fathers in our society may reflect and underline the general legal (formal) and informal position of men in relation to women and children which was alluded to by Vincent. It is a common belief amongst social commentators that the position of women (and children) in relation to men, especially of those who are wives and mothers, has undergone a great change in the last hundred years or so. Richard Titmus, for example, has used the term 'social revolution' to describe what has happened². Hannah Gavron agrees with this view and has summed up the change in terms of three major developments³. First of all, the status of women in relation to men has risen considerably. Secondly, the "number of roles which women can perform in society has increased and become more varied"⁴. Thirdly, women have gained an "extension in the freedom of choice as to which roles they choose to perform"⁵. She goes on to suggest

that, for example, the legal and political positions of women have gradually become more or less equal with those of men. In this context she refers to legal changes which have taken place with regard to divorce, legal aid, the ownership and distribution of property, and rights and obligations towards children, and she suggests that extensions of the franchise have given women equal political status with men.

Changes in the position of women within the educational system and the labour market have also taken place. For Gavron, the educational opportunities of women are now "not far short of those provided for men"¹ and the work opportunities of married women in particular "have greatly increased"². These changes are linked to others that have occurred in the family. The patriarchal family has declined and the 'democratic' family has taken its place; the status of wives and children within the family has improved. There has been an increase in the sharing of tasks and activities between husbands and wives; there is less 'task segregation' within the conjugal relationship with regard to the care and socialization of children, for example³. There have been developments in the sexual aspects of the relationships between husbands and wives which have benefitted the latter and, relatedly, there has been a "revolution of child bearing"⁴. Thus, whilst women's period as wives has increased as the age of marriage has fallen and the expectation of life has increased, "their period as active mothers has decreased as family size has fallen and child-bearing has been compressed into a short period following on marriage".⁵

Despite Gavron's suggestions, the applicability of the term 'revolution' to describe the changes which have occurred in the position of women is questionable. The improvements which have taken place so far have perhaps been only limited and to an extent offset by competing developments. As part of an ideological defence of the family, Ronald Fletcher has suggested that "the family is now concerned with a more detailed and refined satisfaction of needs than hitherto, and it is more intimately and responsibly

bound up with the wider and more complicated social institutions in the modern state than it was"¹. Gavron agrees with this view. She claims that

As far as the essential functions /of the family/ described by MacIver are concerned - sexual, procreative, and the provision of a home, higher standards are demanded by society today than ever they were in the nineteenth century. Parenthood and the care of children is now a highly self-conscious affair in which the maintenance of a high standard is insisted upon, and the pitfalls are for ever being exposed.²

Gavron's study of young married women then revealed that whilst husbands (especially, perhaps surprisingly, those with manual occupations) tend to participate in the carrying out of domestic tasks, including those which are child oriented, they do less than their wives. Mothers still take, and are willing to accept, greater responsibility for the bringing up of children and they still look to their homes and their children for their main area of activity. Therefore, "it can /still/ be said that the lives of /.../ young mothers are centred around their children and their home"³, or that "the working-class /as well as the middle-class/ mother /is/ dominated by her role as a mother, /especially/ when the children are young"⁴. The prevailing 'dominant' ideology in our society, whilst encouraging parents to put increasingly greater effort into the upbringing of their children, continues to encourage the mother to do more than the father.

Juliet Mitchell in *Woman's Estate*, has made a similar point⁵. She suggests that the position of women in our society needs to be viewed in terms of four separate but inter-related dimensions. That is,

The key structures of woman's situation can be listed as follows: Production, Reproduction, Sexuality and the Socialization of Children. The concrete combination of these produce the 'complex unity' of her position; but each separate structure may have reached a different 'moment' at any given historical time⁶.

By 'production' Mitchell means that production which is carried on outside the home within the market sector of the economy, and the other three

'structures' correspond to MacIver's three 'essential functions' of the family¹. She accepts that the position of women within the realm of 'production' has changed and even improved, but only to a limited extent. She says

Engels thought that the precondition for the liberation of women was their introduction into the industrial economy - the paid, labour force. With women as 42 per cent of the United States labour force /and 37 per cent of the British labour force/, the 'precondition' has all but been achieved².

On the other hand, in Britain the percentage of women in the industrial labour force has changed only slightly during this century, and

the composition of their jobs has not changed decisively either /.../ Sociologists can put it bluntly: Within the occupational organization they are analogous to the wife-mother role within the family /.../ The pattern of 'instrumental' father and 'expressive' mother is not substantially changed when the woman is gainfully employed, as her job tends to be inferior to that of the man's /.../³.

It remains the case, therefore, that women are

probably the most exploited sector of the work-force. But this exploitation as part of the working class is made invisible by their identification with the other aspects of their condition - their oppression as wives within the family. Here they join all classes of women to work - from an economic point of view - in a pre-capitalist mode of production. Here they are more analogous to peasants under feudalism⁴.

That is, "the family structure dominates even at the scene of work"⁵; a woman sees her work as subsidiary to her domestic tasks, and it is still the case that within the "family she experiences a yet more fundamental division, that of her and her husband"⁶. So, even today

women are confined within the family which is a segmentary, monolithic unit, largely separated off from production and hence from social human activity. The reason why this confinement is made possible is the demand for women to fulfil these three roles: they must provide sexual satisfaction for their partners and give birth to children and rear them. But the family does more than occupy the woman: it produces her. It is in the family that the psychology of men and women is founded.⁷

The 'dominant' ideology and structure of our society continues to relegate women to the home. "Bearing children, bringing them up, and maintaining

the home - these form the core of woman's natural vocation, in this ideology"¹.

At the same time, other changes in this ideology have increased the demands on women in the home. Whilst women have perhaps made some advances within the realms of 'sexuality' and 'reproduction', they have perhaps lost out within the realm of 'socialization'. That is,

As the family has become smaller, each child has become more important; the actual act of reproduction occupies less and less time, and the socializing and nurturance process increase commensurately in significance. Contemporary society is obsessed by the physical, moral and sexual problems of childhood and adolescence. Ultimate responsibility for these is placed on the mother².

Mitchell comes to the conclusion that

the liberation of women can only be achieved if all four structures in which they are integrated are transformed - Production, Reproduction, Sexuality and Socialization. A modification of any of them can be offset by a reinforcement of another (as increased socialization has made up for decreased reproduction). This means that a mere permutation of the form of exploitation is achieved³.

The idea that there has been a gradual movement in our society towards a greater concern with the socialization and care, with the well-being, of children or with domestic activities in general, is in line with arguments in favour of the suggestion that there has been a change towards the social isolation and 'privatisation' of the elementary family as presented by, for example, Goldthorpe et al. The idea has also been supported by Philippe Aries, who has described and attempted to provide an explanation for the drift towards the 'child-centered' family that has occurred in our society over the last several hundred years⁴. His explanation refers to the changing 'needs' of society and, as such, bears a resemblance to Parson's account of the decline of the 'extended family' and the 'structural' isolation of the 'nuclear family' which, he suggests, has occurred with the process of industrialization⁵. Likewise, Juliet Mitchell argues that

The family /.../ has clearly undergone many changes with the advance of the economic methods of production which have always necessitated more and more elaborate social formations

to accompany them./.../ under early capitalism the main economic task of the family was to produce large numbers of children for the new industrial jobs which demanded enormous numbers of workers; but under advanced capitalism, labour-intensive industry gives way to capital-intensive and quality rather than quantity of workers is what is required. The family adapts itself accordingly 1.

Here Mitchell is following Peggy Morton, who has suggested that

Profits depend more and more on the efficient organization of work and on the 'self-discipline' of the workers rather than simply on speed-ups and other direct forms of increasing the exploitation of the workers. The family is therefore important both to shoulder the burden of the cost of higher education, and to carry out the repressive socialization of children. The family must raise children who have internalized hierarchical social relations, who will discipline themselves and work efficiently without constant supervision /.../ Women are responsible for implementing most of this socialization².

Morton's last point about women's involvement in the socialization of children is, of course, of crucial importance to an assessment of their current position in society - their relationships with men - and whilst it appears to be justified, perhaps it requires qualification. That is, the available evidence also appears to suggest that men are, and have become increasingly, involved in this task. Has their involvement increased at a rate commensurate with the increased emphasis on the socialization of children and perhaps at a rate which has meant that women's involvement has hardly changed and even declined? Whatever the changes which have taken place in this respect, how might they be accounted for? Might the roots of the changes towards an increased emphasis on socialization, as suggested by Morton and Mitchell, be similar to those of the changes in the division of labour concerning this process? Perhaps, that is, the changing labour needs of our society can be cited. Perhaps an explanation can be provided by referring to changes in the labour market with regard to the time and energy required of men and, at the same time, with regard to what is required of women. As Mitchell has pointed out, women have become increasingly involved in 'production' over the last hundred years or so, but they have been largely concentrated into a few, often expanding

and new, types of job. For instance, at least according to Mitchell, the current needs of capitalist society are satisfied by women in that in the realm of 'production' they "form a cheap pool of labour"¹.

Mitchell's analysis of the position of women can be criticised. As Chris Middleton has pointed out², despite claiming to provide an analysis within a Marxist framework, she has failed to provide an adequate account because she is guilty, in fact, of being influenced by a view of women's domestic tasks which is characteristic of bourgeois economists and sexists in general. That is, for her 'production' is to be equated with 'market production' to the neglect of domestic activities which, properly speaking, should also be seen as productive. Domestic activities, including the bearing and rearing of children, are productive by way of the creation and recreation of labour power for use in the market sector of the economy. If we adopt this view, then shifts in the nature of, and in the involvement of men and women in, the socialization of children are shifts in the nature of and involvement in the process of production, which fit in with accompanying changes in the market sector of this process and in the changing needs of capitalist society.

This albeit not very detailed analysis of the position of women in our society, with particular reference to their activities within the process of the socialization of children; or, perhaps another way of saying the same thing, this analysis of the social relationships between men and women and their children, may contribute to an understanding of the nature of any type of 'nuclear family', whether or not it is also a 'conjugal family'³. In the absence of a marital tie, the relationship of mothers to their children is similar and the law has stepped in to help ensure that this is so. The law about the relationships of unmarried mothers and fathers to one another and their children reflects and even exaggerates the prevailing 'dominant' ideology concerning the relationships between mothers, fathers and their children in general. According to Gavron

with the exception of the unmarried mother, the legal position of the woman today is greatly improved as compared with one hundred years ago, particularly within marriage¹.

The changes in the law regarding marriage and divorce have, of course, by-passed the unmarried mother - she has not benefitted from them. Nevertheless, the legal position of unmarried mothers may be interpreted as superior to that of unmarried fathers, at least by way of her rights over their children.

In current English law², an unmarried mother has the sole right to the custody and guardianship of her child unless and until a court of law decides otherwise. Whilst an unmarried father has no automatic legal rights, he may apply to a court for access to and even custody of his child. He may also apply to adopt his child but, although a man may not normally be allowed to adopt a girl, there is no legal bar to a woman on her own adopting a boy. An unmarried mother has not only the right to apply to adopt her child, she also has the right to offer her child for adoption by someone else without the consent of the father. The consent of the father to an adoption is not required as he is not a parent under the Adoption Act of 1958. His only rights in this respect are to appear before the adopting court to object to the adoption and to start proceedings to seek the custody of the child himself so that, if he succeeds, the adoption proceedings fall to the ground. On the other hand, the High Court have made it clear that the mother is under no obligation to seek out the father and explain to him that he may seek custody of the child in the adoption proceedings, although some county courts are now requiring that all named putative fathers be interviewed in order to ensure that they do not wish to do so. According to the Adoption Act, the putative father does have the right to be notified of adoption proceedings if an affiliation order has been made against him or he has entered an agreement to pay maintenance for the child. No notice need be given if there is no affiliation order or agreement, unless he has shown an interest in the child and the mother reports this

to the court.

The mother is legally obliged to provide for the upbringing and maintenance of her child unless and until she has her custody withdrawn by a court or she has her child legally adopted. The father is not legally obliged to help her and has no legal duty towards his child unless an affiliation order has been made against him under the Affiliations Proceedings Act of 1957. Any single woman (including a widow or woman separated from her husband and living permanently apart from him or a divorced woman) who is pregnant or who has given birth to an illegitimate child can apply for an affiliation order. She is required to apply to a magistrates' court in the area in which she normally resides and within three years of the child's birth, unless it can be proved that the putative father has maintained the child within this period or, if he has ceased to reside in England within the three years, within twelve months of his return. A mother may apply while she is pregnant, but the case will not be heard until the child is born.

The subsequent hearings, for which legal aid is available, are designated as domestic proceedings and may therefore receive only limited publicity. It is necessary for a mother to give evidence in person only when the defendant does not admit to being the father, when her allegations must also be corroborated before the court can find in her favour. Part III of the Family Reform Act of 1969, which came into force on 1st March, 1972, allows evidence obtained from blood tests to be used in cases where the paternity of the child is in dispute and the court may, on the application of any party to the proceedings, give a direction for the use of blood tests. If the court adjudges the defendant to be the father it may order him to pay the mother a weekly sum towards the cost of maintaining the child, as well as the expenses incidental to the birth and, if the child has died before the making of the order, the child's funeral expenses. Where the mother's application is made before or within two months of the

child's birth, the court can order weekly payments to be calculated from the date of birth. Payments under an affiliation order are subject to the provisions of the Attachment of Earnings Act of 1971, which makes it possible for an employer to deduct maintenance at source and to pass it over to the mother. In the face of this last possibility, at least according to Brome, "some fathers change jobs to avoid paying"¹. Brome also says about the unmarried father

Until a few years ago, the law idiotically tried to drive him to support, without giving him legal rights over the child. In some cases he paid maintenance and never saw the child. The Legitimacy Act, 1959, made it possible for him (under section three) to apply for custody of the child or for access. Sometimes fathers abuse the privilege and exploit it as a means of re-establishing relations with the mother /.../

What, at first sight, appear to be trivial sums for supporting an illegitimate child are enforceable by law. In 1952 it was 30s a week, today it is £2.10s, and that figure is currently under fresh review. Quintin Hogg would like to see it raised to £5 a week².

Of course, an unmarried mother is not legally obliged to take the father to court. This applies under all circumstances, even when, for instance, the father does not volunteer to help towards the maintenance of the child. However, unmarried fathers may, and often do, agree without a court order to help. The mother may then decide, and be encouraged, to get an agreement in writing which contains admission of paternity and an official stamp in case it is necessary later on to enforce it in a County Court or so that it might be used as corroborative evidence for an affiliation order. A private agreement of this kind, like an affiliation agreement, continues if a mother adopts her child, but does not normally do so if she marries someone other than the father.

This summary of the legal position of unmarried mothers and unmarried fathers in relation to each other and to their children might be taken to suggest that, at least in some ways, the formal position of unmarried mothers is superior to that of unmarried fathers. Mothers may have little or no direct advantage over fathers, but they may have some indirect

advantage by way of their rights with regard to their children. On the other hand, it may be argued that any advantage in this respect is perhaps more than offset by greater obligations. Moreover, it is almost certainly the case that the informally based obligations of mothers in general are greater than those of fathers and that they outweigh any formal advantage which unmarried mothers may have over unmarried fathers.

The rights and obligations of unmarried mothers and unmarried fathers may be seen to simply reflect, though perhaps in a simplified and exaggerated fashion, informally based rights and obligations. Accordingly, to the prevailing 'dominant' ideology, women as mothers should be concerned with the care and upbringing of children at the expense of other activities (such as those carried on within the market sector of the economy), and should be more concerned than fathers with this task. The principal obligation of men as fathers is to win 'bread', or an income, to be used by mothers in carrying out their duties to their children or, that is, for the use and care of the units made up of mothers and their children¹.

Marriage then formalizes and underlines this situation². In the absence of marriage, the law then steps in to ensure that children are still cared for and that the units made up of mothers and their children are protected, by formalizing the normal obligations of fathers and mothers. Unmarried mothers have rights over their children in return for this obligation, but fathers have no, or at least few, rights in return for their obligations. The fathers' rights and the rights and obligations that the law imposes on husbands and wives towards one another, are unnecessary to the care and upbringing of children and, if legally imposed in the absence of marriage, would undermine marriage.

Of course, knowledge about the legal relationship between unmarried mothers and the fathers of their children does not necessarily tell us very much about the actual or informal, daily relationships between them. To begin with, it is possible that the law is ignored or at least not fully utilized.

Unmarried mothers may sometimes have a good deal of contact and close relationships with the fathers of their children (as the research referred to earlier illustrated), but they may sometimes have only very little, or even no, contact and only very distant relationships (as my research illustrates). Fathers may still be 'boyfriends' and thereby play an important part in their social lives. On the other hand, unmarried mothers may have other boyfriends who play similar parts. Later on in this chapter, the relationships my informants had with boyfriends, if and when they had them, are examined. To begin with, however, the relationships they had with the fathers of their children are considered. In doing so, attention is paid to matters such as their relationships with the fathers before they conceived; their approaches to information management with the fathers; if, when and how the fathers learnt about their pregnancies; the fathers' responses on learning; their relationships with the fathers since conceiving; their contact with and feelings about the fathers; and their use of the law in their dealings with the fathers¹.

1. Ann

When Ann conceived she had known the father of her child for several years. They were living in the same house and were engaged to be married². He was the first person Ann told about her pregnancy and was the only person she had told when, a few weeks later, she left home. Referring to when she told the father that she might be pregnant, she said "he made me send a pregnancy test off, and I went to the doctor once I got the reply from that". On learning that she was pregnant, the father offered to pay for an abortion and then re-affirmed a promise he had made to marry her. However, apart from thinking that marriage between them "wouldn't work", Ann thought that the father "wouldn't go through with it". She said, "he talked about standing by me, but I realized it was all talk. When it came to doing anything about it, he wouldn't do anything - it was no good relying on him and his promises. So, I decided I'd best do things for myself and

lead my own life". Ann went to live seventy miles away in Midtown and considered the possibility of adoption.

Ann did not see the father again until after her child had been born. She let him know that she had given birth and "not so long after" he visited her in Midtown. Since then, she had seen him on only two occasions by the time of our first interview. The last occasion was about two months before, when she visited him in London¹. In addition, she said, "he phones me once or twice a week". During these calls, the father showed an interest in her son. Ann said, "he phones up and he says, 'how is the horrible brat?', 'is he boss-eyed?' He never finishes the conversation without asking how /my son/ is. And if I say there is something wrong with him, he wants to know exactly what". This interest was the principal, perhaps the only, reason the father had for calling.

At our second interview², Ann reported that she still received these calls "about once a week", but that they involved only "depressing conversations". She explained, "we just don't have anything to say to each other any more. It seems pointless him phoning up every week". Even the father, she said, "keeps saying 'I don't see any point in me keep phoning'. And I say 'well, I don't ask you to. Why do you keep phoning?' So that puts the ball back in his court - and he can't answer that one. And he sort of says, 'well, unless you ask me not to, I will'. So it's sort of stale mate the whole time". He continued to telephone, Ann explained, because "he likes to know how we are getting on". More correctly, she added, "he is interested perhaps not so much in me as in /my son/. Because, I mean, a son! I think most men... If it had been a girl, I don't think he would have bothered at all. I think most men have an affinity for a son rather than a daughter, I don't know why". Ann did not care whether the father telephoned, and he only telephoned because he was interested in enquiring after her son.

Between our interviews, Ann had seen the father on one occasion. She said

"he came **down** one weekend. We had quite a nice weekend actually - no arguments or anything. We went out quite a lot. He doesn't drink, so it was no fun for him going into pubs. We'd sort of go into a pub and sit there and there wasn't much to talk about. So he'd just sit and buy me drinks and stick to his orange juice, and all very boring". This visit was "about a month and a half" before our interview. Then "he came down again the week before last, /but/ he didn't tell me he was coming - just came down, and I was out. So he stayed in /Midtown/ for two hours trying to phone and decided I wasn't going to be in - thought I had disappeared off somewhere and went back. So I didn't see him". I asked her how she had felt about missing him and she replied, "I was a bit cheesed off, really. Not so much that I had missed him, but that I had missed a chance to go out".

In a similar way, Ann was hoping that the father would visit her again at Christmas, a few days after our interview. The father, she reported, "had said he would come at Christmas and I took it to be he would come for Christmas, where he seems to be taking it that he will pop in some time over Christmas. So I have sort of given up hope about that and sort of decided that I will ask everybody else, and maybe one person out of all of them will turn up". She had thought that the father was going to spend the whole of Christmas with her, but, she said, "/he/ phoned up last night and I said 'when are you coming?' and /he/ said 'Oh, I'll pop in some time over Christmas, I don't know when it will be'". However, it was possible that he would not even visit her at Christmas, so she had decided to ask her friends to do so instead. When I asked her if she had looked forward to the father coming down, she replied "not particularly. Not to him coming down, it was just nice to think that somebody was going to be here at Christmas and nice to think that he'd be here for /my son's/ first Christmas. I don't know". Ann welcomed visits from the father only in so far as they meant she would have company and the chance to go out. In

return, he visited her mainly because of her child.

Despite the father's interest in her son, he had shown little interest in helping her financially. He had given her no money until several weeks after she had given birth, when he did so under pressure from the S.B.C. They had told Ann that if she could not get him to pay her something voluntarily, she should let them know who and where he was, so that they could take him to court. Alternatively, they would take her to court. That is, she persuaded the father to pay her an allowance and then told the S.B.C. what he had agreed to because "it was either that or /the S.B.C./ were getting very nasty and saying they wanted to take somebody to court - they didn't care who it was". Ann therefore, was "supposed to" get a weekly allowance from the father. But, she said, rather than abiding by the agreement, "he just gives it to me when he feels like it". In other words, she said, "I've had a few perks from him - bonuses, shall we say - but I don't get what I should get at the moment". However, she added, "I'm working on something. But I've got to have something on him first, because he's a slippery bloke".

Although the father was not paying her what he had promised, she did not inform the S.B.C. This was because, she explained, "they would just take him to court, or as I say, they would want somebody to take to court - I'd rather do it for myself". She thought that if they took the father to court "they would only lose the case". That is, he would deny he was the father and there was not enough evidence to prove otherwise. She said, "he'd deny it in court", and added, "he wouldn't deny it to me /but/ he swears blind he is not guilty" to anyone else. He would deny he was the father in court, she continued, "because he would take /being taken to court/ as a personal insult rather than anything else. It wouldn't be the money he'd have to pay or anything like that, it would be more an insult to him". But she said, "I'm hoping to take him to court eventually when I've got something on him". She intended to take him to court when she had enough

evidence to prove that he was the father. To gather this evidence, she said, "I want to get him down here and get a tape of some of the things he says which could be incriminating in court. But otherwise I have got nothing on him at all really". She wanted to tape "conversations, just general conversations". She said, "I'm hoping that I might be able to catch something that would be useful /such as/ admission of parenthood or something". Ann did not think the father suspected her of trying to get evidence: "If he did, he'd be too on his guard", she said. But if he did suspect, she added, "I don't think he'd expect what I'm planning to do".

By our second interview, Ann had "just got the tape-recorder", and was hoping "to make some useful tapes next time he" visited her. However, he had learnt that she was thinking of taking him to court. A few weeks before "he just sort of said 'what's this I hear about you taking me to court?'" That is, "somebody told him", but, she said, "he wouldn't tell me who. I know somebody told him, but I don't know how they found out, or who it was". He did not tell her who had informed him, but he did say "'if you take me to court, you won't get anything out of me'". Ann believed this would be the case until she had "something more definite" to support her claim that he was the father. But, perhaps, the task of getting evidence had become more difficult.

I asked Ann if there was anyone who could testify on her behalf in court, and she replied "yes, but most of the people we knew at the time were his friends, who obviously aren't going to do him down". When I suggested that this might not apply to members of her family, she said, "Oh, well, family don't count I don't think, in a court of law. I don't think it stands up".

The father was thus able to say to Ann, "'when I've got some money, I'll send you some'". However, he had "said he would pay the rent on a place next year". Ann said "his suggestion was that he get /my son/ and I a flat

in London, as of January, which I don't really want. I would rather he paid the rent at this place. I don't know why he particularly wants us to be in London". If Ann and her son were living in London they would be within easy visiting distance of the father instead of being about seventy miles away. But she did not particularly want to live so near to the father. She was reluctant to go back to live with her mother because that too meant she would be living near the father. Referring to the suggestion she had made to the father that he should pay the rent for her present accommodation, Ann said "he said he would think about it, but I think he would rather us be in London".

2. Elaine

When Elaine conceived she had known the father, who was living about ten miles away in Northtown, for several years. She did not try to pass with him and she said about his response to the news that her pregnancy had been confirmed, "I don't think he really believed it, but anyway he said 'let's get married', and things like that". However, Elaine had said "'I don't want to get married' /.../ He asked me to marry him, but I just didn't want to get married. I just thought it would be better for me and /my son/ - sometimes it works out and it wouldn't have worked out with us, because he's the work-shy type". She added, "I thought /my son/ would have a better life with me and my mother, because he's got a normal home, whereas if I married him we'd probably be living out of suitcases and it'd be an awful existence".

Furthermore, Elaine's mother "didn't like him at all. And /Elaine/ thought 'who do I choose between, my mother or him?'" Elaine said, "I knew if I married him she probably wouldn't want anything to do with me any more". Also, although her relationship with the father "was alright before /she/ had the baby", her own feelings for him changed afterwards. She said "I went out with him for five years and as soon as I had the baby I just suddenly went off him". As a result, she said, "I was really nasty to him when

I was pregnant - I really hated him. He used to come outside - to meet me - in his car every night at work and I used to say 'go on' and get on a bus and go home". However, she added, "then I went out with him again for a while when I was pregnant. And it was my birthday - it was April and /my son/ was due about May - and he was due to come over and see me that day. It was a Saturday and he rang up and he said, 'Oh! I can't come to see you, the football game's on'. And you know... I... that's it, I didn't want to know him after that, I thought it was so selfish".

She had no more contact with the father until her son was several weeks old, although the father tried to get in touch with her at about the time when she gave birth. That is, Elaine said, "I didn't contact him after that at all until I'd had the baby and then I was in the hospital... I had /my son/ in the morning - about 2 o'clock - I hadn't told /the father/ I was going into the hospital. And Thursday night the nurse came and said 'there's the phone for you'. And I said 'I don't want to speak to him, don't tell him'. I was really scared, because I hadn't told him I'd gone into hospital or anything, you know. And apparently while I was in hospital he came round and mummy said he was always hanging around". Although Elaine avoided contact with the father at this stage, she got in touch a few weeks later. She said, "I had nothing else to do with him for about six weeks and I wrote him a letter and I said 'well, if you want to see him I'll meet you at so and so'. And he turned up and I went out with him for about... It's sort of been on and off since I had /my son/ really - I went out with him for about six months, I guess, afterwards. And then we broke up. And then last summer, went back together again for about six weeks and we broke up again. So I guess this is about the final time - and I haven't seen him since October. So I guess this is more or less it now". She had had no contact with the father for about ten months and there was a possibility that she would have none again. She explained, "I think we just realized that we were going nowhere - you either have to

get to a stage when you have to get married or... ". She said, "I just told him I didn't want to get married and that was that".

In any case, she added, "he wanted to know me /but/ he didn't want to know /my son/. He was embarrassed by it all - he wouldn't walk down the road with him, or anything". When Elaine and her son saw the father in Northtown "he used to say 'we can't walk down this street', where everyone would see /them/". She said "before /the pregnancy/ we used to go in a coffee-bar and talk to his friends and that. And suddenly now... pushed away... 'hide! hide!'..." The father did not want others to know about his illegitimate child. Elaine said "I was so mad because he never even told his parents. While I was more or less being outcast by my family, they didn't know anything. That's why I felt mad actually, because I was the one who was having the baby". Nevertheless, she added "they do know now. /His mother/ found the letter". His mother then let him know that she had discovered. Elaine explained "apparently he had a row with his mum one day. And he said 'Oh! I didn't want to be born'. And she said 'well, neither did your son', or something. And that's how he found out that she knew". Elaine said "I know all his family and that. I used to get on ever so well with his mum, and I used to go round there for tea". But she had had no contact with them since she gave birth. She said about his mother "we get on quite well, I'm surprized she didn't write to me or anything, really - because we used to get on really well together". The father offered to marry Elaine, but he "was hostile towards /her son/". On one occasion, for example, she said, "I asked /the father/ for a couple of bob and he sort of begrudged it. I wanted to get some milk for /my son/ and /he said/ 'I want that for my cigarettes'. That sort of attitude". This was only one of several incidents which indicated that the father was "generally hostile towards" her son.

The father had never helped Elaine financially, although the S.B.C. had put pressure on her to get the father to give her some regular assistance

and to take him to court if he did not pay her voluntarily. She resisted this pressure for a while, then decided to take the father to court, and finally changed her mind again, "a couple of days before" she was due to go to court. She explained "I went to a concert or something and /the father/ was there. He didn't say anything - he knew, but he didn't say anything. And I felt so bad about it that I knew that I couldn't go through with it". Elaine preferred not to receive an allowance from the father. She explained: "I feel more cut off this way. I feel more independent".

Summing up her feelings about the father, Elaine said "I have no sort of resentment against him at all. It's funny, you'd think you would, but I don't at all. But you say sort of 'oh well, it's your tough luck' sort of thing". She added, "I'm/still/ fond of him /even though/ I could never marry him now".

3. Gillian

When Gillian conceived, she had known the father for about two years and they were planning to get married. She said "on my twenty first birthday, we were getting engaged. And financially he was drinking his money away, so we never. And from then on everything started going wrong for us. But he never..... He had this attitude, he didn't think he was good enough for me". She explained, "I think when we used to go out together, and people used to say about me I was different. And I think I was different from the type of girls he had been going out with. You see, he's Irish and most of the girls they go with are, how can I put it....?" In comparison, the father thought "what a nice girl I was", and he said "what a nice personality I had". She added "I didn't come from the town, I was from the country. And I was different - more like /the/ girls back from where they come from".

Gillian said "it wasn't very long that I'd been going out with him that he wanted ^{me} to marry him and I wouldn't. I mean, I wasn't sure of my feelings -

I hadn't been going out with him for that long and I definitely wasn't sure". Nevertheless, eventually she agreed to get engaged to him. However, she did not do this because "before that he'd started drinking, drinking ever such a lot. And then /Gillian/ said 'well, it's either drink or me'". Shortly afterwards he was the first person she told about her pregnancy after she had been to the doctor to have it confirmed. She said "I went to the doctor's and the same day I came home, then he knew I was pregnant". When I asked her how he responded to the news, she replied "his first reaction was 'why was I away from work?', more than anything". She explained "I don't think he believed it - well, I'm positive he didn't". Later on, however, the father suggested abortion. That is, he said "'get rid of it'". By this time the father had changed his mind about wanting to marry Gillian and he had found a new girlfriend. She said "he didn't want to talk about /the pregnancy/. And I said 'well, something's got to be settled'. Actually, at that time he was going with somebody else and I said 'well, it's partly your responsibility as well as mine'. And I said 'I'm not giving up the baby no matter what, so when actually are you going to help me?'" He responded to this by promising to "come up and see me and talk about it". However, he didn't do this. Consequently, she said, "I rang him up. I said 'it's not a thing you can forget about in a hurry or to sort it out on the telephone'. And in the end... 'fine, that's alright. If you're going to keep it, I'll support it'". But, she said, "he hasn't done a thing".

Gillian explained, at least in part, why she decided to keep her child, when she said "I think all along I thought to myself, 'he'll come back to me, he's bound not to leave me'. Then even when I had /my daughter/ I thought 'surely he's got to support me'. Then it was completely different". He did not do as she had hoped. As we have noted, Gillian left home during her pregnancy and went to live in Westown with her sister who was angry with the father for the way he had treated her. Since then, Gillian

said, "my sister's seen him and spoken /to him/ but she's sort of got the attitude 'what have you done to /Gillian/?' sort of thing. She sort of dislikes him a little bit. They always got on well /before/".

Despite Gillian's relationship with the father, she got on "ever so well" with the father's sister and brother¹. Gillian said "I am in touch with his sister-in-law actually. I see her quite a lot, and his brother".

Referring to his brother's wife, Gillian said "nearly every Friday I see her. Or I go up there for dinner, or at the weekends".

A few months after giving birth Gillian had her daughter christened without letting the father know. She explained "I knew he would come but I didn't want him to. /It/ would have been a bit funny. My brother and my dad - he's a very quiet person, he'd probably... I think everybody would've gone out for a drink together and he'd have said something then. That's my dad's way of going round things". She had another reason for not inviting the father: she said, "/my/ attitude was that I didn't want him to /come/ because he hadn't got in touch /to find/ out anything about us before then. So I didn't want him to then". Gillian's feelings about the father had gradually changed. She said "/now/ there's a little bit of hatred there, I think". Also, "I'm going to take him to court next month". She had eventually decided to take him to court after learning about the things he had been buying for "the girl that he /was living/ with". She said "his sister-in-law said 'Oh, he bought so and so a new pair of hot-pants'. So, of course, it got /me/ mad. So I said 'if he can buy hot-pants, he can buy his own daughter something'. So I am going to make sure he does. That is what started it off, anger more than anything. And when I left /his sister-in-law/ I went to the solicitor's. I was fuming and he said 'oh dear, you had best calm down. You had better sit down'. I was really mad".

The father and his girlfriend were living "just down the road" from Gillian and when I asked if she ever came across him, she replied "I have done. I

did when I first lived here, but not... I go out of my way to avoid it. Not so much now, but before. Because it used to upset me so much". I asked her when she last saw him and she replied "about a month ago. I went out shopping with the boy I am going out with. And I saw /a friend/ in a cafe, so I went in for a coffee. And I didn't even know he was in there. And then he came past and he said 'hello /Gillian/', and asked how /my daughter/ was and that's all. I didn't answer him".

4. Hilary

Hilary had known the father of her child for over three years when she became an unmarried mother. He was over thirty years old and married, but he had left his wife and had begun living with Hilary at about the time she conceived. Hilary said "it was a coincidence really. He was talking about leaving his wife, would I go and live with him, and as we moved into this flat, I fell for the baby. It all fell in place together". A few weeks later she was told by her doctor that she was pregnant. Then, she said, "I just went home and told /the father/". His response to the news was to say "'Get rid of it. Get rid of it'". But, Hilary said, "I refused". The father's immediate response, in other words, was to encourage Hilary to have an abortion. This, Hilary explained, "was because 'what would /my/ wife say?' No, I was quite firm in my mind - I wasn't going to have an abortion just because he wanted me to". Consequently, Hilary said, "he got moody, and he wouldn't talk. And then in the end he said 'well, if you want to keep it, we'll keep it'. And then when she was born he worshipped her".

I asked Hilary if there had ever been a suggestion from the father that he should get a divorce and that they should marry, and she replied "there was, and there still is. I think the divorce proceedings are starting to go through at the moment". Hilary said "at first I said 'alright' - I would marry him, if he got a divorce. But later on, when things started going wrong for us, I said 'no' - I wouldn't. You don't really know a

person until you've lived with them. And if you're not married and you're just living with a person, it's like a trial, isn't it? You can see whether things would work out or not". Whilst she changed he mind about wanting to marry the father, he had not changed his mind about wanting to marry her. She said "I wouldn't marry him now. Not so long ago he wrote and mentioned about a divorce and would I still marry him. And I wrote back and said 'no, I wouldn't want you if you were the last man on earth'".

Hilary and the father lived together until a few months after she gave birth, when he left her. Hilary said "we were living together until my daughter was about five months old and then he walked out". This was because of "/the/ pressure of /his/ work and one thing and another. He's had a mental breakdown and it was all on the verge of this. And what with his moods and one thing and another. I don't suppose I admitted he was going down with this - I thought it was just being nasty. I said to him one day 'if you don't alter your ways, we'll consider /leaving/. I've had enough. I'll leave and take the baby'. And there was a lot of pleading going on, and I couldn't stand it any more. And then he did go". The father left and "was admitted to hospital".

A few weeks later, Hilary moved also and eventually went to live in the hostel in Westown. Shortly afterwards, Hilary "took /the father/ to court for a maintenance order". She explained "he was giving me voluntary payments and he never once missed giving me it. But then I thought 'it's all very well, these voluntary payments. If they stop and you haven't taken any legal action within the first year of their birth, you haven't got a leg to stand on'. I thought 'I've got to do something constructive. You can't just go on voluntary'". The father had tried to persuade her not to take him to court. Hilary said "he came down once - it was a week before the case - and he asked me if I wouldn't take him to court. And I tried to reason with him. I said it wasn't to get more money out of him. I was

quite content with the thirty shillings a week. It was just the fact of it becoming legalized". In court, Hilary reported, "he played the big, happy father. 'Yes I am the father'. He didn't try to conceal it or try to deny anything".

The father had made just the one visit to Westown. Since then, however, Hilary had seen him on several occasions. She had visited him in London after it had been "agreed between solicitors" that he could see her daughter "every two months". That is, she said, "I take /my daughter/ down and while the weather's been nice I've been going perhaps once a month. I go and see him because I don't want him to come here". She explained "you can't have men in your room - you've got to take them into the common room. And with that lot, I wouldn't invite anybody here". Referring to when she saw the father, she said "he tries to be friendly, as if we were starting from square one. But I won't have it. I put on a hard face. We go back to his place and perhaps have lunch and take /my daughter/ out somewhere. But I'm very cold towards him". She explained "I think it's because of everything that happened, the position I'm in now because of him. I'm trying to make him think that I don't care twopence about him, or I've got no feeling for him at all. I think to myself 'if I didn't get mixed up with him in the first place, I wouldn't be in the position I'm in now'. I mean, I don't regret keeping /my daughter/, I love her. But I can't help that bit of resentment at the back of my mind, that if I didn't go out with him in the first place, this would never have happened".

5. Iris

When Iris conceived, she had known the father for a few months. He was married, but "he wasn't living with his wife, he was completely separated from his wife". Iris said "I was going out with him for a few months and I got pregnant. And... I was quite fond of him". However, she added, "when I found I was pregnant, I had already... well, I had finished with him. I didn't want to go out with him any more. But when I found I was

pregnant, I really, you know, couldn't face him any more. Well, I suppose it affects some people like that but I just couldn't bear the thought". She decided to try to pass with the father and therefore had "never told him" about it. As we have noted, Iris had lived with her sister until the fifth month of her pregnancy, when she left, having told neither the father nor any member of her family. She had wanted to pass with them and she saw the move she eventually made to the hostel in Westown as advantageous in this respect. She had wanted to avoid contact with the father (and her family), and she had managed to do so. As far as she knew the father had not learnt.

She said, "the thought of /the father/ just sickened me. And I thought 'well, he might want me to marry him and he might want a claim on his child'. And I thought not. I couldn't bear having him around me all the time, even if it was only to see the child. And then I'm fully independent". Despite her feelings about the father, the S.B.C. tried to persuade her to get in touch with him, or to let them know who and where he was so that they could get him to pay her an allowance. She let them know where they might find him and was "terrified" that they would do so. She was relieved to find, however, that he had not been contacted and therefore had not learnt.

6. Marie

Marie had known the father of her child for about two years when she became an unmarried mother. She said about him and the relationship she had had with him before she conceived "he's not a very conventional girlfriend-boy-friend type person. He's got the sort of job where he's always travelling about. Let's say I was a good friend - well, I thought I was. We were friends more than anything else and whenever he was home we used to go out and I used to see him quite a lot". Marie, as we have already noted, had conceived the first time she had had intercourse with the father and this had helped to make it difficult for her to believe that she had conceived. The father responded in a similar way to the suggestion that she was pregnant.

When he was told, Marie said, "he wouldn't believe me". She had "trouble to get through to him the fact that /she/ was pregnant", or, at least, that he was the father of her child. In other words, "he didn't think it was his baby". He thought, Marie said, that "it was something that was my business and that it wasn't anything to do with him". That is, she said, he thought "it was my problem. I'd got to get rid of it. It was only once that he offered to help, and that was when he phoned me up at the hospital and said 'OK, when you get out of there we'll have a good job done".

Marie went into hospital with a 'suspected miscarriage' as a result of being examined by a gynaecologist she had gone to see about an abortion and whilst in hospital, the father had offered to pay for an abortion. However, Marie said, "that was just talk. It wasn't anything forthcoming". On this occasion, Marie reported, "he showed the first and last piece of compassion because I haven't heard /from/ or seen him since". They had, in fact, seen each other since. Marie said "once he went past me in his new sports car, and waved 'ha! ha!' And I had a stomach out here somewhere". Apart from this, however, the only contact she had had with the father since her stay in hospital had been by way of letters she had written him. Marie said "I write to him, sending him photographs of how /my daughter's/ progressing. I've written about half a dozen letters since".

Marie's experience during her visit to the gynaecologist and afterwards in hospital, persuaded her against abortion. She explained "I suppose I thought everything was working out rather nicely", because "I'd been in touch with my boyfriend and he was quite... not exactly pleased, but I felt he was going to stand by me". Furthermore, although she continued to consider the possibility of adoption, she said, "I think I knew in my heart I'd never have it adopted". That is, despite the way she was treated by the father throughout the rest of her pregnancy, she "thought he'd change when the baby was born". Marie said "all through the time I was

pregnant, I thought 'oh, it doesn't really matter, he's frightened', and all the rest of it, and 'things will be alright afterwards'. And now I suppose I just think that he didn't want to get... Perhaps he thought that having a baby meant getting married. He's got the sort of job where wives don't figure in the picture". Soon after the father learnt, Marie reported, "my mother went to see his mother and the parents got involved with it. And I do think it rather put the lid down absolutely closed, that now parents were involved 'to hell with it'". She added "both sets of parents wanted us to meet, just to meet and talk things over, which was the logical thing to do. /But/ there wasn't any duress for marriage, there wasn't any duress for money. It was just that we'd got to sort things out between us, and it never came off". There was no pressure put on the father to get married but "he /had told/ his mother that it wasn't his child at the beginning and obviously he could never change his mind. It would take a very big man to say 'oh, I was lying, it is my child'". That is, "when it got to the parents, and obviously his parents asking him outright, he said 'no', it was nothing to do with him. This was his reaction to his parents, so therefore he's got to be consistent to his parents because they're obviously the important part of his life".

When Marie, under pressure from the S.B.C., decided to take the father to court to get him to pay her an allowance, she had expected him to deny paternity. Moreover, she said "my solicitor told me I hadn't got a chance in hell of winning the case which put me off. It was just my word against somebody else's and he didn't think I'd got any chance - that he was fighting it so absolutely. He wanted blood tests taken. And /the solicitor/ said 'I don't think you'll win but we'll go ahead with it'. And by this time I was on tranquilizers again, waiting for the court case". However, she said, "he admitted it in court. Well, he got his solicitor to admit it in court". Consequently, as well as not having seen each other otherwise, and despite expectations, "we didn't even meet in court because he didn't

come". At first, Marie resented the pressure from the S.B.C. to take the father to court. She explained "I had this lovely romantic idea that if I kept quiet and didn't ask or beg for anything that he'd come back. If I made life difficult for him then he'd say 'to hell with her'. But I haven't made life difficult and he's still said 'to hell with her'". Marie began to "feel very bitter". She said "when he's on a four thousand pound a year touch, why shouldn't I get something or why shouldn't /my daughter/ get something". Then, she explained, "I started hearing stories of where he'd been for his holiday, and he'd got a brand new TR 6 and everything. And I thought perhaps I would take him to court". The court ordered the father to give her "only four pounds a week", which she "signed over to /the S.B.C./ because he's a bit of a bad payer". Therefore, she said, "I don't get a penny of it". Apart from this allowance, she had not received any money from the father. However, she said, "I don't think I shall ever be bloody-minded about it, quite honestly". She thought she would never ask him for more money. For one thing, she said, "I think I'd be almost scared to meet him now actually".

Marie summed up the state of her relationship with the father by saying "I don't exist except on a banker's order. No, I don't exist at all". She added "what I don't understand is how he can totally ignore me. I don't... I say I don't mind, that's not true. But I would like him to take some interest in /my daughter/". She said "I suppose I'm just hurt all the time that he should have behaved like this. I think 'why?' I wonder how he can be so completely hard - there must be a soft spot somewhere, it's just a matter of finding it". She was surprised by the way he had treated her. She said "I didn't expect this reaction. No, I'd have expected a lot of responsibility". However, it is possible, she thought, "that he just didn't want to get involved with me and so therefore he's cutting /my daughter/ out altogether".

Despite the way the father had treated her, she said "I shall never forget,

obviously. /And/ I'd like him to get in contact with /my daughter/. That is, she said, "I'm not really quite over /the/ father yet. And I /have/ this little hope in the back of my mind that he would come charging along one day and say 'I'll accept...' Not that we'd get married. Not that. I want him to accept /my daughter/ and perhaps have a sort of relationship with him". This hope would come to mind, she said, "especially when it comes to... round to /my daughter's/ birthday and Christmas". In accordance with the suggestions and research of both Vincent and Brome, which were referred to earlier, the fathers of my informants' children appear not to have been 'sexual exploiters'. In the main, my informants had known the fathers for quite some time and had close relationships with them when they conceived¹. Thus, Hilary had known the father for several years and had begun living with him at about the time she became pregnant; both Ann and Gillian had known the fathers for several years and had arranged to marry them, although Gillian's relationship with the father of her child appears to have begun to change at about the time she conceived, as the father became less involved with her and became involved with another girl; Elaine had also known the father for several years and had had a close relationship with him for several years; Marie had known the father for a number of years and was emotionally involved with him, though perhaps he was less involved in return; Iris was exceptional in that she had known the father for only a few months and she did not have a very close relationship with him.

The reports of my informants suggest that young females on learning that they are unmarried mothers decide to adopt approaches to information management with the fathers of their children which vary according to the 'social distance' of the relationships they have with them. Thus, Hilary, Ann and Gillian all told the fathers as soon as they had learnt, or had become suspicious and, moreover, before telling anyone else; Elaine also told the father very early on; Marie was slower and more reluctant to tell

the father; and Iris not only decided to try to pass at the beginning, but also was still trying to do so at the time of interviewing.

The responses of the fathers, if and when they learnt, also appear to vary according to the 'social distance' of the relationships they have (or at least according to their involvement in the relationships they have) with the mothers. Thus, the fathers of Hilary's, Ann's and Elaine's children all suggested marriage, although those of Hilary's and Ann's children had also suggested abortion, and the father of Elaine's child had first of all found it difficult to believe. The father of Marie's child had also found it difficult to believe at first, but later suggested abortion. He did not, however, suggest marriage. In a similar way, the father of Gillian's child had first of all found it difficult to believe and had then suggested abortion without suggesting marriage, despite an earlier proposal. It is perhaps an exaggeration to interpret his response as rejection however, if only because his involvement with Gillian had already waned and he had another girlfriend. Perhaps the response of the father of Marie's child was closest to rejection, but even in this case it may be an exaggeration to conclude that rejection did take place, in view of the father's lack of involvement with Marie.

The fathers' initial responses appear to correspond somewhat with the way they subsequently treat the mothers. Thus, the father of Hilary's child continued to be deeply involved and to suggest marriage, and had voluntarily provided her with financial assistance. This is despite the fact that Hilary's feelings had waned and that she had taken him to court to formalize his assistance. The father of Ann's child, on the other hand, had become less involved and no longer suggested marriage, and although he had shown a great deal of interest in her child, he had hardly helped her financially. He had agreed to help under pressure from the S.B.C., but had failed to fulfil his promise and Ann was considering taking him to court. In a similar way, the father of Gillian's child had agreed to help her financi-

ally but had not done as he had promised, with the result that she was considering taking him to court. Elaine had received some help from the father of her child, though not enough to satisfy the S.B.C. from whom she had resisted pressure to take the father to court. The father of Marie's child, whilst he had offered to pay for an abortion, had not volunteered any financial assistance. So she eventually took him to court where he was ordered to offset some of the assistance she had been receiving from the S.B.C.

Marie had eventually, but reluctantly, succumbed to pressure from the S.B.C. to go to court. She had feared that the father would successfully deny paternity and she had not welcomed the prospect of what she suspected would be an unpleasant court appearance. Fortunately the father admitted paternity at the last minute, though Marie still went through what she felt to be the ordeal of attending court. It may be said, following Goffman, that Marie had been reluctant to pursue her claim for assistance through the courts as a result of 'blackmail' by the father. Goffman has noted that there are several forms of blackmail which are used against stigmatized individuals, perhaps the most important of which is that of the 'self-saving' kind where

the blackmailer, by intent or in effect, avoids paying an earned penalty because enforcing payment would result in the creditor's discrediting¹.

In this context we may recall Vincent's suggestion that in order to prove paternity, unmarried mothers must disclose their identity, something which they may be reluctant to do and which consequently may allow the fathers of their children to remain anonymous, ostensibly innocent and therefore free to withhold assistance from them². Perhaps more of my informants were blackmailed into not going to court and into accepting little or no financial assistance. Elaine's decision, for example, may have been affected in this way, though she claimed it was based on a wish to remain independent, and so without interference from, the father. These were

the grounds claimed by Iris for not having even told the father about her unmarried motherhood.

The reports of my informants suggest that any change in the relationships and contact which unmarried mothers have with the fathers of their children is unlikely to be because of rejection by the fathers. Thus, Hilary had less contact simply out of choice. Her feelings towards the father had changed and she had moved away from him, and was interested in having only as much contact as was necessary in order to comply with the court's decision to allow the father access to her child. At the time of interviewing, she was living about thirty miles away and apart from exchanging occasional letters, usually only saw him about once every couple of months, when she and her child visited him.

Ann had decided that the father's offer of marriage was probably ingenuine and so, at least partly, on these grounds decided to move away from him. From then on her feelings for him gradually changed and she became interested in having contact with him only in so far as it provided her with company and the opportunity to go out. At the same time, the father's feelings changed also and he wanted contact with Ann only because of his interest in her child. At the time of interviewing, she was living about sixty miles away and, apart from telephone calls, the only contact she had with him was by way of visits they made to each other every few months.

At first, Gillian was keen on marrying the father despite his lack of involvement and his close relationship with another girl. However, eventually she moved away and gradually her feelings changed so that by the time of interviewing, she was no longer interested in contact with him, and she was planning to marry someone else. Although the father was living within a couple of miles she had no contact with him except for when, very occasionally, she came across him by accident.

Elaine had declined the father's offer of marriage because she thought it

would not be successful and because her feelings for him had changed. Since then she and the father had gone through a number of phases in which they had again drawn close and had had a lot of contact, but at the time of interviewing, she was not interested in this any longer. The father was living within only about ten miles, but she had not had any contact with him at all for almost a year.

Marie was another of my informants who had wanted to marry the father, despite not receiving an offer. Moreover, she had continued to be interested in marrying or at least having a close relationship and contact with him. However, he had shown no interest in return and the only contact she had with him was by way of letters she occasionally sent to him.

Whilst Marie may have been having no contact with the father because she had been rejected, the reports of my informants in general suggest that any reduction in contact is more likely to be a consequence of the responses of the mothers themselves to their unmarried motherhood and, perhaps connectedly, of changes in the feelings of the mothers or the fathers or both. Iris is an extreme example in this context in that she had consistently tried to pass with the father by attempting, successfully, to avoid contact with him, although it might be noted that in this case Iris was not trying to pass because she feared rejection. On the contrary, she expected acceptance and feared that the father would try to interfere in the upbringing of her child.

If and when fathers do reject, however, it may simply be in an attempt to avoid what they believe to be the consequences of being rejected themselves because of their association with unmarried motherhood or, that is, because of their unmarried fatherhood. This appears to be applicable to the case where Marie was rejected (if she was rejected) by the father. To begin with, he suggested abortion, but more to the point, he denied paternity to his parents, for example. In a similar way, the father of Elaine's child, whilst not rejecting her, had suggested abortion and had then been interested

in keeping his unmarried fatherhood a secret. Likewise, the father of Ann's child had suggested abortion and had then denied paternity. The father of Hilary's child had also suggested abortion and had been interested in passing, at least with his wife.

In those cases where, for whatever reason, unmarried mothers have little or no contact with the fathers, they may, as a result, have limited and unsatisfying social lives. This may have applied to Ann. At the same time, however, the mother may participate in social activities with other men. They may, in other words, have 'boyfriends' who are perhaps important to their social lives¹. According to the available evidence, it is usual for unmarried females² in the age range of my informants to have boyfriends with whom they are 'going steady' or, at least, with whom they have frequent 'dates'. As long ago as 1949, A. B. Hollingshead noted about the United States that even "among sixteen year olds, dating is the accepted practice, and any boy or girl who does not date is left out of mixed social affairs"³, which by this stage represent the principal means by which social activities are pursued. Despite its age, this statement would appear to be applicable to both modern America⁴ and to modern Britain⁵. By their mid, and even early, teens the majority of people⁶ will have had boyfriends or girlfriends with whom they will have gone out on dates and who would have been important to the quality of their social lives. The next part of this chapter is concerned with an investigation of the relationships which my informants had with any boyfriends, if and when they had them. Attention is paid to such matters as their approaches to information management with boyfriends; if, when and how boyfriends had learnt of their unmarried motherhood; how boyfriends had responded if and when they had learnt; and how boyfriends had treated my informants since they had learnt⁷.

1. Ann

When I asked Ann if she had a boyfriend, she replied "well, all my friends

are male, but none of them are what you call 'boyfriends'. I don't think any see me as 'female' at all". She added, "whenever I've sort of had spurts of having boyfriends I have always sort of gone outside my particular circle of friends, because I think deeper relationships spoil friendships, basically". Ann had not had what she regarded as a boyfriend since going to live in Midtown. She said "I haven't had any since I've been here. I joined Computer Dating Service, because I thought it was about time I went out. But I didn't join it with the idea of finding a prospective mate for life, or anything. I just joined it because of the problem of getting out around here". As a result, she said, "I had quite a few people coming round /and/ I went out with all of them - either for drinks or a meal or something". However, there was only one with whom she had more than one date. She said "I think I saw one of them a few times. /I/ think he was quite keen, but I wasn't really keen. As I say, I wasn't looking for a serious relationship with any of them".

With each of the men she met through the Computer Dating Service "it eventually outed" that she was an unmarried mother. When I asked her how they had responded, she replied "they think 'aye aye, she's after a husband', or 'this is a pushover'". She experienced similar responses from many other men who learnt. She said, "they are interested in getting to know you in the normal way. Then they ask 'what do you do?' and I say 'I am occupied as a mother'. Then they change". She was discouraged by their responses from having any further contact with them. Apart from incidents of this kind, Ann said, "there is one chap, that I went out with one or two times. And his parents were absolutely scandalized, you know, that he was going to see an unmarried mother, and in the end he stopped coming because of this".

2. Elaine

Although Elaine had no contact with the father of her child at the time of interviewing, he had been her boyfriend for periods up until about a year before. In addition she had had several other boyfriends since becoming

pregnant, although she did not have one at the time of interviewing. She said "I haven't got any boyfriends - not so much this year". She added "I haven't really been out with anybody for ages now - I never get out much these days. You know, /I/ just meet a chap at a dance and that's it, and I think no more of it - it's just a dance and a few drinks and that's it. Or I have boyfriends and I have them for about six months. Yet before, I used to go 'two weeks with that one and two weeks with this one', and now it's not at all like that". None of the men she had met at dances had become boyfriends. In fact, she said, "boyfriends I've had are either people I knew before or people I've met with /my son/ so I've never had to say 'well, I'm an unmarried mother and I've got a boy...'", As we have already noted, she tried to pass with the men she met at, for example, dances.

Elaine had not experienced being thought of by men as a "'girl of easy virtue' and things like this". Also, she added, "I've never found anybody who thinks I'm trapping them" into marriage. She added "maybe that's because I don't want to get married". On the other hand, she said, "I had one /boyfriend/ who wanted to get married and everything. And it was just because of the baby, it wasn't me at all. I'd known him a long time and didn't have to tell him anything, because I knew him. And I got mad in the end, because he used to drive me absolutely spare. He used to say /to my son/ 'come to daddy'. And we went round to his mother, and his mother was going 'come to grandma'. I couldn't believe it. It was just the baby really. He's married now. We just sort of broke it off. It put me off. I didn't want anything like that. It was just too good to be true for an attitude".

Elaine mentioned one boyfriend who, in contrast, "wasn't looking to get married or anything". She said "I went out with this chap a couple of months ago. I first met him when I was about a month pregnant, actually. And I quite liked him then. And I met him /again/ when I'd just had the

baby - he was about four weeks old. /And/ he still quite liked me. I was surprised - I thought he might say 'Oh go away'. And I thought 'Oh my God! he still actually quite likes me'. Then I sort of went out with him for a couple of months. And then we broke up. And then we went back together again for a couple of months. We used to go for meals and that. I quite enjoyed that. I think he knew that I didn't want to settle down or anything". Elaine had had no boyfriends since, but not because of the responses of the men she had met. She explained "being an unmarried mother you tend to stay at home. You don't get to meet boyfriends. You know you just don't have a chance pushing a pram round all day. You don't expect to meet Rock Hudson in the street, you know, and say 'Oh, you're the lady I've been looking for all my life'".

3. Gillian

Gillian had a steady boyfriend at the time of interviewing, whom she had known before she became an unmarried mother. "He was a friend of the family, actually. I never liked him... ". She did not begin to like him until towards the end of her pregnancy. When I asked her how he had responded to the news of her pregnancy, she replied "'I'd never thought you'd manage', was the attitude at first, while I was carrying. Because the first time I actually saw him /after conceiving/ was when he was going with my brother to visit my dad when my dad was in hospital. And they came to pick me up at my sister's. And I hadn't been well that day. And we got a little way in the car and I was sick and that. And we had to come home. And he seemed ever so concerned about me, and it started from there". He became her boyfriend a few months after she gave birth. She said "I've been going with him for six months now". Moreover, he had asked her to marry him. She said "I think I will /marry him/. Well, I know I will, some time next June".

Gillian saw her boyfriend several times a week. She said "I usually go out Mondays, Fridays, you know, Saturdays - something like that. It depends,

whatever day /Hilary/ doesn't want to go out, then she looks after /my daughter/ for me. So really I'm quite lucky". When she went out, it was usually with her boyfriend and she had arranged to go out with him after our interview: they were going for "a drink and a talk".

Although Gillian claimed to have had no other boyfriends, she had met other men at dances, for example, from whom she had experienced responses. Gillian described how "sometimes they think 'Oh, I'm going to be alright here'". That is, they expected her to be "loose". However, Gillian said, "I tell them where to get off". When I asked her if anyone had assumed her to be looking for a husband, she replied, "no. /But/ it depends on the girl, really. I mean, the last thing I ever wanted to do was to get with a bloke and that's it, get married and what have you".

4. Hilary

At the time of interviewing, Hilary did not have a boyfriend. However, she had been living with the father of her child until her daughter was about five months old, and she had had other boyfriends since. There are, she said, "only two people I could say were boyfriends". We have already noted how Hilary had tried, successfully, to pass with both of these boyfriends. Whilst she had told them about her daughter, she had not told them she was unmarried. That is, Hilary had presented herself as a separated mother. It is interesting to note, however, that although Hilary may have wanted to keep her unmarried motherhood a secret, she did not necessarily want others to know she was married. Referring to the 'wedding' ring she wore, she said "sometimes I slip it off - very rarely". For example, she said, "once I went to a dance in the town and I thought to myself, 'I'm going to enjoy myself, so blow everything'. So I put it on /another/ finger".

5. Iris

When I asked Iris if she had a boyfriend, she replied "I've got a few boys, you know, I go out with now and again. I don't want to get tied up with

a particular bloke". She added "there was one, but I sort of drifted away a bit. We just realized that we weren't suited. He was going through divorce proceedings and of course, he didn't want to get involved with anyone, and I didn't, and we just forgot about it. I'm still friends with him, you know. See him sometimes. I don't go out with him, but I see him".

She had last been out with a man about a week before our interview. She said "he works at my place and he just phoned up and asked me to go to the pictures with him, and I did". The people she worked with were "mostly men", and she said about them "they take you out, take you down the coast and that sort of thing - with the kiddies. It's the sort of relationship I've got with the blokes at work". Occasionally, she added, "the boys at work invite me to their houses, you know, with their wives - for lunch and dinner". She said "there was one boy there used to take me out for meals and everything, used to take me out twice a week sometimes. But he has got a girlfriend now, so...". She did not regard him as a boyfriend. She explained "he was only nineteen or something". She had not had what she regarded as a boyfriend amongst her work-mates.

We have already noted that Iris had never tried to pass with the men she met. On learning, she said, they ask "'Oh, have you?' But I have never had a fellow say to me 'Oh, I don't want to go out with you again'". After letting them know, she added, "I've always had a fellow ask me out again". When I asked her if she had ever been assumed to be 'sexually loose' or to be looking for a husband, she replied "no. I don't know, I don't think I have ever come up against that". However, she noted, "some fellows say 'would you like to get married?' And I always say 'no'". I asked her if anyone had offered marriage and she replied "you are joking - who wants me?" However, she said, "one fellow said to me while I was going out with him, 'if I asked you to marry me, what would you say?'. I said 'no'. I don't think I would get married, actually".

6. Marie

When I asked Marie if she had a boyfriend, she replied "no. I don't have that sort of relationship any more". She had several friends who were male, but she did not regard any of them as boyfriends. She had not had a 'boyfriend' since she conceived, apart from the father. This was because, she explained, "I've gone off men. I suppose I haven't met anybody. It's only just taken me... Well, I suppose I'm not really quite over /my daughter's/ father yet". Marie knew no one apart perhaps from the father who she wanted as a boyfriend and she did not feel deprived for not having one. She explained, "I'll tell you why. I met somebody not very long ago who was very keen to start off some big thing and I weighed up in my mind, all cool and calculating, the advantages and the disadvantages of being on my own, and I'm much better off. I'm my own boss. I haven't got to bother about anybody else's feelings. And it suddenly came home to me that I think I was a bit scared of having any deep personal relationship. I don't want anything deep any more because I don't want it to lead to anything". In other words, she said, "I don't want any relationship with people who want some hold or claim - I want to be completely independent".

Although Marie did not have a boyfriend, she had several male friends with whom she went out occasionally. She said "I go out with people for a drink on the odd occasion, which is really all I want". She had been out with one of these friends a few days before our interview. She said about him "we see each other a couple of times, /perhaps only/ once, a week. I don't see him always. He phones me up two or three times a week". She added, "somebody /else/ just phoned me, actually, this afternoon. This particular chap I've known for years and years. I haven't been out with him before though. I don't mind going out with people like that, that I know".

We have already noted that Marie did not try to pass with men she met. For instance, she said "I went down to /a night-club/ soon after /leaving

London/ with a girl who's separated. And a couple of guys came up and asked us to dance. And they asked the normal questions: 'What do you do?' And I said 'I'm a mother', and he just walked off and got his drink. And the other one asked my friend and she said she was separated from her husband, and he did the same. They both did the same in one evening". I asked Marie how she had felt about his response and she replied "it hurt a bit that somebody could be quite so ignorant as that. Because it was bad manners as much as anything else. I suppose it made me inclined not to say anything after that - just for that evening. /But/ it hasn't really altered my policy of telling people straight away, because you have to get it over with".

On another occasion, Marie said, "there was a chap at a party I went to who I told, who was... He didn't say anything, but he just obviously tried to keep away from me afterwards. Perhaps because he was embarrassed". She added "there have been several incidents with a few people like that". However, she added, "they're not being nasty. Just, perhaps, they don't know how to cope with the situation". Moreover, others "I've met and told, they've" not even been embarrassed. "I was just thinking of one of the chaps at evening classes - now he didn't bat an eyelid about it. He just carried on and said what was I going to do, or something like that. It didn't make any difference" to him.

Each of my informants had at the time of interviewing, or had had at some time since conceiving, at least one boyfriend other than the father and had been in the company of men who might be regarded as 'prospective' boyfriends¹. Some of these boyfriends were ones with whom they simply had a single or the occasional date, but others were ones who were 'steady'. Four of my informants - Elaine, Gillian, Hilary and Iris - had or had had steady boyfriends. In fact, Gillian had a steady boyfriend at the time of interviewing who she was engaged to marry. The only ones not to have at least one boyfriend of some kind at the time of interviewing were Elaine and Hilary.

The reports of my informants show that unmarried mothers sometimes try to pass with prospective and even actual boyfriends, but that they are perhaps more likely not to. Some mothers will try to pass in all instances, others will never try to. Thus, Hilary always tried to pass and had successfully done so with the two steady boyfriends she had had. Of my other informants, Elaine was the only one who admitted having passed by intent with boyfriends and even she had not done this very often. Ann, Gillian, Iris and Marie claimed never to have passed in this way with boyfriends.

When unmarried mothers do not pass with boyfriends, they may experience rejection, but it is perhaps more likely that they will not, and that at the most they will be the object of embarrassment. Marie was the only one of my informants who had perhaps been rejected - by a man she met at a dance. Apart from this, the most she had experienced was embarrassment, and the most that any other informants had experienced was being thought of as promiscuous and searching for a husband. Moreover, neither Elaine nor Iris had even experienced responses of this kind.

If and when unmarried mothers do not have boyfriends or do not develop relationships with prospective boyfriends or lose boyfriends, it is unlikely to be because of rejection. It is far more likely to be because of the mothers' lack of interest or at least opportunity and, perhaps relatedly, their own responses to their unmarried motherhood and their subsequent approaches to information management. Thus, Marie appeared to have little interest in boyfriends, perhaps partly because of her continued involvement with the father, whilst Ann and Elaine appeared to have only limited opportunity to meet prospective boyfriends. Neither Marie nor Ann ever tried to pass, but if and when mothers do try to pass with boyfriends, it could create difficulties for their relationships with them. Trying to pass may involve mothers in trying to keep their children secret, as with Elaine, for example; or it may involve them in trying to hide the fact that

they are unmarried, as with Hilary who presented herself as a mother who was married but separated. However, trying to pass in either of these ways may also involve mothers in trying to maintain or introduce various kinds of distance between themselves and boyfriends. Thus, Hilary reported how she had to keep her address secret by, for example, keeping boyfriends away from the hostel in which she was living. Elaine, of course, may also have been presented with a similar problem. Moreover, Elaine and perhaps Hilary may have had limited opportunity to meet prospective boyfriends because of their wish to keep their unmarried motherhood a secret.

The reports of my informants suggest that activities with boyfriends are likely to make an important contribution to the quality of the social lives of young unmarried mothers. Some mothers, such as Gillian, will have boyfriends with whom they participate in activities which form the major part of all their social activities. Those who do not rely on boyfriends in this way, perhaps because they do not have any, may instead rely on other friends, the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

FRIENDS

It was noted in chapter three that usually, whilst females in the age range of my informants are likely to have much contact with their families, they are also likely to participate for the most part with non-kin in activities which constitute their social lives. Then, in the last chapter, it was also noted that these same people will usually have boyfriends with whom they share many of their social activities and even on whom they depend for a 'normal' social life. However, such a social life may require more than boyfriends. That is, young unmarried mothers may need other friends¹ with whom they can participate in normal social activities. When they do not have boyfriends, they may not be able to have a normal social life, but may nevertheless require other friends for the pursuit of any kind of social life.

Of course, the friendships achieved and sustained by individuals will depend on a complex set of factors. Friendship styles tend to vary not only with the age of individuals but also with their social class, for example, as was alluded to in chapter three. Thus, for Goldthorpe and Lockwood, both the 'traditional' and modern affluent sections of the manual working class tend to make friends largely amongst people with whom there is 'given' social contact, or with whom 'structural relationships' already exist, such as - and perhaps especially - kin and neighbours. They tend not to 'make' friends in the same way as - or, that is, to have the social skills of - the middle class, who tend to make more friends amongst people who are not kin, neighbours or even work-mates². This variation in friendship styles is a matter not only of different opportunities or of different skills, but also of "different patterns of preference"³. However, whatever their social class, do the friendship styles and consequently the social lives of unmarried mothers tend to be abnormal because of limited opportu-

nities stemming in some way from their unmarried motherhood? This chapter is concerned with questions of this kind.

In turn, we will examine my informants' relationships with friends, by considering such matters as the nature of their relationships with friends when they conceived; their approaches to information management with friends; if, when and how their friends learnt about their unmarried motherhood; the responses they experienced from their friends, if and when they learnt; the way they were treated by and the way their relationships developed with friends after they became unmarried mothers; and if, how and why they lost and gained friends.

1. Ann

At the time of interviewing, Ann's friends included those she had had when she conceived. She said "all my own friends, I still see". She first met them "when /she/ was at school". That is, she said, "I have several friends /who/ I grew up with who I still know and see. /But/ they live back home". These friends, in other words, were living about seventy miles away from where she was living in Midtown.

Ann left home a few weeks after learning about her pregnancy and went to live in Midtown. At that time she had told only the father about her pregnancy, and she wanted to pass with her family and friends. A few weeks later she told her family, but it was several more weeks before she let her friends know. She said "nobody knew until I came down here. Even my /.../ friends didn't know until a couple of months before he was born, when I actually decided I was going to keep him". That is, although she "was never afraid of their reactions", she had wanted to pass with her friends and consequently tried, with success, to avoid contact with them for several months. When eventually she let them know, she experienced no rejection or hostility of any kind and her contact with them was re-established. Thus, at the time of interviewing, she saw one or more of them every few weeks, usually when they visited her. She said "they are always coming down

at weekends".

Occasionally she would see one or more of them during visits home, but not always. She explained "when I go to stay with my mother, she feels that if I go out that I am abusing her hospitality by doing so, and I have to stay in and all we do is look at cups of coffee all night. There is never anything to talk about". Apart from staying in and not visiting friends, she would not necessarily be visited by them. She said "if I'm at home and they know I'm there, they sometimes pop round. /But/ when I am /at home/ I don't see anything of my friends unless I phone up and say 'come round'. Because if I say 'I'm going to be /at home/ next week', they don't know I am going to be /at home/ next week until I am there. Because I change my mind about things, decide not to go, if something comes up". She had been home a few weeks before our second interview, when she simply "sat in the whole time" and none of her friends visited her.

Ann would occasionally see some of her friends' parents and she said "the parents have been very good to me - a couple of my friends' parents - very good indeed". She added "I think most of my friends' parents tend to think 'well, it has happened, that is all there is to it', and accept me as I am - child or not".

Ann perhaps had closer relationships and more contact with some friends than with others. For example, she said, "one friends, she's married but separated with a young child. I've seen her perhaps seven or eight times since I came here /about a year ago/". At our second interview she mentioned another friend who she had particularly wanted to attend a party she had held a few weeks before. "A lot" of her friends attended, "but the main one /.../ couldn't. It was because his car broke down and he felt he should be working on his car rather than going to a party". He was not a boyfriend. She said "he is my 'big brother' - just sort of cheers me up when I need cheering up". Ann's friends in general did her a similar

service. When I asked her if her friends helped her in any way, she replied "no, not really. I think they are enough help just by keep coming down and what have you /.../. They keep my morale up - boosted". She looked forward to visits from friends, but, she said, "I get a bit fed up with it - it goes for long spells and nobody comes down at all".

Ann had hardly made any friends since conceiving and therefore had few friends in and around Midtown. She said "I don't know anybody in /Midtown/".

That is, she said, "I have no special friends in /Midtown/ apart from the girl who lives here" and a neighbour. Ann explained "you are more apart, because before you could go out and meet people and what have you". She had little opportunity to meet people with whom she might have developed friendships because she hardly went out. She said "there is always a baby-sitter /.../ if I want to go out. It's more my own situation, I suppose. I sometimes feel I wouldn't like to go out because of him, but not actually because I've got him - more my own situation". Ann may have meant that she was reluctant to go out and meet people because of her unmarried motherhood, but this was not as a result of any previous experience of rejection or hostility. Thus, she had met, and got to know, a few other people in Midtown but she had experienced little, if any, hostility from them. These include the girl with whom Ann had lived ever since she went to Midtown. At the time of interviewing, there was hardly anyone else apart from this girl living in Midtown with whom she went out in the evening, although it was "not very often" that she went out even with her. When they did go out, Ann's child would be looked after by one of her neighbours - the only other friend she had made since she had become an unmarried mother. This friend was married and living "next door but one", and Ann would usually "see her every day". For example, Ann would often visit her for "coffee and a chat". However, Ann told me at our first interview that this neighbour and her husband were planning to leave and by the time of our second interview they had gone to live abroad. They left, Ann said, "two weeks

ago, nearly. All very sad".

By our second interview, therefore, Ann had only one friend in Midtown - the girl with whom she was living. But even she had decided to leave. Ann said, "she has decided to take up a job in America". She explained "the lease runs out" on the house within the next few weeks. "We could renew it for another two years but /my friend/ has decided to leave". She added "if I can find somebody to share, then I can renew the lease". That is, she said, "I can have this place again. /But/I have got to find somebody to share with, and all the people I know either live in London or they have jobs which are fairly good jobs, and if they came /to Midtown/ they wouldn't be able to get a job. I'm going to advertise, I think". Ann preferred to stay, but when I asked her where she might go instead, she replied "I've just got no idea at the moment - no idea of any particular place that I'd want to go to. I wouldn't mind eventually getting a place /near home/". Then, she added, "I suppose I would be nearer to my friends and things. I don't know. I think it would be very lonely in London, because I know a few people in London, but not that many - not enough to warrant moving up there. But then I don't know anybody in /Midtown/ either. It's just that it's nicer to be bored in /Midtown/ than it is to be bored in London". Whilst she had, and perhaps would continue to have, few or even no friends in Midtown, she would probably have little contact with friends if she moved near home. That is, she said, "most of them have moved away now. I don't know where I want to go really. /However, if/ one of a number of people sort of said 'we want you to be here', that would more or less decide me that that was where I wanted to be. Because I would know that if I was there, that I would be seeing a lot of at least one or two people". I learnt later that within a month of our second interview Ann left Midtown and went to live within a few miles of her next to oldest sister, about 100 miles the other side of London.

2. Elaine

Unlike before she conceived, Elaine had few friends, and little contact with those friends she had. That is, changes had taken place in her relationships with the friends she had had at the time when she conceived. However, these changes, she said, "/were/ not because of /my son/. No, not really. /My friends were/ all the same really". In other words, although her friends had learnt about her unmarried motherhood, none of them had rejected her or had responded with any kind of hostility. Thus, she said, "for about the first year /after giving birth/ it was alright because I used to know lots of people /even though/ there's hardly anybody I know these days". She added "last year there were about eight of us. Every day I used to see my friends out and since about last summer everybody's gone their own way. And as I get older I suppose it'll get worse". In other words, she said, "this last year, everybody seems to be settling down. Last year I quite enjoyed myself. I had a lot of friends from the Art College. And now they've all got their boyfriends, or living with their boyfriends. So it's a different situation. It's just as people get older, they all sort of go their own way. I think it's easier for a younger unmarried mother - sort of, if you're sixteen or something. I should imagine they have an easier time, because all their friends are still single. But as they sort of get to twenty, you find you're sort of left... All your friends are branching away".

Elaine summed up by saying "you find that when you're older all your friends are getting married or they've got boyfriends. All my friends have coupled off now. I know about one girl I can actually go out with in the evenings". This girl was living about fifteen miles away and Elaine had known her for several years. Elaine said "I met her at college - secretarial college. We've been very chummy. The summer I got pregnant she took up nursing. She has got a different set of friends now, and we found we didn't need each other so much. Now, since she's been nursing, I see her about

once a week. We've been going for a drink or something like that. But she has her nursing friends now". After a period of about two years during which Elaine had hardly any contact with this friend, she "started phoning up and for about five weeks /Elaine/ saw her about once a week". However, Elaine added, "I haven't heard from her for about the last month". She had been out for the evening with this friend about a month before our interview, but "she didn't phone /Elaine afterwards/ because /they/ had something like a row". They quarrelled about whether her friend should drive her home at the end of the evening.

Elaine had had no contact with this girl for about a month and it was possible that she would have no more contact. Unfortunately, this girl, Elaine said, "is the only one I know who's unattached. All the rest have got boyfriends or... I have got a couple of friends who say 'oh, come on out with us for a drink', but you feel... You just sit there and you feel awful". In other words, she said, "/you/ can't go out with /these/ friends because you always feel that you are intruding". Elaine mentioned one friend, and perhaps the only friend, with whom she had a close relationship. But this friend was living about sixty miles away and Elaine had little contact with her apart from exchanging letters, even though she encouraged Elaine to visit her. Elaine said "I've got a friend who lives in London and she's always saying to me 'come on up' - she's got a flat. She's about the only one of my friends who genuinely cares. Other ones, you get in touch with them, you lose contact with. She's about the only one who actually writes and actually asks about how I'm getting on. She's always saying 'come up and see me', and she genuinely means it, where other people say 'Oh, come round and see me', and you know they don't... I feel I could stay with her with /my son/. With anybody else I'd feel like he was in their way". When I asked Elaine why she had not taken up this friend's offer to stay with her, she replied "I just can't make the break. I wish I could actually".

Elaine had not only lost contact with most of the friends she had had at the time when she conceived, but she had also made few, if any, friends since. She explained "being an unmarried mother, you tend to stay at home /because/ you lose all your contacts and friends. /Therefore/ you don't get to meet many people". This was not because of any rejection she had experienced from people whom she had met and might otherwise have become her friends, it was simply because she did not have the opportunity to meet people in the first place. It was in this way that her unmarried motherhood had resulted in her having few, or at least little contact with, friends. The situation would have been different if she had not become an unmarried mother. She explained "I would be working and meeting people. Being at home all the time you get quite lonely. It's awful, it's like being old before your time".

3. Gillian

Gillian, as we have noted, had a boyfriend whom she planned to marry. In addition, she had several other friends, some of whom were close. However, she had lost contact with all but a few of the friends she had had when she conceived. That is, she said, "I had lots of friends at home" but contact with most of them occurs "only if I bump into them. But otherwise I don't have any contact with them at all". This change in her relationship with her friends had occurred, she explained, "because most of them are married". Their marriages had drawn them away from the contact and closer relationships she had had with them. She had not experienced any rejection or hostility from these friends, although she had done so from the husband of one of them. Gillian said, "I'm friendly /with her/ but not so friendly since I had /my daughter/. Because she's married and her husband's got funny ideas, funny attitudes". Despite living within about two miles of this friend at the time of interviewing, the only contact Gillian had with her was by accident, when out shopping, for example. She had last come across her in this way about two weeks before our interview.

Although Gillian had not experienced any rejection or hostility of any kind from friends, she had expected to do so and this had led her to try to pass with them by leaving home and moving away from them. As far as she knew, some of these friends had still not learnt of her unmarried motherhood at the time of interviewing and therefore she had still not experienced any responses from them.

Amongst the friends who had learnt, however, there were some with whom she still had close relationships and a lot of contact. She mentioned, for example, one friend who was married and living within a couple of miles. Referring to this friend's response to her unmarried motherhood, Gillian said "her attitude was 'if you haven't got anywhere to go /Gillian/...'. /She said/ that her mum had a spare room and that I could go there. That was back home again. Her mum and dad were concerned about me as if I was their daughter". Gillian had last seen this friend about two weeks before, when they "bumped into each other in town /and/ went for a coffee and a chat". Also, she said "I can /visit her/ any time I want to". Gillian did occasionally visit her although she neither received visits in return nor went out with her in the evenings. She had one friend who visited her and with whom she occasionally went out in the evenings. This friend was unmarried and was living within a couple of miles. Gillian said "I know another girl who I knew before I had /my daughter/. I see her a lot. Well, nearly every day I see her. Because she comes down here to see me, perhaps in her dinner hour or she rings me up. She will probably ring me up tonight as she hasn't been down". She added "I have been out with her. Some Friday evenings we go out together".

Gillian had "two or three" friends whom she had known, but who had not been friends, before she conceived. These, she said, "are more friends who were friends of my sister /who lives in Westtown/ and are now friendly with me. Like one, I am friends with her - that's the one I didn't know she was an unmarried mother. But I am ever so friendly with her. We go out

together. /We have/ sort of drawn closer to each other, really, because of the children. We have got something in common". As well as developing friendships with a few girls she had known before she conceived, she had developed similar relationships with others she had met since. She said "there's friends that I used to work with when I came to /Westown/. There's a girl that used to work down there, she comes to see me, well, once a week she comes to see me". When I asked Gillian how this friend had responded to her unmarried motherhood, she replied "she didn't believe it. /All the/ people at work didn't believe it. No one did. They said 'Oh, she's not', you know. The people at work, they were ever so good to me - money wise, you know, as well as other ways. I was pretty bad, and I used to go to work and I used to be sick, and I used to have time off a lot - which in many places, if you have time off work that's it. /My boss/ was ever so good". This friend was unmarried and was living with her parents less than a mile away. As well as receiving visits from her, Gillian would occasionally make visits in return. I asked her how this friend's parents had responded to her unmarried motherhood and she replied "the impression I got /was/ 'Oh /Gillian's/ a nice girl'". She added "they came to the christening and everything".

Gillian had developed a close relationship with this friend, but she had drawn even closer to another girl she had met for the first time since moving to Westown. This was Hilary, who, Gillian said, "is the top friend, I suppose, now. Well, I see her more often than I see anybody". She would usually see, and perhaps spend several hours with, Hilary each day. At the same time, however, she hardly ever went out with her. That is, they had hardly been out together since Gillian became the housekeeper in the hostel. Gillian said "we have /been out together/ in the past. The housekeeper /who/ was here I got on pretty well with her, and so did /Hilary/. But now if I want to go out /Hilary/ has to babysit for me and I babysit for /Hilary/". Thus, Gillian had not been out with Hilary for

several weeks because they would usually babysit for one another when they did go out. However, whereas Gillian would usually babysit for Hilary on no more than one occasion each week, Hilary would usually babysit three or four times a week. Gillian would usually go out at least three times a week, more often than not with her boyfriend.

Just as the marriages of some of the friends she had had when she conceived had resulted in her having less contact with them, so the close relationship she had developed with her boyfriend had resulted in her having only limited contact with the friends she had at the time of interviewing. Also, because of this relationship, she may have been unlikely to develop new friendships in the way she had earlier. She had never found it difficult to develop friendships with people because of rejection or hostility. Her unmarried motherhood did perhaps affect her chances of making friends, but only because "you've got the child there all the time /and/ you just can't go off and leave it".

4. Hilary

Hilary had no contact with most of the friends she had had when she conceived. She said "I have lost contact with a lot of people, sort of moving here". She had lost contact with "all /her/ friends in London", some of whom she had known for several years. They were, she said, "mainly school friends and friends that I used to work with, people that I had met through other people...". Moreover, some of them were, she said, "good friends". Contact had been lost, she explained, because "you try to make a fresh start, meet fresh friends, and try to forget the past". Until a few months after giving birth, Hilary had lived in London with the father of the child, who then left her. Then, shortly afterwards, she went to live thirty miles away in the hostel in Westown. On moving, as far as she knew, only a few people had learnt about her unmarried motherhood. She had tried to pass with most people, including many of her friends, because of the responses she expected from them. In the case of

friends she had had when she conceived, trying to pass had meant trying to avoid contact, and so moving to the hostel had been advantageous in this respect. She could maintain contact with the few people who knew and more easily avoid contact with the rest. In addition, she could perhaps make a new circle of friends who would not necessarily know about her unmarried motherhood.

No changes had taken place in her relationships with friends as a result of rejection or hostility of any kind. Thus, she had experienced no rejection or hostility from the friends who had learnt. Referring to these friends, she said "three of them - I used to do voluntary nursing and they did too. /My pregnancy/ didn't make any difference to them". These friends were amongst the few people who visited Hilary in hospital when she gave birth. Apart from them, Hilary had told her closest friend. She was, Hilary said, "quite chuffed really. We went everywhere together and everybody used to say 'you are almost like sisters'. And she tends to look on /my daughter/ as a niece through this". However, contact with this friend had become more difficult when Hilary moved to Westown. Hilary said, "she has been down to see me about two or three times since I have been here. She came down with her boyfriend. But she is working now, she is a student nurse, and we don't see much of one another. But we write, practically every week".

This friend's parents had also learnt about her unmarried motherhood, and when I asked how they had responded, Hilary replied "now her father, it doesn't make any difference to him. But her mother, she has always been a snotty one, and even more so now. Because I went down to see them one day and her mother was very cold and sort of... well, she didn't say much in general". Hilary mentioned one other friend who had learnt. This was, she said, "a friend of /the father/. When /the father/ left, he tried to - not exactly step in - but help me all he could. And then when I moved to /the guest house/, he used to come and visit me quite frequently". However,

this friend had died just before she moved to Westown.

In addition to the few friends she had told before leaving London, Hilary had told one other afterwards. Although she had known her for several years, she had attempted to pass by avoiding contact until shortly before our interview. Hilary said "it was only a few months ago that I had the courage to write to her and tell her that I had got a baby. She tried to get in touch, but not knowing where I was... She lost contact with me, although I knew where I could contact her - which I didn't because of the baby". However, when eventually she told her friend, she did not experience the response she had feared. Instead, her friend "said 'come down for the weekend, let's see the baby'", and as a result Hilary had stayed with her and her family for the weekend prior to our interview. Hilary said "they are all very nice, and said 'what a credit she is to you' and 'how will you manage, going to work?' and that sort of thing".

Whilst Hilary had lost contact with many of the friends she had had, she had made several new friends, all of whom were living in or near Westown. These included friends she had made in the hostel. She said "/a/ girl who used to be here. We were as thick as thieves. She was the house-keeper and she was parted from her husband. And he used to come down to visit her, and she was expecting a baby. And they were reunited". At the time of interviewing, this girl was living with her husband a few miles outside Westown. I asked Hilary if she still saw her and she replied "not very often. We did when she first moved away. One Saturday she'd come down to lunch with me, and the next Saturday /we/ would go with her. /However/ with the pressure of work, the fact that the baby was due, she hasn't got time for anybody, you know. They are at a difficult stage".

Hilary had developed a particularly close relationship with Gillian, who in return regarded Hilary as her closest friend. Hilary said "I suppose the only friend I really value is /Gillian/". At the same time, although

Hilary spent a considerable amount of time with Gillian, she hardly ever went out with her. Hilary said "/it is/ very rarely, really, that /Gillian/ and I go out together, because of the problem of babysitting. /The/ last time /we/ went out was about three or four weeks ago. I asked her if she would like to come with me to dance, after work. And she came with me. But apart from that, it is ages since we went out together". On this occasion, another mother in the hostel looked after their children. Hilary said "/the girl/ in the next room /babysat/. I had babysat for her several times about that time, and I asked her if she would mind babysitting for us two. And she did. And, well, I babysit practically every night for /Gillian/, so...". As we have noted, Gillian, unlike Hilary, had a boy-friend with whom she went out several times a week. On these occasions Hilary would usually babysit, as she had arranged to do following our interview.

As well as the friends Hilary had made in the hostel, she had made several friends at work. These included a girl with whom she regularly went dancing on Monday evenings. When I asked Hilary if she had made any friends on these occasions, she replied "well yes, in a way. I suppose seeing the same old faces, you tend to say 'hello'. And when you pass each other you get chatting to them. They're a nice crowd up there". However, she had no additional contact with them, or with the friend with whom she went dancing. This was perhaps simply because Hilary was trying to pass with them: none of them knew about her unmarried motherhood and she did not want them to know. Referring to the girl from work, Hilary said "she knows I've got a baby, but she thinks I'm separated".

Only a few people outside the hostel knew about her unmarried motherhood, including the "manager" and her "boss" and "one /other/ chap from work". She explained "this chap from work said to me 'like a lift home?', and I said 'yes please'. And up to then all he knew was that I lived /on this road/ - what number, he didn't know. And he said 'well, what number do you live at?'. She told him the number and in response "he nearly hit

the roof of the car and he said 'Oh no!'. Hilary said "he was very surprised really - he said 'Oh no, not you?' /Then/ he said 'I don't suppose you get on very well where you are living'. I said 'no'. And he said 'I can understand it'. He thought in a way I was different from the typical unmarried mother, and just a girl who came unstuck"¹. I asked Hilary why she had let this friend know about her unmarried motherhood and she replied "well, I felt I could trust him. Well I can. And he is a good friend. And I thought 'well, as he is giving me a lift home, he may as well know the number'. But I knew the kind of person he was". Hilary did not regard this friend as a boyfriend. She explained "he is a lot older than me. He is just a friend". She had hardly any contact with him outside of work. In fact, she had hardly any contact with any of her work-mates outside of work, even though, apart from the few in the hostel, she had made no friends elsewhere. Thus, when I asked her if she had made any friends since arriving in Westown, she replied "well yes. People that I work with - mainly because being at work all day and here all the rest of the time, you can't really make a lot of friends unless you go out".

Hilary did not have many friends and she did not go out very often with the ones she did have. Consequently, she had little opportunity to make friends other than in the hostel and at work. However, her lack of friends was not in any way a result of the responses of people with whom she might have made friends to her unmarried motherhood. It was rather a result of her own response. She had not experienced any rejection or hostility, but she feared doing so, and consequently tried to pass by keeping her unmarried motherhood a secret and by avoiding contact with people.

Although Hilary said "I don't want to go out", she had made use of a recent opportunity to do so when it had not presented the problem of trying to pass and the possibility of experiencing unwelcome responses. She recalled how a member of the hostel committee "was talking to /Gillian/ during the

day and /Gillian/ told the truth, how I'm always in". Consequently, this person, Hilary said, "has been saying to me for a long time about going out and meeting people and this, that and the other. Then she phoned up and said that she'd met this girl who was interested in doing any kind of voluntary work and meeting people and would I be willing to meet her. So I said 'yes, quite willing'. And she came down and stayed for a couple of hours and we had a talk and that. Then she suggested that /my daughter/ and I go with her out on Saturday for a ride". By the time of our interview, "this girl /had taken Hilary and her daughter/ out a couple of times - to make a break", and Hilary said "tomorrow night /we/ go to her place for a meal and then another evening she'll come to me". She added "she seems quite nice, she seems my type. We always seem to be getting on fine".

5. Iris

Iris had "got loads of friends". However, she had little or no contact with most of the friends she had had when she conceived. That is, she had "quite a few friends before", but at the time of interviewing she had contact with only "some" of these. She had lost contact with at least "two good friends", as well as "the boys that /she/ used to go around with". Iris explained "I haven't really been in touch with /these/ friends. I haven't had time really. /What is more/ they have got their own families now. You know how friends drift apart, that sort of thing. That's what happened really - we have just drifted apart". Perhaps Iris's account, however, is inadequate: a few months after conceiving she had left home and moved away from these friends without having told them about her pregnancy because she had wanted to pass with them. Moving away had made it easier to avoid contact and thereby to keep her unmarried motherhood a secret, although by the time of interviewing, she was no longer interested in trying to do this. She said "if I went up there - if I had time - I'd probably go and see them".

She had perhaps become less interested in trying to pass with the friends

she had had because of the responses she had experienced from other people since leaving home. When she left, she had told only a few people, although none of these had been particularly hostile. The first person she "told /was/ this lady who /she/ used to work with", who in response said "'Oh, you poor girl'. /Then/ she said 'couldn't you have an abortion?' /Iris/ said 'I don't want one, I don't want an abortion'. So she said 'well, you'll have to have something done - you'll have to see somebody and get it settled'". Her friend then persuaded Iris to see a social worker. Iris said "and /she/ came with me, which was very nice of her, because it was snowing and everything". The social worker was helpful in that she "fixed /Iris/ up with this doctor and his wife"¹. Iris said "/they/ thought I should have him adopted, /otherwise/ it wasn't fair on the child - that I couldn't give him all the things that they could give their child. Maybe I can't. Maybe I can't send him to college, send him to boarding school. But it doesn't matter. If the child is clever enough, he'll get a good school, doesn't have to go to a boarding school". Another person to learn, Iris said, was "the manager of where I was working /before leaving home and he also/ kept on and on and on at me /about adoption/. And, well, he upset me really, because he kept on about it, you know - nasty, somehow". Again, she said, "it was for the child's sake. And the more he kept on at me /it/ made me more **determined** that I was going to keep it. When the area manager found out what was going on, you know, that he was putting the pressure on me, well, he went mad. 'It's your baby', he said, 'if you want to keep it, you keep it. Don't listen to anybody'".

Before going to live in the hostel in Westown, Iris also told the closest of her friends, who responded by saying "'how could you be so stupid. You should have had more sense'". On the other hand, she kept it a secret from this friend's parents until after she moved to the hostel, even though she had a very close relationship with them. She said "I thought more of this family than of my own", and she referred to her friend's parents

as "mother and father". Iris said "I didn't tell my 'mother'. I just told my friend, and said 'I can't tell her, she'll be upset'. So /my friend/ said 'Oh, you must tell her, because she wants to know what is happening to you and why you are living in /Westown/, why you haven't come to see them'. So I thought perhaps I'd better. So I sat down and wrote to her one night. And I sent her a photograph of /my son/. And she phoned me up straight away and invited me down there. And I did go down. And, of course, all my friend's aunts and uncles - that are my 'aunts' and 'uncles'. They were very good, actually. Of course, 'mum' cried a bit. 'Dad' said 'well, are you happy?' you know, 'is this what you want?' And I said 'yes', and they said 'if this is what you want then I'm happy'".

Iris had last seen this family about two months before our interview when she visited them. And in addition to occasional visits, Iris and her friend would "phone each other up". At the same time, however, Iris did not have any contact with the other friends she had had when she conceived, or, for that matter, with anyone who did not live in or near Westown.

After moving to Westown, she made many new friends, including several with whom she had particularly close relationships. She explained "I am one of these people that likes everyone, you know". She had made a number of friends amongst the other mothers who were living, or who had lived, in the hostel. Thus, she had a close friend who had lived in the hostel until a few months before our interview. Iris said "she and I were very close. When she was here we used to go out together. But she was still seeing the father of her baby and she has moved now" with the father. However, she said, "I /still/ see quite a lot of her. I go over there and she comes over here. /In fact/ she comes round quite often /and/ we go out for a drink or to a party, or a dance". Iris had last seen this friend "a couple of weeks" before our interview. On this occasion, Iris said, "she came over here and we went to see my new flat¹, and we went into a pub and had a drink. It was a Monday night, and she caught a bus home, and I went to

my folk club".

Iris went to the folk club with another friend, one who was still living in the hostel¹. Iris would go out with her "nearly every Monday night" to the folk club, and had arranged to do so following our interview. At the folk club, she said, "/there is/ a full house, /and/ we just sit around and listen to folk music". She had made "no close friends" there. However, through the friend with whom she went to the folk club, she had made another friend whom she visited occasionally and whose flat she had arranged to take over within a few weeks of our interview.

When Iris went to the folk club, she left her child in the care of another friend in the hostel - that is, with Janet, one of my original sample of unmarried mothers. Occasionally Iris went out with Janet, and then the friend with whom she went to the folk club babysat. However, Iris did not do this very often because "/Janet/ has always got a string of boyfriends. /Janet/ is one of these girls who is always 'boyfriends', you know". She had last gone out with Janet about two weeks before our interview "to a stag party", to celebrate the marriage of one of her workmates. Her workmate, she said, "got married not last Saturday, the Saturday before. And he came along to me and said '/Iris/ are you coming to my stag party Thursday night'". She said about her workmates in general, "they are very nice. It's mostly men" and "I've made a lot of friends" amongst them.

I asked Iris how her workmates had responded to her unmarried motherhood and she replied "well, I was a bit casual about it, you know. The first week I was there, it was like they never saw women before, because there were only a few of us /girls/. And of course we started talking, and some of them /spoke/ about their children, and I said 'oh, you've got children? I've got a little boy', 'Oh, have you?', 'You married?', 'no', 'why not?' 'Watch it!', 'What difference does it make?' Well, they're marvellous really. With the fellows at work, they seem to show me a hell of a lot of respect, you know". She had experienced no hostility of any kind from them. She

explained "the thing is, where I work, one wouldn't dare be horrible to me about it, because of the others, you see. They would just give him the cold shoulder, and say 'that was a bit nasty'".

Her workmates had given her presents. She said "one of them went on a course and came back with a /toy/ drum for /my son/. On another occasion, she said, "a boy at work came in one day with a pair of trousers for /my son/. Also, she said, "there is an old man - he brings me things - apples yesterday - all sorts of things. He brought me tomatoes out of his garden". Her workmates helped her in other ways. She said, "I was going on holiday. Well, /my friend/¹ and I were going on holiday. And two of the boys from work took us down there, and wouldn't take any money for the petrol, took us out to lunch and God knows what". In addition, she said, "/my workmates/ take you out, take you down the coast and that sort of thing - it's the sort of relationship I've got with the blokes at work". She said "they invite me to their houses, you know, with their wives, for lunch and dinner". Iris summed up by saying "I've been quite lucky, I suppose - I've got some good friends".

6. Marie

Marie had some friends, but she said "there's not very many of them", perhaps no "more than half a dozen". That is, "I haven't got /many/ friends /but/ I've got a lot of acquaintances". She added "I suppose a friend /as opposed to an acquaintance/ is somebody I could... If I was, well, kicked out of my house or something, they'd be the people I'd phone up /for/ practical advice and help, who I'd think perhaps would be able to help me". They were also people whom she could "phone up to say 'oh I'm depressed. Let's go out this evening', or 'can I come round for a chat?'" Moreover, "with friendship, you can let them lapse and still pick them up at the same point". In other words, she did not necessarily have much contact with her friends. Marie counted six friends, "four girls /and/ two men". However, she said, "I haven't seen any of these people all that recently

really, because of the trouble with the house¹. We haven't had much time to even phone anybody up. But it wouldn't really make any difference. I think I could phone all these people right now, and there'd be the same relationship as last time I saw or heard from them".

Four of Marie's friends, including three of the girls, were living in London, about sixty miles away. The **fourth** girl was living "round the corner" from Marie and the second man was living in Midtown, about ten miles away. The three girls who were living in London were her daughter's godparents. That is, Marie said, "she's got three godmothers. It's really one way of keeping in touch with friends - there's a sort of tie that keeps us in touch all the time. /For example/ they take the usual sort of Christmas, birthday interests, and write to see how she is". In return, she added, "I've sent /them/ the first 'official' photographs. I had some photographs taken /especially/ for the godparents". Also, she said "we write quite regularly -/usually every/ two or three weeks". However, Marie did not see them very often. She had not seen one of them for "about three months", and she had not seen another "since /her daughter/ was about six months old", that is, for about a year. Moreover, she said, "I haven't heard from her recently, because I think she's moved, and I don't know her address. But she's a stewardess and her husband works for an airline. And they're the sort of people that might not meet up for three or four months, and they wouldn't really have time to write letters and that".

Marie had first met this friend whilst working as^a/stewardess, after she had conceived but before she had learnt about it. She had got to know only one of her six friends - the third girl who was living in London - after learning of her pregnancy. Marie said "I met /her/ because of /my daughter/ - I went to stay with her family when I was pregnant". She explained "well, my mother used to work in social work and the woman I went to stay with had had my mother's job before her. So although I didn't know them

personally, I knew of them. And I went and met them and then I went up to lunch with them a couple of Sundays and we all tried to get to know one another before I actually moved in. But I had a room of my own. But I found in the end that I was living as one of the family". She added "it's just that they used to have a spare room. Sometimes they have students. They're very Christian people, and they didn't like giving donations to vast organizations. If they felt there was anybody they could help, they did it that way. They were so practical and sympathetic the whole time. I couldn't have managed without them. They were besotted with babies. They thought it was the most marvellous thing that could happen to anybody having a baby. And they encouraged me to make things and helped me. And they thought she was absolutely wonderful from the word go, and no baby is wonderful from the word go, but they thought she was. And now, when they ring up, they don't say 'how's /Marie/?' they say, 'how's /my daughter/?' I couldn't have wished for nicer people, I really couldn't".

Marie began living with this family about six months after conceiving, and she stayed until about four months after giving birth. She said "I could have stayed longer. I knew I could have stayed there for as long as I liked, but I wanted to be independent as soon as she was born. So that's how I moved down to /Midtown/"¹. Since moving, she had seen this family, including her friend, on several occasions. The last time was "about three or four months" before our interview, when Marie and her daughter stayed with them for a few days. In addition, Marie occasionally spoke with them on the telephone, and exchanged letters with them. She said "/my friend/ phoned me up last week".

Marie had less contact with the fourth of her friends in London than with any of her other friends. She said "the guy from London, I haven't seen for ages. He's one of the ones that just pops in. We don't write or anything, but when he comes down, he comes to see me". On the other hand she had been seeing her friend in Midtown "about once a week". When I asked

her when she had last seen him, she replied "last week. I saw him in /Midtown/ because I'd got the car". She visited him, but "not to go out". Marie had most contact with the friend who was living in Northtown. She had known this friend for several years. Marie had told her, before anyone else, about her pregnancy. Marie said "she's been a friend of mine since I was sixteen. We're still friends, but we have different worlds up to a point, at the moment. She's getting married at the end of the year and she's very much wrapped up with buying a house. I usually see her once a week. On Saturday, I either go round there for coffee or she comes here - it's a long-standing arrangement. But her family like to see /my daughter/, so it's nearly always me going round there".

As well as her friends, Marie knew many people whom she would perhaps visit, receive visits from, and go out with, but who were acquaintances rather than friends. Most of these were living in or around Midtown, and she had got to know several of them only after she had moved there from London after giving birth. She had met several at the evening class she was attending once a week, one of whom she occasionally went out with in the evenings. She said "I go to evening classes on Thursday, and perhaps we go for a drink afterwards - with /this acquaintance/ - because he gives me a lift home". Also, she said "we /sometimes/ see each other /apart from this/ a couple of times, /sometimes only/ once, a week. I don't see him always - he phones me up two or three times a week". She had last seen him a few days before, when they "went for a drink in /Midtown/ in the evening".

Some acquaintances had had bedsits, like herself, in the house where she lived on first moving to Midtown from London. They were, she said, "all pretty friendly there. We all used to get on quite well. It was more like a community rather than a bedsitter place". She continued to see some of these people after she had left, particularly during the period when she went back to Midtown to live. For example, "two girls and a chap /she/

used to share /the/ house with, used to pop in" to see her. However, she had not seen any of these people since moving back to Northtown, three weeks before our interview, although, she said, "I think two of these people I could phone up and invite over and they would come, or I could be invited over there and I'd go".

For about six months after conceiving, Marie "was in a flat with four other stewardesses", one of whom was the second person she confided in about the possibility that she was pregnant. Marie said "she was kind /and/ she came to the doctor's with me". However, she did not tell "the other girls /because she/ thought /they/ would be so terribly shocked and offended". She did not tell them until "it was very much confirmed". However, "the first thing /one/ said was '/Marie/, why on earth didn't you tell me - I've got some quinine tablets in my handbag for when I thought I was last year'. And I was horrified. I couldn't believe it, because she looked like an angel". Both this girl and the other flat-mate, Marie said, "were giving me advice. I'd got to either have something done and get rid of the baby or I must have the baby adopted, and carry on. Because they were so keen on this life, this stewardess's life - they didn't think I should miss out".

Whilst these two "were very kind", when Marie eventually told her third and fourth flat-mates, the third suggested "it was God punishing /her/ for being 'naughty'". Marie explained "she was a virgin, and a virgin she was going to stay. She thought I was terribly wicked. I'd been wicked and I had to pay for my mistakes". Ironically, Marie added, "I had her coming into my bedroom one night, about two months afterwards, crying her eyes out because 'it' had happened". She had lost her virginity, although "she was even more righteous after that, because she said if she had got pregnant, she would have had an abortion. In fact, she was two days late, I think, with her period, and she'd already been down to the doctor's and had two little tablets to bring on her period. And she was even more

righteous then". Marie's unmarried motherhood led to a change in her relationship with this third flat-mate. Marie said "before we were alright. She used to come down and spend weekends here with us. /However/, she came from Scotland /and/ she'd been brought up in a very restricted household. And I think coming down to London and seeing what went on, first of all shocked her and after that, she jumped on the band wagon". Marie described this girl's response as "laughable", and explained "I'd never met it before, you see". However, whilst the first two also "thought it was funny", the fourth did not. She was "the friend" of the third flat-mate, and "was quite religious as well. And they stick together".

I asked Marie if the responses of her third and fourth flat-mates had anything to do with her decision to leave the flat, and she replied "Oh no, no. It was just highly amusing". She left simply because her flat-mates "were a bit wild, and it wasn't very good being pregnant and living in a pretty wild flat". Also, "it was a bit of a strain because they were getting their roots in and going all over the world and I was just sitting at home and getting more and more pregnant and more and more depressed". She did not see any of them after leaving. She explained "I suppose we'd come together as... Well, you see, we were all unhappy in digs, and we all got together about the second week in training school. And we didn't really know one another, and we were pushed together for a short time. And I'd still continued my life down here, and at weekends and time off I used to come down here to the people I knew. Whereas they were more inclined to stick together, the four of them. They couldn't go home as often as I could, and they had a life /amongst/ themselves, and I was always a bit of an outsider. I didn't join in. I used the flat for convenience more /than anything/".

Marie had also lost contact with a number of the friends and acquaintances she had had when she conceived. In some cases this was because of their responses to her unmarried motherhood. She said "I know it's an old cliché,

but you do find out who your friends are. And the people who I thought were friends and turned out they weren't, I just dropped like hot bricks". She mentioned "one particular couple /she/ used to be very friendly with, who /she/ wrote to the whole time /she/ was pregnant and afterwards, and kept in touch the whole time - week after week". However, she said, "I came back and was told that the stories going around were just out of this world with what I was doing and what was happening. And I thought, well, you know, I put my trust into somebody at a time when keeping your mouth shut was probably the best thing to do". That is, Marie said, "I wrote to /them/ all the time I was pregnant and told them all the ins and outs, which you do to people you think are your friends and I found that this was going round our local pub. Every time I wrote a letter, she was giving a resumé in the pub that night. And I came back and the chap I was nearly engaged to, he said to me, 'if this is friendship, then forget it, because they really have been terribly two-faced and they have been stirring it for you all the time you've been away'. And so I just lost contact with them. I didn't go up there or phone them any more and they phoned and wrote and sent presents for a little while and after they didn't get any reply from me, they gave up, until I saw him just recently". This couple was living in Northtown and Marie said, although "I've tried to drop them like hot bricks, I met the husband last week. And he was all sort of 'Oh, do come up and see us'". However, Marie said, "I don't want to go up and see them - I don't think I could be friendly with them".

There was "another couple" Marie had regarded as friends before she conceived, but not at the time of interviewing. She said "it was a silly thing, but it hurt me more than anything. It was a married couple that I've known quite a time. And a friend of mine¹ went up there, and they said 'Oh, do you see anything of /Marie/?' and /my friend/ said 'Oh, yes, I see her once a week'. And the wife said 'does she know who the father

is?' And after I'd gone to court and gone through all this to have somebody doubting that I could be as mean as to name somebody who wasn't - that hurt me. I suppose I shall /come across/ them, and chat to them now. But, it hurt me that there must be quite a few people like that, who don't completely believe me, who thought that just because /the father/ had got a very good job, I was naming him because he'd got money".

As well as losing these friends, she had far less, or even no, contact with several other friends and acquaintances, though not because of their responses to her unmarried motherhood. In this context she mentioned "one particular friend", who was living about three or four miles away. She had "got a pretty good social life", and for a while after moving to Midtown from London, Marie saw and went out with her a good deal. Marie said, "I used to stay with /her/ quite a lot. We used to see a lot of each other. We used to go out practically every week at some time or another. I'd go out with her, or stay the weekend with her, if mother would look after /my daughter/. I'd go to parties and things. And then I decided I didn't really want to do it any more", that is, "I just didn't want that sort of social life". Marie had not seen this friend for several weeks. Although, Marie said, "it's my own fault because she's always phoning me up and saying would I like to go out, and I say 'no'".

Marie had far less contact with friends in general because she had become "anti-social". I asked her why she had changed in this way and she replied "well, that's a good question, because I don't expect I would have been. Whether it's got anything to do with /my daughter/ or not I don't know, but I'm such a changed person. Before, I'd have always wanted to make sure that I kept in touch with people. It would have worried me if I'd lost contact. And I suppose that my world is so much /my daughter/ and me at the moment that it doesn't worry me if people drop out". She said, "everybody needs friends, I think I need friends", and added "obviously I'd like more contact /with friends/. But if I knew a lot of

people who I liked and wanted to go out with, I wouldn't be able to go out as much because I wouldn't leave her more than a couple of nights a week. It's not fair to let somebody else take the responsibility for her. I don't think I could ever know enough people, but I just feel a bit limited at the moment. My time isn't my own really". In other words, she said, "practically, all my interests are towards /my daughter even though/ mentally, all my thoughts aren't towards her". She had become "inward looking". This was, she explained, "because, to be let down by somebody when you're three months pregnant, it's bound to carry something, and I think it's come out in me that I don't trust people. So therefore I don't really want to get too involved with people, not to get hurt again, I suppose. Superficial relationships rather than anything deeper". In other words, "everything's become less intense, I suppose, generally. I suppose that must be it, because I don't really take people as seriously as I used to. It must be from the experience /as an unmarried mother/. I think it's aged me a lot in a short time. It's made me an old, old lady".

Marie had become less interested in maintaining and developing friendships, in having contact with and going out with friends. Consequently, she said, "I don't go out very much and meet many new people", with whom friendships may develop. In any case, she said, "I'm not too happy seeing anyone these days", because "I'm a bit neurotic at the moment, so it's a bit difficult. Because I'm much less tolerant than I used to be with anybody. I don't suffer anybody really these days. But I'm sure that's only because I'm going through a bad patch. I can't be bothered with the trivialities of small-talk and being pleasant when I don't feel like being pleasant. If I go into the town in a bad mood, then everybody I meet will know I'm in a bad mood. Whereas before I used to put on a bit of an act, I suppose - be smiling, cheerful. Oh yes - 'she's always cheerful and happy' and I think 'Oh to hell with it now'. And I come across... Everywhere I go, I

seem to come across somebody that I fall out with - it doesn't matter where I go, I manage to find the awkward ones. So I'm beginning to think it's me after all this time. I had a bad patch at the doctor's: I took /my daughter/ to the doctor's on Thursday and I came across a receptionist who was bloody-minded to say the least. And then she tried to be clever and she said 'Mrs.....' She'd looked up in the file, you see, and she'd been a right bitch up to this moment and said 'Mrs.....', with the emphasis on the 'Mrs.', so I turned round and I said 'Miss'. And there were all these people in the waiting room, and I scooped /my daughter/ up and took her into the doctor's and they all went 'ahha'".

*

At the time of interviewing, my informants had differing numbers of friends and, in particular, of close friends. Iris and Marie each had a large circle of friends, quite a few of whom were close. Both Gillian and Ann had fewer friends, and perhaps fewer who were close. Hilary and, perhaps especially, Elaine, had very few friends including ones who were close.

My informants also had differing amounts and styles of contact with friends. Iris had a considerable amount of contact with her friends, by way of mutual visits, going out in the evenings and at weekends, and correspondence. This amount and style of contact was facilitated by the fact that most of her friends, including those who were close, were living nearby and were readily available for contact. Marie had less contact with friends, although she still had a good deal, again by way of visits, going out and correspondence. A good proportion of her friends were living nearby though perhaps Marie's friends in general were not as available for contact as Iris's. Marie had relatively more friends, especially close ones, living beyond easy visiting distance and relatively more whose availability was limited because of 'competing' ties, for example.

Gillian had perhaps as much contact with friends as Marie. She visited,

was visited by and corresponded with, friends. She also occasionally went out with them, although she perhaps did not go out with friends as much as she would have done if she did not have a steady boyfriend. In Gillian's case, contact with friends was limited because of a competing tie. All her friends were living close by and were generally available for contact.

Ann had a good deal of contact with friends, in so far as she was living with one and exchanged visits with another who was a neighbour. However, overall, she had only a very limited amount of contact with friends: she did not see much of them and she did not have very much contact by way of correspondence. She did not go out very much with friends, including the one with whom she was living and the neighbour. The greatest proportion of her friends was living over fifty miles away and so were not readily available for contact. She tended to see and go out with them only when one or more visited her every few weeks.

Hilary also had a good deal of contact with friends only in so far as she was living in the hostel with a few and she worked with most of the others. She received very few visits from, made very few visits to, and hardly went out with, friends, including the few friends with whom she neither lived nor worked. She had one fairly close friend amongst the latter, who was living over thirty miles away and who, in any case, had a competing relationship. Hilary exchanged letters with this friend, but hardly saw her. She had no other friends to speak of, apart from a girl she had been introduced to by a member of the hostel committee, specifically for the purpose of developing a friendship and going out in the evenings and at weekends.

Elaine had perhaps less contact with friends than any of my other informants, in fact, at the time of interviewing she had more or less no contact except by way of correspondence with the closest of her friends who was living over fifty miles away. She hardly ever saw or went out with friends.

The few friends she had were either not living locally or were not readily available for contact because of competing ties, for example.

The reports of my informants suggest that the 'friendship-patterns' of young females will undergo, perhaps considerable, change if they become unmarried mothers. That is, young unmarried mothers will experience change in, firstly, amount and style of contact they have with friends and, secondly, the number and identities of their friends. At the same time, however, they will have widely differing experiences in these respects. Whilst on the one hand Iris's amount and style of contact with, and number of, friends had probably undergone very little change, on the other hand her friends' identities had changed considerably. Thus, she had lost the vast proportion of the friends she had had when she conceived, but in their place, she had gained many new friends, largely in and around Westown, where she was living at the time of interviewing.

The changes experienced by Marie were very different. On the one hand, both the number and identities of her friends had undergone comparatively little change, but on the other hand, the amount and style of contact she had with friends had undergone considerable change. She had lost a few friends and had gained a few, but not very many in either case, and overall the number had probably remained more or less constant. However, she saw quite a lot less of her friends and, perhaps especially, she went out with them far less.

Gillian had perhaps experienced change in all respects, but in each case the change had not been very great. Thus, she had lost a few friends and had gained a few, but overall the identity and number of her friends had remained very similar. Also, she had lost some contact with friends, though not very much, and she had perhaps altered her style of contact with friends - but if so, only slightly. At the time of interviewing, she hardly went out with friends; instead she went out a lot with her boyfriend. But the situation may have been similar before she became an unmarried mother, when

the father of her child was her boyfriend.

The changes experienced by Ann were in the opposite direction to those experienced by Iris. That is, whilst on the one hand the number and identities of her friends had hardly changed, on the other hand the amount and style of contact she had with them had undergone considerable change. She had lost only a few friends, if any, and had gained only a few. But she had far less contact with friends in general and - especially - went out far less with them.

Hilary and perhaps especially Elaine, had both experienced changes in a similar direction to those experienced by Gillian but in an exaggerated fashion. The number and identities of their friends had changed a lot, as had the amount and style of contact they had with them. Each had lost many friends and had gained only a few, and each had far less contact with friends in general, particularly by way of going out.

Whilst young unmarried mothers are likely to lose at least a few friends, and at least some contact with others, it seems unlikely that very much of this change will be due to rejection or any kind of hostility. Some unmarried mothers will experience responses of this kind from a few friends. Thus, Marie had experienced hostility from several of her friends, and as a result had drawn away from them. However, Marie's experience was unusual in that unmarried mothers are perhaps likely to experience no hostility at all from friends. Thus, none of my other informants had done so. It is also possible that unmarried mothers will experience hostility from the relatives, and other connections, of their friends. Thus, the husband of one of Gillian's friends had rejected her. But, even experience of this kind seems unusual. All my other informants had found that, if anything, their friends' relatives and so on had been accepting and helpful.

It also seems unlikely that young unmarried mothers will be unable to make friends because of rejection and hostility. Thus, none of my informants reported experiences of this kind from people with whom they might have

developed friendships¹. It is, instead, far more likely that young unmarried mothers will both lose friends and have difficulty in making them because of their own responses to their unmarried motherhood.

For example, Iris had lost friends only because of her attempts to pass with friends she had had when she conceived. She had moved away from her friends, having told only a few of them about her unmarried motherhood. As a result, it was more difficult for her to have contact with both the friends she had told, even though she had not experienced any hostility from them, and those she had not told, even though she was no longer interested in passing with them. Iris had completely changed her approach to information management, from being a passer to being a non-passer, and consequently had been able to take advantage of the opportunities she had had since moving to make a lot of new friends. At the time of interviewing, Iris did not complain of anything connected with her unmarried motherhood that prevented her from making new friends or which limited her contact with friends, and she seemed generally content with her friendship-pattern.

Marie's response differed from Iris's. Although she tried to pass with some friends to begin with, she soon told them all. As far as friends and people with whom she might develop friendships were concerned, she had always been a non-passer, and therefore she had lost neither any friends, nor any contact with them, nor been unable to make new friends, because of her approach to information management. Apart from the few friends she had lost because of their responses, she had limited contact with some friends only because they were not living within easy visiting distance, or were otherwise unavailable for contact, or because she lacked interest in having more and different contact. Her interests were centered on her daughter, and she seemed more or less content with her friendship-pattern.

Gillian, unlike Marie, had lost friends because of her attempts to pass.

In fact, apart from the friend whose husband had rejected her, she had lost friends because of her approach to information management. She had moved away from the friends she had had when she conceived, without having told any of them about her unmarried motherhood, although she eventually let some of them know. As a result, it had become slightly more difficult to have contact with most of these friends, both those who had learnt and accepted, and those who had not learnt but with whom she no longer tried to pass. Gillian, like Iris, had changed from being a passer to being a non-passer and consequently had been able to make full use of the opportunities she had had to make some new friends. At the time of interviewing, her unmarried motherhood affected her ability to make new friends and her contact with the friends she already had, only in so far as she had no husband with whom to share the responsibility of looking after her child. Although even this affect was perhaps not as great as that exerted by the close relationship she had with her boyfriend.

Ann had also lost contact with friends as a result of attempts to pass. Like Gillian, she had moved away from the friends she had had without having told any of them about her unmarried motherhood, although unlike Gillian, she eventually let all of them know. Consequently, although she had been completely accepted, it had become difficult to have more than a very limited amount of contact with these friends. Moreover, partly as a result of this - despite having changed from being a passer to being a non-passer - she had had little opportunity to develop new friendships.

Hilary had also tried to pass with friends she had had, and had eventually moved away from them, having told only a few about her unmarried motherhood. Consequently, it had become difficult to have contact with not only the friends who had not learnt, but also the ones who had learnt, even though she had been accepted by them. Hilary was exceptional amongst my informants in that she was still a passer at the time of interviewing. Thus, she

had consistently tried to pass and so avoid contact with most of the friends she had had when she conceived, as well as with most other people. Her approach to information management had therefore meant that she had had limited opportunity first of all, to meet people with whom she might have developed friendships, and secondly, to develop close relationships with people who she did meet. She had been able to make only a few new friends, and many of these did not know about her unmarried motherhood.

Finally, Elaine had never tried to pass with any of her friends and therefore had not lost any of them as a result of either the way she had been treated by them or the way she had managed information with them. At the same time, however, she had lost virtually all contact with the friends she had had when she conceived. This was because they had moved away or had become otherwise unavailable for contact, as a result of competing relationships, for example. Moreover, this change was, at least partially, responsible for her having made very few new friends. Whilst she had become more or less a non-passer¹, she had little opportunity to meet people with whom she might have developed new friendships.

Young unmarried mothers are likely to have friends, boyfriends, or members of their families who are available for contact and with whom they can share social activities. At the same time, however, there may be other people with whom they have a good deal of contact and who have an important bearing on the quality of their social situations. In the next chapter, the relationships which young unmarried mothers have with neighbours, work-mates, and so on, are investigated prior to an examination of their formal relationships with, for example, S.B.C. representatives.

CHAPTER SIX

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

This chapter culminates in a summary discussion of the 'immediate' social relationships of my informants, hence its title. Before that, however, relationships other than those which have been covered in previous chapters are considered. These are ones which, though perhaps not as important to their social situations as those they had with family and friends, may, nevertheless, have had some direct or indirect significance. Later on their relationships with 'service organizations' are examined, but to begin with, the topic is that of relationships with neighbours and others, including work-mates, for example.

For many years there has been a flourishing debate amongst sociologists and other interested parties on the issue of the nature of local, neighbourhood or community¹ social ties and networks in contemporary industrial societies. Various arguments and a fairly large amount of evidence have been presented which tend to come down in favour of either one of two conflicting conclusions. The first of these suggests that there has been, in some sense, a decline during the last couple of hundred years in the strength and importance of these ties and networks. This was the theme of Tönnies book, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, which was first published in 1877². For him, nineteenth century European society was undergoing a gradual change from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft*: the first being characterized by "intimate, private and exclusive living together", the second by "public life" and by "transitory and superficial" relationships³. This development was taking place at the same time as, and in connection with, other processes such as industrialization and urbanization. Pre-industrial rural life was very close to *Gemeinschaft* as an 'ideal type' and as such may be thought of as akin to a 'traditional' extended family⁴. The decline

of Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft may then be seen as corresponding to, and connected with, the supposed decline of the extended family¹.

Tönnies' concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft are usually translated into English as 'community' and 'association', and as such imply that his thesis was that nineteenth century Europe was witnessing a 'decline of community'. One hundred years later, a similar process was still taking place, at least in the urban areas of the United States, according to Maurice Stein in his book *The Eclipse of Community*². He examined several 'community studies'³ and came to the conclusion that the inter-related processes of industrialization, urbanization and bureaucratization had been accompanied by, or had resulted in, the corresponding demise of 'community'. This was manifested in a decline of autonomous 'local communities' and relatedly of a sense of 'community' amongst the inhabitants of the areas in which these had once been strong.

The criteria by which Stein judged the eclipse of community were different from those which had been used at an earlier date by Wirth, when coming to a similar conclusion⁴. For him the typical "urban mode of life" of his day was characterized by "the substitution of secondary for primary contacts, the weakening of the bonds of kinship and the declining social significance of the family, the disappearance of the neighbourhood, and the undermining of the traditional basis of social solidarity"⁵. He then suggested that

Being reduced to a stage of virtual impotence as an individual, the urbanite is bound to exert himself by joining with others of similar interest into organized groups to obtain his ends. This results in the enormous multiplication of voluntary organizations directed toward as great a variety of objectives as there are human needs and interests⁶.

Wirth's assertions and predictions have some support in the writings and studies which have been concerned with urban life in Britain. Ronald Frankenburg in his *Communities in Britain* reviews a large number of community studies which have been carried out in the British Isles in both

rural and urban settings, and as a result attempts "to construct a morphological continuum along which the communities described /.../ could be arranged"¹. This continuum represents a "series of social changes leading from rural 'community' to urban 'alienation' and 'anomie'"². He suggests that

rural societies have a community nature; people are related in diverse ways and interact frequently. They have - or feel as if they have - interests in common³.

On the other hand

urbanized societies have an associative nature. Although there may be a greater number of possible relationships, they do not overlap. There is often comparative infrequency of interaction. People tend to feel they have needs, rather than interests, in common⁴.

For Frankenberg, in other words, "the ties linking individuals in urban areas are /.../ fewer than their rural counterparts. The mesh of the network in towns is larger, but the city dweller may make up for this loss by a larger number of more formal role relationships. There is always the possibility that the individual's links with other members of society may become tenuous"⁵. This assessment accords with Elizabeth Bott's suggestion about the "differences between the immediate social environment of /elementary/ families in urban /areas of/ industrialized societies and that of families in some small-scale primitive" societies, "and in certain rural areas of industrialized societies"⁶. For Bott, "the situation may be summed up by saying that urban families are more highly 'individuated' than families in /the/ relatively closed communities" to be found in rural areas⁷. By 'individuation' Bott means that "the elementary family is separated off, differentiated out as a distinct, and to some extent autonomous, social group"⁸. Thus, the decreasing autonomy of 'local communities' which was claimed by Wirth has occurred alongside the increasing autonomy of the elementary family. Bott uses the term 'individuation' rather than that of 'isolation' (the term which is more usually used in this context), because all urban families maintain some "relationships

with external people and institutions /.../ Indeed no urban family could survive without its network of external relationships"¹. Moreover, she notes "the difference in individuation between an urban family and a family in a relatively closed community is one of degree"².

Bott's suggestions have been echoed by Goldthorpe and Lockwood, who have also provided research evidence which supports the conclusions that they come to about the types of people they studied in Luton in the nineteen sixties. They describe, first of all, the 'traditional' urban working class way of life. Thus:

The salient characteristics of the 'traditional' type of working-class district could be said to derive from the relative stability and the social homogeneity of its population. The tightly knit network of kinship and the close ties of familiarity between neighbours are the products of successive generations of families living out their lives alongside each other; the strong sense of communal solidarity and the various forms of mutual help and collective action reflect the absence of any wide economic, cultural or status differences. Built up from its distinctive ecological and demographic base, the community constitutes a closely defined pattern for social living and one, moreover, which is highly resistant to change on account of the powerful normative controls that it is able to impose upon its members³.

They then note the arguments which have been put forward in favour of the idea that various economic, technological and ecological changes⁴ have brought about the "decline and decomposition of the working class" in its traditional form⁵, and have brought about, moreover, the 'embourgeoisement' of the working class and thus a trend towards a "'middle-class' society"⁶. But, they suggest,

many of the newly observed features of the social life of manual workers and their families - most notably, their home- and family-centredness - have been too readily interpreted as implying a shift in values and norms in a specifically middle-class direction. To a large extent, ongoing changes in working-class life-styles are open to an alternative explanation in terms of the adaptation of traditional patterns, either to the problems posed by new conditions (e.g. physical separation from kin) or to new opportunities (e.g. those provided by better accommodation, greater security and higher wages). Indeed, the assumption that middle-class life-styles are being emulated is not only unnecessary but is also suspect: for there appear to be certain quite distinctive features of middle-class social life that members of the new working class characteristically do not display (e.g. regular mutual entertaining between couples and a relatively high level of participation in clubs, societies, etc.)⁷.

Their study and comparison of a sample of 'affluent' manual workers and their families, on the one hand, and a sample of non-manual workers and their families on the other hand, provided

support for the idea /.../ of a process of 'normative convergence' between affluent manual and lower-level white-collar groups - one focal point of this being an overriding concern with the economic fortunes and social relationships of the conjugal unit. /.../ it would seem that the majority of our manual and white-collar couples do have in common a propensity to devote their spare time overwhelmingly to home and family and to limit their wider social contacts even to the point at which the family is in a state of near isolation¹.

They refer to "the absence of familiar relationships between immediate neighbours /.../. Indeed, there was little evidence that our respondents were involved in any specifically 'neighbourhood' life at all, in the sense of subcultural patterns shaped and sustained through the close interpersonal ties of the locality"². Goldthorpe et al help account for this in terms of the 'physical mobility' of their sample and of the inhabitants in general of the areas in which they were living³. Moreover, they were mainly living on new housing developments which were not only inhabited by people who were new to one another, but who were also highly heterogeneous as far as social class was concerned⁴. They were mainly owner-occupiers on private estates.

In the context of the ecological changes which have brought about the breakdown of traditional working-class patterns of urban life, Goldthorpe and Lockwood refer to two sets of inter-related changes. Firstly, "the expansion of the urban population as a result of the 'drift' from the countryside" (or perhaps more generally, the increase in geographical mobility and the resulting increases in population turnover) and secondly, "the spread of urban areas as central districts are redeveloped and new suburbs, estates and satellite communities are created"⁵. In Britain, the latter has mainly taken the form of the extensive building of new estates and new towns by public authorities⁶.

A good deal of research on urban housing estates in Britain has been

carried out in recent years¹, all of which show, first of all, perhaps unsurprisingly, that local authority housing estates are inhabited mainly by manual workers and their families. They also show a consistent picture of elementary families in near 'isolation' from one another, of a situation where "active interaction with neighbours is at a minimum"². As Young and Willmott say about Greenleigh: "the 'home' and the family of marriage becomes the focus of a man's life, as of his wife's, far more than in" Bethnal Green, the working-class borough of London where they carried out the earlier part of their study³, where "cohesion arises out of the shared poverty and lack of social and geographical mobility of its inhabitants"⁴.

For Frankenberg, "the key to the understanding of social relationships on housing estates /.../ lies in uncertainty"⁵. The inhabitants come from different places, they do not know their neighbours, do not know what they expect from or how to treat them. Hence, they are wary and nervous of their neighbours, are slow to become involved with and quick to withdraw from them. On the other hand, the normal situation does not seem to be one where families are in a state of complete 'isolation'. According to Young and Willmott

People do not treat others either as enemies or as friends. They are wary, though polite. They pass the time of day in the road. They have an occasional word over the fence or a chat at the garden gate. They nod to each other in the shops. Neighbours even borrow and lend little things to each other⁶.

In a similar way, Goldthorpe and Lockwood discovered about their sample of affluent manual workers and their families that they often had relationships with neighbours which were friendly, strong or close, and important to their social lives. Thus, after referring to the "large part that parents, siblings and in-laws /played in their/ respondents' lives"⁷, they go on to note that, especially when kin were not reasonably available for contact, "neighbours - broadly defined as persons living within ten minutes' walk - /were/ of comparable importance to kin in /their/ respondents' associational patterns, and /were/ generally more important for

the couple than friends made through work or in any other way"¹.

Perhaps, given time, manual workers and their families, however affluent, on estates - especially those which are homogeneous - will become more 'settled' and acquainted, with the result that patterns of neighbourly interaction will be re-established along traditional working-class lines². In the meantime, there are possibly still many urban areas like Bethnal Green which, according to the studies by Young and Willmott, Townsend and Marris³, have the characteristics of the traditional type of working-class district. One such area is that of St. Ann's in Nottingham, where Coates and Silburn carried out research into poverty⁴. In addition, there may still be many towns like Ashton, the fictitious name of the town studied by Dennis et al in the 1950's. This is a relatively 'isolated' town, in both a physical and social sense, where "the inhabitants /.../ are all working class"⁵ and largely dependent on one industry - that of coal-mining - all of which is conducive to the maintenance of a traditional way of life. Finally, there are towns like Banbury, which has been studied by Margaret Stacey⁶, where, despite its lack of 'isolation' and its inhabitants' heterogeneity and mobility (and consequently, according to Stacey, the absence of a 'community')⁷, there is still a good deal of contact, help and socializing amongst neighbours, especially in predominantly working-class districts.

With this discussion of 'normal' community and neighbouring patterns in mind, the pertinent background characteristics of my informants and of the areas in which they were, and had been, living will be summarized before going on to an examination of their relationships with neighbours.

Ann had been living with her mother on the outskirts of London for several years until she moved to Midtown during her pregnancy. She spent a few months in the centre of Midtown - a town of similar size and character to Banbury⁸ - firstly living with two other girls in a flat and then with one

of these girls in lodgings. However, at the time of interviewing, Ann and this same girl had been renting a house on the outskirts of Midtown for several months. The particular area in which they were living was perhaps more rural than urban, and it was predominantly middle-class and 'settled'¹.

Elaine had been living with her mother in the centre of Midtown for several years. It was a fairly heterogeneous and a somewhat unsettled area of old artisan-type terrace houses and new middle-class town houses.

Gillian, Hilary and Iris had all been living for several months in the hostel in Westown, again a town of similar size and character to Banbury². It was perhaps mainly middle-class, but was also a fairly heterogeneous, unsettled area with many large Victorian houses not far from the centre of the town. Gillian had moved to the hostel from a Mother and Baby Home and before that from her married sister's home, both of which were situated in Westown. She had moved to her sister's from a small village a few miles outside of the town, where she had been living with her father for several years. Hilary had moved to the hostel from inner London, where she had lived with her father for several years until about the time she conceived, then with the father of her child until a few months after giving birth, and finally in lodgings for a few days. Iris had moved to the hostel via a Mother and Baby Home, from the middle-class outer suburbs of London, where she had been living with, and working for, a doctor and his family. She had moved to the doctor's from her sister's, a few miles away, where she had been living for several years.

At the time of interviewing, Marie was living with her parents on the outskirts of Northtown, a seaside town which was similar in size to both Midtown and Westown. It was a settled, homogeneous area of owner-occupied houses, where Marie and her parents had been living for several years before she conceived. At about the time she conceived she went to live in a flat with four other girls in inner London, where she stayed for several months before going to live with a family, a few miles away. Shortly after

giving birth, she went to live in a bed-sit in the centre of Midtown. But she stayed there for only a few months before, first of all, going to spend a few months with her parents in Northtown, then returning to Midtown, where she rented a house not far from where Elaine was living, before finally going back to her parents' again.

We might expect, given the earlier discussion, that none of the areas in which my informants were living at the time of interviewing would have been characterized by high degrees of 'social cohesion' or 'communal solidarity'. Nevertheless, we might also expect that under 'normal' circumstances the 'neighbouring patterns' of my informants would show some variation. Thus, Elaine and Marie would tend to have closer and stronger relationships and more contact, shared activity and involvement, with neighbours than my other informants, perhaps especially Gillian, Hilary and Iris. However, how did their neighbouring patterns compare in view of their unmarried motherhood? The next part of this chapter is concerned with questions of this kind. Attention is paid to such matters as the social distance of the relationships and the amount and style of contact they had with neighbours; how, if at all, their relationships had changed; if, when and how neighbours had learnt about their unmarried motherhood; the responses of neighbours who had learnt.

The term 'neighbour' is used in a very loose or broad sense to include all people living or working in the same areas as my informants. As such, it may be taken to encompass my informants' work-mates, if and when they had them. In any case, the discussion at the beginning of this chapter about 'community styles' is relevant not only to the topic of relationships amongst neighbours, as they are conventionally defined, but also to that of relationships amongst work-mates and even face-to-face social relationships in general. As such, it provides background information on what is 'normal' as far as the various categories of relationships which are covered in this chapter are concerned¹.

A good deal of the information gathered about my informants' relationships with neighbours and work-mates has been given already in previous chapters. In the following, relatively short, discussion, references will be made back to this.

1. Ann

As was noted in the last chapter, Ann had only two friends in Midtown - the girl with whom she was living and a neighbour. She had a good deal of contact with the neighbour - she usually saw her every day, occasionally for several hours, and in addition she received various kinds of help from her, including baby-sitting. However, by the time of our second interview, this neighbour had left and Ann had another in her place. This was the second girl with whom Ann had shared a flat on first moving to Midtown. Ann said "we know them of old. It is the girl I moved out of my first flat because of, and her boyfriend". She added "I don't like them". Ann and her friend had left the flat after "about a week" because "she liked to regiment the place - it was like being in the army or something", and then went into "bed and breakfast" while they searched for other accommodation. Ann had had very little contact with her new neighbours since they had arrived, two weeks before our interview. She said "we went round once, and left as soon as we could. I try and keep away as much as possible".

Referring to her neighbours in general, Ann said "I find a lot of people feel sorry for me, although they wouldn't say it to me, but through /the/ girl who used to live next-door-but-one. She said, half of them say 'poor girl, it's not much of a life for her', and all this. She sort of turned round and said 'well, she gets more fun out of life than you do'. She wouldn't actually say 'than you do' but 'than some people'". At the same time, however, her neighbours "just accept" her. The next door neighbours, she said, "are nice and chatty. But they work and so I don't see them a lot". The others "are chummy" and "they say 'hello'". In other words, she

said "it's not so bad around here. The old woman down the end is always watching, and notes when somebody goes in". But, she said, "I think she does it with everybody. I think she is just out and out nosey".

Another neighbour "down the road", who was a "registered baby-minder", had offered to look after Ann's child at "a reduced rate" if she ever went out to work. At the time of our first interview, Ann was planning to take up this offer, because a local optician had asked her to be his part-time assistant. She hoped to begin within about a month. However, she had still not started by the time of our second interview, four months later. She explained "I went in to see about it, and he was very evasive about it. So I thought 'sod that!'" Ann had not, in fact, had a job since shortly after she learnt she was pregnant. She had worked for the local council as a clerk, but left without any of her work-mates having learnt about her unmarried motherhood.

2. Elaine

Elaine said about her neighbours "at first /some/ don't know quite what to do, then they get used to it - then they accept you as a 'mum'". That is, she said, "they're all sort of friendly. It's funny - people you would expect to sort of... really put themselves out". In fact, she said, "the neighbours have really changed", but not in a way she would have expected. She explained "soon as people find out, they're really nice. All the people that were distant are now really friendly". For example, she said, "people like in the /local grocer's/ shop, they're really nice. Before, they never would speak to me. Now they really are friendly, and make a real fuss of /my son/". In other words, she said, "lots of people around here, they're all really chummy and friendly. Whereas before, we were just sort of 'customers' and now they really are friendly". Elaine's relationship with the grocer and his wife had changed. She said "for my birthday, they sent me five pounds, and before, I hardly even knew them. And when /my son/ was born, /the grocer/ said 'ah, I must be his godfather,

I must be his godfather'. They really are friendly. Every time we go and buy something, he always puts in a couple of bags of sweets for /my son/".

As well as presents from the grocer, Elaine received assistance from other neighbours. She said "we have got - next-door-but-one - this couple, and we have them come in and baby-sit sometimes. In addition, she would "have little coffee mornings with the woman who, with her husband, was living next door, although she did not see much of these neighbours otherwise. She explained "they go out a lot and that. We're friendly, not chummy-chummy. I go in for coffee. But they're in a group or something. At Christmas she always brings /my son/ round some sweets and stuff like that". Referring to the neighbours in general, Elaine said "I've got more friends that are more like family now, than in my own family". Thus, on her previous birthday, she received "about five cards /but/ the only family card" she received was from her mother, "the rest came from friends and the neighbours, people /she did not/ even know". Elaine had developed similar relationships with her "mother's friends at work". She said "/they/ knit jumpers for /my son/ and send him presents at Christmas. If I take him /into where they work/ there's a fuss made over him. Mum is closer to people round here and at work than her own family, really. They really are nice. When it comes to birthdays, they send /my son/ really nice toys and gifts".

Elaine had not had a job herself since about the fifth month of her pregnancy. She had been a clerk in a solicitor's office, until her employer asked her to leave, as she thought, because of her pregnancy. Her work-mates had guessed, but apart from being teased, she had experienced no hostility until her boss took her aside and said "'We feel that you're not experienced enough'. And a week before he'd been telling how good /she/ was. And he just said 'I hope you'll understand'. He was very nice about it". Elaine "just said 'alright' /and/ had a 'boo-hoo' in the loo, /but knew/ it was because /she/ was pregnant".

3. Gillian

One of Gillian's neighbours had said about the hostel in which she was living "'it shouldn't be here'". This neighbour, Gillian said, "has been up and saw the Committee. The main thing is that 'a place like this shouldn't be in /this district/ where the houses are close together, because the children make too much noise'". However, Gillian suggested, "it is an excuse. If it was just a mother, and her husband was out at work, and he comes home at five o'clock, and all this lark, she would probably be perfectly alright - probably wouldn't say anything. But because she knows we haven't got any men here, she has got this attitude. I mean, she naturally wouldn't say anything to anyone else, I am positive. She might say 'would you mind keeping the noise down', but because she knows they haven't got any fathers she bawls out of the window 'shut up!' Things like that. And that makes you wonder, because the other day she was giving them lollypops - makes me think that afterwards she feels sorry".

This neighbour and her husband had lived in the house next door for about six months. Gillian had very little contact with not only them, but also with the previous occupants. She said "the lady that used to be there, we never used to talk or anything. It was so quiet round there. You would never know anybody was there". In fact, she added, "apart from the lady next door, we don't come into contact with many" of the neighbours. She had little to do with "the lady the other side next door". Gillian explained "she is deaf anyway. So it is probably lucky for her. /However/ her daughter came to stay with her, and she brought her two children, and their ball came over in this garden. And she came over and asked me if I would mind looking. And I said 'oh no'. And I helped her look for it. And she said 'how many babies are there now?' So I told her 'eight'. And so she said 'oh, that's eight mothers lives here'. And I said 'yes'. And she said 'any idea when the number will be going down?' So I said 'well,

as soon as one goes, somebody else comes in'. She said 'any chance - now /abortion/ has been legalized - any chance of the number going down?' So I said 'no, I shouldn't think so'. I got the impression she was a bit snooty". Shortly after this incident, Gillian said, "I saw her down the shop, when I was out shopping one morning, and she sort of went past me like this /with her nose in the air/. So I did the same". The treatment Gillian had experienced in this case was exceptional. Gillian said "other people, like the /people at the/ butcher's, who I come into contact with - getting things for the kids, things they have to eat - are very nice, and they know, you know, that we are at /the hostel/".

Gillian had a job at the time of interviewing, but it was as the house-keeper in the hostel and therefore meant that her only work-mate was the girl who came in to take care of the children in the day nursery. However, she had worked until about six months after conceiving and had had other jobs for several months after giving birth. Shortly after learning she was pregnant, she left the job she had been doing without having told her work-mates. However, within a few weeks she had started another job as a semi-skilled worker in a factory where her new work-mates soon learnt about her unmarried motherhood. Gillian found that, to begin with, they had difficulty in believing she was an unmarried mother, but that they then showed complete acceptance. In fact, they helped her in various ways. She said "people at work didn't believe it. They said 'oh, she's not', you know. The people at work, they were ever so good to me - money wise, you know, as well as other ways. I was pretty bad, and I used to go to work and I used to be sick, and I used to have time off a lot which in many places, if you have time off work, that's it. /My boss/ he was ever so good".

As was noted in the last chapter, Gillian had made one particularly close friend, with whom she had continued to have a good deal of contact. Soon after giving birth, Gillian returned to this job for a while, then, in order to be closer to the hostel, took on another for a few weeks, before

taking up the job in the hostel.

4. Hilary

Some of Hilary's neighbours were among the few people who knew about her unmarried motherhood, but she had little contact with the ones living nearby. She said "the only neighbour I come into contact with is a dentist who lives a couple of doors down /the road/, and he is very nice. And his two receptionists always speak. But the actual /next door/ neighbours, I very rarely see - except this one next door, and she seems to have got the attitude of 'children, they are a damn nuisance'. She has never actually said anything to me, but the attitude that she takes during the day of banging on the fence and telling children to shut up. Her attitude in general, /she/ sort of looks down on you - and 'unmarried mothers and blasted children, making a row all day', you know". She said about the other next-door neighbours "well, I have never seen the woman downstairs in the house next door, /but/ the one upstairs, I spoke to her once, she seemed alright". She added "I see /other neighbours/, but I have never spoken to them".

As has already been noted, Hilary had a job as a clerk, but only a few people at work knew about her unmarried motherhood. These included a couple of her superiors "who /had/ got to know", and only one other person. This work-mate had responded with surprise and shock, but not with any kind of hostility. Hilary was still trying to pass with the rest of her work-mates, including the girl with whom she went dancing. Overall, she had very little contact with her work-mates outside of work.

This job was the only one she had had since giving birth, but she had worked, again as a clerk, up until the eighth month of her pregnancy. She had also tried to pass with her work-mates there, although they had become suspicious. In response "they seemed a bit quiet, not their usual selves", but apart from teasing her they showed no signs of hostility".

5. Iris

Iris had very little contact with neighbours. She said "I don't see any"

of them. However, she added, "I have heard that /one of the next-door neighbours/ has been bothered by the noise the children have been making, which I think she has no right to complain about because the children's home was here before she came". Also, she said, "the lady next door /on the other side/ said to /Gillian/ 'how do you come in here, what happens?' And /Gillian/ said, 'oh, as soon as one leaves another comes in'. And she said 'oh dear, I thought there might be less girls getting pregnant now that the Abortion Act is in'. Most of us are touchy about abortions. It's obvious that we didn't really go in for abortion". Apart from these neighbours, she sometimes came across "the dentist /who/ says 'hello', 'good morning', 'good evening'. /Although/ if he is with his wife, he won't." As has already been noted, Iris had a job as a semi-skilled worker in a factory, and her work-mates, who were mostly men, had learnt about her unmarried motherhood. However, she had experienced no rejection or hostility. On the contrary, she had been completely accepted, and had developed some friendships amongst her work-mates with whom she had some contact outside of work and from whom she received presents and help.

For a short time after giving birth, she had had a part-time job in a dry-cleaning shop, working "with a very nice man", but moved to a full-time job in a similar shop. However, "the area manager - who was a bit funny - decided he couldn't keep /her/ on because /she/ couldn't do Saturdays. And so /she/ was out of work" for a few weeks until she got the job in the factory.

She said about her full-time job in the dry-cleaners: "My old boss, actually, he found it for me". This was the 'district manager' who was in charge of the shop where she had worked during her pregnancy. She had worked with two other people - the manager of the shop and the friend Iris had told first about her pregnancy. As has been noted, this friend had shown no hostility, and after suggesting abortion, had helped Iris in various ways. However, when the manager of the shop learnt, he responded in a different

way. "He said 'why don't you get rid of it?' /Iris/ said 'no'". But, Iris said, "he gave me hell for a while. He said it wasn't fair on the child and etcetera". Then "he asked me to have /the child/ adopted. He kept on and on and on at me. And, well, he upset me really because he kept on about it, you know. Nasty, somehow". He thought "I was being horrible and nasty to the baby, because he had just had a baby and he didn't think it was fair for anyone else to have a child without a father". However, Iris added, "when the district manager found out what was going on - you know, that he was putting the pressure on me, the manager of the shop - well, he went mad: 'it's your baby', he said. Of course, he was a Roman Catholic. 'If you want to keep it, you keep it. Don't listen to anybody'". Referring to when the district manager had first been told about her pregnancy, Iris said "he went mad. He said I wasn't to /work so hard/. 'Go home early rather than stay late'". At the same time, she added, "they said I could work as long as I liked. So I decided to work for six and a half months". Moreover, "the district manager said I could have the job back whenever I wanted".

6. Marie

When I asked Marie, who at the time of interviewing was living with her parents, how much contact she had with her neighbours, she replied "not very much". She would usually see them "only if the children are playing out the front", when she would "pass the time of day" with them. However, her neighbours were generally "very friendly". She said about her next-door neighbours "they're trying to get me married, but apart from that it's alright". They would say, "in a friendly way, 'the best thing for you is to get married' - as if you stood on a corner and said 'here I am'". Marie said about all the neighbours she had had since becoming an unmarried mother "/I have had/ no real trouble. I've had nosey neighbours. But, that's about all. No, I've never had any abuse hurled at me over the wall or anything". Her last lot of neighbours in Midtown, for example, "were

dying to know what was going on". Thus, "my next-door neighbours" were curious, although "this wasn't until I had some parcels delivered to 'Miss....' and I wasn't in, and they took them next door. /Also/ the girl over the road used to come over and say 'it's so much nicer being on your own than living with your in-laws', and this sort of thing. And they were just inquisitive, I think". I asked if she thought that her neighbours would have shown any hostility if they had known for certain that she was an unmarried mother, and she replied, "I don't think so - depending on my conduct. I don't think it would have mattered, if I conformed with their ideas of what I should be doing. But if I'd have had parties every night, or if I had a different man arriving and going at breakfast time, I think then perhaps their attitude would have changed then. But I was pretty conventional to have around".

She had experienced no hostility from neighbours, not only during her last stay in Midtown, but also during her earlier one. As has been noted already, on first moving to Midtown, she stayed in a bed-sit in a house with several other people, all of whom had accepted her and amongst whom she had made some fairly close friends. On the other hand, she had perhaps experienced some hostility from two of the four girls with whom she had shared a flat in London at the beginning of her pregnancy¹. These girls had been fellow stewardesses for the airline company with which Marie had had her last job. They had been among the few work-mates who had learnt about her unmarried motherhood, but the only ones from whom she had experienced responses of this kind.

There was a substantial variation in the neighbouring patterns of my informants at the time of interviewing. Thus, Elaine appears to have had a good deal of contact and shared activity and some fairly close relationships with neighbours. Both Ann and Marie also had quite a lot of contact and shared activity as well as some fairly close relationships. In contrast, my other three informants had only a limited amount of contact and only

distant relationships with the neighbours living within the immediate vicinity of the hostel. Perhaps by way of compensation, however, Hilary and, especially, Iris, had work-mates with whom they had some contact outside of work and had developed friendships.

This variation fits in very well with the one which, it was decided earlier, could have been expected under 'normal' circumstances, and, in fact, my informants' unmarried motherhood appears to have made very little difference to the relationships they had with neighbours at the time of interviewing.

My informants had experienced very little hostility from the neighbours they had had. Ann had experienced none whatsoever. Elaine might have experienced a response of this kind from her employer at the time when she conceived, but that was all. She had been totally accepted by the neighbours living nearby, and had even drawn closer to some of them.

Gillian, Hilary and Iris had apparently experienced some hostility from the neighbours living next door to the hostel, but none of them had ever done so from others. Moreover, the hostility of the next-door neighbours may simply have been directed at the hostel or, more specifically, the noisy activities of their children. They had found that both those neighbours living nearby and those work-mates who had learnt about their unmarried motherhood had mainly accepted and had sometimes provided various kinds of advice and assistance. Likewise, Marie had found that neighbours who had learnt had usually accepted. The possible exceptions were the two girls with whom she had worked and shared a flat at the beginning of her pregnancy. Apart from this, she had experienced only curiosity from neighbours who did not know for certain that she was an unmarried mother, and who, Marie supposed, would not have been hostile even if they had known.

The reports of my informants suggest that the neighbouring patterns of unmarried mothers are less likely to be affected by responses from neigh-

bours to their unmarried motherhood than by their own responses. For example, four of my informants - Ann, Gillian, Hilary and Iris - had moved away from neighbours they had had when they conceived, as part of an attempt to pass with them, with the result that contact had become more difficult and often completely lost.

*

The relationships of unmarried mothers that have been examined so far, have been largely of the 'informal' kind. According to Elizabeth Bott,

informal relationships, that is /.../ relationships with friends, neighbours and relatives /.../ are felt to be of much greater importance than the more specialized and formal relationships that are maintained with doctors, clinics, schools, and so forth ¹.

However, some relationships, such as those with doctors, may not always be classifiable as simply 'formal', and even those relationships which are simply of this kind may nevertheless have important 'direct' and 'indirect' consequences for individuals' social situations. Moreover, some of the arguments in favour of the decline of 'community', such as those presented by Tönnies and by Wirth which were discussed earlier, may be taken to imply that there has been, and continues to be, an increase in the importance of this type of relationship. We might recall, in this context, Goffman's point about how stigmatized individuals may be 'passers' and may consequently have little 'informal' contact, but may nevertheless be required to have contact with, and to reveal their identity to, the representatives of service organizations². Hilary, for example, was a passer and consequently had only a limited amount of informal contact, but had had to apply to the S.B.C. for assistance and as a result had been required to tell its officers about her unmarried motherhood.

The responses experienced by unmarried mothers to their unmarried motherhood from the representatives of service organizations, such as the S.B.C., may have consequences for their social situations not only directly, by way of their affect on their relationships with the representatives in question,

but also indirectly, by way of their affect on their approaches to information management with other people.

The next part of this chapter is concerned with an investigation of the formal social relationships of unmarried mothers. My informants' relationships with the representatives of medical and health organizations, such as nurses, health visitors and doctors; with social workers; and with S.B.C. officers, are examined.

At the time of interviewing, Marie was a semi-passer, in that she sometimes tried to pass within certain types of formal relationships, especially those she had with nurses. This was because of the treatment she had experienced from "people in authority", as she put it. In fact, she had experienced more unpleasant treatment from people of this kind, that is, from "people /she had/ been forced into contact with through having the child", than from "people /she would/ meet at any other time". Moreover, "she singled out people like... in the medical profession - health visitors, for example", as having treated her the worst. For instance, she said, "I had to take /my daughter to the local hospital/ and it was all smiles until we got to the father's name. And attitudes do change, I find anyway - in official people, rather than in individuals", She explained "I'm considered less of a mother because she wasn't planned. So, therefore, I'm 'doing the minimum', and I won't put myself out to do any more for her". She had been treated in the way she had because of what had been expected of her in view of her unmarried motherhood. She had come to the conclusion that nurses and health visitors, especially, think that because the pregnancies of unmarried mothers "are not planned", their children "are not wanted".

The nurses in the hospital where she had given birth had assumed she would have her child adopted. At birth, her daughter was placed in an incubator and later Marie "was walking down the corridor one day and a woman from another ward came and said 'oh, have you seen that poor little mite in the

incubator who's going to be adopted?" Marie said "it didn't hit me then who they were talking about. But they were talking about /my daughter/, and the nurses had... Perhaps they'd had a lot of these cases, and it was assumed that I'd have her adopted. Nothing had been said ever". These nurses thought that Marie might even try to abandon her child. Marie was ready to leave hospital before her daughter, but, she said, "they didn't want to let me out of the hospital, because they thought I'd leave her. And I had to promise the sister that I would /visit the hospital/. And it was two bus journeys to the hospital every day. Not for me to see /my daughter/, but for them to see I'd go there". She continued "then she was transferred to a heart hospital, where she had two operations. And they were very, very nice there - exceptionally nice - until the last day. And then they said will you come to pick her up at a certain time. And I said 'look, I can't get here until after seven o'clock', because I couldn't get a lift until that time. And I didn't get there until eight, and they'd been phoning where I was living to find out where I was because, again, they assumed I wasn't going back and pick her up".

These nurses also assumed that Marie would not take adequate care of her child. Health visitors shared this assumption. Referring to health visitors, Marie said "at the beginning, they think you won't be able to adapt to motherhood, so therefore you'll be perhaps resenting your child all the time, instead of doing what you can". Alternatively, "they feel that you're so much on your own that you haven't got a clue about babies, and so therefore you need some advice". Consequently, "they think they should come and tell you how to feed your baby and what your baby should be doing". But "I'm afraid I don't like being given advice". She said about the visits she received "I just resent being called upon every two or three months to be told what I should be doing". She explained "I object to being checked upon, whether I was married or unmarried. I suppose in some circumstances it's quite useful - they can tell whether the children are

being mistreated or underfed, and this sort of thing. But I just object to somebody coming in from outside, into my home, and looking me over and my child".

Marie's daughter went into hospital for an operation when she was about nine months old and Marie "was lucky enough to be able to stay with /her/ all the time". But, Marie said, "I'd have nurses coming in and telling me when to feed her and when to change her nappy, and this sort of thing". She added "I did object to being told when she was about nine months old when I should feed my own child and what I should be doing with her". It was possible that the nurses "were doing it to other people", but it was more likely that they singled out unmarried mothers for this kind of treatment. This is because, she explained, they have "still got this idea that as you didn't choose to be a mother - it happened - that you're not very good, and so therefore they shouldn't really waste their time on you".

At the same time, Marie thought, the way nurses, or anyone, treated her, depended on "what other experiences /they/ have had in their lives". Nurses treated her as they did because "they have been dealing with all sorts of people and all sorts of unmarried mothers - perhaps for years and years". She explained "if people have met somebody who was an unmarried mother before who's been sweet, charming, and this sort of thing, perhaps they treat me in the same way; if they've had bad experiences before....!" I asked Marie if she thought, therefore, that the nurses she had encountered had had only such experiences with unmarried mothers, and she replied "oh, it can't be always. No! I can't be the first intelligent unmarried mother....! I'm only joking. It must be their experience of other people generally. People are inclined to class you as an 'unmarried mother' before they get to know you as a person. There is this group, and they associate you with it, perhaps before, whereas some people get to know you first and then tie up the two things". Nurses and health visitors imagined the typi-

cal unmarried mother to be "a sixteen year old who's got no common sense". Nurses, she said, "have got their idea /of the 'unmarried mother' and/ before you come in they look down their little list, and they say 'oh, Miss... Now this girl is going to need to be told... We need to tell this girl what to do and when to do it'". Marie could "just imagine" that nurses and health visitors pictured the typical unmarried mother to be "an unintelligent sixteen year old, with no home to go to, nobody to advise her, who is grateful for everything". Marie said "this big thing about 'you've got to be terribly grateful for any little piece of advice'. And not only have you got to be grateful, you've got to follow their advice". Marie was not grateful for the advice from nurses and health visitors. She did not need it, and she objected to the assumptions behind the belief that she did need it.

Marie was the only one of my informants who made a general complaint about treatment by nurses and health visitors, although Elaine did complain about the way she had been treated by one nurse in the hospital where she gave birth. Elaine said "when I was in /the hospital/ there was this sister and she was really nasty". She said "'Oh, you're going to have this baby adopted, are you?'" Elaine, who had "more or less decided beforehand" to keep the child, retorted "'no, I'm not'". This nurse, Elaine said, "was just the type to make you" finally decide against adoption.

Hilary had no complaints about the nurses in the hospital where she gave birth. She said "although the hospital staff knew - it was down on their records - they always called you 'Mrs.' and not once did they make you feel you weren't a married woman. They were very nice". Gillian expressed similar feelings about the way she had been treated by the staff of the maternity home where she had given birth. She said "the matron spoke to me and she said... you always get it. I mean, it's not unusual really. You go to these places - the maternity home or wherever you go - and they want to know your name and who will be coming to visit you, because only husbands are allowed in the evenings. So I thought, 'it's no good me trying to hide

anything, because surely they're going to be able to find out something anyway, so I might as well tell them". Despite Gillian's apprehensions, the matron "was ever so nice, and she said 'could I talk to the father or anything for you?'" Gillian reported that the staff in general were "all very nice really. They call you 'Mrs.', even though you are not", for example. However, not all unmarried mothers in the home were treated in the same way. Gillian said "there was one unmarried mother there, but this was her second child. I don't know why, but the attitude towards her was different from what it was towards me". The staff and the other patients, she said, "accepted me as one of themselves. But to her, never". They treated the other mother "as if she had the plague or something", perhaps "because it was her second child, /and because/ they think 'well, it's understandable, it can happen to anybody the first time, but the second time...!'"

Iris had also found that the staff in the hospital where she gave birth were "alright, pretty nice". She said "they were wondering what I was going to do, whether I was going to keep the baby or not, /but/ they just treated me like everybody else really". For several weeks both before and after giving birth, Iris was living in a Mother and Baby Home, where she was treated in a similar way. Her only complaint about the staff in the home was that "they were too soft". She explained "I mean, some of us were going out into the big, bad world with our babies. We were to secure". Iris got a place in the home, as well as somewhere to live beforehand and a place in the hostel afterwards, with the help of a social worker. Consequently, she had no complaints about the social workers she had come across either. Likewise, Hilary had had help in getting a place in the hostel as well as accommodation beforehand from a social worker. Although Gillian was not helped in the same way, she was referred to the hostel by the social worker with whom she had been put in touch by the matron of the Mother and Baby Home where she had been living. Ann, however, had been given no

assistance or guidance from social workers in this respect. She was referred to a social worker (who in turn had referred me to her) by the Citizen's Advice Bureau. Ann said, "generally, she is very nice", but "you can never work her out - you can never make out what she's thinking". For instance, Ann had considered adoption, but she said about this social worker, "she was careful not to say anything which might influence me. She was just there to put it through if I wanted the baby adopted, and sort of help if I didn't". Elaine had had dealings with the same social worker, but she had experienced different treatment from her. She had decided to keep her child only after seriously considering adoption, and she said about this social worker "as soon as she found out I wanted to keep it, she was really nice, but /before that/, when I said I wanted it adopted, she was really hostile towards me. I was about four or five months when I went there and she was very cut and dried".

Marie, who complained so much about the way she had been treated by nurses and health visitors, also complained about social workers. When I asked her if she had had any contact with social workers, she replied "oh, don't talk to me about social workers. I have never met such a thick load of women in my life". Soon after having her pregnancy confirmed, Marie got in touch with a social worker "who was very nice to start off with - very nice woman". But, Marie said, "I found she could only tell me about what I already knew. Obviously she couldn't make up my mind - this is when I didn't know what I was going to do /about adoption/. All she could do was give me addresses of adoption societies or the Unmarried Mother and Her Baby Council - this sort of thing. And tell me the pros and cons, which I had already formulated anyway. So that wasn't a great help". Social workers in general had not given her the help she had needed, and were, therefore, no better than nurses and health visitors in this respect. Marie said "when it comes to the crunch, these health visitors are alright at giving advice about how much orange juice you should give them every week,

but when you need them like I did when I was living in bad conditions... I'd got a child with something wrong with her chest, and I said 'look, can't you do something and help me get a council flat' - absolutely useless. They didn't know what to do".

My informants' involvement and relationships with nurses and social workers differed, although, with the exception of Marie, they had experienced little, if any, hostility from these types of people. Their involvement and relationships with S.B.C. officers also differed, but in this case they had experienced far more unpleasant treatment and even hostility. At the time of interviewing, only three of my informants were receiving assistance (that is, those three without jobs), but all of them had had some dealings with the S.B.C.

Hilary had received assistance for a period of four or five months, beginning shortly before she went to live in the hostel. When I asked her how she had been treated by the officers she had come across, she said "just always as if 'you hear this thing every day - just take it down - you mustn't show any emotion'". When she first applied for assistance, she said, "they just asked a lot of questions - the whereabouts of the father - and I told them. I suppose their attitude towards /the father/ was 'why should /we/ provide when he could'". She told them that the father had "offered to pay for /her daughter/ but nothing to live on - just the money he should pay towards /my daughter's/ maintenance". Hilary was given an allowance which included an amount to cover the rent of the flat in which she and her daughter were living. But, she said, "I was only there for a couple of weeks, then I went to this guest house". Then, "a young officer came to see me at the guest house", and he "was very nice". Referring to the officers in general, she said "not once could I ever say they were unkind, they didn't want to help - because they did. They were very good. I didn't come across one that I could say made me feel that I shouldn't have been claiming".

Hilary, Iris and Gillian had all received assistance at some time through the office in Westown¹. In fact, the only time Iris had ever received assistance was for a few weeks after going to live in the hostel. When she first applied, the officer she met "was very nice". Moreover, she had found them all to be "very nice down that office". On the other hand, she knew of "one girl that they were terribly rude to". This girl, Iris said, "is pregnant. I don't know her myself, but this boy at work, he knows her. And he said she went down there for some money, and they kept saying she wasn't entitled to any for some reason. I forget most of it now, but they were very rude to her". Iris was not completely happy about the way she had been treated. They were, she said, "very nice to me down there, /but/ the funny thing was, they kept saying they were going to write to the father". Iris was not receiving any help from the father and, moreover, had not even told him about her pregnancy. She still wanted to keep it a secret from him, and so did not want the S.B.C. to carry out their threat. She said "if he is paying maintenance, then he has every right to see the child". Iris did not want the father to have any rights with regard to her child, but in response to repeated suggestions from the S.B.C. that the father should pay something, and that either she or they should get in touch with him, Iris gave them the father's name and address. She said "I don't think it's right. They shouldn't make you tell about the father. /It/ upset me really because I was always terrified that they were going to go and find him". The officers told Iris of a way in which the conflict between their wishes and her own could be resolved. They "said, 'well, if you get a job there is nothing we can do about it'". In other words, they tried to persuade her to get a job so that she would no longer receive assistance. Iris knew that the officers "couldn't make you get a job, because you are entitled to social security. But, they said, 'if you get a job, we cannot take action against the father, we cannot go to see him, we would completely forget this'". Iris did eventually get a

job, "but then all of a sudden you are out of work... 'where's the father?' And you think 'oh God, not again'". Nevertheless, the officers did not get in touch with the father, and Iris said "I knew they wouldn't do it. They kept threatening me, but they wouldn't do it".

Like Iris, Gillian had not received assistance before going to live in the hostel. Also like Iris, she was not receiving any help from the father when she applied, and consequently was subjected to pressure from the S.B.C. to get him to help. When she first visited the office, she found, like Hilary, that the officer she met behaved "just as if she had dealt with hundreds of cases". Shortly afterwards, Gillian received a visit at home from another officer. This was, she said "a man, and he was ever so pushy". He was "more concerned about the father's name and all this". He enquired about the father, and, unlike Iris, she "answered all the questions /she/ could". She let him know who the father was and where he lived. However, she found, like Iris, that the S.B.C. did not contact the father although she had had no reservations about them doing so. Unlike Iris, Gillian was not subjected to pressure to go out to work. Nevertheless, after a few weeks she got a job out of choice. She would have preferred, in fact, to have had a job all along, and to have been able to manage without going to the S.B.C. She had only applied for assistance after her savings had run out and she had been persuaded by a member of the hostel committee to do so. Referring to the S.B.C. officers she had come across, she said "they always seemed fair. But... I don't know about the other girls, but I know how I felt when I received the money. I know it's the government and everything, but I felt 'well, you haven't earnt it', sort of thing".

Whilst Gillian's feelings about receiving assistance had not been affected by the way she had been treated by S.B.C. officers, Ann's feelings had. Ann, along with Elaine and Marie, was receiving assistance at the time of interviewing. She had applied for the first time about a year

before, in Midtown, and had been receiving assistance ever since. Shortly after applying "they sent somebody round who was a bit off". He was, Ann said, "very formal /and/ I felt pretty belittled, you know. He was being the holier-than-thou type, as though he was giving the money and I wasn't as good as him, you know". Later on, a second officer visited her, and he "was much nicer, he was very nice". Ann said "it was just the tone in which he spoke to me was much more friendly". Ann was not receiving an allowance from the father, so consequently, the next officer who visited her suggested she should either get the father to pay her something voluntarily or tell him who and where he was so that the S.B.C. could get him to pay. Ann said "his attitude was, he was going to take somebody to court - he didn't particularly care who it was or what happened". As was noted in chapter four, the father had volunteered an allowance, but had not paid what he had promised. Nevertheless, Ann had not told the S.B.C. because she feared they would take him to court.

Ann said about S.B.C. officers "they don't take feelings into account. They are just concerned not to give a person more than they have to". Elaine had gained a similar impression. She had been receiving an allowance for about three years, and had found that, in general, the officers "didn't treat /you/ badly, or anything - they just treat you normally". However, when she first applied for an allowance at the office in Midtown, the officer she met "was really nasty". Elaine said "every time I went up there he used to badger on at me to give him the father's name and that, and his address, to get money out of him". Elaine also was not receiving any money from the father when she applied for assistance, and she was told she should get the father to give her something, either voluntarily or through the courts. She said "they insist that you have to try and get some money out of them. They want to know all the details and things. And they tell you to go to a solicitor, and they'll pay. And you really have to do it, otherwise they don't pay you the money, so

I went". She decided to take the father to court, but later changed her mind. She said "I just went up /to the office/ one day, and I didn't care what he says to me. Because he's quite nasty really, he's quite upsetting you, he really gets at you - sort of tells you off in a nasty way all the time. So I thought I'd be nasty back. So, last time I went up there, I said 'I'm not going to take him to court'. And he was... Suddenly he was quite nice to me. And I never saw him again after that". Elaine had come to the conclusion that "really they only" try to persuade you to take the father to court "so they don't have to pay you so much".

At the same time, Elaine had been "surprised" to find that they had not suggested she should go out to work. This was, she said, "because the /first/ chap at the office said 'when do you think you'll return to work?' And I said 'well, when /my son's/ about two', you see. I was expecting a letter to come on his second birthday - 'out!', you know. And this chap who comes here, he said 'when do you expect to go back to work?' and I said 'well, when /my son's/ about two'. And he said 'oh, I shouldn't bother'. He said 'it's not worth it, usually. The child comes the worst out of it, being lumbered with someone or other'. He said 'I shouldn't bother to go until he's about five'. I was utterly amazed". She had received several visits from this officer, and she said "he's really nice. He's really friendly. He stays here for about half an hour. We have cups of tea and everything".

Elaine did not complain about S.B.C. officers to the same extent as Marie, who said "I don't like them very much", and added "the trouble started, I suppose, after /my daughter/ was born. I had a very young man come round to see me, which was very embarrassing for him, but he had to ask me if I knew who the father was. And I said 'yes' - of course I did. I was an absolute twit, because I shouldn't have said anything. And I told them who he was, and gave them a photograph and everything else. Then they

started pressuring me - 'you've got to take him to court, you've got to take him to court'". She realized later that she was not required to give information about the father. But, she said, "I didn't know at the time - they asked me a question, I gave the answer. He didn't tell me first that I didn't have to answer any of his questions. They were just an official board and official questions, and I had to answer them". Despite what happened on this occasion, she thought that the officer "was quite nice". On the other hand, she said, "the one I met after that was was rude and offensive, so that I had to have somebody in the same room at the same time. He asked me questions like was I living with /the father/ before I had /my daughter/, and was he the first person I'd had sex with, and this sort of thing, which was nothing to do with Supplementary Benefits. I asked /him/ did I have to answer them, and he said 'no', and I said 'O.K., I'll have somebody in the room from now onwards'. He just upset me so much that I said 'do I have to answer these because I don't really want to?'". She answered the officer's questions at first because, she said, "you get used to it - you get used to people asking you these sort of questions. And it is only when it gets to a certain point, and you think to yourself, 'I think he's gone a bit far this time'".

She received further visits from other officers and was told she should get the father to give her an allowance, either voluntarily or by taking him to court. Also, she said, "I had letters from them. Every time I applied for a new book or something, they'd say 'when are you going to take him to court?' And in the end I had to write to them and say I wanted my photograph of the father returned to me /because/ I wanted privacy maintained. Because I had one chap who came to see me, who told me that he knew /the father/, which we thought was a bit unprofessional. And so I asked for my photograph back. And I said I was not, repeat not, going to take him to court". Marie was against going to court because, at least

in part, she thought the father would successfully deny paternity.

But, under continuing pressure from the S.B.C., she eventually agreed to do so. She said "I changed my mind /because/ I knew that if I didn't do it within the first year, that they could do it at any time they wanted to. And of course that would mean that they would get the money while I was on social security, but as soon as I came off....!"

After deciding to take the father to court, Marie "got in touch with Social Security and said 'look, I'm taking him to court /in/ January - you will be present, won't you?' And they said 'Oh no. We won't be present'. So, /Marie/ said 'it's you that really wants me to go'. 'Oh well', they said, 'we'll send you a letter - will you please send it back to us? Will you fill it in and send us back the details if you win, afterwards?' And, after all that fighting, all they wanted to know was how much money at the end - they weren't prepared to do anything else". Marie was apprehensive about appearing in court. "Luckily", she said, "the day before we went to court, /the father/ admitted it". Consequently, although she still found the hearing "horrid", it was "better than /she had/ expected". She explained "I was expecting a stand-up fight - I was expecting to be cross-examined. But it was only the day before that we got a letter saying that he was admitting it. So, I got to court - he wasn't present, which made it easier - but three magistrates, who might be anything - they don't know anything about anybody - they're just general people, pronouncing sentence on me. My back was put up a bit, before, when I was ordered to read my 'yes sir, no sir, three bags full sir'". Then, she said, "his solicitor pleaded guilty for him - well, whatever they say, you know, he admitted it. But it was a bit of an ordeal because you felt as if you were just one of a few thousand other cases they went through, and they are all a little bit bored. It was all over very quickly, and it wasn't as bad as I expected. But it still wasn't very nice having to get up in the witness stand, even if you were

only giving your name and address, and everything else". The court ordered the father to pay Marie a weekly sum, which she "signed over to /the S.B.C./. Because he's a bit of a bad payer, and", she said, "they might as well have the trials and tribulations of chasing him up for the money". Referring to the court order, she said "I don't get a penny of it".

Marie had not seen an officer since the court case, when she received a visit from one because she had moved from her parents' and had begun renting her own house. She had applied for an increase in her allowance to cover the rent, which had been granted. However, since the court case, she had moved back to her parents' and, consequently, had had her allowance reduced again. Since going to court, Marie said, "I haven't seen any officers. That is what makes me cross. If you move somewhere else where they've got to give you some more money, they come round and they turn the place upside down to see if you're suitable that they should be paying you so much a week. And when I wrote and told them I was back here, because they're having to pay me less, they don't care if we're all sharing one bedroom, if I've got enough to eat. Just because they're having to pay me less, they don't bother. They didn't even come to see me this time - they just sent me a new book - because it was nearly six pounds less than I was getting".

Marie had come to the conclusion that "the people in Social Security are inclined to feel that they're giving you money out of their own pocket, and so they judge you perhaps that way". At the same time, she thought that they probably treated unmarried mothers in a special way. She explained, "with Social Security people, perhaps they're older people, and so therefore have got older ideas of morality, perhaps". Marie's beliefs in this respect were similar to those of Ann, who said about S.B.C. officers, "their attitudes are much the same to everyone, but maybe worse if you're unmarried". But, Ann added, the way "they treat you is understandable". She explained "with the rise in unmarried mothers keeping

their children, and everything, I suppose they tend to think 'well, why should we pay out money for these children', and so on". Nevertheless, Ann tried "to have as little to do with them as possible, because they are the only people /she had/ come up against" whose treatment had given her cause for complaint.

Marie, on the other hand, tried to have as little contact as possible with not only S.B.C. officers, but also 'people in authority' in general.

Referring to health visitors, she said "I tell you, I shall have somebody coming to that door quite soon, and I'm not even letting them in the house now. It's the one piece of officialdom I can turn down, and this is why I'm becoming a bit more militant about it. I can tell her on the doorstep to go to hell - I don't want to see her. Whereas you can't really do it to the Social Security man, or something like this, because you're dependent on them for money, or whatever". Her decision to treat health visitors in this way was, she thought, "probably a reaction over the last eighteen months of having /my daughter/ - that people have always been there to give me advice". Also, her experience over this period had led her to the conclusion "that you need someone behind you - it doesn't matter if you're married or you're not - but, it's having someone behind you, somebody to stick up for you and fight your battles". She had found that "if you are on your own, people are inclined to dish you out what they want to, and expect you to put up with it". But, instead, she had become "bloody-minded". She said "I'm very much on the offensive to make sure I get my just desserts as well as everybody else", and added "it's the circumstances that have made me like this - that you have to fight all the time".

Unmarried mothers tend to have some dealings with service organizations such as, and perhaps especially, the Supplementary Benefits Commission, to whom they apply for financial assistance. Some, however, have more dealings than others. Thus, Ann, Elaine and, especially, Marie, in comparison with my other three informants, had had quite a lot to do with

the S.B.C., for example. However, unmarried mothers tend to want to have as little as possible to do with service organizations, especially the S.B.C. This may, in part, be because of the meaning they attach to receiving assistance. Gillian, for example, thought it degrading to receive assistance - money which, as far as she was concerned, is unearned and is therefore 'charity'¹. At the same time, however, it is perhaps more likely that unmarried mothers will want as little as possible to do with the S.B.C. because of their experiences with its representatives.

All of my informants, with the possible exception of Hilary, had complaints about the way they had been treated by S.B.C. officers, although some had more complaints than others. The extent and nature of their complaints seem to have some relation to the extent and nature of their involvement with the S.B.C. If Hilary had any criticism at all, it was about the detached and formal way in which she had been dealt with. All my other informants, however, complained about being put under pressure to get the fathers of their children to give them an allowance. In this context, they mentioned suggestions that either they or the S.B.C. should get the fathers to volunteer an allowance and that if there was no success in this respect, they should take the fathers to court and get them to pay that way. Ann had been persuaded to get the father to volunteer an agreement and Marie had been persuaded to take legal action against the father, with the result that she had undergone an unpleasant court appearance. Elaine, on the other hand, had successfully resisted strong pressure to get the father to pay by taking him to court. Elaine was one of several of my informants who had answered questions from officers about the identity and whereabouts of the fathers. Iris had done this, despite her expressed wish to pass with the father of her child. Iris also complained about suggestions from officers that she should get a job.

Several of my informants had come to the conclusion that the treatment they had experienced from officers is explicable in terms of a wish to grant them as little money as possible, for as short a time as possible. This was the conclusion of Marie, for example, who had found that officers behaved as though they were being asked to give away their own money. Marie also thought that although officers would tend to treat all their clients in a consistent way, they would, at the same time, tend to be more severe with unmarried mothers. Ann, on the other hand, was not so sure about this. She said "I don't know whether it is particularly being an unmarried mother that brings this attitude out in them, or whether they are just like that to everybody"¹. If they were more severe with unmarried mothers, however, it was understandable in view of the increase in illegitimacy and subsequent demands on the S.B.C.².

It is perhaps to do with the fact that the services provided by the S.B.C. are essentially confined to those of the financial and material kind that unmarried mothers tend to have more contact with, and to have more complaints about treatment from, S.B.C. officers than the representatives of any other service organization³. My informants did not have only complaints to make about S.B.C. officers, but they had more complaints about them than about other representatives. Most of my informants made largely favourable comments about the way they had been treated by social workers, for example. Thus, Gillian, Hilary and Iris had all been helped in various ways by social workers. Ann had not been helped very much by the social worker with whom she had had dealings, but nevertheless had no complaint to make. On the other hand, Marie did criticize the social worker she had met, for not having given her the help she had wanted. Only Elaine made a further complaint, that a social worker had been hostile because she had been considering adoption.

Elaine made a similar complaint about a nurse in the hospital where she had given birth. However, this was the only complaint made about representatives of this kind, apart from the general criticism which was made

by Marie. As with social workers, both nurses and health visitors had not given her the help and advice she had needed. The advice they had given had been either poor or misdirected. It was based on the assumption that she would not take adequate care of her child, because she was either not interested in doing so or was incapable of doing so. Marie therefore looked on it as unwelcome and unjustified interference which stemmed from a typical image of unmarried mothers as naive and irresponsible. In the case of nurses, this image even led them to be wary of the possibility that Marie would try to abandon her child. This image was perhaps based, in part, on direct experience of unmarried mothers, but it was largely based on indirect, culturally informed, experience. Marie's experience of treatment by social workers, nurses and health visitors had led her to try to have as little to do with them as possible, and, in the dealings she did have with them, to be aggressive and sometimes to try to pass. However, she admitted the possibility that her behaviour towards these representatives was somewhat misplaced. Perhaps, she said, "I've seen so much of the inequalities that can happen /that/ I am imagining this before I go into anyone in authority". Thus, whilst she had gained the impression that the latter tried to take advantage because she did not have a husband, she said "I don't know whether I'm being extra sensitive and thinking it's just me because I'm on my own". Moreover, the assumptions that guided her behaviour may not have been arrived at simply as a result of direct experience. Thus, when I asked her to sum up and explain the way she had been treated by 'people in authority', she said "/it is/ so difficult, because before you've had the child, you imagine attitudes". Then, "after you've got the child, the attitudes could be caused by many factors. I mean, the nurse might have got out of bed the wrong side, or something. It might not just be me. I try not to be sensitive, or extra sensitive, because otherwise I'd get hurt all the time by just silly little remarks. But I got the

impression in hospital that because I was... I suppose it was unmarried and I hadn't got a man there, that I needed... They undermined my intelligence, anyway!"

*

In this and the previous three chapters, the 'immediate' social relationships of my informants have been thoroughly examined. In a similar way, Elizabeth Bott's investigation was of the "immediate /social/ environment" of her sample of elementary families; that is, of their "external relationships with friends, neighbours, relations, clubs, shops, place of work, and so forth"¹. As was noted in chapter three, she found that her families' social environments resembled one another in assuming the form of a network, but that they varied in that, as networks, they had differing degrees of 'connectedness'. Moreover, and relatedly, they varied in terms of "degree of individuation"². As was noted earlier in this chapter, Bott preferred to use the term 'individuated' rather than "the more commonly used term 'isolated'"³, apparently because even when families are not 'isolated', (which they are unlikely to be), in the sense of being completely cut off from social contact, they may be "differentiated out as distinct"⁴ because of the type or quality of contact involved. However, Reeder and Reeder, in the article mentioned in chapter one, suggest that the term 'social isolation' itself is often used to describe the type and quality of social contact. They say

The concept of social isolation is not only broad in scope, but it has been defined in a variety of ways. Implicit in most of these definitions has been the notion of either a lack or diminution of meaningful social contacts and relationships⁵.

Elizabeth Bott herself uses the term 'isolation', possibly in this sense, and therefore instead of 'individuation'. Thus, she had studied "several couples who /.../ had almost no informal network at all", and therefore "were living in a state of /.../ isolation or near isolation. They kept up necessary contacts with service institutions, paid a few duty visits

to relatives, and had superficial contacts with neighbours, but that was all"¹.

Reeder and Reeder also suggest that

it appears desirable to differentiate between social isolation as an objective entity, i.e., having few contacts or relationships with meaningful others, and isolation as a subjective entity, i.e., a person's feelings of estrangement, despair, hopelessness, etc. A number of other writers have stressed the value of making this distinction².

Peter Townsend is perhaps amongst the latter. In *The Family Life of Old People*, he distinguishes between 'social isolation' and 'loneliness'.

Thus

to be socially isolated is to have few contacts with family and community; to be lonely is to have an unwelcome feeling of lack or loss of companionship. The one is objective, the other subjective, and /.../ the two do not /necessarily/ coincide³.

In the next part of this chapter, information which has already been presented is used to judge the quality of my informants' social relationships. The term 'social isolation' is used in its 'objective' sense, to sum up the amount and type of social contact which they had with other people⁴. Also my informants' own feelings of isolation are referred to, and in this context the notion of 'loneliness' is used. Just as Bott discovered that her families were not equally 'individuated', so I found that, at the time of interviewing, my informants were by no means equally isolated or lonely. Moreover, in accordance with Townsend's suggestion, there was no simple relationship between degree of isolation and degree of loneliness.

At the time of interviewing, Ann had very little contact with her family and her friends, the great majority of whom were living over fifty miles away. Contact was limited to infrequent visits, some correspondence and a few telephone calls. Nor did she have much contact with neighbours, apart from the girl with whom she was living and one who was a close friend. She did not have a boyfriend. This was in contrast to the situation before she conceived, when she was living with her mother and near

to other members of her family and most of her friends. She summed up by saying "I don't know anybody in /Midtown/", and consequently "I'm bored /here/". When I asked Ann if she was lonely, she replied "oh yes, but then everybody is lonely, aren't they". I then asked her if she was more lonely than she had been before she became an unmarried mother, and she replied "I think you are more apart, because before you could go out and meet people and what have you. But I don't think so. I think /my son/ fulfils a certain longing".

Elaine was living with her mother, but had almost no contact with the rest of her kin, even though some were living nearby. Moreover, she had few friends, and very little contact with the friends she had. Contact with friends was more or less limited to exchanging letters with the closest of them. She did not have a boyfriend, but she did have a fair amount of contact with neighbours, by way of visits and shared activities. In fact, the amount and type of contact she had with neighbours had improved since she had become an unmarried mother, whereas that she had with family and friends had done the opposite. She had been accustomed to having a good deal of contact with family as well as a large number of friends, including boyfriends, with whom she spent a considerable amount of time. Elaine summed up by saying "there's hardly anybody I know these days". As a result, she was "quite lonely", and she said "I am much lonelier than I was".

Gillian had a fair amount of contact with her family, especially her married sister, who was living not far away in Westown. She saw her sister several times a week, and visited and had telephone conversations with her father regularly. Also, she had quite a few friends, most of whom were living nearby and with whom she had a lot of contact. She had very little contact with neighbours, but she had a boyfriend, whom she saw and went out with several times a week. Apart from seeing considerably less of her family, the amount and type of informal social contact she had was

not very different from what it had been before she became an unmarried mother. When I asked her if she was lonely, she replied "No. Not now. But before... Sometimes I do. The time I get lonely is when /my boyfriend/ is not here. I mean, lately I am occupied all day long - it don't bother me - but when I've got time to sit down and start thinking about things... 'If only things were...you had someone'. Like, if I go out, it's alright then, but I still have to come back here".

Hilary saw very little of her family, none of whom was living closer than thirty miles. Her father was living closest, but she had no contact with him whatsoever. She had only a few friends outside the hostel, and she did not have very much contact with them. She did not have a boyfriend, and she saw hardly anything of the neighbours. The amount and nature of her informal social contact had changed considerably from before she became an unmarried mother, when she had lived with her father, before going to live with the father of her child. Hilary gave the impression of being fairly lonely, but not as lonely as she might have been had her child not performed a similar function for her as Ann's child had done for her.

Iris was unusual in that she had no contact of any kind with the members of her family, who were numerous but living over thirty miles away. However, she had a large number of friends whom she saw a good deal. She had boyfriends with whom she went out occasionally, but she had little contact with neighbours. She had witnessed a considerable change in her relationships with kin, but she had much the same style of contact with friends. When I asked her if she was lonely, she replied "no, not really. When I wasn't seeing my 'mum' and 'dad', /the parents of one of her closest friends/, I was lonely, very lonely, for them. It was really upsetting me. I wanted to get in touch with them, really - but it worked out in the end".

Marie was living with her parents and her grandmother, and she had many

friends with whom she had a fair amount of contact. She had a few boy-friends with whom she went out occasionally, and she had some contact with neighbours. Her relationships with family were more or less the same as they had been before she became an unmarried mother, yet she had quite a lot less contact with friends. She said "I'm not really a very lonely person", and added, "I really don't, hardly ever, feel lonely. I don't really. I might wake up in the morning, and it might be a bad day, and I might start feeling sorry for myself and want somebody to talk to. But it's only on bad days. And everybody must get like that at times. I've become more introverted, I think. Very bad. I'll have to go to a psychiatrist!"

At the time of interviewing, Elaine was perhaps the most isolated of my informants, and was also perhaps the loneliest. Ann was almost as isolated, and, although lonely, was perhaps less so than Elaine because of what her child meant to her. Hilary was also fairly isolated, but again, not as lonely as Elaine because of what her child meant to her. Marie was less isolated and perhaps less lonely. She also, may have been less lonely than she might have been because of what her child meant to her. Gillian was less isolated still, and although she sometimes missed her boyfriend, she was not really lonely. Iris was perhaps the least isolated of my informants, and was not lonely. There was a fairly close relationship between my informants' degrees of isolation and their degrees of loneliness, but it was not necessarily a simple one. Thus, both Hilary and Marie might have been lonelier, if loneliness depended simply on their degree of isolation. However, the feelings of unmarried mothers about their social situations (or their 'subjective isolation', to use Reeder and Reeder's term) may depend to some extent on how their current situations compare with those they have enjoyed previously, including, and perhaps especially, those they enjoyed before they became unmarried mothers¹. Thus, Elaine and Ann had experienced considerable changes in

the amount and nature of their social contact. Marie and, perhaps more so, Hilary had experienced less change in this respect. Gillian and Iris had experienced relatively little change. At the same time, it may be more correct to say that the feelings of unmarried mothers about their current social situations depend on how they themselves see their previous situations and how they themselves make comparisons. That is, their degrees of loneliness will depend on how they compare their current social relationships with the ones they had, say, before they became unmarried mothers. In this context we may note how the 'subjective isolation' of Ann, Hilary and Marie at the time of interviewing may have been attenuated by the relationships they had with their children¹.

The feelings of unmarried mothers about their social situations may depend, not only on how they compare them with what they see as their own previous situations, but also on how they compare them with what they see as the situations of other people, such as, and perhaps especially, other 'mothers alone'. Connectedly, they will depend on how they account for their situations. Despite some variation, each of my informants had experienced very little rejection or hostility of any kind from other people, and so would have found it difficult to account for any change in her social situation in terms of the response of others to her unmarried motherhood. On the other hand, some of my informants would have been able to refer to their own response to help account for the change they had witnessed in their social situations². That is, they would have been able to account for the substantial changes they had witnessed, by referring to the ways in which they had gone about managing information about their unmarried motherhood.

Whilst at the time of interviewing, Ann was a non-passer, at the beginning she had been a passer and this had led her to leave home and to move about sixty miles away from the nearest of her family and friends. It

was her own initial response to her unmarried motherhood that was the source of the considerable change which had taken place in her social situation. She had since experienced the responses of all her family and friends, as well as those of many other people, and she had experienced very little, especially long-term, rejection or hostility. Apart from the unpleasant treatment she had experienced from S.B.C. officers, which in any case she thought was not necessarily due to her unmarried motherhood, she had been rejected only by the parents of a boyfriend and, temporarily, by her mother. She had come to the conclusion that "an unmarried mother is much more acceptable now than a few years ago, /that/ it's changed a lot over the past few years". She said "I think it is easier nowadays than it would have been in the past. I think you are quite accepted by most people. And people you are not accepted by, well, you tend to think they don't matter - which, as far as I'm concerned, they don't". She was of the opinion that unmarried mothers are still not completely accepted. Thus, for Ann there is still "a great difference" between the way in which unmarried mothers are treated compared with widowed mothers, for example¹. Consequently, widowed mothers are "socially better off" than unmarried mothers. Ann said about "society nowadays - if you've got a child and you've got the prefix 'Mrs.', then it's all sort of respectable and nice, and people feel 'oh dear, what a shame, her husband's been killed' or 'her husband's run off and left her', or something. And the attitude is much more sympathetic".

Ann suggested that "the thought of an unmarried mother shocks a few people - 'not the kind of person I want my child to associate with'". She said "I think that people who are narrow-minded about it, tend to think /you/ should never have /had pre-marital sexual intercourse/ in the first place. I think it's false morals. It's like putting themselves up to religion and what have you. A false moral attitude". She thought that, in particular, "the Church of England are a load of hypocrites". She explained "they go to church every Sunday, and say their prayers like

good little people - it's like Catholics, going to confession and then saying 'Our Father, I sin, I got drunk last night', and do exactly the same thing again. And on a different level, the Church of England is just the same, or the kind of people that go to Church". Thus, Ann did not "agree with the Christian religion as practised". However, she did "want to have some religion for /her son/", and had considered becoming a Quaker. She said "I have heard a lot about Quakers recently, and what I have heard appeals to me. It seems to be more liberal in outlook than any other religion I have come across. It seems much more free in its outlook. There seems to be no religion brought into it all, really. I mean, basically it's religious, but they don't push it down your throat".

Elaine would not have been able to account for any change in her social situation in terms of the responses either of other people or of herself to her unmarried motherhood. She had tried to pass extensively to begin with, but she had not moved away from home and she soon became far less interested in passing. At the time of interviewing, she was still a semi-passer, in so far as she occasionally tried to pass with men, but she had experienced responses from all her family and friends along with many other people. Elaine had experienced some hostility - from her brothers and her two oldest sisters, especially. But it was "only /her/ sisters, nobody else at all" who had rejected her.

Elaine believed that other unmarried mothers sometimes experience far more severe treatment. She said "some people I know - they're unmarried mothers - and their parents have chucked them out...terrible time". I asked Elaine why some people treat unmarried mothers in this sort of way and she replied "I don't know, it's just a natural reaction, I guess". She added "even if someone says to me 'she's an unmarried mother', I say 'is she really?' I do this myself. I find I do".

Gillian would have been able to have attributed some change in her social

situation to her own response to her unmarried motherhood, but not to the responses of others. She had begun as a passer and consequently had moved away from family and friends. However, by the time of interviewing, she had become a non-passer and she had experienced responses from all her family and most of the friends she had had, as well as from many other people. She had experienced hostility from only a few people - that is, from only a small minority of her family, the husband of a friend and perhaps a couple of neighbours.

I asked Gillian to try to explain why some people treat unmarried mothers in this way, and she replied "I don't really know. I suppose because of what they call 'babies without a dad', really. I suppose the woman next door /for example/, thinks that the kids aren't growing up properly without fathers". As was noted earlier, Gillian's aunt had been hostile for a while because she believed that Gillian would "never be able to manage".

Hilary would have been able to account for the change which had taken place in her social situation largely in terms of her own response. She was the only one of my informants who had been a consistent passer from the beginning. She had moved away from home and, although all her family had eventually learnt about her unmarried motherhood, most of her friends, both past and current, had not. She had experienced the responses of relatively few people to her unmarried motherhood, but she had also experienced very little hostility. Only her father, who had rejected her, and perhaps a neighbour, had responded in this way. Hilary summed up by saying "I can't really say how people do react to unmarried mothers, because I have always lied about it - I have always said I am married. So what people's actual views about unmarried mothers are... I can't say I have really had any bad feeling because of it". However, Hilary apparently believed that she had not experienced any hostility because, and only because, of her successful attempt at being a passer. People would

tend to be hostile if they learnt, she thought, because they tend to "take the attitude that /unmarried mothers/ are all sort of 'couldn't care less who they go with', sort of 'the loose type'".

Iris, like Hilary, would have been able to account for change in her social situation in terms of her own response but not in terms of the responses of others. She had been a passer to begin with, and consequently had moved away from family and friends. All of her family and most of these friends had still not learnt about her unmarried motherhood. However, she had become a non-passer and had experienced the responses of many people. She had experienced no hostility, apart perhaps from that of a neighbour and the manager of the shop where she had been working when she conceived. But, referring to the latter, she said "he was well-meaning. He thought it was for my good. He was fairly fond of me. And he thought it was for the baby's good. So you can forgive him really". Overall, she thought, "I have been lucky really. I know there are a lot of people who have it rough. I have always been fairly independent and adjustable. I adjust to different surroundings quite well. I am lucky in a way because I don't let things bother me that much". Whilst she had come across very few people who had been hostile, she believed that some people might respond in this way because of "this Victorian thing - 'she's a loose woman'", or "because they are frightened of the neighbours and the social aspect, and they feel '/she/ has done naughty things, and she shouldn't have', and they don't want to know". This explanation was similar to one suggested by Marie.

Marie would not have been able to account for any change in her social situation in terms of her own response, and would have been able to do so to only a limited extent by reference to the responses of others. She had been a passer at the beginning, but not for long, and she had not moved away from family or friends. At the time of interviewing, she was still a semi-passer, in so far as she occasionally tried to pass with rep-

representatives of service organizations, especially nurses. However, all her family and friends had learnt, as well as many other people. Apart from having experienced some hostility from representatives of service organizations, she had done so from the father of her child, a few of her friends, from a couple of the men she had met, and, temporarily, from her parents. However, in general people had accepted her, especially in the long run. That is "most people accept it. Most people are alright".

Marie said "I don't have any nastiness, just inquisitiveness. /For example, the neighbours in Midtown/ were dying to know what was going on". Also, she said, "everybody looks at you twice when you tell them. They weigh you up a bit more. Everybody certainly notices you a bit more when you tell them, and you can see things going through their minds". By way of example, she referred to an occasion when she told "a girl and a woman" who attended the same evening class as herself. She said "they were talking about going to teacher training college. And I said 'I suppose I've got to do teaching, it's the only thing you can do if you've got a child, isn't it'. And I could see them looking at me as if to say... Perhaps it's just me... they're totting it all up". Some people may have responded in the way she suspected of "the landlady at what used to be /her/ local pub". Marie said "I can just imagine it now as I've sort of been 'caught out'. I used to go in there with quite a lot of different people and I expect they thought that I was sleeping around all the time. This is the only thing, that they just look back and reflect on your life before and think 'oh yes', which might not be true. It doesn't matter if it is true..."¹.

Marie thought that the social situations of unmarried mothers "must be getting better". She noted "at least I wasn't shoved out into the street to beg my bed and breakfast". But, she also thought that her experience of the responses of others was not necessarily that of other unmarried mothers. She said "I have had it easy against a lot of girls, I know I

have". I asked her to explain why some people might find unmarried mothers unacceptable, and she replied "Oh, this is the moral hang-up isn't it". She added "it must be religion. It must come from 'thou shalt not commit adultery', or words to that effect". Thus, unmarried mothers would be unacceptable in comparison with widowed mothers. She said "I can imagine great sympathy for a widow against me, because I've been wicked". That is, "I 'shouldn't have done it', or something. I 'shouldn't have had the baby'. It's getting caught" that matters. In other words, a girl who has premarital sex without becoming pregnant is not unacceptable because "there's no outward sign" of her misbehaviour. As an unmarried mother, Marie said, "I've got the outward sign, haven't I. I parade it along... perhaps that's it. Perhaps I show off my naughty deeds by this baby. And perhaps if you have an abortion or go on the pill or something... So therefore people don't have to take notice of it. But when you present them with a baby, they have got to take some attitude". Marie's explanation here is perhaps the same as the one presented in chapter one, which suggested that people's responses to unmarried motherhood may depend not simply on whether or not they disapprove of it but also on the way they expect to be treated by others if they do not show they disapprove by responding in the appropriate way.

On the other hand, Marie might have been suggesting that by showing signs of her misbehaviour, she herself was not responding to it in the way which is considered appropriate. As has been noted, Marie had found that many people respond with embarrassment. She explained "people don't like you to come out with it, I don't think. You're supposed to be slightly shy and retiring about it. But if you're bold and you come right out, people don't know how to cope". She added "perhaps that is the thing. Because obviously, I would have thought, in the majority of cases the girl would have been proud of their babies, well I'm proud of my daughter and I want to show her off to people. So perhaps this is it, the fact that

I think she's beautiful and wonderful and does all the right things, perhaps I shouldn't. Perhaps I should be hiding her indoors and taking her out when nobody's looking, or perhaps I ought to behave... Perhaps I don't behave in the right way. Perhaps because I walk into somewhere 'I'm as good as you are and I expect the same service as everybody else does...'".

One possible way in which a stigmatized individual may try to deal with a situation in which his failing may cause embarrassment to others, is to try to 'cover'. According to Goffman

persons who are ready to admit possession of a stigma (in many cases because it is known about or immediately apparent) may nonetheless make a great effort to keep the stigma from looming large. The individual's object is to reduce tension, that is, to make it easier for himself and the others to withdraw covert attention from the stigma, and to sustain spontaneous involvement in the official content of the interaction /.../. The means employed for this task are quite similar to those employed in passing - and in some cases identical, since what will conceal a stigma from unknowing persons may also ease matters for those in the know /.../. This process /is/ referred to as 'covering'. Many of those who rarely try to pass, routinely try to cover¹.

It is possible then, that unmarried mothers will try to reduce the 'obtrusiveness' of their failing by 'covering' in order to ensure that it "interferes with the flow of interaction"² as little as possible. Apparently, at the time of interviewing, Marie however was not only usually unwilling to try to pass, but also unwilling to try to cover. This, as far as she was concerned, was the source of a good deal of the embarrassment and hostility she provoked in others.

Marie did try to pass on occasions, depending on whom she was dealing with. She said "the /only/ people I object to telling now, is authorities. People like in the hospital especially". She tried to pass with this type of person because of her experience of the way she had been treated by them when they knew her to be an unmarried mother. That is, she had found that hostile responses are most likely to come from "people like in the medical profession - health visitors /for example. And more generally, from/ people in authority rather than people /she/ would meet at any

other time". However, whilst she expected this type of response from most types of people in the medical profession, she did not expect it from "doctors, because they're usually men. And men are much kinder than women - women are always worse". She said "I've never found doctors, paediatricians, or my G.P. /hostile/. The doctors themselves have always been nice, both male and female. And it's been the nursing staff who have been the ones that I've had to make complaints about". In other words, she said "it's people that could have been in my position. Mainly girls who are now perhaps... Perhaps they were pregnant when they got married or they've been on the pill for five years - these are the sort of people that I find cast more sort of moral judgements". She added "it makes me sick. I don't mind the completely pure and innocent ones in this society doing it, but I do object to the people doing it that are just being lucky. I don't like people wondering about me that ought to do a bit of self-analysis first". At the same time, she said, "with nurses, it always amazes me, because they're the people who should be the most understanding. But they are not, not in my experience. Perhaps it's the fact that once people get into uniform, you always think you're a bit better when you've got a uniform on - you're slightly more superior. I know I always did. I'm sure it must be something to do with this officialness but I can't see how. But it always does seem, as I've said before, that the people who shouldn't be judging are the people who do judge".

As has been noted, Marie had also experienced hostility from S.B.C. officers, and had explained this in terms of age. S.B.C. officers are usually older people and are therefore more likely to subscribe to the traditional rules which proscribe unmarried motherhood. In addition, she said, "it's dependent on a person's education, how they have treated me. I'm not saying people who aren't very intelligent - that's not on - but just ordinary sort of people without any further education or anything

like this, have been more inclined to perhaps feel awkward. Whereas somebody who's had more education is better equipped for being told something like that". For example, she said, "there was /the/ chap who was at /the/ party I went to. /He/ was a right East Ender, Londoner. He was embarrassed", whereas the man she told at the evening class "didn't bat an eyelid about it".

For some of my other informants, there seemed to be certain types of people who are more likely to respond to unmarried motherhood with hostility. Ann, for example, in a similar way to Marie, expected older people rather than younger ones, to respond with hostility. This expectation was based, she claimed, on her experience of people's responses. She said, "I find it's generally sort of middle-aged people - married, staid people - who married the first bloke that they ever went out with, and what have you. They can't sort of think back to when they were young and the things they used to do". We may recall how the only person with whom Ann had tried to pass during the previous year or so, was an estate agent, because "he looked middle-aged and respectable". Both Gillian and Elaine had also come to the conclusion that people's responses depend on their age. Thus, Gillian claimed "young people accept me more than older people do", and Elaine suggested "/people do not respond with hostility if they are/ my age - they never do. I think my generation don't really say anything, do they". Nevertheless, we might recall that the only people with whom Elaine still tried to pass at the time of interviewing, were young men she met at dances.

The expectations and explanations which unmarried mothers have about how and why different types of people respond to unmarried motherhood, may be of use to sociologists in furthering their understanding of these phenomena. They are, after all, based on the experience of 'participant observers'. However, they cannot, of course, be taken as the sole source of information in this respect. To begin with, the experience of unmarried

mothers will not necessarily tell them all there is to know about why people treat them as they do, and furthermore, their experience will not necessarily be an accurate reflexion. Their experience as unmarried mothers may, for example, be affected by their experience before they became unmarried mothers. Moreover, it is also possible that whatever their experience since becoming unmarried mothers, their expectations and explanations will be based on their previous experience. Marie, it may be recalled, alluded to this possibility when I asked her to try to account for the treatment she had experienced from nurses. Thus, the expressed beliefs of all my informants about the responses of people to unmarried motherhood, inspite of any consistency amongst them, need to be viewed with caution.

At the same time, however, knowledge of these beliefs is essential to an understanding of my informants' own responses to their unmarried motherhood, and therefore of their treatment of other people, of their social relationships and social situations. In fact, the reports of my informants suggest that the responses of unmarried mothers themselves to their unmarried motherhood are perhaps more useful than the responses of others, in helping to account for the state of their social relationships and the degrees of social isolation they enjoy. Thus, whereas some of my informants - that is, Ann and Hilary - had become relatively isolated because of their own responses, none of them had done so because of other people's responses. The relative isolation of Elaine and Marie was not because of their own responses, but neither was it because of the responses of others. This point, coupled with the fact that my other two informants, Gillian and Iris, were perhaps hardly any more isolated than they had been before they conceived, brings to mind the two related issues of (a) the importance of the responses of unmarried mothers, as well as those of other people, to an understanding of their social situations and of (b) the way in which the social situations of unmarried mothers

differ from those of 'normals' (to revert back to Goffman's term).

Some evidence has already been presented on these issues in this and previous chapters, and further evidence is presented in the next chapter, which is concerned with the social lives of unmarried mothers.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SOCIAL LIVES

After examining the social relationships of young unmarried mothers in previous chapters, their social lives are investigated in this chapter. A precise definition of the term 'social life' is difficult and perhaps unnecessary here, but it has to do with how and with whom people spend their leisure time. Thus, the social lives of unmarried mothers are made up of their shared leisure time activities. But what is meant by the term 'leisure time'? Again - as Gordon Rose has suggested - "leisure time and activities are difficult to define precisely. Nevertheless, some things - going to the pictures or to the club - are clearly leisure and can be measured"¹. This approach is similar to the one adopted by Goldthorpe and Lockwood in their study of affluent manual workers and their families, where a definition of 'leisure time' was implied. They reported on the "styles of social life"² of their samples by providing "detailed information /.../ on the /.../ use made of leisure time, or, rather, of non-working time"³ which included information on "leisure time social relationships"⁴. But what is meant by the term 'work'? According to Peter Worsley

In our own society, the term 'work' would seem to have a perfectly unambiguous meaning. It refers to a specialized undertaking clearly marked off from others in time and space. Work is an activity which takes place in an office, a market place or a factory - somewhere separate from the home. Secondly it occurs during periods of time - 'nine to five', the 'evening shift' and so on - which are likewise segregated from other periods of time.

Yet while the meaning of the word would appear at first glance to be perfectly clear, there are in fact certain problems and contradictions in the way we use it. Thus a person expending considerable physical energy in his garden, or in redecorating the front room is not normally considered to be 'working'. In official statistics, housework is not usually regarded as work although the activities of the housewife may be more exhausting than those of her husband⁵.

This last point of Worsley's takes us back to the discussion at the

beginning of chapter four. Is housework 'work'? The answer to this question lies perhaps in Worsley's suggestion that "what is, and what is not work is socially defined; it is not a quality inherent in a particular act"¹. How, then, should 'work' be defined, if at all, for the purposes of sociological analysis? Should the 'social definition' be taken as a guide even if it excludes housework? According to Stephen Cotgrove, "the housewife 'works' even though" the prevailing 'social definition' in our society does not include her activities as work. However, for the purposes of the analysis in this chapter we may regard 'work' as that "which takes place at particular times in particular places for the purpose of gaining an income". People 'work' when they are pursuing their "'occupations', that is to say those roles which determine /their/ market situation"². Work is activity within the market sector of the economy. Thus, the examination of my informants' social lives is concerned with how and with whom they spent their time when they were not pursuing their occupations or jobs³.

According to Gordon Rose, "we do not have much easily accessible factual information about leisure in Britain, and most of the information available is related to adolescents"⁴. However, apart from the possibility that the available information on the leisure activities of adolescents is pertinent to the present discussion, there is, in fact, a fair amount of contemporary available data on the rest of the population. For example, the Social Science Research Council Survey Unit carried out a study of leisure activities in Britain in 1973⁵. They presented information on the percentages of people who 'frequently' engage in various activities, some of which were home-based and some of which were not.

At home: 92 per cent frequently watched television; 79 per cent read newspapers; 71 per cent relaxed; 63 per cent listened to music; 39 per cent read books; and 22 per cent gardened. Outside of home: 71 per cent frequently visited family and friends; 50 per cent went to the pub, etc.;

32 per cent went for car rides; 29 per cent went for meals; 21 per cent participated in clubs and societies; 19 per cent took part in sport and the same proportion watched sport; 15 per cent went to the cinema, theatre, etc.; and 11 per cent went to bingo.

Variations in participation in the different activities according to age and according to 'education' were measured. For some of the activities there were either small or complex variations. This applied to the variations according to both age and education with regard to watching television and going for car rides; according to age alone to reading books, participating in clubs and societies and playing bingo; according to education alone to reading papers, listening to music, gardening, visiting family and friends, going to the pub and watching sport. However, there were direct relationships between age and reading newspapers, relaxing, and gardening. There were inverse relationships between age and listening to music, visiting family and friends, going to the pub, going out for meals, taking part in sport, watching sport, going to the cinema and theatre. There were direct relationships between education and reading books, going out for meals, participating in clubs and societies, taking part in sport, and going to the cinema and theatre. There were inverse relationships between education and relaxing, and playing bingo.

These findings are in line with those of a similar study carried out by S. De Gazia in the United States in the early nineteen sixties¹, which has been discussed by Gordon Rose. According to Rose

An analysis of a national sample of 5,000 were asked what they did yesterday; this is given for people over twenty and analysed by educational attainment. There are distinct gradients moving up the scale in those who read magazines or books, listened to records, went to meetings or went pleasure driving, but otherwise there is little variation. Those with the least education score were highest on the item 'none of those listed', but whether this is a 'not known' category is not apparent. People seemed to watch television or work around the house or garden just as much, whatever their level of education. Viewing studies in England also show little variation in the time spent viewing, although the actual programmes and whether viewing BBC or ITV are affected by class².

The S.S.R.C. findings are also given some support in the results of a study by Young and Willmott of married men in full-time employment in the London Metropolitan Region in 1970¹. Information was presented on leisure activities in terms of social class - measured according to whether the informants were professional and managerial, clerical, skilled, or semi-skilled and unskilled. Informants had been asked whether or not they had participated in various home-based activities, sporting activities and other leisure activities at least once a month in the previous year. Again, television was found to be the most popular home-based activity within the sample as a whole and there was very little variation in terms of social class. As far as the popularity of home-based activities in general is concerned, there was either only small or complex variations in terms of social class². On the other hand, there was a clear relationship between active participation in sporting activities³, and social class: those in the higher classes participated more. In the area of other leisure activities, variations tended to be either small or complex. The most popular activities were going for drives, to pubs and for walks, although it may be noted no information was provided on visiting family and friends. Perhaps the clearest variations had to do with going out for meals and attending church: in each case there was a direct relationships between social class and participation.

Information on holidays away from home suggests that there is a direct relationship between number of holidays and social class - measured in terms of occupation. Thus, according to a national survey carried out by the British Travel Association in 1973, whereas over 80 per cent of those in social class AB usually take one or more holidays each year, under 50 per cent of those in social class DE do so⁴.

There appears to be some variation in participation in various leisure activities according to sex. The S.S.R.C. study shows that watching

television, reading books and visiting family and friends are similarly popular amongst both men and women, whether or not they are in full-time employment¹. However, men spend more time than women as a whole reading newspapers, relaxing, going to pubs, going out for meals and participating in and watching sport. On the other hand, women as a whole spend more time than men listening to music and going to bingo. Amongst women, those in full-time employment spend a good deal less time than the rest reading papers and relaxing, but they spend quite a lot more time going to pubs, going out for meals, taking part in sport and going to the cinema and theatre.

The most popular home-based activity, watching television, has steadily become more popular over the last few years, according to figures provided by the B.B.C.². Thus, the average number of hours that people (over the age of five years) spend watching television increased from 18.7 in February, 1970, to 19.3 in February, 1973³. Moreover, all age groups and all social classes⁴ increased their viewing over this period. At the same time, however, there are clear and consistent variations in number of hours according to social class and age. In the case of social class, there is an inverse relationship; in the case of age, people between fifteen and twenty-nine years of age tend to watch television less than both people who are younger and people who are older. This variation according to age is perhaps consistent with the S.S.R.C. findings discussed earlier, which suggest that younger people engage less frequently than older people in many activities within the home but more frequently in many activities outside the home.

Gordon Rose has alluded to an explanation for this variation. Young people, he suggests "have /.../ benefitted a good deal from post-war affluence and since they are less committed, are more often out and about"⁵. Young people are likely to be less constrained than older people by ties and obligations when it comes to spending their time and money. A study

by Mark Abrams of Teenage Consumer Spending in 1959¹ suggested that the real earnings of single people in the age range fifteen to twenty-four years had increased at a faster rate than those of other age groups, and, moreover, that their 'uncommitted money' (that is, the income they have left after paying taxes, insurances, board and lodgings, and fares) rose faster than that of other groups. In 1959, the uncommitted money of this section of the population stood at about £830 million. Large sums of this are then spent in ways which have been encouraged by commercial organizations and the mass media. A separate 'teenage market' has developed, which for some is indicative of the existence of a 'youth culture', at least, or especially, amongst some sections of young people, in our society. Hannah Gavron, for example, says

Certainly the existence of a 'youth culture' is without dispute. Essentially working class, and exploited commercially, it is symbolized by the pop songs (which today are not the province of the working class alone) catering for what Time magazine once called 'Teen feel', in which the illusions of youth are exalted as being the only things of value in a dark and oppressive world².

She then suggests

The analysis by Abrams of how teenagers spent their money /.../ reveals the most clear-cut pattern of tastes specifically directed at those ends which form part of the youth culture. Teenage expenditure formed at least 25 per cent of all expenditure on motor-cycles, records and record players, cosmetics, and on the cinema. The average boy spent a pound a week on drinks, cigarettes and entertainment, the average girl spent a pound a week on clothes, cosmetics and shoes. So the adolescent girl in the brief period between childhood and marriage has been released from her dependence on her family, both by her potential earning power, and by her ability to pass into a world of her own, dominated by her peers, which may appear totally alien to her parents.³

According to Gavron, therefore, young females up to about twenty-three years of age⁴ are likely to participate in a youth culture which is, at least partially, manifested in, or expressed by, their patterns of expenditure⁵.

In a similar way to Gavron, Gordon Rose suggests that a youth culture exists mainly within the working class, and that it is, in fact, grounded

in a general working-class culture. Thus

There are some elements in working-class acculturation which, exaggerated in adolescence, tend to support a leisure-based subculture¹.

The differences which exist between youth and adults, and which characterize 'youth culture', are to be found mainly in the area of leisure and apply mainly to the working class, although, following Gavron, they are becoming increasingly assimilated by the youth of the middle class.

Rose notes that

working-class boys and girls are less interested in clubs and other 'approved' activities than the middle class. The Crowther Report found that boys who had attended modern schools spent an average of 4.5 evenings per week on leisure activities outside the home as compared with 4.0 for those who had attended grammar and technical schools and spent rather more time on outdoor activities and the cinema. With the girls the patterns were more similar. In general those who took part in further education went to the cinema less. In the grammar and technical school sample 79 per cent of the boys and 60 per cent of the girls were members of one or more clubs at the time of interview, while the corresponding figures for modern schools was 56 per cent and 35 per cent. The samples covered those who had left school eighteen months to three years previously, and because of varying leaving ages covered people from sixteen to over twenty².

Whilst the studies by the S.S.R.C. and by Young and Willmott, along with many other sources³, suggest that the working class as a whole participate less in clubs, 'societies', voluntary organizations, and similar 'organized activities', they do not suggest that they nevertheless spend (more of their) leisure time in activities outside of home. The working class participate more in some activities, playing bingo and perhaps going to pubs, but they participate only as much or less in other activities, such as going to the cinema and theatre and perhaps even visiting family and friends. The Young and Willmott study suggests that whilst the middle class participates more in each type of activity - home-based, sporting, and other - they spend a similar proportion of their leisure time on each type. Both the middle class and the working class tend to spend quite a lot more time participating in home-based activity than in the other two types together.

Evidence of this kind may be taken by some to suggest a trend towards a 'mass culture'¹. This culture is subscribed to by all social classes and (perhaps like 'youth culture') is the product of commercial organizations and the mass media. Also, it is characterized by leisure activities which are largely centred on the mass media and on being entertained, or which are passive rather than active and creative. Hence, the popularity of television and of programmes which require the viewer to do little more than watch. It is a consequence of, and in turn allows for, exploitation, and it is the outcome of, and in turn encourages, alienation. The trend towards a 'mass culture' may be seen as concomitant to the shift away from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft, and to the trend towards the social isolation of families and individuals.

The suggestion that there is a trend towards a 'mass culture' bears some similarity to aspects of the embourgeoisement thesis, as spelled out by Goldthorpe and Lockwood. According to this thesis, the 'social life' of manual workers and their families has become, and is becoming, more home- and family-centred, and as such is shifting in the direction of the style which is typical of the middle-class. As has been noted, Goldthorpe rejected these ideas in favour of a process of 'normative convergence' between the upper, or affluent, sections of the manual working class and the lower sections of the non-manual middle class. Thus, the styles of social life of these two sections of the population now show at least some similarity. Referring to their research samples, Goldthorpe and Lockwood sum up the situation as they see it, in this way:

while our affluent workers are, as husbands, as family-centred as the white-collar workers we studied, the white-collar couples are on a number of counts little or no less privatised in their social lives than are our affluent workers and their wives. Although in several respects the white-collar couples clearly reveal more middle-class traits in their styles of sociability, it is equally evident that they too are not involved in any very intensive social round of visits, mutual entertainment and other shared activities with a wide circle of friends, such as might be observed in the case, say, of couples of higher managerial or professional status.²

The styles of social life of their sample were similar in that they were more or less equally 'privatised'; that is, "decisively centred upon the home and conjugal family"¹. There is obviously a close connection between the notions of 'privatisation'² and 'social isolation', but the two can be distinguished. Goldthorpe and Lockwood used the term 'isolation' and although they did not define it or distinguish it in any precise way from 'privatisation', they implied that for them it has to do with the nature of people's 'social contacts' and hence the quality of their social relationships³. This is similar to the approach adopted in the last chapter. 'Privatisation', however, has to do with the nature or quality of people's social lives - with such matters as how, where and with whom they spend their leisure time. There may be a close connection and correlation between the nature of people's social relationships and the nature of their social lives, such that the most isolated are also the most privatised, but this is not inevitable. For instance, people may have family, friends, work-mates, neighbours and so on, with whom they have a good deal of contact but with whom they spend little of their non-work time, at least, or especially, outside of home. Thus, they may not be isolated even though they may be privatised.

Goldthorpe and Lockwood refer to a number of factors which helped to shape the social lives of their sample of affluent working-class families. They suggest that privatisation was the "most probable concomitant of the workers' orientation to work and of their /.../ employment"⁴. There were a number of ways in which the nature of their work influenced their out-of-work lives⁵. Goldthorpe says

in some degree for all those we studied, an active and varied social life within their present community was /.../ made difficult to establish because of the exigencies experienced by our affluent workers in the daily performance of their jobs /.../. Leisure hours were frequently curtailed and occurred at unusual and often varying times of day; in addition, energy and what could perhaps be termed 'social vitality' were likely to be unduly sapped. In these ways, therefore, obstacles must inevitably have been created /.../ to any kind of frequent and regular association with persons outside the immediate family group⁶.

The standard working week of these manual workers at the time of interviewing, in 1962, was between forty and forty-two hours. In addition, most of them usually worked several hours a week overtime. By comparison, the standard working week for the sample of non-manual workers was thirty-eight and a half hours, and they hardly ever did any overtime. In April, 1973, the average total hours per week that were worked by manual men in full-time employment was 46.7; the average worked by manual women was 39.9; and the average worked by non-manual women was 36.8¹.

Three of my informants had jobs at the time of interviewing. These were the ones living in the hostel, where there was a rule that all residents should have jobs. Gillian had been the housekeeper in the hostel for about five months. She started work at 8.30 a.m. and finished at 5.30 p.m., although, she said, "you might as well say the job doesn't finish at five thirty really, because you are on call if anything happens. If one of the children is ill or something like that". She mentioned some ways in which this job was better than the one she had had previously. She said "it's lucky for me really because before, I was one of the girls and I was working - going out to work - which is hard on some of them really. Because you are gone from... I used to leave here at twenty past seven, and I didn't use to get home until half past five. So by the time you get home, you wash and change /your children/ and feed them and everything, they are in bed, and then you get up in ^{the} morning... You don't sort of see the child except at weekends". Whilst her job had advantages with regard to location and, connectedly, the amount of time it took up, and whilst she did not make any specific comment on how it affected her 'social vitality', she did say "I don't mind housekeeping, /but/ the children can get a bit on top of you. I mean, eight kids all day long - even though you have somebody to help you - it is a bit much. And I find that I get irritable with my daughter. I find that I loose my temper with

her very easily, because I have been with the other children". Nevertheless, Gillian enjoyed her job whereas she knew of other mothers who did not enjoy theirs. She said "if they are doing a job and they are not enjoying the job, then /they are/ bound to take it out on their child, not hit them and things like that, but sort of tend to say things, you know".

Both of my other two informants who had jobs, indicated that they enjoyed them. Hilary described herself as an 'insurance officer' with the Department of Health and Social Security. She had been in this job for just over a year, since shortly after going to live in the hostel. She worked for forty-two hours each week, but she did not complain about the demands this made on her time and energy. Iris also did not complain about the demands which the forty hours she spent doing her job made on her. She had been working for a telecommunications company for about seven months. The job, she said "is hard to describe really. A bit of everything. One day I asked /the manager/ what I was and he said 'you're a trainee on installation' and yesterday I asked him what I was and he said 'you're a trainee wire-woman'. I haven't done a bit of wiring since I've been there. It's silly really".

Both those of my informants who did have jobs and those who did not, may have been affected by a further possible source of privatisation¹ referred to by Goldthorpe and Lockwood. Their sample of manual workers

might often have /had/ only very limited time at their disposal which could be regarded as 'spare' or 'free' in any genuine sense; that is, which /was/ not taken up with work outside the home - including preparing for and recovering from this - or with the multifarious activities required to keep a house, garden, car, and so on in a minimum state of repair².

They found that often "after finishing work and after carrying out their various chores and familial obligations, /their/ affluent workers wanted only to 'take it easy' and relax before the daily round began again"³.

In other words, a possible source of privatisation beyond the demands on time and energy made by jobs, is the demands made by domestic tasks.

A further, but related, possible source of privatisation for Goldthorpe's sample of manual workers was the jobs of wives. They note that

among the wives of our affluent workers almost all who did not have young children were themselves in gainful employment, and that so too were a number of those in the period of active motherhood /.../. Where /.../ wives sought in this way to raise family incomes to still higher levels, further limitations on the couple's social life were the probable outcome: most obviously through time in the evenings and at weekends having to be given over to housework, shopping and other chores, but here again, one would suspect, also as a result simply of physical fatigue¹.

Wives who went out to work had less time and energy to spend on domestic tasks and therefore to spend reducing the demands made on the time and energy of their husbands. Their jobs meant that not only they themselves but also their husbands had less 'spare time' and 'social vitality'.

Perhaps another way of saying this, is that wives were able to go out to work because of the help they received from their husbands in the carrying out of domestic tasks². In a similar way, my informants' ability to go out to work (as well as their spare time and social vitality) would have been dependent on the availability of help in looking after their children and in carrying out other domestic duties. Of course, unlike the wives studied by Goldthorpe, none of my informants had husbands to help them. However, all of them had some alternative source or sources of help. Thus, those who were living in the hostel were able to leave their children in a day-nursery so that they could go out to work, and they were able to rely on other residents for some assistance - with babysitting in the evenings, for example. Of my other three informants, Ann was able to look to the girl with whom she was living and to the neighbour with whom she had developed a close relationship for some assistance; Elaine was living with her mother, and could rely on her for help; and Marie was living with her parents and grandmother, and could rely on them.

For Goldthorpe, the privatisation of manual workers and their families is not necessarily explicable simply in terms of the "various exigencies"

in their lives. "it could /.../ always be claimed that what is reflected here is /.../ the free expression of values"¹. Goldthorpe does in fact claim that this style of social life was not "entirely the unwanted and unwelcome consequence of their quest for affluence" - it "was something that in many ways they positively valued"². The values which were being expressed through privatisation, may be ones to which members of society in general subscribe. But this does not necessarily mean that Goldthorpe's sample had simply been socialized into them. A privatised social life may not only be encouraged by these values, it may also be the source of them. As Goldthorpe has suggested

It is not difficult to inquire how /this style/ might perhaps have been born of exigencies, but, once established, provided relationships that were valued for their own sake³.

If and when the members of highly privatised families value and seek this style of social life, they may do so only after and because they have previously had this style forced onto them. Stigmatized individuals, for example, may value a privatised social life, but only after having become privatised because of social rejection. It is conceivable, of course, that if and when people seek a privatised social life they may not do so for its own sake. For example, stigmatized individuals may do so as a means to an end - that is, as part of an attempt to avoid being rejected. But they may prefer, ideally, not to be privatised.

The rest of this chapter is concerned with what the social lives of young unmarried mothers are like and why, and, to begin with, we take a detailed look at the social lives of my informants in turn.

1. Ann

Ann spent very little of her leisure time outside of, or at least very far from, home, or with anyone apart from three people - her child, the girl with whom she was living, and the neighbour with whom she had developed a close relationship. When I asked her how often she went out, she replied "every time my friends come down". Her friends in this case were

the ones living about sixty miles away, near to where she had been living when she conceived. One or more of them would visit her every few weeks, when she would go out with them. She would "just go for a drink, usually". She hardly ever went out otherwise. Thus, she did not go out very often with either the girl with whom she was living or the neighbour, although she had in fact been out with the girl to a pub a few days before. Moreover, a couple of weeks before our second interview, she had gone out with her neighbour. She said "we all went to a pub for a booze-up"; that is, a "farewell do" because the neighbour was going to move.

Ann would usually go out only once a week at the most. When she was not at home, she was usually either visiting the neighbour or performing domestic tasks, such as shopping. But most of her time was spent at home carrying out chores, relaxing, "watching telly, writing, reading - that's about all really". By the time of our second interview, the neighbour had moved and so Ann spent even more time at home. She had last been out a few days before. She said "I went to a party last Saturday down the road, which was a big flop. This friend of mine was /visiting Midtown, and she/ came round about half past eight and said 'do you want to go to a party? We are just going to a party'. So I thought 'Oh great', you know, 'where's the party?' And I think six or seven people turned up the whole evening. /It was just/ standing up and drinking, no chairs. A couple of people danced. Still it made a very pleasant change to get out". Ann had been to another party "a couple of months" before. She said, "we went up to one in London. I have been to two parties this year, apart from the ones I have had here, no more than that - the one in London and the one down the road".

This was one of the few occasions that Ann had been away from Midtown since she had gone to live there over a year before. When I asked her if she had been on holiday recently, she replied "I haven't been this year,

except for the odd week /at home/. By the time of our first interview she had been away on only three occasions, when she had spent weekends visiting her mother. During the four months between our interviews, she had visited her mother "about two or three times". Apart from when she had gone to the party in London, she had been away on only one other occasion. Just over a week before our second interview, she had visited her next to oldest, and favourite, sister, who was living almost two hundred miles away, for the first time since moving to Midtown. She would not have made this visit had she not had a great deal of luck and assistance. At her neighbours' 'farewell do', Ann explained, "there was a chap and he goes up to /where my sister lives/ every weekend to see his girlfriend, so... 'Oh I've got a sister that lives /there/. I haven't seen her for some time'. So he said 'I'll give you a lift up'". She had last visited her mother "the weekend after" the party in London. She said "I think I was fed up with being here, so I went up there", only to find her stay "just the same as ever - boring: just 'sit there and don't do anything'". That is, she just "sat in the whole time", and she saw nothing of her friends.

However, "quite a few" of her friends visited her a few days later, on Guy Fawkes Night. She said "when I was /at the party/ in London, a week or two before, I said 'if I had a party on Bonfire Night, who would come?' And they all said they would come. I just /told/ a couple of people and they passed the word on". This "party was the highlight" for Ann of the period between our interviews¹. She "was debating whether to have /another party/ at New Year or not". However, she said, "I think most people have things arranged. I'm just trying to find out if I had one, if anybody would come. That's the way most of my parties start". Also, she had decided to invite her friends to visit her at Christmas, in the hope that at least "one person out of all of them /would/ turn up". She had looked forward to a visit from the father of her child, because "it was just

nice to think that somebody was going to be here at Christmas", but had come to the conclusion that he would probably not come. Consequently she had asked her friends to visit her, but was not confident that they would do so. When I asked her what she thought she would be doing at Christmas, she replied "nothing. We will be sat in here /alone/". She would probably have a similar Christmas to her previous one, when she was still living in a boarding house in the centre of Midtown. She said "a girlfriend of mine from /my home town/ was at Art School here¹, and she knew this taxi-driver in /Midtown/ who invited me round for Christmas dinner with him and his wife and kids, because I was going to be stuck in bed and breakfast all over Christmas, which is a very depressing thought. So I went over there Christmas Eve, got snowed in Christmas Eve", and stayed the night. She added "it was very boring. They really weren't my kind of people. But, as I say, it was better than bed and breakfast".

Ann also complained at our first interview of being "bored" with her social life because she did not go out enough. But, she was not prevented from going out by the lack of someone to take care of her child. She said "there's always a baby-sitter, if I want to go out". The neighbour, for example, would baby-sit. However, getting help in this respect had become somewhat more of a problem by the time of our second interview, when Ann said "it is a bit more difficult now because /my neighbour/ always used to do it for me. Now I will have to ask some people I know down the road, who will baby-sit for me. The only trouble is, I have to think ahead, whereas before I could just go down /to my friend. If/ somebody came up and said 'come out for a drink', or something, I'd just go down to /my friend/ and leave the key with her, and go. Whereas now, I have to think perhaps a day ahead. Or if I'm going out and /the girl I live with/ isn't, she will baby-sit". Nevertheless, she added, "I have never wanted to go anywhere and not had a baby-sitter". Her social life

was limited simply because she had little opportunity to go out. That is, she did not go out "unless something /came/ up", which usually happened only when she was visited by friends. But, she said, "I get a bit fed up with it. It goes for long spells and nobody comes down at all". In Midtown there was no one to go out with apart from the girl with whom she was living, and she found going out with her unenjoyable and a "waste of time". This was because they usually only went to a pub where they passed the time by themselves. Consequently, Ann did not go out and meet people through whom she could develop a fuller social life. She said "I /even/ joined the Computer Dating Service because I thought it was about time I went out". In this way she had met several men with whom she had had a few dates.

Ann had experienced a considerable change in her social life since she became an unmarried mother. She explained "you are more apart because before you could go out and meet people and what have you".

2. Elaine

Elaine, like Ann, had experienced considerable change in her social life, although only after she had been an unmarried mother for over a year. She said "it's been quite quiet this year", in fact "this last year's been right miserable. /But/ last year I used to go out quite a lot. We used to go to all the dos at the University /for example/. But this year I haven't done much of anything". She explained "for about the first year it was alright because I used to know lots of people. But now they're all settling down. There's hardly anyone I know these days". In other words, "I don't go anywhere now. It's quite quiet now /because/ I'm older. I've settled down a bit. You find that when you're older all your friends are getting married or they've got boyfriends. I know about one girl that I can actually go out with in the evening". This girl, she said "is the only one I know who's unattached" and living nearby. However, as was noted in the last chapter, Elaine had perhaps lost contact with her also, following a quarrel they had had when they

last saw one another. She had not been out with anyone since. Thus, when I asked her when she had last been out, she replied "about a month ago, I guess". There were other friends living nearby with whom she had been out in the past, but they were married or were otherwise 'attached'. Therefore, she said, "I can't go out with /them/ because you always feel you're intruding". There was one friend who was unattached and with whom she had a close relationship, but she was living over sixty miles away. Elaine said "/she/ is always saying to me to 'come on up'". However, Elaine had not been to see this friend. She explained "I just can't make the break. I wish I could".

Elaine hardly ever left the vicinity of Midtown or stayed away from home overnight. The last time she had done both these things was about a year before, when she visited one of her brothers who was living abroad. This had been her last holiday, and she had no plans for another one. She said "mummy said she'd pay for me to have a holiday, but I don't really want to go. I'd rather have three weeks of peace". Elaine had spent both the last Christmas "and the Christmas before" at home. Referring to her mother and herself, she said "/we/ always spend Christmas Day /together/. It's quite quiet. We just watch T.V.". Although, she added, "/my mother/ goes over to /my sisters'/ on Boxing Day, to supper or lunch or something. /And last Christmas/ we went out for the evening on Christmas Eve. We went for a meal to a restaurant". Elaine, it may be recalled, was estranged from her sisters, and she said "the only time I miss /my sisters/ is at Christmas". She explained "because /my son/ is just stuck here with me and mummy, whereas before /he was born/ we always used to go over there. And there was a ruckus with her kids, and that. And he would have liked that, I reckon". But now "they never /even/ send me a birthday card or Christmas cards, or anything like that. Whereas before they used to send me a birthday present and Christmas cards, and stuff like that. And even on my twenty-first /birthday/ they didn't send me a card". She said "I got one /card/ from mummy. And I got more from

the neighbours, really, than family. The only card I got was from mummy, the rest came from friends and neighbours - people I don't even know". When I asked Elaine if she had done anything to celebrate her twenty-first birthday, about three months before our interview, she replied "no. I think mummy and I just went out for a meal".

Elaine summed up by saying "I don't go out much at the moment". But this was not because she was prevented from going out because there was no one to take care of her child. She said "if I wanted to go out I always feel as though /my mother/ is there", and she added "I think it would be harder for somebody living /away from home/ because they are really tied up. I must say, I've got my mother and I go out if I want to". However, Elaine hardly used her mother in this respect, because she had little opportunity to go out. Thus, she had far less opportunity than she had had earlier on, and also compared with her mother. Elaine said "/my mother/ goes out about five times a week. She goes to whist drives and the theatre with friends at work. She says to me 'I wish you'd go out'. You know before, I used to go out every night and come back about four o'clock in the morning. She'd never go out. And /my mother would say/ 'Oh disgusting. Why don't you stay in one night?' And now I stay in most of the time, and she says 'Oh I wish you'd go out', She's always offering to pay. She says 'why don't you go to the pictures. I'll pay'".

At the time of interviewing, Elaine's social life was largely centred on home, and on her child and her mother. Just about her only social activity outside of home was the "coffee mornings" she occasionally had with one of her neighbours. She said "I have much more of a recluse life than before. And some days I'm afraid to go out, you know. And I feel 'crikey, if I'm not careful I'll turn into a real recluse'. I can see it quite easy. Because as my friends go away I tend not to go out so much. Even in the day time, I don't go out that much, you know, because it's unnecessary for me. Because I don't do any shopping. I have nothing

to keep me busy. I do sort of dress-making, and stuff like that, and I sort of tidy the house up. And sometimes I do the supper. But I'm not like a proper house-wifey-type-thing, because I never have to go out and buy things like that. And I never really have to go out and spend any money. Mummy goes out and buys the groceries day by day and I never buy anything for a couple of weeks. The only time I go out and buy anything is when I go out and buy /my son/ some paper nappies".

Elaine was highly dissatisfied with the quality of her social life, and she was consciously trying to improve it by getting a job. She said "I feel that I must do something this coming year. Because I've been stuck at home for about two or three years. If I don't do something, I'll go nuts. You feel cooped up the whole time". It is possible, she added "/that/ I'll go to London, and stay with /my friend/ for the winter, or something - just to see how I get on. Because there's lots of child-minders and things like that up in London". If she had a job she would spend less time at home. Moreover, she said "when you're out working you can meet boyfriends, and stuff like that. And so you do have the chance to go out". A job would provide her with the opportunity to meet people with whom she might go out. At the time of interviewing she lacked this opportunity because of her unmarried motherhood. That is, if she had not become an unmarried mother, she "would be /for instance/ working and meeting people", and her social life would not have changed in the way it had.

3. Gillian

Gillian spent a good deal of her leisure time pursuing activities outside of home. Moreover, she shared it with quite a few friends, both from within and from outside the hostel. She would visit and sometimes be visited by friends, although when she went out it was usually with her boyfriend. She went out with her boyfriend about three or four evenings a week. She had arranged to go out with him immediately after our inter-

view, when they would probably go to a pub. She had also seen him the day before. She explained "he came home with me at the weekend". About once a month she would visit her father for the weekend, and sometimes she would take her boyfriend. She had spent the last Christmas at home, and she thought she would probably spend the next one there also. However, apart from these visits to her father, she hardly ever left Westown or spent nights away from the hostel. When I asked Gillian when she had last been away on holiday, she replied "I haven't been on holiday this year because I haven't worked at this job long enough yet".

I also asked her if she ever went to parties, and she replied "yes. All the normal things, you know. Everything carried on like it was before, except... Well, you are a bit more tied". In other words, her style of social life had changed very little compared with before she became an unmarried mother and had changed to this extent only because of the demands her child made on her. Her social life was less full because of her unmarried motherhood. She explained "an unmarried mother can't say 'I'm going out' or 'I'm going up to the pub for a drink'. Whereas with a married mother /for example/, if she wants to, or if she does get tired, there's always the husband to take over from her. But, if you're an unmarried mother, you've got the child there all the time. You can't just go off and leave it". Being an unmarried mother, she did not have a husband to help look after her child. On the other hand, she was not totally without help in this respect: other residents in the hostel babysat for her so that she could go out. Hilary, in fact, usually performed this service on several evenings a week. Gillian said "I usually go out Mondays, Fridays, you know, Saturdays, something like that. It depends. Whatever day /Hilary/ doesn't want to go out, then she looks after /my daughter/ for me, I'm quite lucky". Because of Hilary, she said, "I go out quite a lot actually".

Gillian went out about as much as she wanted. When she was not seeing her boyfriend, she would visit friends or her older sister who was living

nearby. Comparing herself with other unmarried mothers living in the hostel, she said "I go out in the evenings - not every evening, but if I wanted to I could go to my sister's, you know, I can always go out. Some of them, when they get home /from work/ that is it for them". She usually visited her sister "about three times a week". Often they would stay in and "talk about the kids, or what /they had/ been doing", but occasionally they would "go out shopping". When, after work, she did not go out, she would perhaps spend time with Hilary, or entertain visitors. In addition, she found time for some "reading and knitting".

4. Hilary

Hilary's style of social life had changed considerably, so that very little of her leisure time was spent outside of home or with anyone apart from her child and the other residents in the hostel. Before becoming an unmarried mother, Hilary said, "I used to go out quite a lot. We used to go to the pub - when /the father/ and I were going out - perhaps every night, unless we were going somewhere else. I used to go to the concerts at the Albert Hall and we used to go to the theatre quite a bit". In addition, she said, "I used to be in St. John's Ambulance, and I used to go to theatres if somebody was taken ill. I used to live and die for it, so we used to do it together". But now, she said, "I usually go out /only/ once a week - not always". When she went out she would usually "go to a school of dancing with a girl from work". Unlike before she conceived, she hardly ever visited a pub. She said "I /have been/ perhaps to the pictures and then for a drink afterwards. But I very rarely go to the pub". She added "I've been to the pictures about four times since I've been here. But it is expensive up there and unless there's a really good film that I want to see, I don't go". She had not been to the cinema or to a pub for several months. Moreover, when I asked her when she had last gone out anywhere, she replied "I was away over the weekend, but apart from that, I think about three or four weeks ago". On that occasion, she had been dancing.

However, she had spent the weekend prior to our interview with friends about thirty miles away in London. This was the first time she had seen these friends - with whom she had tried to pass until shortly before - since she had become an unmarried mother. In a similar way, she had seen her aunts and cousins for the first time, when she spent a week with them a few months before our interview and shortly after letting them know about her unmarried motherhood. Apart from this, Hilary had not had a holiday away from home since she conceived. In fact, she had not had a holiday since she "was fifteen, /when she/ went to Switzerland with the school". Moreover, Hilary had hardly ever stayed away from the hostel overnight. For instance, she said "last Christmas, I was here. I didn't go away. Two other girls stayed. And /the previous/ housekeeper, her mother stayed here, because /the housekeeper/ and her husband went away. And we all had Christmas dinner together". She added "I might go away next Christmas. /My aunts/ may invite me to /stay with them/ or I might even go to the family I went to this weekend".

However, Hilary did make fairly frequent visits out of Westown. Every one or two months, for example, she took her child to see the father in London.

Although Hilary hardly went out at all at the time of interviewing, she had been going out quite a lot more until a few months before. That is, she said, "/it/ has only been this last few months that I've been going out only once a week". She explained the change which had taken place by saying "when /the previous housekeeper/ was here, before /Gillian/ was housekeeper, there wasn't so much the problem of babysitting. But since, /Gillian/ and I... we baby-sit for one another. We don't just sit at home because of the babies. So I go out perhaps once a week and perhaps every other night /Gillian/ will go out". The previous housekeeper would baby-sit for both Hilary and Gillian so that they could go out, sometimes together. But since she had left, Hilary and Gillian had to rely much more on one another. Consequently, Hilary could not go out

as often with Gillian, her closest friend. Hilary said "/it is/ very rarely that /Gillian/ and I go out together, because of the problem of baby-sitting. /The/ last time /Gillian/ and I went out was about three or four weeks ago. I asked her if she would like to come to the school of dancing after work, and she came with me. But, apart from that, it is ages since we went out together". On this occasion, she said, "/the girl/ in the next room /baby-sat/. I had baby-sat several times for her about that time, and I asked her if she would mind baby-sitting for the two of us, and she did". When Hilary went out, Gillian would usually baby-sit. However, Hilary baby-sat much more for Gillian than Gillian baby-sat for her. Hilary said "I baby-sit practically every night for /Gillian. But/ I don't really want to go out".

Hilary claimed that she did not want to go out more than she did at the time of interviewing. On the other hand, she said, "I get annoyed when I keep baby-sitting - I don't suppose I ought to say it. /But/ I think to myself 'I've had a full day at work /and/ there are things I'd like to do here. And I'm quite willing to stay in of an evening instead of galavanting here, there and everywhere. I get a bit annoyed about /it/. Well, I don't go out, so why should everybody else keep going out. I don't mind now and again, but night after night, it does make me a little bit cheesed off". She did not mind staying in, but she would have preferred to have done less baby-sitting, because of the way it interfered with her domestic tasks. This is apart from feeling that the other mothers in the hostel, such as those for whom she baby-sat, went out too often and to the neglect of their domestic duties. When I asked Hilary if she had any hobbies, she replied "no, not really. I haven't really got time for it. I just come home from work, do the washing and ironing. You don't have a lot of time really".

Despite being busy and despite claiming that she went out as much as she wanted, Hilary indicated that she was willing, and even keen, to have a somewhat fuller social life. A member of the hostel committee, Hilary

said, "was talking to /Gillian/ during the day, and /Gillian/ told the truth about how I'm always in". As a result, this person, she said, "has been saying to me about going out and meeting people, and this, that and the other. Then she phoned up and said that she'd met this girl who was interested in doing voluntary work, and meeting people, and would I be willing to meet her. So I said 'yes, quite willing'. And she came down and stayed for a couple of hours. And we had a talk and that. Then she suggested that /my daughter/ and I go out with her on Saturday for a ride". Hilary added, "she took us out a couple of times to try and make a break". During our interview this girl telephoned Hilary to invite her to go out. Hilary said "she suggested tomorrow night, /my daughter/ and I go to her place for a meal, and then another evening she'd come to me".

5. Iris

Iris spent a large part of her leisure time outside of home, and she shared it with a large number of friends, the majority of whom were living outside the hostel. When I asked her how often she went out, she replied "quite often. Sometimes I might not go out all week, and another time I might have a hectic week. There was one week I went out every night. The last night was a Friday, and somebody said 'come out', and I said 'Oh God, I couldn't'. I just couldn't keep my eyes open. I was walking round like a zombie at work. I was up to about three, four o'clock in the morning. So I just came home and slept for a couple of days to make up for it". I asked her if she went out as much as she wanted to and she replied "Oh, I go out a lot. /After all/ I start work at eight o'clock". Occasionally she stayed in when she would have preferred to go out, but she said "that happens to everybody, doesn't it". In general, she went out about as much as she wanted. She was not prevented from going out by having to look after her child. She said "I hate anyone to take pity on me, you know, and some /people/ do this, you know. They say 'oh, poor

thing. Out at work all day - don't you find it a strain? Don't you feel tied?' I don't feel tied. They say 'Oh, maybe you don't feel tied down now, but you will in a few years time'".

Iris was able to rely on some of the other residents to baby-sit for her when she wanted to go out. She was able to rely on her closest friend and on Janet¹ especially. That is, she said, "/these two friends/ and I usually do it for each other. /They/ go out one evening, you know, either separately or together, while I look after their two. And /the closer friend/ and I go out, which we do to the folk club on Mondays, together. And that's how it goes". Iris went to the folk club "nearly every Monday night", and she had been there the evening before our interview. Moreover, she had arranged to go out with the same friend immediately after our interview. Although Iris did not go out very often with Janet, about two weeks before our interview "/she/ went to a stag party" with her to celebrate the marriage of one of her friends at work. Iris said about the friend "he came along to me and said '/Iris/ are you coming to my stag party on Thursday night?' And I said 'what, a stag party! I can't come to a stag party'. And he said 'yes, you can, you'll have to come'". Although this was the last party Iris had been to, she had been to another a few weeks before. She said, "I went with a friend. That was a grand do - quite nice that was". Iris went with the closest of the friends she had had at the time when she conceived. It took place near where this friend was living, about forty miles from Westown, and Iris stayed overnight with her and her parents. This was the second time Iris had stayed with this friend since she had moved to Westown. Iris did not leave Westown or stay away from the hostel overnight very often. However, about three months before our interview, she and the closest of her friends in the hostel had been on holiday together. Iris said "/this friend/ and I went on holiday. My 'mum' let us have her caravan cheap - didn't cost us much - and we took the kids". I asked her if

she had been away for the last Christmas, and she replied "/I/ stayed here" with two other residents, including Hilary and the housekeeper's mother. She added "I enjoyed it really". But next Christmas "I will probably go 'home'. I don't know if I will go really. Probably some of the fellows at work will invite me to their place". She said, "the boys at work invite me to their houses, you know, with their wives, for lunch and dinner". Also, she said, "they take you out, take you down the coast and that sort of thing, with the kiddies. It's the sort of relationship I've got with the blokes at work". When Iris and her friend went on holiday "two of the boys from work took /them/ down there". Iris had last been out with one of her work-mates less than a week before, when they "went to the pictures". A few months before that, on her birthday, Iris and the "fellows /she worked/ with, went for a drink, at lunch time, down to the pub" which was "quite good really". She added "of course, as soon as they found out that I was moving into a new flat... '/Iris/ must have a house-warming party'. Anyway, they are all organizing a house-warming party, and I haven't got much to do, really - they are all organizing it. They are paying for the beer, they are paying for the food, and I am just the hostess really". I asked her how many people she thought would attend this party and she replied "thirty, I suppose, from work. But, you know, they will all bring their wives and girlfriends".

Iris was looking forward to moving out of the hostel and into a flat. She explained "it's nice to have your own place. Well, you are very independent here really. But, there again, you can't have who you like to stay". That is, she said, "the thing is here, I can't have anybody in - 'out by eleven o'clock'. But where I am /going/ I can have who I like, when I like". The hostel rules did not allow her to have anyone to stay overnight - visitors had to be out of the hostel by eleven o'clock in the evening - and she was not allowed to have men in her room. She said "most of my friends are men, because I work with men. And I've got friends that

just want to sit and chat, you know, but you can't come back here".

Iris had few visitors and instead spent a lot of time with friends outside the hostel. When I asked her if she had any hobbies, she replied "no, I'm lazy. I read. I like history, and black magic, and slaves and things".

6. Marie

Although Marie's social life was fairly full, it was not as full as it had been before she became an unmarried mother or even up until a few months before our interview. She said "I was a real social bird before. I was never in and I was determined once I had the baby that wasn't going to stop me. I was going to go back into my social flight". In other words, "all the time I was expecting /my daughter/ I thought 'Oh my God, I've got to get back in to the social swing of things'". Consequently, shortly after giving birth, she moved from London to Midtown, a few miles from Northtown where she was living when she conceived. She said "I hadn't met very many people in London. It was the fact of moving back to the familiar. I thought /Midtown/ was quite good, because I had this idea that /it/ was full of nursery schools and crèches - that came unstuck. /But/ I knew I could get things like baby-sitters in. I thought I was going to have this wild social life. I felt I still needed it then, and I thought 'well, if I'm around with people, I know there'll always be a baby-sitter'. I thought 'I can go out and perhaps life will be a bit easier'. But of course, when I moved down, I found that although there were baby-sitters there, I didn't want to use them". That is, she said, "I could have picked it up really where I left off. If I wanted to go out, somebody would come and pick me up, or I would get myself to a party. I've got one particular friend /nearby/ who's got a pretty good social life. I'd go out with her and stay the weekend with her, if mother would look after /my daughter/ and I just found I wasn't... I'd go to parties and things. I'd arrange to stay the night there, and I'd come home on

the last train because I was so bored. And then I decided I didn't really want to do it any more". The last party Marie had been to was given by this friend. Marie said "she was having a party and so I went over /but/ this was one of the occasions I came home". Now, Marie added, "she's always phoning me up and saying would I like to go out and I say 'no'".

Marie explained "I just didn't want that sort of social life. I tried it again, doing all the things I'd done before and found that I was totally bored with the whole thing. But what I found a year before as being what I enjoyed doing, suddenly it just didn't mean anything any more and as it was a matter of I had to spend money to go out, I thought 'well, to hell with it. I'm not going to spend money and go out just to be bored'". She added "I've got nothing against going out, but I was usually the sort of person who would go out whether I knew I was going to enjoy myself or not - just to be out - and I'm happier doing other things now. I suppose indoor things rather than going out all the time". That is, "the sort of things I did before don't interest me any more. I've just got new ideas on life, I suppose". She said "I'm not socially inclined any more. I think about a lot of other things that I didn't before. My interests are towards /my daughter/". This change of interests meant, she said, "/that/ if I knew a lot of people who I liked and wanted to go out with, I wouldn't be able to go out as much. Not because my mother would say 'you're not going out', but because I wouldn't leave her for more than a couple of nights a week. It's not fair to let somebody else take the responsibility of her. I don't think I could ever know enough people, but I just feel a bit limited at the moment. My time isn't my own really".

When I asked Marie how often she went out, she replied "it does vary. I do try and not go out more than twice a week. Even if I was invited, I wouldn't go out, I don't think, more than twice a week". During our inter-

view, someone telephoned to invite her to go out, and when I asked her who she usually went out with, she replied "a girl-friend down here - occasionally we go out together. And the girl that phoned me up. There's no pattern". She had last been out two evenings before our interview, when she "went into /Midtown/ for a drink" with another friend. Referring to him, she said "we see each other a couple of times, /sometimes only/ once, a week. I don't see him always". She had met him at the evening class she attended and she said "I combine business with pleasure. I go to evening classes on Thursday, and perhaps we go for a drink afterwards - with /this friend/, because he gives me a lift home".

When she went out with friends, she would often "go for a drink". But, she said, "when I go out on my own, I'm more inclined to go and visit people for an evening. And quite a lot of the time, if I go out, it's to go to friends' houses, to stay there for the evening, rather than actually go out". She had last visited friends in this way "about five weeks" before our interview, when she "went and had a meal". It was, she said, "just before I moved actually. Because /my friends/ lived just round the corner". Three weeks before our interview, Marie had moved from Midtown, where she had been living for about six months, to her parents' in Northtown. As a result it was easier to go out because she had "a built-in baby-sitter". That is, her mother would look after her daughter if she decided to go out. She said "while I was here /the last time/ I started evening classes - I could just go". But then "when I moved to /Midtown/ I had to find a baby-sitter". Consequently, moving "made life more difficult". A friend baby-sat for her when she went to the evening class, "but that was really the only time /she/ went out".

At the same time, however, Marie preferred living in Midtown. She explained, "I like my independence. I value that more than anything", and "it did mean that I could have people coming in". Thus, "I saw more of friends

and acquaintances /when/ living on my own /in Midtown/ because I think there's the fact that if you are on your own, people know that they can drop in at any time. People feel less restricted - that they can just pop in at any time of day or night if you're living on your own". She added "at the moment I haven't got any part of the house which is my own. I'm converting the upstairs into a bedsit so at least I'll have somewhere". That is, she said, "I'm trying to get the attic converted so that I can have some privacy. /Although/ I don't know whether I could really be shut off and have my own friends. It wouldn't be as completely free as living on my own". When she last lived in Midtown, she received visits from, for example, "two girls and a chap /she/ used to share a house with" when she first lived in Midtown. In addition, she said, "people like friends of the family, if they were shopping in /Midtown/, would come in. /Midtown/ really was the central point. This is why I liked /Midtown/ so much because lots of acquaintances either worked or were at college or something in /Midtown/. It's a nice central point".

Marie not only had plenty of visitors when she was living in Midtown, she also occasionally had people to stay. Although this happened, she said, "only if they'd got nowhere to go. It was difficult because, actually, I started off by having a lodger in. /My daughter/ and I shared one bedroom and this girl had the other room, /and/ I couldn't really ask anybody else to stay". As well as hardly ever having people to stay with her, Marie hardly ever went to stay with others. When I asked her when she had last stayed away from home overnight, she replied "Oh my goodness! That's a long time ago". The last occasion had been about four months before, when she and her daughter had "stayed three nights" with the family she had lived with in London. In contrast, before she became an unmarried mother she would often stay away overnight with friends. The change, she explained, "/is due/ to the difference in my committments, I suppose. It's much easier to go if you're a single person - you've

only got yourself to cater for. It's much more of an effort to take your child away as well. And of course I can't bear to leave /my daughter/. You see, I wouldn't go away, really, overnight and stay without her". She had been away on holiday about a year before, but she had been with her daughter and her parents. She said "we went to stay in a caravan, because we thought it would be easier for /my daughter/, for a fortnight. I took /my daughter/ for walks and things. I haven't got anything planned for this year". Referring to her unmarried motherhood, Marie said "the only thing it's stopped me doing... it's stopped me being mobile. That really does get me down at times, but I try not to think about it. I am fixed now to a certain extent. Well, in all respects - the fact that you can go and live somewhere else or you can just pack up your bags and go for a holiday. In all ways immobility. I mean, I can't even go to the hair-dressers now if I want to, without thinking of what I'm going to do with /my daughter/". That is, her unmarried motherhood had interfered with her social life, in that it had resulted in her "being tied to the spot".

Marie summed up her social life by saying "/it is/ non-existent. Oh, I don't really think I've got a social life. I don't think I dare call it a social life. Especially during the summer holidays, when I haven't even got evening classes to go to. It was an evening out. It was an evening away from the television. I don't like the summer. No, I don't think I've got a social life, but I'm not terribly unhappy about it. It was surprising. I thought I'd be terribly unhappy. All the time I was expecting /my daughter/ I thought 'Oh my God, I've got to get back in to the social swing of things' - what I thought was the social swing. Then when it came to the point, I don't know, I suppose if I was truthful, I wouldn't mind going out a little bit more. But I don't have hang-ups about not going out on Saturday night like I used to". She had simply "lost a lot of the inclination to go out". Also, although she might have preferred

to go out a bit more often, she had "lost a lot of self-confidence in front of a lot of people". She said "I was one of these people... I used to be able to walk into anywhere /and/ look as though I was at ease. But now... Perhaps it's not going out that you loose something. If you're indoors seven nights out of seven with just a baby for company and not much adult company, perhaps it's just a natural progression. I don't know. I don't say I'd be scared to do anything else. If I really wanted to do it I'd go ahead and do it. I might have to push myself a bit more than I would have done before". Essentially, if she tried, she would have been able to have "the same sort of /social/ life /she/ had before". After all, she explained, "things don't change very much around here, do they?"

The styles of social life of my informants varied considerably: some were far more privatised than others. Thus, Elaine and Ann were highly privatised, and more so than any of my other informants, although Hilary was perhaps not very far behind in this respect. Of my other three informants, Marie was perhaps the most privatised and Iris perhaps the least. It is difficult to judge how my informants' social lives compared with those of 'normals', but if, as the discussion at the beginning of this chapter perhaps suggests, there is a trend towards a privatised existence in society as a whole, then they would appear not to be so unusual. This conclusion is possibly particularly apposite if my informants are compared with married females who have children¹. On the other hand, females in the age range of my informants, who were between twenty and about twenty-three years old², tend to be neither married³ nor to have children, and tend to be amongst those with the fullest social lives. Therefore, it is possible that at least some of my informants, especially in view of how their social lives varied, were more privatised than they would have been under normal circumstances.

This conclusion is given some support by the probability that each of my

informants had become somewhat more privatised, and that some had become far more privatised, since becoming unmarried mothers. The social lives of Elaine and Ann especially, had changed in this way, and those of both Hilary and Marie had changed in a similar direction. But how might these variations, differences and changes be accounted for?

There was a clear correlation, and therefore a possible connection, between the condition of my informants' social lives and the condition of their social relationships. That is, the greater the degree of privatisation exhibited by their social situations, the greater the degree of social isolation. There was perhaps a particularly strong connection between the degree of privatisation and the quality of the 'style of friendship' - where quality in this case is measured in terms of such matters as number of friends; social distance of relationships with friends; amount and type of contact with friends. Perhaps most important in this context is whether or not my informants had boyfriends, and if so, the nature of their relationships with them. Those of my informants who had the least privatised social lives - Iris, Gillian and Marie - also had boyfriends, or knew men with whom they went out on dates. This is perhaps understandable in view of the discussion in chapter four where it was noted that it is usual for females in my informants' age-range to have boyfriends. Also, each of my informants who did not have boyfriends implied in one way or another that their social lives were not as full as a result.

This applies perhaps especially to Elaine who, before becoming an unmarried mother, often had several boyfriends at a time, and who had had several since, but who, at the time of interviewing, hardly ever went out with friends because most of them were 'attached', as she put it. Consequently, she felt a need for boyfriends, and she expressed an interest in trying to get them. Her opportunities for succeeding in this respect were limited, but she was considering ways of improving the situation, by

getting a job, for example. In a similar way, Ann had tried to improve her social life by making use of a computer dating service to meet men with whom she could go out. The third of my informants, Hilary, had had some boyfriends since becoming an unmarried mother, but she showed less concern than either Elaine or Ann about not having any at the time of interviewing. Nevertheless, she was not very happy about baby-sitting on several evenings a week for Gillian, who had a boyfriend and who therefore went out a good deal.

As has been noted already, none of my informants accounted for not having a boyfriend at any time in terms of the way they had been treated because of their unmarried motherhood. Likewise, none of them accounted for their styles of friendship, or, for that matter, the state of their social relationships in general, in these terms. Their degrees of social isolation, and in particular the quality of their styles of friendship, appear to have been less affected by the responses of others to their unmarried motherhood than by their own responses. Therefore, to the extent that their social lives were dependent on these styles - and it appears as though they may have been highly dependent on them - then their social lives would also have been more affected by their own responses.

The reports of my informants suggest that when unmarried mothers are highly privatised, it is unlikely to be because of rejection or hostility of any kind. It is more likely to be as a result of having lost friends, or at least of having lost contact with them, along with having failed to make new friends because of the way they try or have tried to manage information about themselves. Unmarried mothers may well be highly privatised as a result of being inhibited from having contact with old friends and from making new ones because they are passers. This perhaps applies to Hilary who was, and always had been, a passer. They may also be highly privatised, however, because whilst they are non-passers they

have been passers. Whilst they may no longer be inhibited from having contact with, and from making, friends, they may nevertheless have few friends, or at least little contact with them, because of earlier inhibitions in these respects. When they were passers they may have moved away from friends, who, as a result, may have become less available for contact and for going out, and therefore also less useful for making new friends. The quality of their social lives will then depend on the existence of alternative means for going out and therefore of alternative sources of friendship; or on the existence of alternative 'given' or 'structured' relationships, to use Goldthorpe's terms, on the basis of which new friendships may be developed¹.

Unmarried mothers may well be highly privatised if friends have become unavailable for contact and they lack alternative sources of friendship. This perhaps applies to Elaine, for example, whose friends had become less available for contact and who lacked alternative ways of making friends, especially ones with whom she could go out. She had developed some fairly close relationships with neighbours, but with little effect on her social life. Her friends had become unavailable for contact because they had become attached or had moved away. Ann was also highly privatised because her old friends had become less available for contact and she lacked alternative sources of friendship. In this case, however, it was Ann who had moved, not her friends. She had moved whilst she was a passer. Consequently, whilst she was no longer inhibited from having contact with, or from making, friends, she had little contact with old friends and had been able to make only a few new ones from amongst neighbours and girls with whom she had lived. Her only friend in Midtown with whom she went out, was the girl with whom she was living.

Any change that had occurred in Marie's style of social life could not be attributed to either the responses of others to her unmarried motherhood, or to her own responses. Whilst Marie had been a passer, she had soon

become no more than a semi-passer, and she had not moved away from friends in an attempt to pass. There had been little change in the availability of her friends, and to make up for the few she had lost because of their responses to her unmarried motherhood, she had made several new ones. Thus, she had made some friends amongst the people with whom she had lived or had shared accommodation. In addition, she had made at least one friend through the job she had had at the beginning of her unmarried motherhood. In a similar way, each of my remaining three informants had made friends amongst both other residents in the hostel where they were living, and work-mates. Thus, Hilary had made some friends in these ways, but had perhaps made fewer than she might have, were she not still a passer. She was inhibited from making and having contact with friends because of her approach to information management. Therefore she had not made full use of her opportunities to compensate for the friends she had lost, or at least the contact she had lost with them, as a result of having moved away in an attempt to pass. In other words, she had not made full use of the opportunities she had had to have a fuller social life. Iris, on the other hand, had made full use of the opportunities she had had in these respects. She had lost friends, or at least lost contact with them, as a result of moving away when, earlier on, she had been a passer. However, she had become a non-passer and was therefore no longer inhibited from making and having contact with friends. Consequently, she had made a large number of new friends, both within the hostel and at work, to compensate for those she had lost and to enable her to have a full social life. Finally, Gillian also had a full social life because she had made quite a few new friends, amongst other residents in the hostel and amongst people with whom she had worked, to compensate for the friends she had lost as a result of having moved whilst she was a passer. Whilst, following Goldthorpe, people's jobs may have an adverse effect on their social lives in that they thereby have less time and energy to spend

on them, the reports of my informants suggest that the jobs of unmarried mothers may also have beneficial consequences for their social lives in that they thereby have opportunities to develop friendships. Those of my informants who had jobs were clearly different from Goldthorpe's sample of affluent non-manual workers, though perhaps not so different from his sample of white-collar workers, in so far as they made friends amongst work-mates to a similar extent as they made friends amongst living companions, neighbours and others with whom they had similar 'structured' relationships. That is, Goldthorpe found that

the extent to which /his sample/ of affluent workers had formed close ties with workmates or associated with them outside the plant was surprisingly limited /.../. For these men, workplace friends - or 'mates' - and friends outside work were largely separate social categories¹.

For these workers, their work-mates and the people with whom they shared their social lives were separate categories, not only in an objective sense but also, relatedly, in a subjective sense. They did not seek to confuse the two categories; they did not look to work-mates for people with whom to share their leisure-time activities. That is,

the workplace was where they came to earn their living, to sell their labour for the best return they could get; and while shop floor camaraderie /.../ might in some degree make their jobs less taxing, highly meaningful and rewarding social relationships in work seem rarely to have been anticipated or sought².

In other words, Goldthorpe found his affluent workers to be "distinctive in the extent to which /.../ within their present employment non-economic satisfactions - and in particular those of a 'social' kind - are discounted or disregarded"³. They defined work in almost exclusively 'instrumental' terms: it was "fairly sharply set apart from 'non-work', the realm of relative freedom, in which the satisfaction of needs of an expressive and affective kind could be properly pursued"⁴.

According to Peter Worsley,

there are two senses in which work can be expressive. The first stresses the rewards in work, the rewards to be gained from

doing a job well or with some sense of individual fulfilment. The other refers to rewards at work. This includes the sociable relationships which are formed at the workplace¹.

He adds

it is clear that both these elements - the rewards in and at work - have their place in nearly all jobs, together with the instrumental aspect, the rewards for work. It has been argued, however, that we have an increasing emphasis on the last reward and a decreasing emphasis on the first two kinds².

In contrast with Goldthorpe's affluent workers and against the general trend in society, therefore, my informants with jobs appeared to both seek and find not only instrumental rewards for work but also expressive rewards at (as well as perhaps in) work.

Although the residents of the hostel in Westown were required to have jobs, my informants who were living there did not have jobs simply to abide by the rules. They wanted to have jobs anyway, and they saw living in the hostel as providing an opportunity to fulfil this goal in that they could have their children taken care of while they were out at work. In fact, the main and perhaps the only attraction to living in the hostel was that they could go out to work.

Gillian stayed at work until only a few weeks before she gave birth, and left with the intention of starting again within a few weeks after giving birth. But she did not find a job for about five weeks, and for the last three weeks before starting work she reluctantly received assistance from the S.B.C. At that time her orientation to work was purely instrumental. She said "all I was interested in was sort of paying my rent, and sort of feeding /my daughter/. And that was the main thing, you know. Anything else I wasn't worried about". However, although her orientation had perhaps remained predominantly instrumental, she had made several friends amongst work-mates.

Since becoming an unmarried mother, Gillian had had three different jobs, and at the time of interviewing had been the housekeeper in the hostel

for about five months. As has been noted, she preferred her job as housekeeper because it meant she could be near her child. She said "if I hadn't got /this/ job, I would have applied for a living-in job somewhere else, because I couldn't bear to be away from /my daughter/ so long. I had a job up the road but I was still working the same hours. But I used to have a dinner hour, which was only half an hour, and I used to be so frantic, I used to run down here, even though she was in the nursery, to see she was alright. She is such a big tie for me, I couldn't really take it. The other mums I feel sorry for really, but then some mums don't mind because they prefer to go out to work, and not to be with the children all day. I mean I don't think it is wrong of them or anything, but some of them are just like that and people, you know, I can understand it, enjoy their job more than being with their child really, whereas I missed little things like, what /my daughter/ does in playtime, you know, and what she gets up to, like when she had her first tooth. The nurses really and truly are seeing them grow up, you are not sort of seeing them grow up yourself, or taking part in what they are doing".

In view of the fact that Gillian preferred her job even though it tied her to the hostel, I asked her if she was interested in working simply because of the income it provided, and she replied "no. Because I think you make friends at work, you get other interests as well. I mean, I can understand that. You know, you meet different people. You have got... other than your child, you have got other interests, you know. There is something else". Nevertheless, she added "I /do not/ miss /having a job of this kind/ because I go out in the evenings - not every evening, but if I wanted to I could go up to my sister's, you know. I can always go out. Some of them, when they get home, that is it for them. I mean, it is alright, I am young, but for the older people, you know, who don't go out, there is nothing really except for their work. And if their work is

uninteresting, they are bound to... there is no getting away from it, they are bound to take it out on the child. The older ones, if they are doing a job and they are not enjoying the job, then, you know, it's bound to take it out on their child". One mother to whom this did not apply was Hilary. Gillian said about her "she is one of those girls that enjoy her work. She said that she couldn't possibly stay home and look after her daughter all day. She said that it would drive her potty. Which is understandable really, because she really does enjoy her job".

Hilary went to live in the hostel in Westown primarily because of the chance it offered for her to get a job. She said "there was a chance of coming in here and having work to provide for the child". Her orientation to work at the time was predominantly instrumental. That is, she wanted to get a job because of "the independence. The feeling that you don't have to fall back on anyone else". However, she added "I chose my /particular/ job because I always wanted a job where you meet people and to think that you're doing something for them". Her orientation to work was not totally instrumental, and she claimed she would be prepared to take a fall in income rather than leave her job. She enjoyed her work and had made several friends amongst her work-mates.

Iris perhaps had the most expressive orientation to work of my informants who had jobs. She too had gone to live in the hostel because of the opportunity it provided to go out to work. She said "I was determined I wanted to go out to work. I wanted to support myself, and this was the only place", and she added "I was glad - well, very happy really - that I could go out to work". She had wanted to get a job so much because of the income it brought in, but at the time of interviewing, her orientation was not totally instrumental and she had made many friends. When I asked her if she enjoyed her job, she replied "yes - love it. It's a fantastic job. You know, there are so many people and most of them are

fellows - I like working with blokes". She added "that's the main thing really, working for somebody you like and working with people you like".

Goldthorpe, as we have noted, said about his workers that not only were they privatised but that they also sought and enjoyed privatisation. Moreover, he also suggested that it would be difficult to argue that his worker's preference for this style of life and their associated instrumental orientation to work were simply derived "from the work situation; from the nature, that is, of work-tasks and relationships"¹. In other words, it is unlikely that his workers tended to have a particular orientation to their work and their social lives as a result of alienating work-situations². Goldthorpe says

it may be objected that there is in fact no direct and uniform association between immediate, shop-floor work experience and employee attitudes and behaviour that are of wider reference. This is so because the effects of technologically determined conditions of work are always mediated through the meanings that men give to their work and through their own definitions of their work situation, and because these meanings and definitions in turn vary with the particular sets of wants and expectations that men bring to their employment. Thus, among the workers we studied, no systematic relationship was to be found between the degree to which their work might be considered as objectively 'alienating' and, say, the strength of their attachment to their jobs, the nature of their relationships with work-mates, or their stance in regard to their employing organizations.

Consequently, it becomes difficult to see the instrumental attitudes and behaviour that our respondents in the main displayed as being primarily and basically the effect of their - often significantly differing - tasks and roles within the organization of production. Rather, their propensity to accept work as essentially a means to extrinsic ends would seem better understood as something that to an important degree existed independently of, and prior to, their involvement in their present work situations /.../. It might /.../ still be held that to devalue work rewards in this way for the sake of increasing consumer power is itself symptomatic of alienation - perhaps even of alienation in an extreme form. But in this case, of course, the idea of work as being invariably the prime source of alienation has to be abandoned and its origins must be sought elsewhere³.

As far as Goldthorpe is concerned, it would be a mistake to think only, or even primarily, in terms of "a process of individual adaptation to

the conditions of the work situation". On the contrary, "the narrowing down of work expectations must be regarded not as a product of their in-plant socialization but rather of a prior orientation to work on their part of a decisively instrumental kind"¹.

At the same time, however, Goldthorpe also suggest that one outcome of an instrumental orientation to work is to

Bring the conjugal family into a more central position than previously in the life of the manual worker /.../. In other words, a privatised social life and an instrumental orientation to work may /.../ be seen as mutually supportive aspects of a particular life-style /.../. In consequence of the conjugal family assuming a more 'companionate' or partnership-like form, relations both between husband and wife and between parents and children would seem likely to become closer and more inherently rewarding; certainly more so than could generally have been the case under the economic and social conditions of the traditional working-class community. If workers are better able to satisfy their expressive and affective needs through family relationships, it may be anticipated that those men at least who enjoy no special occupational skills or responsibilities will less commonly regard their workplace as a milieu in which they are in search of satisfaction of this kind².

However, whilst an instrumental orientation to work and a privatised social life may be mutually supportive, is it a prior instrumental orientation to work which leads people to try to satisfy their expressive needs within their families, or is it the satisfaction of expressive needs within their families which leads them to have an instrumental orientation to work? Whatever the answer, it seems likely that people's orientation to work will be dependent on the extent to which they satisfy (or perhaps have the opportunity to satisfy) their expressive needs outside of work. They are perhaps likely to develop an expressive orientation to work when their needs cannot be satisfied within their families and neighbourhoods. Young unmarried mothers, for example, may well value work partly, and even mainly, for the rewards at work, if their families and friends have become unavailable for contact and if they have no alternative sources of friends with whom they can develop a full social life. On the other hand, they may have a mainly instrumental

orientation to work if their friends are available for contact or if they have alternative sources of friends, or at least if they can satisfy their expressive needs in some way outside of work. Thus, each of my informants who had a job had perhaps had a predominantly instrumental orientation to work to begin with, probably because their needs were satisfied to an extent without having jobs. Each of them could develop friendships amongst the other residents in the hostel, for example, and Gillian had family and friends living nearby. It was certainly the case at the time of interviewing, that Gillian had the most instrumental orientation to work. Because of the presence of family and friends - including a steady boyfriend - she was able to judge jobs mainly in terms of income and whether or not they allowed her to be with her child. Consequently, she was quite happy to have a job with no work-mates.

Gillian's child had an important influence on her orientation to work. That is, her child helped to satisfy her needs and therefore discouraged an expressive orientation to work; it also provided her with obligations which encouraged her, first of all, to find a job and, secondly, to find the kind of job where she would be close at hand. She felt obliged to find a job to earn money - although there was an alternative source, the S.B.C., she preferred not to live off assistance. She also felt obliged to devote a good deal of time and energy to being with and looking after her child¹. Iris's child and, perhaps especially, Hilary's child had similar influences on their orientations to work. Although Hilary may have been as child-centred as she was simply as a result of her approach to information management, she did not make use of the opportunities she had elsewhere to satisfy her expressive and affective needs.

The children of my other informants, coupled with their degrees of privatisation, influenced their orientations to work and help explain why they did not have jobs. Elaine, the most privatised of my informants, would have preferred to have had a job and she had a predominantly

expressive orientation to work. She indicated this when she suggested that if she had not been an unmarried mother, her social life would have been different because she "would have been working and meeting people". When I asked her what she thought unmarried mothers like herself needed for an improvement in their lives, she replied "I think amenities to look after... Nursery schools, they're the most important thing, like crèches from nought to five years so that... Well, being an unmarried mother, you tend to stay at home and you lose all your contacts and friends - you don't get to meet so many people. At least when you're out working you can meet boyfriends and stuff like that and so you do have a chance of going out, you know - you just don't get a chance pushing a pram round all day". However she said "I feel that I must do something this coming year because I've been stuck at home for about two or three years. If I don't do something I'll go nuts. You feel cooped up the whole time. /Perhaps/ I'll go to London and stay with /my friend/ for the winter in London".

On the other hand, she added, "I'm lazier /now/. That's the trouble once you stay at home, you get lazier - I wanted to go back to work, but now I'm beginning to... Now the time's coming when I will go back to work, I'm sort of 'oooo', you know". Therefore, instead of getting a job, at least immediately, she said "I'm going back to night-school this year - more to get out". When I asked her what she would study, she replied "oh, I don't know. Anything really. The first year /after giving birth/ I took a couple of evening classes and I also went one night - just for my own pleasure - I went to keep-fit classes, or something like that". The purpose of returning, she said, "/is/ just to sort of keep my mind occupied. It's very boring at the moment". But there was perhaps more to her going back to college than this: She said "I'll probably do another 'O' level, because I'd have five then. But what I'd really like if I had the chance... The main problem is to find someone to look after the

children, you see. If I could, I'd get my other 'O' level, then go to Teacher's Training College - I'd really like that - put him in a nursery school. But that's impossible. If I did teaching, when he eventually goes to school, he'd have holidays off and I'd have holidays off, and so it would all work out well. But I can't really do that; it's just that you want more facilities, for children really. It's not so much the unmarried mother. It's more the child really. If they could get nursery schools going and that, it would help anybody really, much more. I think they should give unmarried mothers nursery places before the married ones".

Ann, who was also highly privatised, would have preferred to have had a job and had a predominantly expressive orientation to work. As has been noted, at the time of our first interview, Ann was looking forward to starting a job as an assistant to a local optician. A neighbour had offered to take care of her child for her whilst she was at work. The main attraction to having a job, she said, "is mainly /the/ social difference /it would make/. Having something to occupy your mind, and sort of meeting people, and everything, and getting away from the house every day". She explained "the main problem for unmarried mothers more than anything else is a social one, rather than the financial one. I can do with more money, but that's not the main thing in getting a job". At our second interview, she reported that she had not started the job because the optician appeared to have changed his mind about taking her on. I asked her if she had considered looking for another job, and she replied "not really, I'd rather wait until /my son/ is about two. That's about the best age, when he needs to have children in a nursery".

Marie, who was less privatised than either Elaine or Ann, was less interested in finding a job and her orientation to work was perhaps less expressive. She said "I won't be working until /my daughter/ goes to school", because "basically I feel I ought to be with /my daughter/ until

she's five. /That/ is the minimum time that she needs someone to look after her, because I couldn't send her to a crèche or play-group /at least for more than/ a couple of mornings. I wouldn't want them to be looking after her all the time". Also she said "/whereas/ other people need to go to work, I don't feel the need. I think a lot of mothers go out to work because they want to be meeting people all the time. They don't want to be confined to the house for five years with a child". She added "I might have felt differently, but when I enquired about nurseries, when she was very small, they wouldn't accept her because of her heart. They only accept perfect children, you see. If they're slightly imperfect....! And so I really hadn't got any choice right at the beginning and, quite honestly, she takes up so much of my time". Marie would have liked a job, but only a part-time one. She said "I'd like to be able to do something for a couple of days a week or a couple of mornings. I don't really want to work full-time". In other words, she would have liked "just to break the routine a little bit". I asked her if she had any particular job in mind, and she replied "no. Well, I wouldn't mind going back and working in the travel agents part-time. Nothing too taxing. Something I'd enjoy. I wouldn't go back to work for money - it sounds as if I don't need it - but I'd go back to work because I enjoyed doing something". More specifically, she saw "going out and meeting people" as the main attraction of a job. "It would be the meeting people at work, rather than the work itself".

Marie would have taken on a job for the "outside interest". But, she added, "I'm not desperately keen. If something came along that suited me and was very convenient... I wouldn't put myself out for a job. It would have to fall into my lap". On the other hand, she said, "I've got to the state where I feel I need to do something - that's why I started doing evening classes and started reading more, really just so that I didn't become another mother who all she could talk about was how much the baby's grown and this sort of thing. But it's more for my own benefit

I think, than anybody else's, that I'm trying to study". However, she was not going to evening classes in order to make friends. When I asked her if she had made any friends there, she replied "no, I don't know anybody really. It's very funny, they say 'Join evening classes and meet people', and you go there at half past six, you sort of nod, and at half past eight you disappear". She added "I wanted to go /because/ I had this big academic drive that I'd got to start somewhere. And I get this idea that the only job I can do with a child, is teaching". Her aim was to become a teacher, but not before her child had started school. In this way she could both have a job and be able to meet the obligations she felt towards her child with regard to being with and taking care of her.

Marie's orientation to work was similar to Gillian's, who, though more interested in having a job because she preferred not to receive assistance from the S.B.C., was equally interested in being able to be with her child. However, Marie's orientation was different to those of my other informants. Thus, Elaine, who also wanted to be a teacher, Ann, Hilary and Iris were not only more interested in having jobs, but also more prepared to leave their children in the hands of others, so that they could go out to work. They would have been more interested in finding nursery accommodation for their children, and more concerned (as Elaine indicated) about the availability of such facilities. Whether or not they had jobs was much more dependent on the availability of nursery places; fortunately for Hilary and Iris, who had jobs, there was a day nursery in the hostel¹.

Marie and Gillian had perhaps the most instrumental orientations to work. They were amongst those of my informants who had the least privatised social lives at the time of interviewing, but perhaps more importantly, they had had to rely least, or not at all, on work as a source of friends with whom they could share their leisure time. Thus, at the time of

interviewing, there was little difference compared with before she became an unmarried mother in the availability for contact of Marie's family and friends. There was perhaps a greater difference in the availability of Gillian's family and friends, but even this was not as great as that which applied to the families and friends of the rest of my informants. There had been substantial changes in the availability for contact of Elaine's friends, and in the availability of both the families and the friends of Ann, Hilary and Iris. In the case of the latter three, this change was the result of the way they had responded to their unmarried motherhood - that is, as a result of having moved away from family and friends in an attempt to pass. However, the reports of my informants suggest that if the family and friends of unmarried mothers do become unavailable for contact, they will have a greater chance of having a full social life if they are able to go out to work. That is, they will have a greater chance of a full social life if they are not prevented from going out to work by, for example, and perhaps especially, (a) the obligations they feel towards their children (and this they are unlikely to be if their family and friends have become unavailable for contact), and (b) the lack of somewhere to have their children looked after. Thus, Iris and Hilary, who had jobs, were less privatised than Ann and Elaine, who did not. By being able to go out to work, unmarried mothers are likely to have the opportunity of meeting people with whom they can develop friendships and share their leisure time. Whether or not they take this opportunity, may then determine whether or not they have full social lives. However, they may not take it, and may therefore be highly privatised, because of their approach to information management. Whilst their work-mates are unlikely to respond with rejection or any kind of hostility to their unmarried motherhood, and are therefore likely to provide them with the opportunity to develop friendships, they may be passers and therefore inhibited from making new friends.

This applied to Hilary, whose social life as a result was highly privatised. At the same time, however, the reports of my informants perhaps indicate that unmarried mothers are less likely to be passers than non-passers, and are therefore unlikely to be inhibited from developing friendships with work-mates if and when they have jobs. Thus, they are more likely to be like Iris, whose social life was far less privatised than Hilary's, and was probably, taking the discussion at the beginning of this chapter as a guide, more or less 'normal'.

After coming to these conclusions about the social lives of unmarried mothers, in the next and final chapter, the main points of this and previous chapters are brought together and further conclusions are drawn about the social situations of unmarried mothers.

CHAPTER EIGHTCONCLUSIONS

The investigation I carried out into the social situations of young unmarried mothers was inspired by an interest in the concept and nature of poverty, and although the findings are of relevance to these issues they also brought about a shift and expansion in the areas to which I have paid attention. This shift was necessitated by a development in the ideas with which I began and on the basis of which I decided to undertake this particular study. Thus, I was led to assume by the suggestions in the available literature and by my perception of popularly held beliefs in our society that unmarried mothers are deviants and therefore stigmatised, and that consequently they are subjected to extensive hostility, rejection and exclusion from other people. I expected that as a result of social exclusion young unmarried mothers would suffer a, perhaps substantial, reduction in their life chances, or relatively high degrees of social isolation and 'deprivation'. (For the sake of convenience, the term 'deprivation' is used here in the sense meant by Peter Townsend, which was discussed at the beginning of Chapter One. That is, it refers to the condition of being excluded from participation in 'common social activities and enjoyments').⁽¹⁾ However, my reading of the available literature also showed that there is very little firm empirical evidence on these matters, and moreover brought to mind the possibility of an additional or even alternative source of isolation and deprivation. It occurred to me that if young females who later become unmarried mothers acquire beliefs and expectations which were similar to the ones with which I began my study, they might try on becoming unmarried mothers to manage information about their identity in ways through which they would exclude themselves socially. That is, as well as or instead of being excluded by other people, unmarried

mothers in some cases and on some occasions may engage in self exclusion, and thereby in activities which would have detrimental consequences for their social situations.

This possibility was then given credence by the data I began to gather from my informants, and as a result I was encouraged to concentrate my investigation on the meanings which unmarried mothers themselves attach to their marital status and on the significance of these meanings for their social situations. Of course, the conclusions I might arrive at in this context would need to be treated as highly speculative and tentative given that like all previous studies designed to collect relevant empirical data I would be relying solely on interviews with a limited sample of unmarried mothers, and only unmarried mothers. But, in view of my limited resources and the various difficulties in the way of getting information in either any other way or from any other people I would necessarily have to depend on this, perhaps best single, source.

The data would then be of value if treated cautiously and if used in conjunction with my stock of knowledge and my hopefully reasonably competent interpretive abilities, to throw some light on the meanings which unmarried mothers attach to their marital status and beyond this on their social relationships and social lives. Thus, the data I gathered leads me to provisionally conclude, first of all, that in our society young unmarried mothers tend not to suffer, at least substantially, high degrees of social isolation or deprivation. Moreover, if and when they do suffer these things it is unlikely to be because of social exclusion, that is as a result of exclusion by others. It is much more likely to be because of self exclusion, either current or previous, or especially in the long run because of the practical problems of being 'mother alone'. Therefore, my data lend themselves to the conclusion that the best approach to an understanding of the social situations of young unmarried mothers in our society involves paying particular attention to the social actions of the mothers themselves

as viewed in the context of an appreciation of the nature of and ideology surrounding the family and, relatedly, the position of women.

The family is undoubtedly an important element or force in our society, on both the structural and connectedly the ideational levels. This importance is reflected in the extent and content of the available sociological literature on the topic. (An, albeit superficial, review of some of this literature was presented at the beginning of Chapter Three). Whilst this literature by no means provides a complete consensus of opinion on the prevailing nature of the family, it does tend to agree on some of the principal features. Thus, it seems to be the norm - in both the statistical sense and the ideological sense - that people live in relatively isolated or structurally differentiated conjugal family units (although whether and to what extent these are new phenomena is a matter of contention). The norm, that is, is for separate and relatively independent household units consisting of pairs of monogamously married adults and their respective children. Their relatively independent activities are then mainly centred on the satisfaction of the sexual and psychological wants and needs of the adults and on the reproduction, care, and socialisation of the children, although in pursuing these activities they also function as 'units of consumption' for the goods and services which the adults produce within the market sector of the economy. The children remain in these units until their late teens or early twenties when, or at least shortly after which, they get married and themselves begin the process of setting up independent conjugal family units. Hence, the norm is for the children to get married in their early twenties and then to have about two children of their own within the next five or six years. It is abnormal - again in both the statistical and ideological senses - for the children to remain single much beyond their early twenties, or to get married and then not to reproduce, or to reproduce without having got married. Each of these alternatives is stigmatised, perhaps especially the last which, after all, flaunts one

of the principal functions of marriage and the conjugal unit.

It is primarily through the agency of the family that children are socialised into the ideological norms, or values, in question. These values are then highly influential in guiding children, especially females, towards activities by way of which the independent conjugal family unit remains the statistical norm, and away from socially deviant activities. In addition, the process of socialisation is likely to have instructed children in the belief that the same values are generally held within society, and therefore that the proscribed activities are stigmatised and have adverse social consequences. This belief in itself is then perhaps likely to guide the activities of children in the direction by which the independent conjugal family remains statistically normal. Moreover, it is conceivable that this belief alone - that is when it is unaccompanied by any subscription to the value - will have this effect, or at least will persuade children to try to appear to be abiding by the norm.

The reports of my informants suggest that these culturally informed expectations are crucial to an understanding of the ways in which young unmarried females who get pregnant - that is, who become prospective unmarried mothers - respond to their new identity; of the meanings they attach to their unmarried motherhood and their subsequent social actions and social situations. At the same time, however, the reports also suggest the need to regard these expectations as influences on rather than determinants of their responses and behaviour, and relatedly as dynamic rather than static features of society. In other words, it would appear that the most appropriate perspective is one which assumes a possible 'interaction' between these cultural elements and unmarried mothers' behaviour and experiences. Thus, the reports of my informants suggest that over time unmarried mothers' expectations about the consequences of their identity change as a result of their experiences as unmarried mothers. Their expectations tend to become very different from the ones into which they

were socialised prior to becoming unmarried mothers, and their social actions and social situations tend to change accordingly.

The reports of my informants suggest that young unmarried females on learning they are pregnant - that is, unmarried mothers - are likely to have culturally informed expectations which lead them to try to keep their new identity a secret from - that is, to try to pass with - other people, and moreover most other people. They are then likely to try to pass not only with 'strangers' but also with 'intimates', including relatives and friends. The extent to which they engage in passing will depend on the consequences they expect as a result of not passing with particular people and on their feelings about these consequences, or that is on the assumed rewards of passing in particular cases. It seems that young females in our society are likely to have been socialised into anticipating greater rewards from extensive passing. The style of passing they adopt will then depend on the particular people with whom they decide to try to pass and, relatedly, on the sort of information which they need to keep secret in order to pass. The latter will vary between cases and over time. Essentially various forms of distance - both physical and social - are employed by unmarried mothers in their attempts to pass. With strangers they may simply maintain social distance by avoiding intimate and close relationships, but with people with whom they already have intimate or close relationships they may introduce physical distance by avoiding contact and even moving away. In these ways they may exclude themselves socially and thereby become isolated and deprived.

By way of their approaches to information management unmarried mothers may suffer deprivation simply as a result of self exclusion, that is without having been subjected to any exclusion by others. Moreover, they may be deprived without having experienced any responses from other people whatsoever. That is, they may have passed, perhaps because they have successfully tried to pass, totally. However, it seems unlikely that they

will pass or try to pass totally for very long. They are likely to let some people with whom they have close relationships, particularly friends, know about their unmarried motherhood, and may well find that other people also gradually get to know. They are then likely to discover that those who do get to know tend not to respond with hostility, or at least rejection, perhaps in some cases against expectations. Then, depending on how they interpret the responses they experience, which in turn depends on the particular types of response they experience from particular types of people, they are likely to alter their approach to information management such that they try to pass less. Hence, in the long run they are likely to get to a stage when they try to pass very little, if at all. That is, over time they are likely to be converted by their experiences as unmarried mothers from being 'passers' to being non- or, at least, semi-passers. Eventually, therefore, they are likely to have experienced the responses of a large number of people, both intimates and strangers, and they are likely to have discovered that very few people respond to unmarried motherhood with hostility or at least rejection.

At the same time, some unmarried mothers will continue to try to pass extensively and therefore to have had very little experience of how people respond to unmarried motherhood. In fact, they will probably continue to be passers because of their lack of experience in this respect - because their approach to information management has prevented them from discovering that their culturally informed expectations about the consequences of unmarried motherhood are somewhat misguided. Consequently they may well continue to engage in self exclusion and as a result may well continue to be isolated and deprived. They are more likely to be deprived, or are likely to be more deprived, than if they had become non-passers, or that is than those mothers who have been converted into non-passers. At the same time, however, 'converted non-passers' may still be isolated and deprived as a result of self exclusion, that is as a result of the self exclusion they

had previously engaged in when they were passers. Thus, as passers they may have introduced physical distance between themselves and their relatives and friends, who as a result may still be relatively unavailable for contact, for going out, for the purposes of making new friends, and so on. On the other hand, again in the long run, non- or semi-passers, and therefore most unmarried mothers, usually have sufficient contact with relatives and friends such that they are not deprived as a result of either exclusion by others or self exclusion.

In the long run young unmarrred mothers are likely to enjoy social situations, or at least to have the opportunities to enjoy social situations, which are not far from 'normal'. However, the 'normal' situation is taken here to mean that which is enjoyed by married mothers of a similar age (the research by Reeder and Reeder which was discussed in the first chapter lends support to the conclusion that the quality of social situations of unmarried mothers on the one hand and of married mothers on the other tend to be comparable), and married mothers, after all, may be more deprived than females who are not mothers; females who are neither mothers nor married; and males, whatever their circumstances. The available and rapidly growing literature on the position of women in our society (some of which was discussed at the beginning of Chapter Four) would appear to indicate that married mothers are more deprived than these other categories, especially the latter. In addition this literature may give some clue as to why, as appears to be the case from my findings, unmarried mothers who are not deprived as a result of either exclusion by others or self exclusion may nevertheless be somewhat more deprived than even married mothers. However, it is instructive to note that in the writings of both sociologists and feminists the discussion of the position of women is largely confined to a consideration of married mothers. This is perhaps surprising in that, at least by implication, feminists would appear to believe that remaining childless or unmarried is a more liberated, or at

least a potentially more liberating, state than married motherhood. In a sense feminists have perhaps been constrained by the ideology they have set out to attack. (It was noted in Chapter Four how the way in which some feminists have gone about analysing the position of women has perhaps been similarly affected by 'sexist ideology').

It seems that after managing to abide by the norm of creating their own independent conjugal family unit, women in our society tend to concentrate their attention on activities within its boundaries, or on those activities which represent the principal functions of this family form. Thus, following Juliet Mitchell, we may speak of women concentrating on the three 'structures' of sexuality, reproduction and the socialisation of children, to the relative exclusion of 'production' which is carried on outside of the family (although, of course, as was noted in Chapter Four, it is perhaps an aberration to regard domestic activities as completely unproductive). Their husbands have much more to do with productive or non-familial activities and much less to do with the familial ones. The family functions tend to be left largely to women. Moreover, again following Mitchell, the activities concerning the care and socialisation of children have steadily become more demanding - we have become not only a home-centered but also a child-centered society - in accordance with the changing requirements of the productive or non-familial sphere.

Now, this division of labour between men and women is again not simply a statistical norm but also an ideological one. Both men and women value it, and try to arrange their activities in accordance with it. Moreover, the main agency through which people are socialised into this value is the family itself. Consequently, people tend to subscribe to it well in advance of being to act in accordance with it. In particular, adolescent females have already been well instructed in the proper feminine 'role' of being a wife and mother, and into the belief that in carrying out this role properly they will be fulfilling the tasks set for them not only by society,

but also and primarily by 'nature'. They are instructed in the belief that they have a 'maternal instinct' and that therefore they should have, and should want to have, children and should want to care for them properly - by concentrating their attention and activities upon them. They are led to feel that if and only if they act in accordance with this 'instinct' will they become truly female. At the same time they are expected to contain these feelings until after they have got married, and usually they succeed in doing so. But, if they do happen to become mothers without having got married these feelings may nevertheless determine their decisions and activities in relation to their children. That is, as the reports of my informants suggest, these feelings may overcome their fears about the possible social consequences of unmarried motherhood such that they may decide to keep their children. It then seems likely that if they do make this decision they will proceed to be 'good' mothers by concentrating on the activities of caring for and socialising their children. Moreover, they may well concentrate far more on these activities than their married counterparts, if not in an attempt to demonstrate to others that they can be 'good' mothers under the circumstances, then at least simply because they do not have husbands with whom to share these activities. The reports of my informants suggest that it is the statistical abnormality of being 'mothers alone' coupled with the feminine ideology into which they have been socialised which in the long run is the principal source of deprivation suffered by unmarried mothers. The literature on women indicates that in recent years married mothers have gained greater assistance from their husbands in bringing up children as part of a more equitable division of domestic tasks in general and in conjunction with a relative democratisation of conjugal relationships (although this possibility has been somewhat neglected in the feminist literature). That is, husbands participate more, and are willing to participate more, in those activities which are centered on the care and socialisation of

children. This development may then be understood or accounted for in terms of the changing demands of the 'productive' or non-familial sphere of society, which has benefitted because of the resulting greater participation of married women in this sphere. Moreover, married women have perhaps gained more time^{and}/energy not only to enable them to go out to work, but also for use in the pursuit of leisure and social activities, wherever and with whom these might take place. Unmarried mothers, on the other hand, have not gained from this development. Whilst they have had to try to meet the greater demands which have been made on them with regard to the upbringing of children - demands which, for example, are reflected in the activities of the 'media' and the State - they do not have husbands to help them meet these demands, never mind with whom to share their resulting leisure time. They have to look to other sources of assistance, such as relatives, friends, voluntary organisations and the State. However, although the assistance which is available from these sources has perhaps increased in recent years it is not always available to a sufficient extent as to provide unmarried mothers with the same opportunities as married mothers.

The reports of my informants suggest that if and when sources of assistance of this kind are available to unmarried mothers, particularly to the extent to allow them to go out to work, they will have the opportunity to enjoy social situations which compare favourably with those of married mothers. At the same time, however, they may not make full use of these opportunities. Even when they are not engaging in self exclusion in an attempt to pass, they may not make full use of the sources of assistance which are available to them because of their feelings about being a 'good' mother. They may feel the need to concentrate their attention and activities on their children and may therefore be unable to trust the care of their children to others, even on a temporary basis. The reports of my informants suggest that it is perhaps these feelings and the ideology from which they stem

which is currently a final bar to unmarried mothers (as well as mothers in general!) enjoying 'normal' social situations.

In recent years there may have been changes in this ideology, such that mothers are perhaps more inclined to share the upbringing of children. Moreover, the relative liberation of women in this respect has perhaps been accompanied by related changes in the other 'structures' which define their situation. The reports of my informants are perhaps instructive in this context, although again any conclusions which might be drawn from them are highly speculative and tentative. They suggest that unmarried motherhood provokes very little rejection and hostility in our society, and perhaps that (a) very few people ~~disapprove~~, at least strongly, of unmarried motherhood and therefore that unmarried mothers are not deviants, in contemporary society¹ and (b) there has been a recent change away from a situation where people in general disapproved, perhaps strongly, of unmarried motherhood, and where therefore unmarried mothers were deviants, stigmatized and subjected to a good deal of hostility and rejection. However, there is very little evidence of a direct and reliable kind that can be used to draw firm conclusions on these matters. That is, there is hardly any data on attitudes to unmarried motherhood and treatment of unmarried mothers in either past or present society². Perhaps all there is available is a body of indirect evidence in the form of data on sexual attitudes and behaviour. However, the relevance of this is disputable in that whilst some writers suggest that disapproval of unmarried motherhood is directed against their sexual misbehaviour, others argue that rather than being based on rules about sex, it is based on rules about bringing children into the world properly supplied with ('sociological') fathers to act as either 'protectors' or to provide them with a well-defined 'status'³. These suggestions, however, are made without reference to any conclusive evidence and even without any clear indication as to what sort of evidence would be conclusive. Moreover, both these views, but

maybe especially the latter, appear to imply that the rule against unmarried motherhood has a purpose behind it, and is perhaps reflected upon, and actively and purposefully held, by those people who subscribe to it. However, is it not possible that whatever the consequences of the rule, those who subscribe to it do so passively or simply because they have been socialized into it, along with reasons, explanations, and rational-

Continued over . . .

izations for its existence and their subscription to it?

Although one of my informants inferred that for her, disapproval of unmarried motherhood is based on a rule about how to bring children into the world, there seemed to be more or less general agreement that it is directed against sexual misbehaviour, and that there is less disapproval of unmarried motherhood as a result of changes towards greater permissiveness.

There does appear to be general agreement amongst writers on the subject that there has indeed been a trend towards less restrictive sexual attitudes and behaviour. Juliet Mitchell, for example, takes this view. That is, according to her there has "been /an/ increase in pre-marital sexual experience /which/ is now virtually legitimized in contemporary society"¹. Moreover, as far as Mitchell is concerned "the so-called 'sexual revolution' and the cult of libertarianism have probably permeated further in England than in other countries of" a similar kind². In addition, the changes which have taken place have occurred mainly in the area of female sexuality. Mitchell suggests

for women, as to a lesser extent for men, the 'sexual revolution' has meant a positive increase in the amount of their sexual (and hence social) freedom³.

The 'revolution' and its greater relevance to women can be partially explained in terms of the development of the pill as a readily available contraceptive. This has allowed for a greater separation of sexual activity and procreation and thus for an increase in sexual freedom and other kinds of freedom. At the same time, however, the full explanation raises doubts about whether "the current wave of sexual liberalization /is/ conducive to the greater general freedom of women". For Mitchell "it could presage new forms of oppression"⁴. The argument here is similar to the one put forward by George Frankl in *The Failure of the Sexual Revolution*⁵, where it is suggested that the change in sexual outlook and behaviour is merely a product of capitalist enterprise and, as

such, has occurred only to the extent and in a way which allows for greater commercial exploitation. It is therefore a 'false' revolution. This approach is shared also by Herbert Marcuse, who, using the notion of 'repressive sublimation' argues that the changes which have taken place in the area of sexuality can be understood in terms of attempts by capitalists to retain control in society¹. Thus, Mitchell claims that for women the 'sexual revolution' has "meant an increase in their 'use' as sexual objects"². She says it is "this /.../ use of sexuality that Women's Liberation objects to - its 'consumption'"³.

There is therefore a good deal of scepticism about the extent, nature and significance of any change which has occurred in sexual attitudes and behaviour⁴. However, if there has been some change towards less sexual restrictiveness and perhaps connectedly, an accompanying decline in the strength of the rule proscribing unmarried motherhood, it could be part of a more widespread development which might be summed up as movement in the direction of greater 'anomie', in the Durkheimian sense: that is, towards a situation where there is an absence of shared rules, or of norms⁵. This movement is then perhaps indicative of a trend away from 'mechanical solidarity' towards 'organic solidarity', brought about by an increase in the division of labour⁶. At the same time, however, an anomic situation may be explicable not so much in terms of the nature of any change but more in terms of its rapidity. Thus, for Durkheim there is a link between anomic suicide and economic crises.

But whatever the 'causes' and consequences of anomie, a development or perhaps more especially, a rapid development towards the weakening of shared rules may be a source of the ways in which people like unmarried mothers treat and are in turn treated by other people in our society.

If there has been a rapid change in the rules about unmarried motherhood, such that there is far less disapproval than there was not so long ago, people may nevertheless be led to believe, by folklore or whatever, that

the rule still exists that unmarried motherhood still attracts strong disapproval and is still stigmatized, and that therefore unmarried mothers are still subjected to a good deal of hostility and rejection. Thus, unmarried mothers may have been socialized into these beliefs and expectations when they were normals, with the result that they are likely to be passers to begin with but probably only to begin with.

Whether or not unmarried mothers remain passers will depend, of course, on their experience as unmarried mothers: on whether or not they experience the responses of others and if they do, on what these responses are like.

The reports of my informants suggest that if and when unmarried mothers do not pass, they are less likely to experience rejection or hostility than to experience acceptance, and also that any rejection is likely to be only temporary. This may be explained in terms of the fact that the beliefs about unmarried motherhood which unmarried mothers will have acquired as 'normals' are likely to be similar to those acquired by people in general. The latter, therefore, are likely to believe that unmarried mothers have broken the social norms¹, and are consequently subjected to a good deal of hostility and rejection. Moreover, they may believe that not only unmarried mothers themselves but also anyone associated with unmarried motherhood will be treated in ways similar to this; where people are associated with unmarried motherhood on the basis of their behaviour in relation to it. It may then be believed that treatment of those associated with unmarried motherhood varies according to their 'structured relationships' or 'connections' with unmarried mothers, such that kin are treated more severely than non-kin, for example. As a result, people may decide to reject in order to try to avoid the consequences they believe follow from being associated with unmarried motherhood. That is, they may reject in order to either

(a) keep their connections with unmarried mothers a secret, or (b) dissociate themselves from unmarried motherhood by responding to it in ways which they believe to be appropriate. Their responses will depend on (a) their beliefs and feelings about the consequences of being associated with unmarried motherhood, (b) their connections with unmarried mothers, and (c) whether or not they think that their response is known or at least is likely to become known.

Thus, kin may be perhaps more likely to reject than non-kin. But whoever it is who rejects, they may do so only temporarily if there is a change in their beliefs, say, about the consequences of being associated with unmarried motherhood. Thus, when people reject unmarried mothers they may do so only temporarily because the beliefs and expectations they acquired about unmarried motherhood before they became connected with unmarried mothers have not been borne out by their experience since. They may come to realize that unmarried mothers and others associated with unmarried motherhood are not, after all, subjected to very much, if any, rejection or hostility.

Perhaps a similar account to this was provided as long ago as the mid-nineteen twenties by Malinowski in his discussion of the way Trobriand Islanders respond to sexual intercourse between members of the same clan. According to Malinowski:

the natives show horror at the idea of violating the rules of exogamy and /.../ they believe that sores, disease and even death might follow clan incest. This is the ideal of native law, and in moral matters it is easy and pleasant strictly to adhere to the ideal - when judging the conduct of others or expressing an opinion about conduct in general.

When it comes to the application of morality and ideals to real life, however, things take on a different complexion. In the case described it was obvious that the facts would not tally with the ideal of conduct. Public opinion was neither outraged by the knowledge of the crime to any extent, nor did it react directly - it had to be mobilized by a public statement of the crime and by insults being hurled at the culprit by an interested party. Even then he had to carry out the punishment himself /.../. Probing further into the matter and collecting concrete information, I found that the breach of exogamy - as regards intercourse and not marriage - is by no

means a rare occurrence, and public opinion is lenient, though decidedly hypocritical. If the affair is carried on sub rosa with a certain amount of decorum, and if no one in particular stirs up trouble - 'public opinion' will gossip, but not demand any harsh punishment. If, on the contrary, scandal breaks out - everyone turns against the guilty pair and by ostracism and insults one or the other may be driven to suicide¹.

The applicability of this account may not be limited to this particular case: it may have wider relevance, in that it may be applicable to similar and even to very different cases in other societies. Thus, people may know, or think, that a rule has been broken², but nevertheless may not respond as though it has until a 'public statement' about it has been, or is thought likely to be, made. Perhaps the crucial thing about a 'public statement' in this respect is that it lets people know not only that the rule has been broken - they may know this already - but also that other people know about this and, moreover, know that they know. That is, a 'public statement' lets people know that their response to the deviation is known and it may as a result mobilize them into responding in appropriate ways, with hostility and rejection perhaps, in order to show that they disapprove of and are not to be associated with the deviation.

The particular case discussed by Malinowski may, of course, be akin to that of the way people respond to unmarried motherhood, in that it is concerned with responses to what are thought to be violations of the rules governing sexual activity. We may, in this context, recall Marie's explanation, discussed in chapter six, of why it is that unmarried mothers are subjected to censure by others for having violated a rule forbidding premarital sex, when girls who do likewise but without becoming unmarried mothers are not. She explained that unmarried mothers have an 'outward sign' of their misbehaviour by which they make people feel a need to treat them in appropriate ways. The pregnancy or child of an unmarried mother may be said, in other words, to act as a 'public statement' of their sexual misbehaviour. This explanation has perhaps been alluded to

by Leontine Young, whose suggestions about the differential treatment of unmarried mothers and females who engage in pre-marital sex but who do not conceive, were referred to in chapter one¹.

In the same chapter, there was also a reference made to Clark Vincent's similar explanation of why unmarried mothers are treated differently from unmarried fathers. Whilst both have broken the rules prohibiting pre-marital sex, unmarried mothers show evidence of their misbehaviour and thereby overtly threaten the rules². Howard Becker has also made references to the harsher treatment of unmarried mothers in making the point that "just because one has committed an infraction of the rules does not mean that others will respond as though this had happened"³.

He suggests, first of all, that

some rules are enforced only when they result in certain consequences. The unmarried mother furnishes a clear example. /.../ illicit sexual relations seldom result in severe punishment or social censure for the offenders. If, however, a girl becomes pregnant as a result of such activities the reaction of others is likely to be severe⁴.

He then notes that

the illicit pregnancy /is/ an interesting example of the differential enforcement of rules on different categories of people. /.../ unmarried fathers escape the severe censure visited on the mother⁵.

However, a couple of issues arise out of these suggestions. First of all, need it be the case that all unmarried mothers are treated in the same way, and, moreover, more harshly than all unmarried fathers and all females who engage in pre-marital sexual intercourse without becoming unmarried mothers? Perhaps the harshness of the treatment will depend on whether or not a 'public statement' of the behaviour in question is made or at least is thought likely to be made. This then allows for the possibility that, for example, some unmarried mothers may not be treated as harshly as some unmarried fathers, even though their unmarried motherhood is known. Secondly, the question arises of whether it is necessarily the case that people who subscribe to the rule which proscribes unmarried

motherhood will respond with rejection to its violation. Whether or not they do respond in this way may depend on the occurrence or likelihood of a 'public statement'. Connectedly, the possibility emerges that even when people do not subscribe to the rule, they will respond to unmarried motherhood as though they do, if they believe in the existence of the rule and witness or anticipate a public statement. This brings to mind the further possibility, of course, that even in the total absence of a rule against unmarried motherhood, people may nevertheless behave as though it existed by rejecting unmarried mothers. Perhaps the term 'behavioural lag' may be an appropriate way of describing instances where people's behaviour is based on the assumption that a rule exists when it no longer does so.

At the same time, however, if and when the rule does exist, the responses of people who subscribe to it may be problematic even when they are not governed by the occurrence or likelihood of a public statement. In this context it is appropriate to recall some of the views and statements of my informants which are referred to in earlier chapters. Thus, Marie explained having been subjected to perhaps more severe treatment than other unmarried mothers in terms of the way she had conducted herself as an unmarried mother. She said "people don't like you to come out with it, I don't think. You're supposed to be slightly shy and retiring about it. But if you're bold and you come right out people don't know how to cope". She added, "perhaps that is the thing. Because obviously I would have thought, in the majority of cases the girl would have been proud of their babies; well, I'm proud of my daughter and I want to show her off to people. So perhaps this is it, the fact that I think she's beautiful and wonderful and does all the right things, perhaps I shouldn't. Perhaps I should be hiding her indoors and taking her out when nobody's looking or perhaps I ought to behave... Perhaps I don't behave in the right way. Perhaps because I walk into somewhere 'I'm as good as you are and I expect

the same service as everybody else does'". In this way Marie explained the unpleasant treatment she had experienced from such people as nurses, health visitors and S.B.C. officers. However, she had been treated very differently by neighbours she had had because she had "conformed with their ideas of what /she/ should be doing". She said "if I'd have had parties every night, or if I had a different man arriving and going at breakfast time, I think then perhaps their attitude would have changed then. But I was pretty conventional to have around". As was noted in chapter six, Goffman suggested that the stigmatized often use the technique of 'covering' with people who know about their failing, if they wish to have smooth interaction. This technique involves trying to prevent their failing from 'looming large', as Goffman puts it, and thereby from causing tension. Marie was not interested in covering with nurses, for example, and as a result provoked responses from them which led to strained relationships. On the other hand, she did not behave in ways which provoked such responses in her neighbours.

We might also recall how one of my informants, Hilary, stratified unmarried mothers in terms of their approaches to information management. As far as she was concerned, unmarried mothers should be 'passers', or at least be reticent about letting others know about their unmarried motherhood. This is because, for her, unmarried mothers should be ashamed of or regret having become unmarried mothers - that is, of having broken the rules proscribing unmarried motherhood.

It is possible, then, that the way in which people who subscribe to a rule against unmarried motherhood respond to its violation, will depend on how unmarried mothers behave. There may be rules about how they should behave, and these may, for example, prescribe that they should show regret at having become unmarried mothers and that they should not break any further rules.

Whether or not people subscribe to rules about how unmarried mothers

should behave, they may have opinions about how they will behave. That is, people may anticipate that unmarried mothers will behave in particular ways. Moreover, people may anticipate that unmarried mothers will behave in ways which are against the rules which apply, and which perhaps they think should apply, to them. As Goffman suggests "we tend to impute a wide range of imperfections on the basis of the original one"¹. In fact, according to Becker "the most important consequence" of being labelled a deviant "is a drastic change in the individual's public identity"². That is

Committing the improper act and being publicly caught at it place him in a new status. He has been revealed as a different kind of person from the kind he was supposed to be. He is labeled a 'fairy', 'dope fiend', 'nut' or 'lunatic', and treated accordingly³.

Becker then refers to Everett Hughes' discussion of master and auxiliary 'status traits'⁴. According to Hughes a 'status' may have one key trait which serves to distinguish those who belong to it from those who do not. In addition those who do belong may be expected to have a number of 'auxiliary' traits. According to Becker,

Hughes deals with this phenomenon in regard to statuses that are well thought of, desired and desirable (noting that one may have the formal qualifications for entry into a status but be denied full entry because of lack of the proper auxiliary traits), but the same process occurs in the case of deviant statuses. Possession of one deviant trait may have a generalized symbolic value, so that people automatically assume that its bearer possesses other undesirable traits allegedly associated with it.

To be labeled a criminal one need only commit a single criminal offense, and this is all the term formally refers to. Yet the word carries a number of connotations specifying auxiliary traits characteristic of anyone bearing the label. A man who has been convicted of housebreaking and thereby labeled criminal is presumed to be a person likely to break into other houses; the police, in rounding up known offenders for investigation after a crime has been committed, operate on this premise. Further, he is considered likely to commit other kinds of crimes as well, because he has shown himself to be a person without 'respect for the law'. Thus, apprehension for one deviant act exposes a person to the likelihood that he will be regarded as deviant or undesirable in other respects⁵.

Unmarried mothers may be assigned the master status trait of deviant, which may then infer that they have other deviant or undesirable traits. Thus, S.B.C. officers may suspect unmarried mothers, rather than widowed mothers, say, of violating the rules about the behaviour of people who receive assistance. Officers may be wary of them cohabiting, for example¹. None of my informants complained about S.B.C. officers on these grounds, but some had found that they were occasionally suspected of being sexually promiscuous. In addition, one of my informants, Marie, complained that nurses and health visitors had regarded her as being unwilling or incapable of taking adequate care of her child, and even of being interested in abandoning it. These expectations about how unmarried mothers will behave may be based on the kind of behaviour by which it is thought they became unmarried mothers. Thus, it may be thought that they became unmarried mothers through a lack of concern about the rules regarding sexual activity, or how to bring a child into the world with proper protection.

People's expectations, whatever their basis, about how unmarried mothers will behave, will have a bearing on how they treat unmarried mothers. Perhaps they can be referred to as the 'social role' of unmarried mothers, though this depends on how the term is defined. For D.J.A. Woodland "a social role is the expected behaviour of the occupant of a social position"². At the same time

Role is a relational term. One plays a role vis-à-vis another person's role which is attached to a counter position /.../.

The expectations that the role partner in the counter position has of ego's role are usually referred to as ego's role obligations or duties, and the expectations that ego has of his role partner are ego's rights³.

The occupant of a 'social position', ego, will be expected by others to behave in a particular way. The behaviour which is expected of him is ego's social role and will affect how others behave towards him. Also, ego will have expectations about how others will treat him and these

expectations will guide his behaviour towards them. If people share expectations and behave according to them, there will be orderly social interactions. However, Woodland then suggests that ego's role can be defined in terms of a set of obligations. The way ego is expected to treat others is prescribed by a set of obligations associated with the social position he occupies and others see it as their right to be treated in this way. Likewise, Michael Banton suggests that it is "sufficient to define roles simply as sets of rights and obligations"¹. That is, for Banton

clusters of rights and obligations constitute roles /.../. By 'rights' is here understood a socially sanctioned claim upon other persons or upon society in general. By 'obligation' is meant a socially sanctioned expectation binding a person to meet certain legitimate claims².

Both Peter Worsley and S.F. Nadel have made similar suggestions. For the former "what the role entails is normatively defined"³, and for the latter, "the role concept refers exclusively to a lawful and normative conformity"⁴. In other words, the concept of role is defined by these writers in terms of "what /the occupant of a social position/ should do" rather than in terms of "people's ideas of what he will do"⁵. This approach, therefore, appears to preclude the possibility of roles which include anything other than approved behaviour, or, that is, which include any deviant behaviour. Any deviant behaviour which is expected (in the 'will' sense) from unmarried mothers, for example, cannot be counted as an aspect of their social role. If nothing other than deviant behaviour is expected from unmarried mothers, can they be said to have a social role, or to occupy a social position?

The approach to the definition of social role mentioned above, would seem to rule out the possibility of having social roles such as that of 'unmarried mother', but Banton has referred to the "role of invalid, addict, or even convict"⁶. Is he, after all, admitting to the possibility of roles which are partially and even wholly deviant? Albert Cohen seems to

do so. He notes that

not all roles with which we are identified are actively sought and cultivated. Some, like the roles of alcoholic and ex-convict we may actively resist. Some, like the role of mental patient we may accept with passive resignation. Some, like the role of prostitute we may adopt for practical reasons, looking forward to the time when we can change it for another, less disreputable but equally remunerative occupation¹.

If social role is defined as 'the expected behaviour of the occupant of a social position', it can be taken to refer to either how the occupant should behave, or, alternatively, how he will behave. If it is taken to refer to the former, then the possibility of having a partially or totally deviant role is logically precluded. If it is taken to be the latter, then whether or not there are any partially or totally deviant roles can only be decided on empirical grounds. Their existence depends on whether or not people's expectations about how others will behave are always governed by their beliefs about how they should behave. According to T.M. Newcomb, however, expected behaviour in the 'will' sense is not necessarily normative behaviour². Or, as Woodland, following Newcomb, puts it,

The expected role behaviour is not necessarily identical with ideal role behaviour /.../ ideal role can be differentiated from expected role but the two seem often to be used synonymously³.

Here, a distinction is made between expected behaviour in the 'will' sense and expected behaviour in the 'ought' sense, but it is still not clear what is meant by the term 'role'. Perhaps it would be worthwhile not only to distinguish between the two senses of expected behaviour, but also to apply the term 'role' to only one of them.

If the term is used to refer to the expectations people have about how the occupants of a 'social position'⁴ will behave, then a distinction can be made between an 'ideal role' and a 'deviant role'. The former would apply to any cases where the occupants of a social position are expected to behave in a wholly approved way, whereas the latter would apply to any case where the occupants are expected to behave in a wholly

unapproved way¹. Of course, these would perhaps be extreme cases, and the likelihood might be that actual roles would be located on a continuum between these 'ideal types'. People's social roles will then have a bearing on how they treat one another, even though the expectations involved may be misplaced and therefore misleading². For example, it may be that in our society the social role of unmarried mothers in relation to other people is more or less of the 'deviant' kind, and that the social role of others in relation to unmarried mothers includes the expectation that the latter will be treated with hostility and rejection. But, the expectations involved may be misrepresentations of how unmarried mothers and others actually behave towards one another. Consequently, these expectations may gradually be replaced by new ones; that is, the social roles in question may change. (Note that as defined here the concept of role does not imply a deterministic or static view of social relationships). However, the roles as they stand may have important consequences for the behaviour and social situations of unmarried mothers. According to Becker, for example

treating a person as though he were /.../ a deviant produces a self-fulfilling prophecy. It sets in motion several mechanisms which conspire to shape the person in the image people have of him³.

Various mechanisms have been proposed and discussed by 'labelling theorists' including some which bring about deviance by way of their effect on the 'structural situation', or on the opportunities or life-chances, of individuals⁴, although for Steven Box

the organizing assumption in labelling theory is that the /individual/ undergoes an identity change from being normal to being a deviant⁵.

Individuals who are labelled as deviant may come to accept the label and to behave in accordance with it. However, whatever the nature and the consequences of the mechanisms involved "some people may be labelled deviant who have in fact not broken a rule"⁶. This may be taken to imply simply that people may be thought to have behaved in a particular way when they have not. On the other hand, it may also involve the possibility

that people's behaviour, correctly perceived, may be thought to have broken the rules when it has not. This applies, perhaps, to the case of beliefs about unmarried motherhood. That is, unmarried mothers may be thought by some to have broken a social norm, when they have not. Consequently, they may be mistakenly labelled and treated as deviants with the result that their social situations and even self-image, may be affected in such a way as to lead them into deviant acts. The outcome may also be that they are excluded from participation in common social activities and enjoyments; that is, 'deprived'.

At the same time, however, as Becker has noted

even though no one else discovers the non-conformity or enforces the rules against it, the individual who has committed the impropriety may himself act as enforcer. He may brand himself as deviant because of what he has done and punish himself in one way or another for his behaviour¹.

But is it not possible that individuals may label themselves as deviant in this way when in fact they are not deviant?. As Box has noted, an individual

may 'know' he has broken the law in the sense that he is convinced that he has done so, but he is, in fact, mistaken. For instance, a car driver may imagine that he has run over and presumably killed a pedestrian, when he has, in fact, only run over a bundle of old rags left on the kerbside by children intending to burn a Guy Fawkes. Out of fear of the consequences, the driver may not have reported the matter to the police².

That is, individuals may believe they have behaved in a particular way, and thereby broken the rules, when they have not. Another possibility, however, is that individuals may believe that their behaviour is against the rules when it is not. They may as a result mistakenly label themselves as deviants with the consequences that may have for their behaviour and social situations. They may engage in deviant activities, perhaps for the first time, and try to keep their behaviour secret. Moreover, in doing the latter it is possible that they will behave in ways which are detrimental to their social situations.

Young females, if and when they become unmarried mothers, are likely to

label themselves as deviant, in the sense of having broken the rules to which people in general subscribe, but are likely to do so mistakenly. The beliefs they will have acquired as 'normals' are likely to lead them to expect others to label and to treat them as deviants. As a result they are likely to try to pass, perhaps extensively, and in doing so may well use techniques of information control which are deviant and which result in their being excluded from participation in common social activities and enjoyments; that is, in being 'deprived'. If young unmarried mothers are found to be 'deprived', it is more likely to be as a result of 'self-labelling' and of 'self-exclusion' than of labelling and exclusion by others. Even when their behaviour, or marital status, is known, they are unlikely to be labelled and treated as deviant to the extent that, as a result, they are 'deprived'. Moreover, unmarried mothers are likely eventually to discover their mistake - to discover that, after all, they would not be labelled and treated as deviants to any great extent or at least for very long - and as a result may well not be 'deprived'.

Nevertheless, how widespread is 'self-exclusion' on the grounds of assumed deviance amongst unmarried mothers? How widespread is it amongst people in general? How do its extent, nature and consequences compare with the extent, nature and consequences of 'social exclusion'? How does it compare in these respects with other types of exclusion, such as that which occurs through a lack of economic resources? These are questions, the answers to which can only be supplied through further research, but it is perhaps appropriate to end with a question of the kind which inspired the study I carried out. Thus, is it best for the purposes of sociological analysis to count people as poor if and when they are 'deprived' - that is, excluded from participation in common social activities and enjoyments - whatever the source of their deprivation, be it a lack of economic resources or social exclusion or, even, 'self-exclusion, for example?¹

AFTERWORD

About a year after the interview with Iris, I telephoned her to clarify a point of information. As we may recall, Iris had left home during her pregnancy without letting her family, most of her friends, or the father of her child know about her unmarried motherhood, and since leaving, she had successfully tried to avoid contact with them. Therefore, at the time of interviewing, she had not had any contact with any member of her family since she had left home about a year and a half before. However, shortly before I telephoned, she had got in touch with her family, when she had told them about her unmarried motherhood and in response they had completely accepted her. Thus, contact had been re-established. Whilst her family's response was contrary to the one she had been led to expect by her pre-pregnancy experience, it fits in well with what could have been expected in the light of the findings of my study.

NOTES

Chapter One

- page 1: 1. Others include J.K. Galbraith (*The Affluent Society*, Penguin, 1962) and Michael Harrington (*The Other America*, Penguin, 1963). This approach to the definition of poverty is not new (it has been subscribed to by Adam Smith and Karl Marx, for example): it has vied with alternative approaches for quite some time. Martin Rein suggests that "three broad concepts of poverty can be identified. Poverty may be regarded as subsistence, inequality, or externality" ('Problems in the Definition and Measurement of Poverty', in P. Townsend, (ed.), *The Concept of Poverty*, Heinemann, 1970, p.46). Perhaps the most notable student of poverty who has adopted the 'subsistence' (or 'absolute') approach is B.S. Rowntree (*Poverty: A Study of Town Life*, Macmillan, 1901; *Poverty and Progress*, Longmans, 1941; *Poverty and the Welfare State* (with G.R. Lavers), Longmans, 1951). On the third approach, which defines poverty in terms of "disutility to the community": see E. Smolensky, 'Investment in the Education of the Poor: A Pessimistic Report', *American Economic Review*, Supplement LV, May, 1966.
- For Georg Simmel 'official' definitions of poverty and assistance to the poor tend to be characterized by this third approach. He suggests that "the goal of assistance is precisely to mitigate certain extreme manifestations of social differentiation, so that the social structure may continue to be based on this differentiation /.../ the focus is the social whole - the political, family, or other sociologically determined circles - there is no reason to aid the person more than is required by the maintenance of the status quo", ('The Poor', *Social Problems*, 13, 1966, pp.121-122. Translated by Claire Jacobson from Georg Simmel 'Der Arme' in *Soziologie*, Duncker and Humblot, 1908). For Simmel, then, "poverty /is/ a social category that emerges through societal definition" (Lewis A. Coser 'The Sociology of Poverty', *Social Problems*, 13, 1966, p.40). Governments and the 'man in the street' have and operate with definitions of poverty which are socially determined or at least influenced. Definitions vary, and there is no absolutely 'correct' definition. It is inadmissible for a social scientist to claim to subscribe to the correct approach to and definition of poverty; it is only admissible to claim to have the best (or at least a good) definition for heuristic purposes.
2. P. Townsend, op.cit., p.2
3. Whilst Townsend uses the term 'relative deprivation' to denote an 'objective' condition in which a person has less of something than some other person or persons, it is used by others to denote a 'subjective', or 'psychological', condition in which a person feels deprived of something which he perceives some other person or persons have. The term in this latter sense was originally used by Stouffer and his associates in *The American Soldier* (Princeton, 1949). For a recent discussion of the concept see W.G. Runciman's *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice* (Pelican, 1972, pp.10-12).

- page 1
(cont.):
4. P. Townsend, op.cit., p.29
 5. ibid., p.29
 6. ibid., p.29
 7. See his 'Measuring Poverty', B.J.S., 1954, pp.130-137
- page 2:
1. B.S. Rowntree and G.R. Lavers, Poverty and the Welfare State: A Third Social Survey of York, 1951. Rowntree had carried out two other surveys: one in 1899 and another in 1936.
 2. K. Coates and R. Silburn, Poverty: The Forgotten Englishmen, Penguin, 1970, pp.17-18.
 3. For a discussion of "the related notions of 'relative deprivation' and 'reference group'" in this sense, see W.G. Runciman, op.cit., chapter 2.
 4. P. Townsend, op.cit., p.29
 5. ibid., p.29
- page 3:
1. On the social exclusion and 'deprivation' of blacks in South Africa, see Leo Kuper, An African Bourgeoisie, 1965. On the social exclusion and 'deprivation' experienced by blacks in the United States, see J.H. Griffin, Black Like Me, 1964. On the experience of blacks in Britain, see Derek Humphrey and Gus John, Because They're Black, Penguin, 1971.
 2. Another way of putting this is to ask 'whilst it is necessary to be 'deprived' to be in poverty, is it sufficient?'
 3. Some of these issues will be taken up again in the final chapter.
 4. Coates and Silburn, op.cit., p.32
 5. Brian Abel-Smith and Peter Townsend, The Poor and The Poorest, Occasional Papers on Administration, No.6, 1965.
- page 4:
1. Margaret Wynn, Fatherless Families, Michael Joseph, 1964, p.18
 2. Dennis Marsden, Mothers Alone, Allen Lane, 1969, p.1.
 3. ibid., p.7
 4. ibid., p.18
 5. ibid., p.18
 6. ibid., p.18
 7. ibid., p.170
- page 5:
1. ibid., p.188
 2. ibid., pp.25-26
 3. Unmarried mothers may have been cohabiting more often than widows. However, it is possible that they were not, and even that they were not found to be. It is possible that any cohabitation by widows was ignored and/or that unmarried mothers who were not suspected of cohabiting nevertheless had their allowance cut on these grounds. Another possibility is that whether or not unmarried mothers were cohabiting more often, they were found to be cohabiting more often simply because they were thought more likely to be cohabiting. In other words, officers may have expected unmarried mothers rather than widowed mothers to be cohabiting. If officers expected unmarried mothers to cohabit it is perhaps valid to suggest that the 'social role' (depending on how this term is defined) of unmarried mothers as perceived by officers included illicit cohabitation. Expectations about unmarried mothers will be discussed later, and the implications of interpreting these as aspects of the social role of 'unmarried mother' will be discussed in the final chapter.

page 5

(cont.): 4. Dennis Marsden, *op.cit.*, p.184

Page 6:

1. It is suggested, in other words, that an unmarried mother has engaged in some form of deviant behaviour. The latter, according to Steven Box, "is nothing less or more than it has always been: rule breaking. It is behaviour which is proscribed. /That is, it is/ norm infraction", (Steven Box, *Deviance, Reality and Society*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971, pp.9-10). Defining deviance in this way leads to the problem of deciding on which behaviour is deviant, and, even, if any behaviour is deviant. This is because a social norm is "a cultural (shared) definition of desirable behaviour", (*International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. D.L. Shils, Vol.11, Macmillan, 1968) or, that is, a commonly prescribed way of behaving. As Howard Becker says, "ambiguities /.../ arise in deciding which rules are to be taken as the yardstick against which behaviour is measured and judged deviant. A society has many groups, each with its own set of rules, and people belong to many groups simultaneously. A person may break the rules of one group by the very act of abiding by the rules of another group. Is he, then, deviant?" (Howard Becker, *Outsiders*, Free Press, 1963, p.18). Or as Box puts it, "the difficulty lies /.../ in the empirical complexity of society; for there inevitably exists, particularly in industrial societies, not one commonly shared and consensually agreed-to culture, but a plurality of cultures /.../. It is the recognition of /this/ moral relativism, that has led some people to conclude that there is no such thing as deviant behaviour. But it does not follow that, just because there are disagreements over the legitimacy of some /norms/, deviant behaviour does not exist". Deviant behaviour exists, but is relative. An individual may be deviant in relation to one 'culture' but not in relation to another. Depending on which, if any, of these cultures is the 'dominant' one (see Box, *op.cit.*, p.7), the individual will or will not have broken the law. Which, if any, culture is 'dominant'; which norms become law; how these events occur; whether there are any norms, are all empirical questions. If there are norms they may be imprecise and difficult to discover but there will be deviance; if there are no norms there will be no deviance, except as an 'ideal type' of behaviour (see Max Weber, *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, Free Press, 1949). Has the unmarried mother broken any norms? If she has, which and whose are they? If unmarried mothers are deviant how might their deviance be accounted for and what are the consequences of their deviance? The information and discussions presented in the following chapters are relevant to these issues.
2. E. Goffman, *Stigma*, Penguin, 1968, p.173
3. *ibid.*, p.9
4. *ibid.*, p.15
5. On widowhood and its consequences in Britain see, for example, P. Maris, *Widows and Their Families*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958; Dennis Marsden, *Mothers Alone*, *op.cit.*; M. Wynn, *Fatherless Families*, *op.cit.*; M. Torrie, *Begin Again*, J.M. Dent, 1970; Alfred Torrie 'The Pornography of Death', an unpublished article by the husband of M. Torrie who is the director of Cruse, the organisation for widows and their children.

- page 6
(cont.):
6. Bronislaw Malinowski, 'Parenthood, the Basis of Social Structure', in *The New Generation*, V.F. Calverton and S.D. Schmulhausen (eds), New York, 1930.
 7. Shirley Foster Hartley, 'The Decline of Illegitimacy in Japan', *Social Problems*, Vol.18, No.1, 1970, p.78
 8. William Goode, 'Illegitimacy in the Caribbean Social Structure', *A.S.R.*, 25, 1960, p.53.
- page 7:
1. *ibid.*, p.53
 2. *ibid.*, p.42
 3. Malinowski, *op.cit.*
 4. George Murdock, *Social Structure*, Macmillan, 1949, p.265
 5. Clark Vincent, *Unmarried Mothers*, Free Press, 1961, pp.6-7
 6. Albert Ellis, *The Folklore of Sex*, 1951.
 7. Leontine Young, *Out of Wedlock*, McGraw-Hill, 1954, pp.6-7
- page 8:
1. Vincent, *op.cit.*, pp.3-4
 2. Kingsley Davis, 'The Forms of Illegitimacy', *Social Forces*, Vol.18, 1939
 3. *ibid.*, p.79
 4. *ibid.*, p.79
 5. *ibid.*, p.80
- page 9:
1. *ibid.*, p.79
 2. Vincent, *op.cit.*, p.12
 3. *ibid.*, p.13
 4. *ibid.*, p.13
 5. Robert Roberts, (ed), *The Unwed Mother*, Harper and Row, 1966, p.14
- page 10:
1. Hartley, *op.cit.*, p.79
 2. Goode, William J., 'Illegitimacy, Anomie and Cultural Penetration', *A.S.R.*, Vol.26, 1961, pp.910-911
 3. Goode, *Illegitimacy in the Caribbean Social Structure*, *op.cit.*, p.44
 4. *ibid.*, p.47
 5. *ibid.*, pp.53-54
- page 11:
1. What Goode means by the term 'commitment' is not clear, or, at least, in using the term he appears to be confusing 'subscription' to a norm, and response to a violation of that norm. These two aspects of 'commitment' to any norm may be related, but they need to be regarded as analytically distinct and their empirical relationship requires investigation. If an individual subscribes to a norm, he may disapprove of a form of behaviour, but his response to a violation of that norm, his treatment of someone who behaves in a way of which he disapproves, is a different matter and remains problematic. Is his subscription to a norm or his response to its violation a measure of his 'commitment'? The significance of the distinction between subscription to a norm and response to a violation of a norm for the social situations of unmarried mothers will be considered later.
 2. Jane Collier Kronick, 'An Assessment of Research Knowledge Concerning the Unmarried Mother', in Roberts, *op.cit.*, p.249

- page 11
(cont.): 3. For example, it may be that whereas in one society marriage always requires a formal ceremony, in another, marriage may be allowed, at least on occasions, without this.
- page 12: 1. Herbert Blumer, 'Sociological Analysis and the Variable', in Manis and Meltzer (eds.), *Symbolic Interaction*, pp.84-94.
2. *ibid.*, p.91 3. *ibid.*, pp.91-92
4. Shirley Hartley, 'The Amazing Rise of Illegitimacy in Great Britain', *Social Forces*, 44, 1965-6, p.536
- page 13: 1. Jane Collier Kronick, *op.cit.*, p.250
2. *ibid.*, p.248
- page 14: 1. Virginia Wimperis, *The Unmarried Mother and Her Child*, Allen and Unwin, 1960, p.60
2. Clark Vincent, 'The Unwed Mother and Sampling Bias', *A.S.R.*, 19, 1964.
3. *ibid.*, p.565 4. Roberts, *op.cit.*, p.12
- page 15: 1. R. Illsley and D.G. Gill, 'Changing Trends in Illegitimacy', *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol.2, 1968, pp.415-433
2. *ibid.*, p.427 3. Roberts, *op.cit.*, p.12
4. Hartley, 'The Decline of Illegitimacy in Japan', *op.cit.*, p.534
5. Jane Collier Kronick, *op.cit.*, p.239
6. There are inaccuracies and biases in the official statistics on a large number of phenomena. For discussions of the official statistics on wealth and income, see R.M. Titmuss, *Income Distribution and Social Change*, Allen and Unwin, 1962; Robin Blackburn, 'The Unequal Society', in *The Incompatibles*, ed.R. Blackburn and A. Cockburn, Penguin, 1967; Michael Meacher, 'Wealth: Labour's Achilles Heel', in *Labour and Inequality*, ed. P. Townsend and N. Bosanquet, Fabian Society, 1972; A.B. Atkinson, *Unequal Shares*, Pelican, 1974. On crime, see Steven Box and Julianne Ford, 'The Facts Don't Fit: On the Relationship between Social Class and Criminal Behaviour', *The Sociological Review*, Vol.19, No.1, 1971; Steven Box, *Deviance, Reality and Society*, *op.cit.* For a general discussion of the problem of interpreting statistics see Darrel Huff, *How to Lie with Statistics*, Pelican, 1973.
- page 16: 1. Jack D. Douglas, *The Social Meanings of Suicide*, Princeton, 1967, pp.205-206
2. *ibid.*, p.181 3. *ibid.*, p.209-210
4. *ibid.*, p.207 5. *ibid.*, p.208
- page 17: 1. Although, of course, this commitment itself may affect and be reflected in the statistics in that whether or not deaths are categorised as suicides may depend on the decisions and abilities of others, such as the officials who categorise deaths.
2. Kingsley Davis, 'Illegitimacy and the Social Structure', *A.J.S.*, 1939.

- page 18:
1. Young, op.cit., p.2
 2. I. Pinchbeck, 'Social Attitudes to the Problem of Illegitimacy', B.J.S., 1954, p.309
 3. I. Shapera, 'Premarital Pregnancy and Native Opinion', Africa, 6, 1933.
 4. ibid., pp.59-60
 5. ibid., p.61
 6. M.J. Herskovits and F.S. Herskovits, Trinidad Village, Knopf, 1947.
 7. Goode, Illegitimacy in the Caribbean Social Structure, op.cit., p.23
- page 19
1. Pinchbeck, op.cit., p.309
 2. Clark E. Vincent, 'Illegitimacy', The International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, ed. Shils, 1968, p.88
 3. Jean Pochin, Without a Wedding Ring, Constable, 1969, p.1
 4. Wimperis, op.cit., p.113
 5. ibid., p.113
 6. L. Reeder and S. Reeder, 'Social Isolation and Illegitimacy', Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol.31, No.3, 1969, p.451.
 7. ibid., p.451
- page 20:
1. ibid., p.452
 2. ibid., p.452
 3. ibid., p.454-455
 4. ibid., p.455
- page 21:
1. ibid., p.455
 2. ibid., p.456
 3. Marsden, op.cit., pp.53-54
 4. ibid., p.54
- page 22:
1. ibid., p.54
 2. ibid., pp.100-114
 3. ibid., p.111
 4. ibid., p.103
 5. ibid., p.103
- page 23:
1. ibid., p. 106
 2. ibid., p.106
 3. ibid., p.100
 4. Especially those, it seems, of the older unmarried mothers, whose reports he favours.
 5. Marsden, op.cit., p.104
- page 24:
1. ibid., pp. 109-110
 2. ibid., p.110
 3. ibid., p.109
 4. Another way of putting this is to say that an unmarried mother's treatment of others will depend on her expectations about how the latter will respond to her unmarried motherhood. She may expect unmarried motherhood to be stigmatized and that she will or would be socially excluded. In this way, her expectations may lead her to try to keep her marital status a secret and even to avoid others. Depending on how the term is defined, it may be said that the unmarried mother avoids others because of her perception of the 'social role' of the latter in relation to that of 'unmarried mother'. This possibility will be referred to again in the final chapter.

- page 25: 1. In this case, the unmarried mother will be presuming that unmarried motherhood is stigmatized and that she is a deviant. She will be assuming the label 'deviant' without having had any experience of being directly labelled in this way by others. Nevertheless, her assumptions will guide her behaviour and may lead her to perform deviant acts, for example, in an attempt to keep her marital status a secret. This possibility (and its implications for the 'labelling theory' of deviance), will be referred to again in the final chapter.
- page 26: 1. Pochin, op.cit., pp.16-17
 2. ibid., p.18 3. ibid., p.18 4. ibid., p.18
- page 27: 1. It is worth noting in this context Douglas's suggestion that "the problem of determining 'real' suicide rates /.../ can be solved sufficiently for scientific purposes only after the shared and individual meanings can be and have been determined for different socio-cultural systems, and only after many of the critical problems of getting at, describing, and measuring the individual cases of suicide have been solved. Indeed, the problem of determining what 'real' rates we are interested in cannot be solved until the fundamental problem of determining meanings has been solved. Since these two general problems are closely related and must be, at least to some degree, attacked simultaneously, a basic reorientation of sociological work on suicide in the direction of intensive observation, description, and analysis of individual cases of suicide seems to be necessary. And, the emphasis of this research and analysis must be on the whole complex of shared and individual meanings of the actions involved in the suicidal process". (Douglas, op.cit. pp.230-231). This suggestion would also apply to the problem of determining 'real' rates of illegitimacy, and also to the problem of accounting for the social situations of unmarried mothers. But what is meant by the term 'meaning'? Douglas does not attempt a definition. He says that "it is not our intention in this work to propose any general definition of the concept of 'meaning' /.../. The concept of 'meaning' is so fundamental to any consideration of human action that it is exceedingly difficult to define it in terms of other factors. This is not to say that an attempt to define the concept is not worthwhile. It is simply to admit that the endeavour is far too much of a job in itself to make it part of such a work as this. The literature on the subject is immense and terribly involved. Consequently, I shall simply rely upon a cultural understanding of the term". (ibid., pp.243-245). This is similar to Pitrim Sorokin's position. According to Sorokin "some of the critics /.../ and some of the contemporary addicts of so-called semantics (behaviourism, logical positivism, etc.), raise an objection to the term 'meaning', and indicate again and again the vagueness of the meaning of the meaning. Yet, like all ultimate terms - such as 'consciousness', 'mind', 'thought' - it cannot be defined more clearly by any other term. But, its essential meaning is clear to anyone who has mind and thought, while to those who do not possess them it will remain a mystery". (P.A. Sorokin, Social and Cultural Dynamics, Vol.IV, p.12). He suggests that it is "perfectly childish" to attempt to replace

page 27
(cont.):

the term 'meaning' with other terms. (ibid., p.12). Nevertheless, C.J. Adcock attempts to clarify the concept. He notes that "perception is the effort to attain meaning /.../. We might argue that the whole point of perception is meaning, and that to perceive without finding meaning would not really be to at all. This is a crucial point and requires further elaboration. What in fact do we mean by 'meaning': This is a question which has led to much disagreement /.../. It may strike the reader as a somewhat unexpected relation but we would suggest that a thing has meaning in so far as it is recognized as a means". He then goes on to distinguish between 'affective meaning' and 'cognitive meaning' in these terms. (C.J. Adcock, Fundamentals of Psychology, Pelican, 1964, pp.143-145).

2. Douglas, op.cit., p.81

3. 'Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft', in Talcott Parsons, The Social Structure of Action, pp.640-641

page 28: 1. Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation, Free Press, 1964, p.101.

2. Douglas, op.cit., p.235

3. ibid., p.82

4. ibid., pp.242-243

5. ibid., p.267

page 29: 1. ibid., p.270

2. ibid., pp.256-257

3. ibid., pp.267-268

4. Douglas says that "by uninformed experience is meant experience of everyday suicidal phenomena that came before one was a student of suicidal phenomena. By informed experience is meant the experience of everyday suicidal phenomena that came after one was a student of suicidal phenomena" (ibid., p.268)

page 30: 1. Sociologists already use their 'experience' to get at the meanings of social actions, but, at the same time, they have usually used this experience incorrectly. According to Douglas, "the fundamentally important point /.../ is that sociologists have acted within common sense to provide themselves with the meanings of social actions to be analysed by the specialised methods of the discipline but they have not normally taken common sense itself to be a subject of investigation" (ibid., p.267). The foregoing discussion should not be taken to imply that I am an ethnomethodologist of any persuasion (c.f. Jack Douglas, Understanding Everyday Life: Towards the Reconstruction of Sociological Knowledge, where a distinction is made between 'linguistic' and 'situational' varieties of ethnomethodology). It is simply designed to point out (a) the need, at least in the particular case in question, to investigate the social meanings in order to be able to understand people's actions and thereby their social situations, and (b) issues surrounding the task of getting at these meanings.

page 30
(cont.):

2. I saw the study as an investigation of the social situations - the social relationships and social lives - of unmarried mothers; as an attempt to throw light on what these are like and why. In particular I intended to focus on the way unmarried mothers themselves respond to their marital status: on the meanings unmarried mothers themselves attach to their unmarried motherhood. It was not to be a 'poverty study', but it would provide information on the processes by which people become poor (depending on how the latter is defined, of course). However, I did not begin the research with the intention of focussing on the responses of unmarried mothers themselves to their marital status. At first I assumed that there is a stigma attached to unmarried motherhood which has important consequences for the social situations of unmarried mothers, and I began with the intention of investigating these consequences by comparing the social situations of unmarried mothers with those of young widowed mothers. It was when I began to review the available literature on unmarried motherhood that I began to shift my focus of interest. This shift was then encouraged by first of all the problem I had in finding informants, particularly young widowed mothers, and secondly, the problem I anticipated of satisfactorily investigating any stigma which might be attached to unmarried motherhood, especially in view of my limited resources.

page 31:

1. Elizabeth Bott, Family and Social Network, Tavistock, 1957, p.1
2. ibid., p.6
3. ibid., pp. 7-8
4. ibid., p.9
5. ibid., p.8
6. My initial intention was to compare the social situations of unmarried mothers with those of young widowed mothers with the aim of throwing light on the consequences of a stigma which I assumed is attached to unmarried motherhood.

page 33:

1. ibid., p.10
2. Although, of course, informants found through agencies other than those of a 'problem solving' kind may have sought help or, at least, may have had 'problems'.

page 37:

1. In what follows I will not be referring to the interviews I carried out with young widowed mothers.
2. Bott, op.cit., p.9

page 41:

1. Although I discovered this only when I was told by another of my informants. Janet had reported having had only one pregnancy. This raises the possibility, of course, that more of my informants misinformed in this respect.
2. This mother had conceived twice before her sixteenth birthday: after being raped by her own father. She had had the two children she produced adopted.
3. The three children she produced as a result of these were not living with her.

- page 42:
1. It is interesting to note that when the father learnt that I wanted to interview Frances as an unmarried mother he "was really hurt and embarrassed. He said 'but you're not an unmarried mother'. He said 'haven't I been to see you every week, don't I come and live with you as much as I can, don't I look after you as well as I can? You are not an unmarried mother'". The father, Frances said, "doesn't really want me to be" an unmarried mother.
 2. These will be referred to from now on as my 'informants', to the exclusion of the other unmarried mothers I interviewed.
 3. This, according to official statistics, is about the age range during which women in England and Wales are most likely to become unmarried mothers.
 4. From now on my informants will be said to have become unmarried mothers when they conceived.

- page 47:
1. Net income only is discussed here.
 2. A church trust specifically for unmarried mothers.
 3. This was £1.50 less than she would have been getting if she had not told the S.B.C. that the father had agreed to pay her an allowance of this amount. The father did not usually give her the £1.50 he had agreed to pay her each week.
 4. Marie was the third of my informants who received an allowance from the father, but this was paid through, and included in, the amount she received from the S.B.C.

Chapter Two

- page 52:
1. Leontine Young, op.cit., p.200
 2. ibid., p.200
- page 54:
1. Clark Vincent, op.cit., pp.15-16
- page 55:
1. R.K. Merton, 'Manifest and Latent Functions', in Social Theory and Social Structure, Free Press, 1957.
- page 56:
1. Erving Goffman, op.cit., p.15
 2. ibid., p.45
 3. ibid., p.45
 4. ibid., p.45
- Page 57:
1. ibid., p.47
 2. ibid., p.47
 3. ibid., p.48
 4. ibid., p.130
 5. ibid., p.50
 6. Jean Pochin, op.cit., p.1
- page 59:
1. Goffman, op.cit., p.103
 2. ibid., p.102
- page 60:
1. ibid., p.103
 2. ibid., p.49
 3. ibid., p.130
 4. ibid., p.50
- page 61:
1. ibid., pp.51-52
 2. ibid., p.53
- page 62:
1. ibid., p.131
- page 65:
1. ibid., p.101
 2. ibid., p.101
 3. ibid., p.58
- page 66:
1. ibid., p.57
 2. ibid., p.57
 3. ibid., p.14
 4. ibid., p.65
 5. ibid., pp.64-65

- page 66: 6. Vincent, op.cit., p.4
(cont.) 7. Goffman, op.cit., p.59
- page 67: 1. ibid., p.59 2. ibid., p.68
- page 68: 1. ibid., p.101
- page 70: 1. This was not the person she had told about her unmarried motherhood. How she managed to pass with this 'boyfriend' is looked at later.
2. As has already been noted, Gillian occasionally came across people during her 'daily round' who she had known before she became an unmarried mother.
- page 71: 1. At our first interview.
- page 73: 1. Goffman, op.cit., p.95
2. ibid., p.19
- page 74: 1. ibid., p.93 2. ibid., p.105 3. ibid., p.94
- page 75: 1. ibid., p.125
- page 76: 1. ibid., p.17
2. C.J. Adcock, op.cit., p.133
- page 79: 1. Before too long, an unmarried mother is perhaps likely to experience the responses of at least a few people. To begin with, she may disclose her social identity for one or more of the reasons mentioned earlier. But also, she may be discovered when she would prefer to pass.
- page 81: 1. Marie had considered the possibility of inducing an abortion.
- page 83: 1. Her own parents had been dead for several years.
2. The extent to which any response experienced by an unmarried mother affects her approach to information management may depend on the 'importance' she attaches to it. For example, whether or not an unmarried mother comes to be 'above' passing may depend primarily on the responses she experiences from family and friends.
- page 84: 1. Whether or not an unmarried mother expects to experience 'non-acceptance', and whether or not she is found to be unacceptable, depends, of course, on how 'acceptance' is defined. For Goffman, 'acceptance' is "the central feature of the stigmatized individual's situation in life" (op.cit., p.19). However, apart from commenting on the vagueness of the notion, he does not try to define it in precise terms. He only says: "Those who have dealings with /the stigmatized individual/ fail to accord him the respect and regard the uncontaminated aspects of his social identity have led them to anticipate extending, and have led him to anticipate receiving", (ibid., p.19); and that those who have dealings with stigmatized individuals are not ready to make contact with them on "equal grounds" (ibid., p.18).
2. Goffman, op.cit., p.68 3. ibid., p.69
- page 85: 1. ibid., p.70 2. ibid., p.71 3. ibid., p.70
4. ibid., p.71 5. ibid., p.22
- page 86: 1. ibid., pp.72-73 2. ibid., pp.113-114

- page 86: 3. *ibid.*, p.114 4. *ibid.*, p.114
(cont.)
- page 87: 1. An unmarried mother may also get married, of course. If she gets married before the birth of her child, the latter will no longer be illegitimate. The topic of why my informants did not get married will be considered later.
2. Goffman, *op.cit.*, pp.20-21
- page 89: 1. Although she had considered the possibility of having her child fostered.
- page 91: 1. Goffman notes that "specialists at uncovering identity can be involved" in viewing the signs of an individual's failing, and that "their training may allow them to be immediately struck by something that is invisible to the laity. A physician who meets a man with dull red discolouration of the cornea and notched teeth is meeting someone who openly displays two of Hutchinson's signs and is likely to be syphilitic. Others present, however, being medically blind, will see no evil", (Goffman, *op.cit.*, p.69). Elaine's pregnancy was visible to a specialist of this kind, whilst it was invisible to her family. We may note, however, that the visibility of her pregnancy is not the same thing as the visibility of her unmarried motherhood. Only if she is also known to be unmarried does the knowledge of her pregnancy make her failing visible.
- page 92: 1. Goffman, *op.cit.*, p.122 2. *ibid.*, p.123
3. *ibid.*, p.122
- page 95: 1. *ibid.*, p.60
- page 96: 1. *ibid.*, p.122 2. *ibid.*, p.122
- page 97: 1. *ibid.*, p.123 2. *ibid.*, p.110
- page 98: 1. *ibid.*, p.43

Chapter Three

- Page 102: 1. The ways in which unmarried mothers are treated by other people may have consequences for their social situations not only in a direct sense but also indirectly by way of the meanings which they attach to their marital status.
2. For a review of 'Recent Research on the History of the Family in Western Europe' see the article by Lutz K. Berkner in *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 35, 3, 1973.
3. R. Fletcher, *Family and Marriage in Britain*, Pelican, 1966, p.19. Fletcher does not define the term 'the family' in explicit terms even though he states that "it can be said to be universal: existing in all known human societies", (*ibid.*, p.19). For one of the better discussions of the problem of defining the term 'the family' and related notions, see C.C. Harris, *The Family*, George Allen and Unwin, 1966.
4. Fletcher, *op.cit.*, p.177
5. M. Farmer, *The Family*, Longman, 1970, p.143
6. R.M. MacIver and C.N. Page, *Society*, Macmillan, 1957

- page 103: 1. G.P. Murdock, *Social Structure*, Macmillan, 1949, p.10
 2. T.B. Bottomore, *Sociology*, George Allen and Unwin, 1972 p.168
 3. Peter Worsley, *Introducing Sociology*, Penguin, 1972, p.138
 4. *ibid.*, p.140 5. *ibid.*, p.140
- page 104: 1. *ibid.*, p.141
 2. c.f. T. Parsons and R.F. Bales, *Family, Socialisation and Interaction Process*, R.K.P., 1956, pp.3-34
 3. For a discussion of Parson's ideas see C.C. Harris, *op.cit.*, Chapter 4.
 4. N.W. Bell and E.F. Vogel in *A Modern Introduction to the Family*, Free Press, 1960, take a structural-functionalist approach to the family, which they suggest performs functions on these three levels.
 5. On this point see P. Cohen, *Modern Social Theory*, Heinemann, 1968.
- page 105: 1. For a summary of Marxist analyses of the family see C. Middleton, 'Sexual Inequality and Stratification Theory' in F. Parkin (ed.), *The Social Analysis of Class Structure*, 1974.
 2. See M. Young and P. Willmott, *Family and Kinship in East London*, Penguin, 1962; C. Rosser and C. Harris, *The Family and Social Change*, Routledge, 1965; E. Litwak, 'Geographical Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion' and 'Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion', *A.S.R.*, 26, 1961; P. Laslett, *The World We Have Lost*, Methuen, 1965.
 3. See M. Tumin, 'Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis', *A.S.R.*, 28, 4, 1953.
 4. See, for example, J.W.B. Douglas, *The Home and the School*, MacGibbon and Kee, 1964, and B. Jackson and D. Marsden, *Education and the Working Class*, Routledge, 1962. Although any suggestions that the 'cause' of educational opportunity is located in 'family styles' has, of course, to be rejected.
 5. See, for example, D.W. Glass (ed.), *Social Mobility in Britain*, R.K.P., 1954.
 6. See, for example, R.D. Laing, *Sanity, Madness and the Family*, Tavistock, 1964, and *Politics and The Family*, Tavistock, 1971. Also, D. Cooper, *The Death of the Family*, Allen Lane, 1971.
- page 106: 1. W.J. Goode, *The Family*, Prentice-Hall, 1964, p.1.
 2. Ego's primary kin include his parents, siblings and children, and his secondary kin include the primary kin of his primary kin.
- page 107: 1. Fletcher, *op.cit.*, Chapter 5.
 2. Goldthorpe and Lockwood, *The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure*, Cambridge, 1969
 3. *ibid.*, p.91
 4. For a discussion of the available data on the relationships between adolescents and their parents, see L. Rosenmayr,

- page 107: 'New Theoretical Approaches to the Sociological Study of
(cont.) Young People', Int. Soc. Sci. J., 2, 1972.
5. E. Bott, Family and Social Network, op.cit.
 6. In fact, she devoted the fifth chapter of her book "to a discussion of the /.../ relationships of three families with their kin", (ibid., p.114).
- page 108: 1. ibid., p.120. These criteria are similar to those used by R. Firth in Two Studies of Kinship in East London, Athlone, 1956. In addition, J. Goldthorpe and D. Lockwood in The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure, op.cit. "following criteria used by Bott /.../ classified /their/ respondents' relations with their immediate kin as 'intimate', 'affective', 'non-affective', and 'unfamiliar'" ibid., p.104.
2. Bott, op.cit., p.121
 3. ibid., p.120
 4. ibid., p.122
 5. ibid., p.122
- page 109: 1. ibid., p.129
2. ibid., p.129
 3. ibid., p.120
- page 110: 1. This approach is repeated later on in this and other chapters.
2. By this is meant the elementary family into which people are born. People's families of orientation are those in which they are mates and parents.
 3. Her father died about three years before she conceived.
 4. This sister was not married, but was "living in sin".
- page 111: 1. Her father had died about two years before she conceived.
- page 112: 1. Her youngest sister died about six months before our interview.
- page 113: 1. Her mother died about three years before she conceived.
2. Her mother's kin were living over 100 miles away, and she had hardly any contact with them.
 3. Her mother died about four years before she conceived.
- page 117: 1. Bott, op.cit., p.58
2. ibid., p.59
 3. ibid., p.59
 4. ibid., p.63
- Page 118: 1. ibid., p.60
2. ibid., p.60
- page 121: 1. The last time she had seen her sisters otherwise was two and a half years before, when they became suspicious about her pregnancy.
- page 123: 1. Her oldest sister's daughter.
- Page 124: 1. Her brother and his wife.
- page 126: 1. Her sister and her sister's husband.
- page 141: 1. Goffman, op.cit., p.43
2. ibid., p.40
 3. ibid., p.41
 4. ibid., p.44
 5. ibid., p.45
- page 142: 1. ibid., p.59
2. An unmarried mother is directly associated with unmarried motherhood, whereas other people who accept her are indirectly associated.
- page 143: 1. See Bott, op.cit., p.140, where the notion of 'connecting relative' is used.

Chapter Four

- page 145: 1. Clark Vincent, *Unmarried Mothers*, op.cit., p.3
 2. *ibid.*, p.3 3. *ibid.*, p.4 4. *ibid.*, p.4
 5. *ibid.*, p.4 6. *ibid.*, p.5
 7. Vincent Brome, 'Unmarried Fathers', *New Society*, 25th July, 1968.
- page 146: 1. *ibid.*, p.113
 1* Reported in Brome's article, *ibid.*, p.114
 2. Vincent, op.cit., p.72
 3. *ibid.*, p.74 4. *ibid.*, p.77 5. *ibid.*, p.79
- page 147: 1. *ibid.*, p.82
 2. R. Titmuss, *Essays on the Welfare State*, George Allen and Unwin, 1963, Chapter 5.
 3. H. Gavron, *The Captive Wife*, Pelican, 1968
 4. *ibid.*, p.45 5. *ibid.*, p.45
- page 148: 1. *ibid.*, p.45 2. *ibid.*, p.45
 3. Support for these suggestions is provided by Gavron, *ibid.*, and also by, for example, M. Young and P. Willmott in *The Symmetrical Family*, R.K.P., 1973
 4. Gavron, op.cit., p.11
 5. *ibid.*, p.43
- page 149: 1. Fletcher, op.cit., p.177
 2. Gavron, op.cit., p.35
 3. *ibid.*, p.79 4. *ibid.*, p.140
 5. J. Mitchell, *Woman's Estate*, Penguin, 1973
 6. *ibid.*, p.101
- page 150: 1. See chapter three
 2. Mitchell, op.cit., p.179
 3. *ibid.*, p.144 4. *ibid.*, p.179 5. *ibid.*, p.126
 6. *ibid.*, p.139 7. *ibid.*, p.151
- page 151: 1. *ibid.*, p.106 2. *ibid.*, p.119 3. *ibid.*, p.120
 4. P. Aires, *Centuries of Childhood*, Cape, 1962
 5. For a discussion of Parson's ideas see C.C. Harris, *The Family*, op.cit.
- page 152: 1. Mitchell, op.cit., p.152
 2. P. Morton, 'A Woman's Work is Never Done', *Leviathan*, Vol.II, No.1, p.34
- page 153: 1. Mitchell, op.cit., p.124
 2. C. Middleton, 'Sexual Inequality and Stratification Theory', op.cit.
 3. For a discussion of the difference between these notions see C.C. Harris, *The Family*, op.cit., The 'nuclear family' is a 'biological grouping' made up of mates and their children, and a 'conjugal' family is a 'nuclear family' where the mates are married.

- page 154: 1. Gavron, op.cit., p.20
2. The source of the information presented here on the legal positions of unmarried mothers and unmarried fathers to one another and to their children is The Guide to the Social Services, published by the Family Welfare Association.
- page 156: 1. Brome, op.cit., p.114
2. ibid., p.14
- page 157: 1. Harris has pointed out that the nuclear family, seen as a 'biological grouping' is made up of "at least two sub-groups /.../ composed respectively of man and woman, and mother and children", where the basic group is that made up of the mother and her children. (C.C. Harris, op.cit., p.67)
2. This is not to suggest that this is what marriage is about or for; that is, that this is in a sense a definition of marriage.
- page 158: 1. It is interesting in this context to compare their knowledge of the law relating to unmarried mothers and unmarried fathers with the earlier exposition of these matters. It will be seen that often they are mistaken in their beliefs in this respect.
2. Ann was living with her mother and the father had been her mother's lodger for about a year.
- page 159: 1. The father was living in London.
2. About four months later
- page 168: 1. The father's parents were dead.
- page 176: 1. This perhaps fits in with the arguments of Vincent and of Brome against the idea that unmarried fathers tend to be 'sexual exploiters'.
- page 178: 1. Goffman, op.cit., p.96
2. See chapter one.
- page 181: 1. The term 'boyfriend' is being used in a broad sense here to include not only men with whom they went out regularly but also, for example, those with whom they had spent some leisure time.
2. Although there are social class variations in this respect.
3. A.D. Hollingshead, 'Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates', A.S.R. 16.
4. See, for example, I. Rubin and L.A. Kirkendall, Sex in Adolescent Years, Fontana, 1971.
5. See, for example, M. Schofield, The Sexual Behaviour of Young People, Longmans, 1965
6. This seems to apply especially to the working class.
7. This is the first time we will examine social relationships with people my informants had not known prior to becoming unmarried mothers.
- page 188: 1. Here a distinction is made between 'boyfriends' with whom they went out or had gone out regularly, and those with whom they had come across and with whom they might conceivably have gone out on a regular basis.

Chapter Five

- page 193: 1. The term 'friends' is meant in a broad sense here, and as such, there may be some overlap between this category of people and other categories, such as boyfriends. In the following, however, a distinction is made between close friends and distant ones, ~~where~~ the mothers' own feelings about friends act as a guide in this respect.
2. J. Goldthorpe and D. Lockwood, *The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure*, op.cit., p.91
3. *ibid.*, p.90
- page 206: 1. We might recall that this is how Hilary viewed herself and how she distinguished herself from most unmarried mothers.
- page 208: 1. Iris had been to live with a doctor and his family to help look after the household.
- page 209: 1. Iris was about to move out of the hostel into a flat not far away, in Westtown.
- page 210: 1. This is the friend with whom Iris had gone on holiday about three months before our interview.
- page 211: 1. This is the girl with whom she went to the folk club.
- page 212: 1. Marie had recently gone to live back home after leaving a house in Midtown because of the bad conditions there.
- page 213: 1. She had been living in Midtown until about three weeks before our interview.
- page 217: 1. The one who was living in Northtown.
- page 224: 1. This is with the possible exception of Marie who had experienced what might have been a hostile response from a 'potential boyfriend'.
- page 226: 1. She occasionally passed with 'prospective boyfirnedes' she met.

Chapter Six

- page 228: 1. There is the problem of how to define this term. For one discussion of this problem see R. Frankenberg, *Communities in Britain*, Pelican, 1971
2. F. Tönnies, *Community and Association*, R.K.P., 1955
3. *ibid.*, pp.37-39
4. A parallel of this kind was drawn by Tönnies himself. There have been a large number of attempts to define the term 'extended family'. For discussions of the issues involved, see C.C. Harris, *The Family*, op.cit., and C. Rosser and C. Harris, *The Family and Social Change* op.cit.
- page 229: 1. For discussions of this topic see C.C. Harris, *The Family*, op.cit., and Lutz K. Berkner, op.cit.
2. M. Stein, *The Eclipse of Community*, Princeton, 1960
3. These include Middletown, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1929 and *Middletown in Transition*, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1937, by R.S. Lynd and H.M. Lynd; and W.L. Warner and P.S. Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, Yale, 1941

- page 229: 4. L. Wirth, 'Urbanism as a Way of Life', in P.K. Hutt and (cont.) A.J. Reiss (eds.), *Cities in Society*, Free Press, pp.46-63
5. *ibid.*, p.60 6. *ibid.*, p.61
- page 230: 1. R. Frankenberg, *op.cit.*, p.237
2. *ibid.*, p.278 3. *ibid.*, p.286
4. *ibid.*, p.286 5. *ibid.*, p.276
6. Bott, *op.cit.*, p.100
7. *ibid.*, p.101 8. *ibid.*, p.101
- page 231: 1. *ibid.*, p.98 2. *ibid.*, p.101
3. Goldthorpe, *op.cit.*, p.86
4. *ibid.*, pp.7-14 5. *ibid.*, p.6
6. *ibid.*, p.6 7. *ibid.*, p.25
- page 232: 1. *ibid.*, p.107 2. *ibid.*, p.44
3. *ibid.*, pp.38-44 4. *ibid.*, p.44
5. *ibid.*, p.12 6. *ibid.*, p.13
- page 233: 1. These include the studies by Ruth Durrant of Watling in the 1930's; by D. Mitchell and T. Lupton of an estate in Liverpool in the early 1930's; by M. Rodgers and C. Smith of an estate in Sheffield in the early 1950's; by J.M. Mogeys of Barton in the mid-1950's - all of which are discussed in R. Frankenberg, *op.cit.*; and by K. Coates and R. Silburn of an estate in Nottingham (see K. Coates and R. Silburn, *Poverty: - the Forgotten Englishmen*, *op.cit.*)
2. Frankenberg, *op.cit.*, p.231
3. Young and Willmott, *Family and Kinship in East London*, *op.cit.*
4. *ibid.*, p.145
5. Frankenberg, *op.cit.*, p.220
6. Young and Willmott, *op.cit.*, p.149
7. Goldthorpe, *op.cit.*, p.89
- page 234: 1. *ibid.*, p.89
2. See C. Rosser and C. Harris, *Family and Social Change*, *op.cit.*, for suggestions along these lines.
3. Young and Willmott, *op.cit.*; P. Townsend, *The Family Life of Old People*, Penguin, 1963; P. Marris, *Widows and their Families*, *op.cit.*
4. Coates and Silburn, *op.cit.* Although they found some evidence of greater community cohesion and solidarity on the housing estate they also studied.
5. N. Dennis, F. Henriques and C. Slaughter, *Coal is our Life*, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1956
6. M. Stacey, *Tradition and Change: A Study of Banbury*, Oxford, 1960, and M. Stacey, *Power, Persistence and Change: A Second Study of Banbury*, R.K.P., 1975
7. See Stacey, *op.cit.*, 1960

- page 234: 8. If anything, Midtown was slightly larger, less 'isolated' (cont.) and more cosmopolitan and unsettled.
- page 235: 1. Although there is not necessarily the absence of strong community relations in all middle-class neighbourhoods. See, for example, J.R. Seeley et al., *Crestwood Heights*, Wiley, 1963
2. If anything it was more like Midtown than like Banbury (see page 234).
- page 236: 1. On the topic of relational aspects of the work-situation see, for example, Goldthorpe and Lockwood, *op.cit.*; D. Lockwood, *The Blackcoated Worker*, Allen and Unwin, 1958; T. Lupton, *Management and the Social Sciences*, Penguin, 1971; D. Wedderburn, 'Inequality at Work', in P. Townsend and N. Bosanquet, *Labour and Inequality*, Fabian, 1972.
- page 245: 1. See chapter five
- page 247: 1. Bott, *op.cit.*, pp.101-102
2. See Goffman (*op.cit.*) on this point.
- page 255: 1. In fact, Hilary had a job as a clerk in this office at the time of interviewing.
- page 263: 1. As is well known, these are common grounds on which people are reluctant to receive assistance, and even exercise prejudice against those who do receive assistance.
- page 264: 1. See Marsden, *op.cit.*, on the way officers treat other types of clients.
2. Note that none of my informants complained about ever being harassed by S.B.C. officers over cohabitation.
3. There is perhaps a greater likelihood of a conflict of interests between unmarried mothers and S.B.C. officers
- page 266: 1. Bott, *op.cit.*, pp.101-102
2. *ibid.*, p.101 3. *ibid.*, p.101 4. *ibid.*, p.101
5. Reeder and Reeder, *op.cit.*, p.452
- page 267: 1. Bott, *op.cit.*, p.109
2. Reeder and Reeder, *op.cit.*, p.452
3. P. Townsend, *The Family Life of Old People*, *op.cit.*, p.188. Townsend draws an interesting parallel here between the concept of 'social isolation' and that of 'poverty': that is, for him both are 'relative notions'.
4. It is regarded as a 'relative' notion in the sense meant by Townsend.
- page 270: 1. Reference group theory and the notion of relative deprivation are perhaps relevant in this context. For a discussion of these ideas, see W.G. Runciman, *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice*, *op.cit.* The possible disjunction between the variation in the nature of people's social situations and the variation in their feelings about these situations is perhaps a complicating issue for those wishing to define poverty in relative terms. See the beginning of chapter one on this point.

- page 271: 1. This point will be taken up again in the next chapter.
 2. As well as, for example, their responses to 'motherhood', which are discussed in the next chapter.
- page 272: 1. It might be recalled here, as I explained in chapter one, that my original intention was to study and compare the social situations of young unmarried mothers and young widowed mothers.
- page 276: 1. For a discussion of the possible implications of this statement by Marie, see the final chapter, where the notions of 'master traits' and 'auxiliary traits' are discussed.
- page 278: 1. Goffman, op.cit., p.125
 2. ibid., p.66

Chapter Seven

- page 284: 1. G. Rose, The Working Class, Longmans, 1968, p.91
 2. Goldthorpe, op.cit., p.85
 3. ibid., p.98 4. ibid., p.87
 5. Peter Worsley, Introducing Sociology, op.cit., p.196
- page 285: 1. ibid., p.196
 2. Stephen Cotgrove, The Science of Society, Allen and Unwin, 1967, p.115
 3. This implies that it is concerned with how my informants without jobs spent all their time.
 4. Rose, op.cit., p.91
 5. This survey was carried out at the end of 1973 as part of the programme of work by the S.S.R.C. Survey Unit on 'subjective social indicators'. It consisted of a random sample of 966 in urban areas of Great Britain.
- page 286: 1. S. De Gazia, Of Time, Work and Leisure, Twentieth Century Fund, 1962
 2. Rose, op.cit., pp.91-91
- page 287: 1. Young and Willmott, The Symmetrical Family, op.cit.
 2. These activities included: watching television; gardening; playing with the children; home decorations/repairs; car cleaning; playing an instrument.
 3. Although, in general, these sorts of activities were relatively unpopular.
 4. British Tourist Authority, British National Travel Survey, 1973. Class AB include members of families in which the chief wage-earner is in a professional or higher managerial or in which the chief wage-earners are in middle-ranking white-collar and other non-manual jobs. Class DE includes members of families in which the chief wage-earner is a semi-skilled or unskilled manual worker.
- page 288: 1. S.S.R.C. Survey Unit, op.cit.
 2. B.B.C. monitoring, reported in Social Trends, published by Government Statistical Service, H.M.S.O., 1974.

- page 288: 3. Average viewing time in August is about 4 hours less than this.
4. That is, the upper middle, lower middle, and working classes.
5. Rose, op.cit., p.82
- page 289: 1. M. Abrams, Teenage Consumer Spending in 1959, London Press Exchange, 1961
2. Gavron, op.cit., p.30
3. ibid., pp.30-31
4. In 1971 the average age of marriage for females was 22.8 years and for males it was 24.8 years. Source: Office of Population and Census Survey.
5. Despite Gavron's assertions, the existence of a 'youth culture' is highly problematic. It depends, of course, on the meaning given to the terms 'culture' and 'youth culture'. See C. Valentine, Culture and Poverty, University of Chicago, 1968, on the concept of 'culture'; and C. Smith Adolescence, Longmans, 1968, on the notion of 'youth culture'.
- page 290: 1. Rose, op.cit., p.84
2. ibid., pp.85-86
3. See, for example, the studies by Stacey of Banbury, op.cit.
- page 291: 1. See H. Marcuse, One Dimensional Man, Boston, 1964 and H.J. Gans, 'Popular Cultures in America', in H. Becker, Social Problems: A Modern Approach, Wiley, 1966.
2. Goldthorpe, op.cit., pp.106-107
- page 292: 1. ibid., p.50
2. Properly speaking, this is a process. See Goldthorpe, ibid., pp.96-97
3. ibid., p.107
4. ibid., p.97
5. ibid., p.101
6. ibid., p.97
- page 293: 1. As reported in Social Trends, op.cit., p.100
- page 294: 1. Goldthorpe, op.cit., p.101
2. ibid., p.101
3. ibid., pp.101-102
- page 295: 1. ibid., p.88
2. ibid., pp.105-106
- page 296: 1. ibid., p.106
2. ibid., p.104
3. ibid., p.106
- page 298: 1. None of the people she had invited to attend came from Midtown. She explained "/I/ don't know anybody in /Midtown/. They were all coming down from /near home/ or London". On the other hand, the girl with whom Ann was living "had a couple of people in from /Midtown/ that she knows".
- page 299: 1. This friend was the one with whom she had been to a party a few days before our second interview, although she had not lived in Midtown for several months.
- page 316: 1. See the discussion of the study by Reeder and Reeder in chapter one.
2. See Table 2 in chapter one.
3. The average age of marriage for females being 22.8 years.
- page 319: 1. Goldthorpe, op.cit., p.91
- page 321: 1. ibid., p.65
2. ibid., p.67
3. ibid., p.65
4. ibid., p.65

page 322: 1. Worsley, op.cit., p.201

2. *ibid.*, p.210

page 325: 1. *ibid.*, p.181

2. See Worsley, *ibid.*, p.210, for a discussion of the links between work-situation and alienation as they are usually presented; that is, locating the sources of alienation in the work-situation.

3. Goldthorpe, op.cit., pp.181-183

page 326: 1. *ibid.*, pp.68-69

2. J. Goldthorpe and D. Lockwood, *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour*, Cambridge, 1968

page 327: 1. See chapter four on this

page 331: 1. Those of my informants who were living in the hostel regarded the task of finding accommodation as a problem which was *as* urgent, if not more so, as the problem of finding somewhere to lodge their children so that they could go out to work.

Chapter Eight

page 335: 1. People who believe this need not, of course, subscribe themselves to the rules by which they believe unmarried motherhood is defined as deviant.

Ideally at this point there would be an attempt to clarify, distinguish and relate several notions which are relevant to the discussion at hand. These are 'deprivation' (which throughout this report I have used, for the sake of convenience, in the sense given to it by Townsend), 'need', 'poverty', 'life-chances', 'life-styles', 'stigma', 'prestige', 'status', 'status group', 'class', and 'social stratification'. However, this would require too much space, and therefore, instead, some idea of the prevailing confusion over these terms can be gained by referring to the following: P. Townsend, 'Poverty as Relative Deprivation: Resources and Style of Living', in Dorothy Wedderburn (ed.), *Poverty, Inequality and Class Structure*, Cambridge, 1974; A. Giddens, *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies*, Cambridge, 1973, p.129, for a discussion of Marx's 'emiseration thesis'; Herbert Marcuse, *An Essay on Liberation*, Allen Lane, 1969, for a highly polemical account of 'needs'; Melvin Tumin, *Social Stratification*, Prentice-Hall, 1967; James Littlejohn, *Social Stratification*, Allen and Unwin, 1972; W.G. Runciman, *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice*, op.cit.; Max Weber: *Essays in Sociology*, translated by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Oxford, 1946; Gavin Mackenzie, 'Class', *New Society*, October 29, 1972.

page 345: 1. Would this mean that the Principle of Legitimacy as formulated by Malinowski (see chapter one) is invalid (at least with regard to our own society)?

2. The evidence from 'past society' is virtually limited to that found in novels such as Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* and George Moore's *Ester Waters*.

3. See chapter one for a discussion of these ideas.

- page 347: 1. Mitchell, op.cit., p.114
 2. ibid., p.140 3. ibid., p.142 4. ibid., p.115
 5. G. Frankl, The Failure of the Sexual Revolution, Nel
 Mentor, 1974.
- page 348: 1. H. Marcuse, One Dimensional Man, op.cit., 1972; and Eros
 and Civilization, Sphere, 1973
 2. Mitchell, op.cit., p.142 3. ibid., p.141
 4. Research on sexual outlook and behaviour in modern Britain
 indicates that perhaps no great change has taken place in
 these respects, at least in recent decades. See, for
 example, M. Schofield, The Sexual Behaviour of Young
 People, op.cit.
 5. E. Durkheim, The Division of Labour in Society, Macmillan
 1947; and Suicide, Free Press of Glencoe, 1951
 6. Durkheim, The Division of Labour, op.cit. This dichotomy
 is similar to the one of Tönnies between 'community'
 and 'association'. See chapter six.
- page 349: 1. Though this does not necessarily imply that they themselves
 subscribe to the norms which it is assumed have been broken.
- page 351: 1. B. Malinowski, Crime and Custom in Savage Society,
 Humanities Press, 1926, pp.79-80.
 2. Though this does not necessarily imply that those who
 believe this subscribe to the rule themselves.
- page 352: 1. See page 7 2. See page 8
 3. H. Becker, Outsiders, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963, p.12
 4. ibid., p.13 5. ibid., p.13
- page 355: 1. Goffman, op.cit., p.16
 2. Becker, op.cit., p.32
 3. ibid., p.32
 4. Everett C. Hughes, 'Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status',
 A.J.S., 50, 1945.
 5. Becker, op.cit., pp.32-33
- page 356: 1. Evidence provided by Dennis Marsden in his Mothers Alone
 is discussed in chapter one.
 2. D.J.A. Woodland, 'Role' in A Dictionary of Sociology,
 G. Duncan Mitchell (ed.), R.K.P. 1968
 3. ibid., pp.148-149
- page 357: 1. M. Banton, Roles, Tavistock, 1965, p.2
 2. ibid., p.2
 3. P. Worsley, op.cit., p.212
 4. S.F. Nadel, The Theory of Social Structure, Cohen and West,
 1964, p.24
 5. Banton, op.cit., p.29 6. ibid., p.19
- page 358: 1. A. Cohen, Deviance and Control, Prentice-Hall, 1966, p.98
 2. T.M. Newcomb, Social Psychology, Dryden Press, 1950.
 3. Woodland, op.cit., p.149

- page 358: (cont.) 4. Ideally speaking, the terms 'role' and 'social position' should not be confused, as they often are. See G. Duncan Mitchell, 'Social Position', in his A Dictionary of Sociology, op.cit.
- page 359: 1. One possible complication here has to do with the problem of whether or not it is necessary for those who expect the occupants of a social position to behave in a deviant way to subscribe themselves to the rules in question.
2. Woodland notes that "role as the expected behaviour of the occupant of a social position is, at least in the most recent literature, distinguished from ego's actual behaviour", op.cit., p.149.
In the following example relating to unmarried mothers it may be noted that young unmarried females on learning they are pregnant do not necessarily expect the same behaviour from all others. The reports of my informants suggest that young unmarried mothers expect, for example, younger people to be more accepting than older ones.
3. Becker, op.cit., p.34
4. On these particular mechanisms see Edwin M. Lemert, Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control, Prentice-Hall, 1967. Of possible relevance in this context is Ira Reiss's article 'Pre-marital Sex and Deviant Behaviour', A.S.R., 1970. Here, an assessment of the three principal approaches in deviance theory - (a) labelling, (b) anomie, (c) social and cultural supports - is made in terms of the light they are able to throw on sexual deviance in the form of pre-marital sexual intercourse.
5. Steven Box, Deviance, Reality and Society, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971, p.218
6. Becker, op.cit., p.9
- page 360: 1. ibid., p.31
2. Box, op.cit., p.220
- page 361: 1. It may be noted that the variation in my informants' styles of social life did not correspond with the variations in either their total income or their 'uncommitted income'. (See chapter one on the variation in my informants' income, and chapter seven for reference to Mark Abrams' notion of 'uncommitted money').

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of principal titles. For a full list of references, see Notes:

- ABEL-SMITH, B. and TOWNSEND, P., *The Poor and the Poorest*, Occasional Papers on Administration, 6, 1965
- ADCOCK, C.J., *Fundamentals of Psychology*, Penguin, 1964
- BANTON, M., *Roles*, Tavistock, 1965
- BECKER, H., *Outsiders*, Free Press, 1963
- BERKNER, L.K., 'Recent Research on the History of the Family in Europe', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 35, 3, 1973
- BLUMER, H., 'Sociological Analysis and the Variable', in *Manis* and Meltzer (eds.), *Symbolic Interaction*
- BOTT, E., *Family and Social Network*, Tavistock, 1957
- BOX, S., *Deviance, Reality and Society*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971
- BROME, V., 'Unmarried Fathers', *New Society*, 25 July, 1968
- COATES, K. and SILBURN, R., *Poverty: The Forgotten Englishmen*, Penguin, 1970
- COHEN, A., *Deviance and Control*, Prentice-Hall, 1966
- DAVIS, K., 'The Forms of Illegitimacy', *Social Forces*, 18, 1939
- DAVIS, K., 'Illegitimacy and the Social Structure', *A.J.S.*, 1959
- DOUGLAS, J., *The Social Meanings of Suicide*, Princeton, 1967
- FLETCHER, R., *The Family and Marriage in Britain*, Penguin, 1966
- FRANKENBERG, R., *Communities in Britain*, Penguin, 1971
- FRANKL, G., *The Failure of the Sexual Revolution*, Nel Mentor, 1974
- GAVRON, H., *The Captive Wife*, Penguin, 1968
- GOFFMAN, E., *Stigma*, Penguin, 1968
- GOLDTHORPE, J., and LOCKWOOD, D., *The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure*, Cambridge, 1969
- GOODE, W., 'Illegitimacy, Anomie and Cultural Penetration', *A.S.R.*, 26, 1961
- GOODE, W., 'Illegitimacy in the Caribbean Social Structure', *A.S.R.*, 25, 1960
- HARRIS, C.C., *The Family*, Allen and Unwin, 1966
- HARTLEY, S., 'The Amazing Rise of Illegitimacy in Great Britain', *Social Forces*, 44
- HARTLEY, S., 'The Decline of Illegitimacy in Japan', *Social Problems*, 18, 1, 1970
- ILLSLEY, R., and GILL, D., 'Changing Trends in Illegitimacy', *Social Science and Medicine*, 2, 1968
- MALINOWSKI, B., *Crime and Custom in Savage Society*, Humanities Press, 1926
- MALINOWSKI, B., 'Parenthood, the Basis of Social Structure', in the *New Generation*, V.F. Calverton and S.D. Schmulhausen (eds.) 1930

- MARSDEN, D., *Mothers Alone*, Allen Lane, 1969
- MIDDLETON, C., 'Sexual Inequality and Stratification Theory', in F. Parkin (ed.) *The Sociological Analysis of Class Structure*, Tavistock, 1974
- MITCHELL, G.D., (ed.), *A Dictionary of Sociology*, R.K.P., 1968
- MITCHELL, J., *Woman's Estate*, Penguin, 1973
- MORTON, P., 'A Woman's Work is Never Done', *Leviathan*, II, no.1
- PINCHBECK, I., 'Social Attitudes to the Problem of Illegitimacy', *B.J.S.*, 1954
- POCHIN, J., *Without a Wedding Ring*, Constable, 1969
- REEDER, L., and REEDER, S., 'Social Isolation and Illegitimacy', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 31, 3, 1969
- ROBERTS, R. (ed.), *The Unwed Mother*, Harper and Row, 1966
- ROSE, G., *The Working Class*, Longmans, 1968
- ROSSER, C., and HARRIS, C., *The Family and Social Change*, R.K.P., 1965
- RUNCIMAN, W.G., *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice*, Penguin, 1972
- SCHOFIELD, M., *The Sexual Behaviour of Young People*, Longmans, 1965
- SHAPER, I., 'Premarital Pregnancy and Native Opinion', *Africa*, 6, 1933
- SIMMEL, G., 'The Poor', *Social Problems*, 13, 1966
- SOCIAL TRENDS, Government Statistical Services, H.M.S.O., 1974
- STEIN, M., *The Eclipse of Community*, Princeton, 1960
- TÖNNIES, F., *Community and Association*, R.K.P., 1955
- TOWNSEND, P., *The Concept of Poverty*, Heinemann, 1970
- TOWNSEND, P., *The Family Life of Old People*, Penguin, 1963
- VALENTINE, C., *Culture and Poverty*, University of Chicago, 1968
- VINCENT, C., 'Illegitimacy', *The International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, 1968
- VINCENT, C., *Unmarried Mothers*, Free Press, 1961
- VINCENT, C., 'The Unwed Mother and Sampling Bias', *A.S.R.*, 19, 1964
- WEBER, M., *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation*, Free Press, 1964
- WEDDERBURN, D., 'Inequality at Work', in P. Townsend and N. Bosanquet (eds.) *Labour and Inequality*, Fabian, 1972
- WIMPERIS, V., *The Unmarried Mother and Her Child*, Allen and Unwin, 1960
- WORSLEY, P., *Introducing Sociology*, Penguin, 1972
- WYNN, M., *Fatherless Families*, Micael Joseph, 1964
- YOUNG, L., *Out of Wedlock*, McGraw-Hill, 1954
- YOUNG, M., and WILLMOTT, P., *Family and Kinship in East London*, Penguin, 1962
- YOUNG, M., and WILLMOTT, P. *The Symmetrical Family*, R.K.P., 1973

