

GENERATIONS IN FARM FAMILIES :
TRANSFER OF THE FAMILY FARM IN NEW ZEALAND

Norah C Keating
and
Heather M Little

Research Report No 208

January 1991

Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit
PO Box 84
Lincoln University
CANTERBURY

Telephone No: (64) (3) 252-811
Fax No: (64) (3) 252-099

ISSN 0113 4485



The Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit (AERU) operates from Lincoln University providing research expertise for a wide range of organisations concerned with production, processing, distribution, finance and marketing.

The AERU operates as a semi-commercial research agency. Research contracts are carried out for clients on a commercial basis and University research is supported by the AERU through sponsorship of postgraduate research programmes. Research clients include Government Departments, both within New Zealand and from other countries, international agencies, New Zealand companies and organisations, individuals and farmers. Research results are presented through private client reports, where this is required, and through the publication system operated by the AERU. Two publication series are supported: Research Reports and Discussion Papers.

The AERU operates as a research co-ordinating body for the Economics and Marketing Department and the Department of Farm Management and Accounting and Valuation. This means that a total staff of approximately 50 professional people is potentially available to work on research projects. A wide diversity of expertise is therefore available for the AERU.

The major research areas supported by the AERU include trade policy, marketing (both institutional and consumer), accounting, finance, management, agricultural economics and rural sociology. In addition to the research activities, the AERU supports conferences and seminars on topical issues and AERU staff are involved in a wide range of professional and University related extension activities.

Founded as the Agricultural Economics Research Unit in 1962 from an annual grant provided by the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR), the AERU has grown to become an independent, major source of business and economic research expertise. DSIR funding was discontinued in 1986 and from April 1987, in recognition of the development of a wider research activity in the agribusiness sector, the name of the organisation was changed to the Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit. An AERU Management Committee comprised of the Principal, the Professors of the three associate departments, and the AERU Director and Assistant Director administers the general Unit policy.

AERU MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 1991

Professor A C Bywater, B.Sc., Ph.D.

(Professor of Farm Management)

Professor R H Juchau, B.Com., B.Ed., M.A.

(Professor of Accounting and Finance)

Professor A C Zwart, B.Agr.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D.

(Professor of Marketing)

R L Sheppard, B.Agr.Sc. (Hons), B.B.S.

(Assistant Director, AERU)

AERU STAFF 1991

Director

Professor AC Zwart, B.Agr.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D.

Assistant Director

R L Sheppard, B.Agr.Sc. (Hons), B.B.S.

Research Officers

G Greer, B.Agr.Sc. (Hons)

T P Grundy, B.Sc. (Hons), M.Com.

Research Officers

L. M. Urquhart, B.Com.(Ag), Dip.Com.

J R Fairweather, B.Agr.Sc., B.A., M.A., Ph.D.

Visiting Research Fellow

N C Keating, Ph.D.

Secretary

J Clark

CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF FIGURES	(i)
PREFACE	(iii)
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	(v)
SUMMARY	(vii)
CHAPTER 1	
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Review of Related Research and Theory	2
1.1.1 The Retiring Generation	3
- Men's Exit from Farming	3
- Women's Exit from Farming	3
1.1.2 Generational Transfer	4
1.1.3 The Receiving Generation	5
- Men's Entry into Farming	5
- Women's Entry into Farming	6
1.2 Research Methods	6
1.2.1 Site and Sample Selection	7
1.2.2 Sampling Decisions	7
1.2.3 Sample Description	9
1.2.4 Data Collection and Data Management	9
1.2.5 Ethical Considerations	11
1.2.6 Strengths and Limitations of the Research	12
- Validity	12
- Applicability to Other Settings	12
- Replicability	12
CHAPTER 2	
RESULTS	13
2.1 Women's Entry into Farming	13
2.1.1 Making a Place	13
2.1.2 Being 'Into It'	16
2.2 Men's Entry into Farming	20
2.2.1 Making a Place	20
2.2.2 Being 'Into It'	23
2.3 Choosing a Successor	25
2.3.1 Attitudes Toward Succession	26
2.3.2 Stage 1, Watching for Interest	27
2.3.3 Stage 2, Determining Eligibility	28
2.3.4 Stage 3, Placing the Successor	29
2.3.5 Stage 4, Letting Go	31
2.4 Women's Exit from Farming	32
2.5 Men's Exit from Farming	35

CHAPTER 3	DISCUSSION	43
3.1	Process of Farm Entry and Retirement	43
3.1.1	Making a Place	43
3.1.2	Into It	46
3.1.3	Retirement	48
	- Hypotheses	49
3.2	Involvement in the Farm Business: Work, Management, Ownership	50
3.2.1	Work	50
3.2.2	Management	52
3.2.3	Ownership	52
	- Hypotheses	53
3.3	Lifecycle Differences in Involvement in Work, Management and Ownership	54
3.3.1	Entry	54
3.3.2	Into It	54
3.3.3	Exit	57
	- Hypotheses	59
3.4	Choosing the Successor	59
	- Hypotheses	62
3.5	Conclusion	62
REFERENCES		65
APPENDIX		69

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1	Process of Farm Entry and Exit	44
2	Involvement in the Farm Business	51
3	Women's Involvement in the Farm Business	55
4	Men's Involvement in the Farm Business	56
5	Women's and Men's Styles of Involvement in Farming	58
6	Choosing the Successor	60

PREFACE

The AERU has undertaken research on a number of topics that relate to rural society generally. These topics are diverse and include rural unemployment, farm structure change, and public drinking. This research adds to our understanding of rural society and is a valuable complement to our other research.

During 1990 the AERU was privileged to have Dr Norah C. Keating from the Department of Family Studies, University of Alberta join the research team. In this report Dr Keating continues her research interest in the intergenerational transfer of farms, and applies her experience to the New Zealand situation. For the first time we have a detailed study of how farmers transfer the family farm to the next generation.

Tony Zwart
Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A sabbatical experience can be greatly enhanced if one is fortunate to meet supportive, thoughtful and hard working people along the way. Throughout this project, there have been several such people who have made this a positive and stimulating experience for me.

Dr Robin Johnson, who showed great interest in this research and who made it all possible by granting funds to undertake the project.

Dr John Fairweather who has been a colleague and supporter throughout my year at Lincoln; who spent time with me in intellectual debate, and who helped with the long list of practical problems from finding transformers for computers to organizing maps and library cards.

Mrs Jan Clark who typed hundreds of pages of near-perfect transcripts despite disruptions on the tapes of barking dogs, chirping birds, laughter and the clinking of coffee cups.

Professor Tony Zwart who invited me to come to Lincoln and provided a pleasant working environment, office space, and secretarial help.

Mr Ron Sheppard who monitored research budgets and kept the administrative wheels turning.

Mrs Heather Little who introduced me to the farmers of Canterbury, who taught me about the culture in which she lives, who worked with me throughout a complex research study, who fed and housed me and who has become a valued friend.

The men and women farmers of Canterbury who gave their time, who gave me a glimpse of their lives, and who shared both happy and painful experiences of their work and families. My life has been enriched by my contact with them. And I apparently provided some 'food for thought' for them as well.

"We've gone through so many changes. It's a revelation. Years ago it would have been unheard of for two researchers to come out here and not be given a big sumptuous lunch. And you probably wouldn't have been female, you probably would have been male"

Well, the lunches were sumptuous but the researchers were definitely female. How times have changed...

Norah Keating
Lincoln University
November 1990

SUMMARY

This report presents data from a study of the farm transfer process between generations of farm families in Canterbury. A small, non random sample of men and women were interviewed, and their responses were used to carefully develop a detailed understanding of farm transfer. Initial ideas were tested in later interviews as the grounded theory approach was used to allow farm men and women to indicate the key factors in farm transfer. Results cover entry, 'into it' and exit phases and the discussion examines farm entry and retirement, involvement in the farm, lifecycle differences, and choosing the successor. Hypothesis for future research are developed and specified. Findings from this study tell as much about how farm men and women move through their business and family lives as they do about how farms are transferred from one generation to the next.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This whole area was one big estate and it was split up in 1896. My great grandfather was a shepherd on the estate and he bought the part where the house is over there. And a wee while later he was away mustering and the other half came up for sale. So his wife went out and bought it while he was away. The story is he had to give up smoking to pay for it. Either I conclude smokes were dear or land was cheap. (A)

This quotation from a contemporary Canterbury farmer illustrates several New Zealand farming traditions. There is a tradition of a farming ladder by which people move from being labourers to owners. There is a tradition of occupational following in which a farm is passed from generation to generation. And there is a tradition of involvement of both women and men in farming.

How has the business of farming changed since great grandfather took up his farm? In many ways, farming in New Zealand is more family-oriented than ever before. Although there is still a farming ladder by which farm workers move into farm ownership (Tipples, 1987), aspirations of farm ownership are much more likely to be fulfilled for children of farm owners than for those who have no connection to a family farm (Loveridge, 1989). Farmers continue to be five times more likely than any other business people to have had parents in the same business (Laband & Lentz, 1983). And women are more involved in their farms than ever before. One reason for this change is the restructuring of agriculture which has resulted in less use of hired labour, especially in pastoral farming. (For a discussion of the economic context of this research, see Appendix A). Research in Canterbury has shown that as a result of restructuring, 41% of farms have reduced hired labour and 38% are using more unpaid family labour (Fairweather, 1987). Women provide a great deal of that labour.

In the 1990s, farm families still form the basis of the structure of rural communities in New Zealand. They not only produce much of the country's wealth, but they provide continuity on the land through the generational transfer of farms. Although most of the farms in New Zealand are family owned and operated, we know virtually nothing about how older farmers retire from business, nor whether transfer continues to be seen as a positive option by older and younger generations. Yet the way in which the current generation of older farmers retire and transfer their farms will affect the financial status of the farm, the quality of their own retirement years, the nature of their ongoing relationships with

the next generation and the social and economic fabric of rural communities.

The purpose of this research was to study the transfer process of New Zealand farms from the perspective of both men and women in the senior generation and of their children. This study is part of a cross-national effort to examine the transfer process of family farms in New Zealand, the United States and Canada. There were two objectives to the study:

1. to understand the process whereby farm families make retirement and transfer decisions from the perspective of both the retiring and receiving generations.
2. to develop a set of hypotheses about the nature of farm transfer in New Zealand.

1.1 Review of Related Research and Theory

The transfer of a family farm requires the coordination of two complex systems: the family and the farm business (Magnuson-Martinson & Bauer, 1985). "The needs of the family and those of the farm move like concentric wheels in a Mayan calendar, intersecting at different, and not always fortunate, points" (Bennett & Kohl, 1982, p115). Farm transfer is one of those intersections between farm and family which may be seen as fortunate or unfortunate depending upon whether it is viewed from the perspective of parents or children, men or women. The issue of farm transfer is highly salient to farmers themselves. It was rated as very important by 87% of respondents in a recent Canadian survey of 7000 farm households (Agriculture Canada, 1987).

Transfer occurs in the stage of the farm business cycle known as exit or disinvestment. The exit stage follows those of entry or establishment; and survival and growth (Boehlje, 1973). Different amounts of labour, management and ownership typify these stages. While high labour and capital inputs are used to build the business during the entry and growth stages; during the exit stage, farmers may give up control of leased land, maintaining their operation on owned land and eventually sell or transfer the farm to children.

The farm family has similar stages: an entry stage of marriage and birth of children; an intensive stage of child-rearing; a launching stage of children establishing their careers and leaving home and a retirement stage of parents leaving work. Urban families expect to have an 'empty nest' phase of several years after the children have left home and begun their careers but before parents are ready to retire. But in farm families, the readiness of adult children to begin their work careers is the 'intersection' that may put pressure on farming parents to consider retirement regardless of whether that is an appropriate time in the farm business for a sale or transfer of assets.

1.1.1 The Retiring Generation

Men's Exit from Farming. Although exit from farming of older farmers is often contingent upon the entry of younger farmers, most research on farm 'retirement' has been focused on the older farmer. There is evidence that farm men move out of farming in three stages (Keating & Munro, 1989). The first stage is reduction in farm labour. This reduction may occur through a shift of heavy labour to children, or through elimination of labour-intensive aspects of the operation such as livestock. Reduction in work load may begin when the farmer is in his mid-fifties. The second area of exit is from farm management. Gradual exit from management requires the presence of a child who is taking over the business. Decisions about production and marketing are relinquished before financial management and the handing over of the chequebook. The third and final exit phase is the transfer of physical assets such as land and equipment.

Although we have some information on the process of exit from the business, little is known about what motivates the beginning of the process or signals its' completion. There are at least three possible triggers for exit. The first are business or financial. Farm men may decide to retire at a point when their farms are developed, when they have a large capital investment and when it is advantageous to realize that capital and have a comfortable retirement. If this is a major reason for exit, we should see farmers retiring early when land prices and farming incomes are high and delaying exit during times when returns from farming are low. The second set of reasons are personal or family related. Phases of the business are roughly parallel to the age of the farm operator. Thus the exit phase of the business may begin when the farmer starts to experience the effects of aging (Bennett & Kohl, 1982). A health crisis of the parent or major choice point of a child such as marriage or need to find a career, may also provide the impetus for moving out of farming (Anderson & Rosenblatt, 1985). Finally, family cycles may be a major influence. In our previous research we have found that farmers furthest along in the exit process are those who have children working with them in the business. Those who consider themselves to be out of the business no longer have management responsibility or day to day work commitments (Keating & Munro, 1989). Thus the end of the exit phase occurs when the farmer has no further farm responsibilities.

Women's Exit from Farming. There has been virtually no research on women's exit from farming, perhaps because women are not often considered to be farmers. Women have been called invisible farmers (Pearson, 1979) whose farm roles are not publicly acknowledged; who rarely own or manage the farms on which they live; and whose work is seen as unpaid help to their husbands (Sachs, 1983). If we don't know how farm women are involved in farming it is difficult to document their exit.

A small amount of research in New Zealand and elsewhere shows that although women provide labour on their farms, the majority are neither owners nor managers. In Canada, younger women have the heaviest farm work loads, despite pressures of household work and

off-farm employment (Keating & Munro, 1988). Sparrow & Young (1983) report that New Zealand farm women have been facing increased demands to work more on their farms because of lower returns from farming and the decrease in outside hired labour. Yet in as late as the mid 1970s, only 16% of farm women in Canterbury had some ownership of their farms (Gill, Koopman-Boyden, Parr & Wilmott, 1976). Less is known about women's farm management, although there is an assumption that younger women are more involved in all aspects of the running of their farms including decision-making (Gill et al, 1976).

To date, there has been no documentation of the way in which farm women move out of farming. It seems likely that the patriarchal orientation of farming results in 'compulsory retirement' for women. When their husbands decide to leave farming, women's farming career ends as well. We need to begin documenting women's involvement in farming and exit from the farm.

1.1.2 Generational Transfer

Generational transfer requires not only the exit of the older generation, but the entrance of the younger. The effectiveness of transfer has been seen as critical to maintenance of the economic value of farm businesses (Boehlje, 1973) and the coherence of the farm family (Russell, Griffin, Flinchbaugh, Martin & Atilano, 1985).

Research on exit of older farmers has not included the perspective of the receiving generation. However, the idea of a 'generational stake' allows for the development of hypotheses about the ideal exit phase from the perspective of men and women in both generations. The basic concept in generational stake is that over the life cycle, relationships between parents and children are asymmetrical (Bengtson & Kuypers, 1971). In the case of older parents and their children, the emotional involvement of both is assumed to be substantial. However, the investment or stake in the relationship is greater for the aging parent who has increasing need for the child as parental power decreases (Knipscheer & Bevers, 1985). Thus older parents become relatively more concerned with maintaining good relations with their children than vice versa. The increased stake by the parents is presumed to result from the greater likelihood that they will become more dependent on their children and must avoid straining the relationship.

In farm families the stake in the relationship may be quite different. At the beginning of the transfer process, the parents maintain control over the work, management and ownership of the operation. Children who wish to take over the farm are dependent upon the goodwill of parents to transfer the operation. They may worry about serving long apprenticeships with no guarantee of ever becoming proprietors. Thus early in the transfer process, children may be seen as having the greatest stake and thus the least power in the parent-child relationship. Russell et al (1985, p361) say that in farm families "the younger generation is striving for self respect, autonomy and a greater share of

responsibility, while the older generation is striving to maintain control of decision making and respect for past accomplishments".

Within this theoretical context, the preferred order of transfer of the parental generation can be predicted. The early transfer of work frees the farmer from the physical demands of the job while allowing him to retain control of the management of the operation. Reduction in management control begins with short term production decisions. More influential management decisions having to do with financing of the operation are held until later. Ownership is transferred last.

For the receiving generation, transfer of work may be important in that the child learns site-specific skills which will increase his ability to be successful. However, early ownership may be more important as a concrete symbol of the child's status as farmer. It may also be a message to other children that they should consider other careers. Yet if transfer of ownership occurs early, the older generation will probably have a higher stake in the relationship because their livelihood may depend upon the success of their child. As yet untested, the ideal transfer process for children may include much earlier transfer of management and ownership than is ideal for the parental generation.

This theoretical argument would suggest that it is unlikely that both parents and children in the same farm could see the transfer as ideal. Research on the intergenerational dynamics of the retirement and transfer suggests that stress and conflict between parents and offspring and between siblings are inherent in the process (Anderson & Rosenblatt, 1985; Hedlund & Berkowitz, 1979; Marotz-Baden, 1988; Russell et al, 1985; Titus, Rosenblatt, & Anderson, 1979). Much of this stress appears to be related to power and control issues, ambiguity and timing of the process.

1.1.3 The Receiving Generation

Men's Entry into Farming. What do we know about the entry process of the receiving generation? Men's entry into farming has been studied from the perspective of the relative odds of entry into farming of children of farmers versus non-farmers. Loveridge (1989) found that among New Zealand farm workers, father's occupation was the best predictor of eventual ownership of a farm. Sons of farmers were more likely to become farm owners than sons of those with other occupations. Loveridge concluded that farm-owning families were more likely to be able to help their children financially because of their control of a large capital asset. A similar argument is presented by Yerex (1981) who says that inter-generational transfer is still the most common system of entry into farming in New Zealand.

Research on the process of entry into farming is more limited. In a study of Dutch Canadian farm families, Selles (1988) found three entry stages. Stage one, began when the son took on some of the field work tasks done previously by the father. Stage two occurred when management responsibilities and some land were

transferred to the son. The final stage of the process was often characterized by declining health of the father and a move to the nearest hamlet. Entry was complete when the father was no longer actively involved in the management of the farm. Entry is facilitated by fathers who expected their farm to remain in the family. They were significantly more likely to have decreased their involvement in work and management than those who did not expect the farm to remain in the family. The former were also significantly more likely to share decisions with sons than those who had not decreased their involvement (Keating & Munro, 1989).

Women's Entry into Farming. Since the tradition of farm succession has been patrilineal, few daughters take over their parents farms. Young woman are more likely to enter farming through marriage. Thus they need to become part of a new farm family as well as find a niche for themselves in the farm business. Most of our information on women's entry into farming is anecdotal but suggests that finding a niche can be a difficult process for young women. Some find it difficult to establish an active role in their farms because of traditionally male-dominated patterns of work and decision making (Sparrow & Young, 1983). Others find the greatest challenge is establishing a good working relationship with their mothers-in-law who may have been the matriarchs of their households for 30 years or more.

Some support for these impressions comes from the research on stress levels of farm men and women. Daughters-in-law have been found to have the highest levels of stress (Weigel & Weigel, 1987), perhaps because of their ambiguous place in their new homes and businesses.

This brief review of research on generational transfer of farms shows that our knowledge of the process is limited. We have some information on men's exit from farming, but little is known about women's entry or exit, nor about men's entry into the business. The dynamics of the actual transfer have not been described, although generational stake suggests that farming children are likely to be more interested in transfer than are their parents.

1.2 Research Methods

There has been little previous systematic investigation of generational transfer of farms. Because of the lack of empirical data or systematic theory building in this area, a decision was made to use an inductive research method. The qualitative method of Grounded Theory was chosen for this study. Grounded Theory is used to examine social processes from the perspective of the individuals directly involved in the phenomenon, and in the context in which the social process exists (Glaser, 1978). The method is based on an assumption of Symbolic Interaction Theory that the meaning of a phenomenon is an internal process. The method provides an opportunity for respondents to be the experts on their experience and to 'tell their story' without the imposition of an external set of assumptions by the researcher. We felt it critical that the description of generational transfer

be grounded in the experience of the men and women farmers who are at the stage in their lives when retirement is an issue.

1.2.1 Site and Sample Selection

The ideal site for a qualitative research project is one in which entry is possible; and in which there is a high probability that a mix of many of the processes, people and interactions that may be a part of the research question will be present (Marshall & Rossman 1989). Canterbury provided the criteria necessary for this research. It has the largest number of farms of any local government region in the South Island, and has had pastoral farming for 150 years (Department of Statistics, 1990). Many farmers are second, third or fourth generation on the land. As a resident of a Canterbury farming community, Mrs Little had access to the community and an understanding of community beliefs and structures.

1.2.2 Sampling Decisions

When using a grounded methodology, the sampling goal is to identify a small number of respondents who are articulate and are 'experts' in the research topic because of its relevance in their own lives. The sample is not chosen in its entirety at the beginning of the study. Rather, sampling is part of an ongoing process of development of hypotheses and the search for 'negative cases' that will disprove those hypotheses. Thus results from each interview inform the choice of respondents for the next interview.

In this study, the first respondents were a couple who had transferred the farm to their only son, and had moved off the farm. The choice of this first couple was made after reviewing the literature on farm retirement which suggests that this is the traditional pattern. The couple was known to Mrs Little, but not to Dr Keating. This gave the research team the advantage of access to the couple but also of sufficient distance to be able to step back and ask what might to insiders seem to be obvious questions. Throughout the interview, the couple indicated that they could not speak for their son, nor for his experience of coming back and taking over the farm. This theme informed the choice of the next interview which was with the son of this couple.

The interview with the son revealed new themes concerning the decision to go farming rather than take up another occupation, and the process of re-entering a community after several years absence. However, since he was the only son in the family, we had no information on how a successor might be chosen from several sons. And since the son was interviewed without his spouse, we had no information on how women enter the farm. Thus it was necessary to interview a husband and wife of the receiving generation. The next couple was chosen because the man was the farming son of three brothers. From this interview we began to develop hypotheses about the way in which a successor is chosen from among several siblings. As well, information from the wife

helped us begin to document the process of women's entry into the business and the community. She had come into the community from an urban setting and had the task of making her place in the area as well as developing her identity as a farmer.

In his discussion about taking over the business, the husband of this couple talked about tensions in deciding who would be the successor. Since we needed to know more about the entry experiences of men with several siblings, we looked for a couple in which there had been a harmonious resolution of this process. For the wife, a theme was that of finding a place in the community. Thus couple number four was a farm man who had farmed with his brothers before farming on his own, and a farm woman who had not been confronted with the task of entry into the community since she had grown up in the area.

The final couple in the receiving generation was one who came into farming abruptly because of the death of the husband's father. This couple provided useful information on the advantages and difficulties of taking over a farm earlier than either generation would have preferred.

At this stage of the study, we had begun to develop a picture of the process of entry into farming of younger women but still knew relatively little about the involvement of older women in the transfer process. Two women from the retiring generation were interviewed to further explore themes in the involvement of older women in their farms. One woman had had minimal experience in direct farm work and had seen herself as supportive to her husband. She and her husband had not yet retired and she provided valuable information on how women help their husbands through the exit phase of the business. The other woman had run her farm for several years before her son took over. She was the only woman we interviewed who had run a farm on her own and she provided the 'negative case' which gave a view of women's retirement from farming.

The next two interviews were conducted with people chosen to help us begin to further develop our hypotheses about the variation in transfer solutions. The next couple had retired but continued to live in the homestead and the husband maintained an active interest in the farm. This couple appeared to be the antithesis of couple number one who felt that the only way in which families could maintain good intergenerational relationships, was to let the son take over and move far enough away to avoid interfering. The final first-round interview was conducted with a retired couple and their farming son. This was the only interview with two generations together and it provided a family view of the transfer process.

After the first major data analysis described below, four second-round interviews were conducted. The first three of these interviews were done with respondents from the first sample. In each case, the purpose was to get more information and confirmation of emerging hypotheses. Two women of the receiving generation were interviewed to confirm hypotheses about the nature

of women's involvement in work and management. A bonus in one of these interviews was the presence of the teenage daughter of one of the women. This young woman was working on her family's farm and was very interested in farming as a career. She provided valuable insights into farming aspirations of the next receiving generation. A man from the retiring generation was interviewed to discuss hypotheses about perspectives of older farmers on generational patterns in transfer. The final interview was with a couple not part of the round-one sample. The couple was chosen because they identified themselves as not interested in transfer to their children, even though they had received their farm from parents. This negative case was useful to determine the limits of interest in generational transfer.

No round-three interviews were conducted since the data were deemed sufficient for an initial description of the transfer process and the development of hypotheses about variation in aspects of entry and exit.

1.2.3 Sample Description

In total, 18 people were interviewed. In three cases, respondents were members of retiring and receiving generations in the same family. Farmers in the study ranged from first to fourth generation on the same farm. Those who were first generation farmers acquired their farms through several methods: purchase through a Returned Servicemen's Rehabilitation Loan after the second world war; movement up the 'farming ladder' from married couple to farm owners; marrying the farmer's daughter; transfer from parents. The family with the longest tenure on the same farm had been there since 1883. The most recent acquisition was taken up in 1966.

Most farms were sheep, or mixed sheep and beef operations. They ranged in size from 300 to 2700 hectares with a variety of land types from rolling arable downland to tussock to peat swamp. The farms are all in a dry area susceptible to drought.

All members of the retiring generation had transferred their farms to a son or son-in-law or were in the process of transfer. Those who had retired lived in a variety of locations including homes in a nearby town, a house on the farm or continuing to live in the homestead. All members of the receiving generation had been family successors. All but one of the receiving generation lived in the homestead.

1.2.4 Data Collection and Data Management

Data were collected through face-to-face interviews with sample members. Both researchers were present at all interviews. Since it was important to make certain that respondents comments and perceptions were accurately recorded, all interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed.

Before we began interviewing, a decision was made to tape-record all interviews. This was to ensure an accurate recording of the

respondents perceptions of transfer, and to eliminate the need for detailed note taking throughout the interview. In our experience, note taking is more disruptive than tape-recording, since while taking notes, the interviewer either must impose a slower pace on the interview or risk losing much of the richness of the data. Interviewees often find that note-taking inhibits the positive aspects of a conversation with another person such as eye contact.

All interviews were set up by Mrs Little who called prospective sample members and informed them of the purpose of the study. With those who were interested in taking part, interviews were set up at the convenience of sample members, in their own homes. Interviews lasted from one to two hours. The questions in each interview changed as the researchers developed and tested hypotheses about transfer. The first interview was the most open-ended, with questions used to prompt the respondents to tell their story about retirement and transfer. Especially in the early interviews, the researchers attempted to avoid interpretation during the interview in order to make certain that they did not impose too many of their own biases on the process. Second and subsequent interviews were based on findings from previous interviews. As themes begin to emerge from each interview, an attempt was made to disprove developing hypotheses. For example, as we began to develop hypotheses about the lack of involvement of older women in the farm business, we looked for situations in which women had been actively involved. Later interviews were also used as a validity check to determine whether or not the developing theory made sense to the respondents. At second and subsequent interviews, hypotheses from the retirement process and generational stake theories were presented to see if they 'fit' for New Zealand farmers. Interviewing continued until we had support for major themes and no new themes emerged.

After each interview, the researchers tape-recorded their impressions of the interview, emerging themes and ideas for further sample members. These recordings formed part of the data of the project. As transcriptions of interviews became available, they were also read for emerging themes as well as for areas which needed to be explored with new respondents or with subsequent interviews with the same respondents. Phrases used by respondents were tested for validity in subsequent interviews. For example, the ways in which women described their involvement in decision making were discussed with all women to finally determine the four categories: sounding board, jury, partner and manager.

The second phase of the data analysis was the detailed analysis of all transcribed interviews. This phase of the analysis occurred in four steps. In step one, two full sets of transcribed interviews were colour-coded to identify respondents and first or second interviews. Each researcher read all interviews, making notes on salient themes, recurring ideas and phrases and patterns of belief. The purpose of this phase of the analysis was to generate categories of meaning that are internally consistent but distinct from one another (Guba, 1978). Categories were developed through discussions between the researchers as each read the transcripts. Categories generated from this analysis were the

following:

- Making a place
- Choosing a successor
- Moving out of farming

In step two interviews were re-read and coded according to the categories. One set of transcribed interviews was then cut and sorted by category, so that all statements about a category such as choosing a successor were sorted together. In step three, statements from each general category were read and sub themes developed. Choosing a successor was later divided into stages of waiting to see, determining eligibility, choosing the successor, putting the successor in place and being fair to non-farming children. The themes of making a place for yourself and moving out of farming were divided into statements by men and by women.

The final step of the analysis was to develop general statements about relationships among categories of data; that is, to build grounded theory (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). This step occurred throughout the writing of the final report and is described in the discussion section of the report.

1.2.5 Ethical Considerations

Several ethical issues were considered in the design and implementation of this study. The first was whether intensive, face-to-face interviews would unduly violate the participants' privacy or disrupt their everyday worlds. Several privacy issues were reviewed. The first was that of privacy within the community. As with most farming communities, North Canterbury social networks are interrelated and we were aware that many of the participants were acquainted with one other. To protect their anonymity, no names of sample members were given to any other member of the study nor to anyone in the community at large.

A second issue of privacy occurs within families. Because of the topic we were studying, respondents talked at length about relationships with other family members. Great care was taken when conducting separate interviews with members of the same family, so that no information given in one interview was discussed in another. A third issue was a concern that as a community insider, Mrs Little might be privy to information that would not be shared in a social context. We attempted to deal with this issue by making certain that potential respondents knew of Mrs Little's involvement and felt free to decline our invitation to participate. Mrs Little made the initial contact with all potential respondents who knew that she would be present at all interviews. One person did decide not to take part in the research.

A second set of ethical issues has to do with the storage and dissemination of information from the project. Every attempt was made to maintain anonymity of respondents. Transcriptions of tape-recorded interviews were coded with interview numbers and initials for first names. Tapes were stored in a secure location

and were labelled with respondent code numbers only. A single list of names of addresses of respondents was held in a secure place by each researcher. In the report itself, a general description of types of farms provides background on the study without revealing the identity of specific respondents.

1.2.6 Strengths and Limitations of the Research

Any research method has its strengths and weaknesses. Lincoln & Guba (1985) argue that the most important criteria in evaluating all research are: validity, applicability to other settings and replicability of the findings.

Validity. One of the strengths of the grounded method lies in the validity of the research. Respondents in this study described the experiences of transfer in their own lives and were the experts in the assessment of the relevance of hypotheses developed by the researchers. Their words and phrases are used in the Results section of the report to make explicit the connections made by the researchers between the data and the interpretation of the data. Assurance that data from the study are valid is especially important in developing a grounded theory since the data provide the underpinnings for the theory.

Applicability to other Settings. Generalizability to other settings is less central in a grounded method than in deductive methods since the purpose of the former is to develop hypotheses and of the latter to test those hypotheses. Generalizability becomes important at the stage of hypothesis testing when a case is developed about applicability to farmers in other parts of the country, farmers who are involved in other types of farming or farmers who are members of younger generations. Generalizability was not a goal of this study nor are any claims made about the applicability of the findings to other settings.

Replicability. Qualitative research does not purport to be replicable. "The researcher purposefully avoids controlling the research conditions and concentrates on recording the complexity of situational contexts and interrelations as they occur" (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p148). This lack of preconceived structure does not mean that procedures, protocols and decisions are not carefully developed. However, because of a flexible design that develops in response to emerging ideas from the data, qualitative studies cannot be replicated. We attempted to control for biases in interpretation by involving both researchers in the critique of analyses, by searching for negative cases, by checking hypotheses with respondents and by returning to the research literature as final hypotheses were being developed.

CHAPTER 2

RESULTS

The transfer of the farm includes several interrelated processes. These include both the entry and exit of men and women, and the process of choosing a successor in the next generation. 'Stake' in the next generation and in the farm influences the way in which a successor is chosen and the exit process of the older generation. In the following sections we include quotations and indicate gender with F. and M. and the letters at the end of each quote denote our reference to the interviews.

2.1 Women's Entry into Farming

F. When I first met you, you told me that the neighbours were waiting to see you come back and to peg out your new house site and you would do so when you could find a woman who could make a perfect scone. And I thought, what a chauvinist. (O)

Women's entry into farming had two phases: making a place for herself in the community, the family and the farm; and consolidating her place, or being 'into it' as she developed her role as farm woman.

2.1.1 Making a Place

Women from non-farm backgrounds were disadvantaged at entry because they did not know what their place might be. For these young women, the decision to go farming was made jointly, but with the understanding that they were going to take on their husbands' way of life.

F. I can honestly say now looking back I really had no idea whatsoever. None whatsoever. I mean what looks like something wonderful. You know when you're looking at everything through rosy coloured spectacles when it comes down to the running your everyday life, it doesn't work out quite the same. (D)

Marriage brought no automatic entitlement to a strong place in the farm. Whether from an urban or rural background, those who entered a family farm had to earn a place in the farm and in the family. There was no assumed place, even for those who came from farm backgrounds. Marrying a farmer was a way to get back to (or stay in) a place you knew and loved. Women were willing to bide their time until their husbands decided they were ready to 'go farming'.

F. When you marry into a farm it's usually the husband that you marry and the mother and the father and then you are number four.

I. Number four in terms of...

F. Everything. Pecking order basically I think. (E)

F. I knew I'd have to marry a farmer if I wanted to get back to the country.

I. So coming onto this farm suited you very well?

F. Oh absolutely. I was rapt (G)

F. He made the decision (to do other things for a few more years). I felt that what he wanted to do was important. That I could fit in with it. He needed to get that out of his system. Because once he came back to the farm it was going to be for many years. (E)

Although marriage provided entry into the farming milieu, establishing a place also required entry into the community, into the household and the family, and into the business. Ease of entry into the country life depended on whether you were raised in the country. For those who grew up in the country, coming into a new community was not seen as difficult, since the life was familiar. In contrast, urban women were moving into unfamiliar territory about which they had some inaccurate expectations.

F. Well you see, I love country life. I was born in a little country village so my roots are in the country. And I love anything to do with the country life. (D)

F. Really I found it quite depressing to begin with because I'd been told that country people were so friendly and everything was so wonderful in the country. I found it wasn't like that at all and that it took quite a long time to feel part of the community. And you really had to work quite hard at it. (L)

For most women, the place that was waiting for them was that of homemaker or farm wife. Country girls knew their role, much of which was centred around food preparation, and later, child care. City girls had to learn both the expectations of the role and the skills required of it.

I. Did you know what you were getting into in terms of the expectations of your parents-in-law for what kind of farm wife you'd be?

F. Yes because my own parents had much the same view. Yes, I knew what I was getting into. (C)

F. Well in the days when we first farmed I talked to another friend of mine who was also a city girl and we decided the only way we could get accepted was to be able to make beautiful pikelets and sponge cakes because

all the country girls could. In those days people had enormous afternoon teas and the shearers went from house to house giving everybody marks from one to ten on who were the best cooks. We rated probably minus one. (L)

For young women, finding a place in their new families was influenced by the way in which they developed their relationships with their parents-in-law. Mothers-in-law controlled access to the household while fathers-in-law controlled access to the farm.

M. I know a couple whose marriage has split up. And a large part was the suffocating nature of 'she who must be obeyed from above'. (I)

F. We moved into this house and (parents-in-law) were living up in the yards. And we built on a kitchen and bedroom. And that sort of created a fair bit of guilt because I felt I'd come into her home. (E)

M. Dad didn't like you coming out and helping.

F. It was very hard to get out and do very much at all.

M. Even though he was older he'd always try to cut (wife) out of a job. Whatever job it was. (J&MH)

Although all women had a homemaker role, the nature of their farm role was not clear. For the most part, it appeared that young wives were not expected to have an active farm role either in farm work or in management or ownership of the farm. Women's homemaking tasks were generally expected to come first, regardless of whether they had farm work experience. Those who did farm work at this entry stage enjoyed their involvement in the farm, but met with some disapproval if homemaking tasks were neglected. Others were content to be supporters to their husbands who did the vast majority of farm work. Some were constrained by homemaking and child rearing duties, or by attitudes that disallowed their involvement. Some worked along side their husbands, but only because their labour was needed and hired help was not affordable.

F. Farming was my forte. I'd far rather be outside than be inside. And I mean that was frowned upon in those days. (C)

F. But I mean I didn't help on the farm or anything. I didn't know really much about it at all. So if (husband) had meetings at night I would go out and the lambing sheds were over there. And we had a little office where we could look through sort of windows. Keep an eye on them and that sort of thing. (D)

F. I was never allowed on the farm. You

didn't have girls on the farm. This was my place in here. Although I was busy with my children which helped. But that was my place. You were never ever asked to 'go out and just drive the tractor up the paddock while I bring something else up'. Nothing like that. That was it. (C)

F. I had been brought up on a farm. I didn't work on the farm because there was hired help. But (during a crisis) we ran 3000 acres and I worked and I loved it. (N)

Few women were actively involved in farm decisions or were legal partners in the farm at the entry phase. Some did not expect to be actively involved, while others resented being left out. Most had little place in farm decisions as long as there was another man on the place. None of the women entered into formal partnerships upon marriage. At the entry stage, men are the legal owners of farms. In part, lack of access to partnerships was because farming husbands were often still involved in complex partnerships with parents and siblings from which they had to extricate themselves.

F. I just saw my role as being the person who listened and said well you know it will be better. It will be all right and you know we've been through this before and it's come out all right. Just a kind of back stop. (L)

F. When we first came here I often used to feel left out because (hired man) and (husband) used to discuss things that needed doing. I used to feel a wee bit frustrated that perhaps we couldn't afford all the development. (E)

F. No the farm was in (husband's) name. It wasn't a partnership. We talked about putting it into a partnership but it was going to cost too much and it wasn't worth it. (E)

2.1.2 Being 'Into It'

Results from the first stage show that by the beginning of their farming careers, the tasks faced by these women were remarkably similar. All had to find their place in the community, in the household and in the family. Few were expected to actively participate in farming and few did so, except by necessity.

After several years living on their farms, women's involvement varied greatly. Some women found 'their place' as farm wife. Others found the homemaker role insufficient and waited for the opportunity to be more involved. This often occurred at a turning point in their family lives such as children getting older or a change in health status of their husbands; or in the business such as when parents or siblings withdrew as formal

partners or hired labour left.

F. I frankly never really had time to get involved in the farming scene as such. But I think a lot of rural women downgrade what they do. But I think that the farm wife really is at least half the role in farming just by being there. (L)

F. Well I was fairly tied up with rearing three small children for the early years. But as soon as they were mobile I was into it. And there were very few things I couldn't do. And I doubt if he would have been able to cope without help from me. (G)

F. We had always worked together. But when he was in hospital I had to take over the business side of it. So therefore I kept involved with it after he came out. Up till then he'd run it and I was quite happy. Once I started to be interested I didn't want to be left out again you see (C).

F. Well it took about two years to negotiate all the lease and renting (with other family members). But once that was done I thought I'd better involve myself in the farm. I thought I'll get involved on the physical side so that if anything ever happens to (husband) at least I know how the farm's run. Where all the stock are and what the policy is. (O)

F. I must admit that when (hired man) left I really enjoyed it because suddenly I was actually needed. (Husband) would come in and say could you come and give us a hand or could you come and tow me here. I definitely felt more useful when (hired man) left. (E)

By the end of the entry period, women had a much greater range of involvement in the farm, from traditional homemaker to working partner. There were several ways in which women were involved in farm work, farm decisions and formal partnerships.

Three approaches to farm work included 'homemaker', 'half farm hand' and 'boy'. Homemakers retained the primary role of homemaker and did little farm work. Their farm work was minimal and was primarily 'helping out' their husbands. Women realized the vulnerable position they were in by not being able to do farm work. 'Half farm hands' did more farm work but their jobs were limited and under close supervision of their husbands. They saw their work as unskilled and some regretted their lack of ability which prevented them from being more help. Women who became 'the boy' did more farm work and took pride in their skill. They worked more independently and did a greater range of jobs than the 'half farm hand'. Being 'the boy' provided opportunities to choose some of the tasks they liked to do best.

F. I never really had time to go out and learn about farming and so really I even now don't do terribly much out on the farm except I'll help (husband) with the stud books. So if anything had ever happened to (husband) I don't think I would have stayed on and farmed. (L)

F. Basically I'm there if he needs me for extra things. Like a 'half farm hand'. Just run, fetch and carry. I'd be the first one to admit I have felt at times very inadequate. I do feel that I'd like to be able to do more at times. (E)

F. And I'm working on the farm now as a 'boy'. And we get on very well together.

I. And what does the boy do?

F. The boy assists the manager. I've got two sheep dogs. And as I've got better I can do more. (O)

For 'the boy', doing farm work was a conscious decision designed to allow further entry into the farming community. However, being a worker on the farm has its' price. Most women took on farm work in addition to their other duties, although they felt that the increased sense of purpose was worth the extra work..

F. You get more status by being a farmer. That's the way I see it. If you are able to speak on an equal footing you have some status. You can say how did you get on at the ewe fair? Or how's the feed supply lasting, or how are your dogs going? (O)

F. (My daughter) goes into the shearing shed and then she has to rush back to the house and put the potatoes on and serve the lunch and then go back out and take mobs of sheep. Well to me that's really working. I think those farmer's wives are doing 3/4 of the work really because they're having to do both things. (L)

I. Would you rather be the boy (than be free to do other things)?

F. Yes, I'd rather have a purpose. It seemed a bit vacuous running around playing tennis. (O)

As with farm work, there were a variety of ways that women were involved in farm decisions. These included: the silent partner, the sounding board, the jury, the partner and the manager. The silent partner was least involved in decisions. She supported her husband's decisions but did not take an active role in decision making. The sounding board was only slightly more involved in decision making. She knew more about about day-to-day decisions on the farm but did not attempt to influence them.

F. They feel that they have to be calling

the tune and making the decisions even if they're the wrong ones. I suppose partly I saw that as my role. I think he would have found it very threatening if I had jumped into the fray and said oh I think we should do things this way. The male's the provider and they have to call the shots. (L)

F. Basically he knows what pattern he's into. You know, he'll say we have to start crutching so I know that that's coming up. Or I'll say, what are you up to today? No, it's not a total partnership because I often don't know what he's going to be doing that day. Basically he makes the farming decisions from day to day. (E)

The woman who acted as the jury was more active in farm decisions than the sounding board. She was knowledgeable about decisions being made and provided alternatives so that the decision was the best possible one. She responded to plans that her husband developed. Women partners are equal in decision making. For them, ideas could be generated by either partner and consensus was reached before action was taken. Only women farming on their own were senior or sole managers. Most often they were thrust into sole management when they became widows and decided to remain in farming.

F. (Husband) made the final decisions but I mean we discussed things and he listened if I had ideas other than his. I mean he listened, and we discussed them. Then he made up his mind. I think I influenced the management to a certain extent. (G)

M. Most things are consensus decisions I think. (K)

F. It was the best thing that ever happened to me. Suddenly I was on my own feet and it was only me. It really gave me a challenge and something to live for. (C).

By the time entry was completed, some women had no legal involvement in the farm, some were partial partners and some were full partners. Many women who were not partners felt that the legal aspects of partnership were not as important as the working partnership. However, some would also have liked the symbol of being an owner. Other women became partners in parts of the business such as the stud. This gave them legitimate access to decision making in that aspect of the farm. Women who were full partners were formal owners jointly with their husbands in all land and stock. Their partnerships developed through turning points described earlier.

F. It's not a partnership. It's in (husband's) name. I would probably feel that it was putting the partnership down in name rather than just knowing that we are. (E)

F. We discuss the stock and we have to make a decision as to what bull we might buy and I give my opinion on the animals. It's not just a partnership in name only. (J)

F. It all changed when we got the lease finally sorted out and then we went to see our own farm accountant and I went so I was involved from there on.

M. It was an advantage to be in partnership. And (wife) decided if she was going to be in legal partnership she was not going to be a sleeping partner. She was going to be an active partner. (B& N)

2.2 Men's Entry into Farming

M. It was pretty inevitable I'd end up here one day. (R)

The process of entry into farming for young men also began with the job of making a place for themselves on the farm. Making a place began with the knowledge that they would be farmers. It involved marriage, re-entering the community and resolving family issues about who would farm.

2.2.1 Making a place

Unlike women, all of the men knew 'their place'. All wanted to be farmers.

I. And did you think, well eventually I'm going to be a farmer?

M. Yes, I think I did. If I was honest about it, yes. (P)

M. I was desperate to get into a farm and we managed to get this sort of run down place. It was pretty awful. (B)

Those returning to family farms felt their return was inevitable. It was a matter of the timing of family stages: marriage and raising a family; and retirement of parents.

M. I think it came to the stage where if we wanted a family I had to make a career. I'd achieved certain things in what I was doing so it just sort of happened. I must have been more settled in my outlook to be able to shift back up. (A)

I. How do you know when it's time?

M. I was having trouble to do any physical work on the farm so either (son) had to come home about then or somebody would have to look after the farm. (R)

Unlike women, marriage was not a prerequisite for going farming. However, some men saw marriage as necessary for their own farming future. Wives offered companionship, an understanding of farming, or access to a farm.

M. At that stage I had no intention of returning to farming physically unless I was married. I couldn't see any point in being single on a farm.

I. Why not?

M. Probably just too male oriented. Somebody to do the washing. The other thing was loneliness. I'd seen too many lonely people on farms (R)

I. And how did you get into farming

M. I married the farmer's daughter. (R)

Similar to women, most farm men had the task of entry into the community, the family and the business. However, the issues were different than those for women. Although many were returning to the community of their childhood, even those returning 'home' sometimes felt they were strangers. Many had been away from home for many years while going to school or doing the 'OE' (Overseas Experience). Returning after a professional career in the city or a stimulating overseas experience required a period of getting back into the community.

M. I had acquaintances but you know it took a while to get back into the district. Yes, I was a stranger. (P)

M. Well it was a wonderful world (city job). You were just some sort of guru up in the clouds somewhere. (R)

Moving onto the farm required making a place for themselves in the family business. Some had a place waiting for them because of illness or death of their fathers, while others returned to farm with parents during a period of transfer. Young farm men made their mark on the farm as their wives did in the household.

M. And when my father died my sister was given a share of the place and my brother and myself farmed it as one unit for about four years. (F)

M. Soon after we got married (wife's) father suggested we come up here. We worked for him with the prospect of going into partnership with him. (R)

M. And my neighbours brother took over the home block. One of the first things he did was cut out a row of trees which his father had planted when he first went there. It was quite upsetting. And his father couldn't remember that when his father went he cut down every tree on the place and restarted. (A)

Reentry as the farmer sometimes required negotiating with siblings. Negotiation could be a difficult or congenial undertaking, but usually took several years.

M. They (siblings) had the fear that I was jumping the gun and going to steal their inheritance. (R)

M. And there was another complication too that some of the land was in trust for my sisters. Eventually we sold off part and with that we could pay the girls out. (P)

M. Well a farm about 4 miles away came up and my elder brother farmed there and my middle brother and I carried on here for a further ten years. We looked for one of us to branch out and he saw a farm and he was more than happy to go. So I am lucky to be home. (K)

Only those who bought farms on their own did not have to do the work of making a place in the family.

F. And I suppose possibly because we didn't have our own farm that had been handed down through several generations that we were able to get on with our lives. Sometimes I feel quite envious of people round about who have all these cousins, in-laws, and then you see them squabble and so on I thought perhaps we are quite lucky not to have it. (L)

Although all men expected that farming would be their major role, not all had well-developed farming skills. Competence at farming ranged from those who had been farming their entire lives and had grown up on farms; to those who had been away from farming for a period of time and had to re-learn the skills; to new farmers. Lifelong farmers were returning to lives that were familiar to them and had skills developed in childhood. They had specific ideas about what they were going to do as farmers. Many re-entry farmers had been away for many years and had had no farm experience as adults. They weren't as certain of their farm skills and often worked for parents or with hired men as 'the boy' for a period of time after their return. New farmers had to start from the beginning. Most apprenticed on other farms before farming on their own, although some were disdainful of the idea that you had to come from a farm background to do well in farming.

M. I was always interested in breeding sheep. I probably knew even when I was 18 or 20 that if I went farming I'd be into sheep. (K)

M. I sort of basically started out as 'the boy'. Well, the new chum. Before I came back there was always the married man who

knew how to run it. And then there was usually a single man here. And between them they ran it. And I sort of filled the role of the single man, the learner. (A)

M. I was purely city. I'd never touched a sheep or anything like that until I first went farming and worked for Mr. X. He was a marvellous farmer and he was a very good boss. He taught me everything I knew. (R)

Most men gradually took on farm decision-making. They worked with parents or with an existing manager for a period of time or relied heavily on formal and informal consultants.

M. Well I was only about 15 when I left school and came home. And after two years he (father) almost left the agricultural side for me to run. And he looked after the sheep. Then gradually I integrated into the sheep. (F)

M. So we came back and managed for one year and did exactly what the previous manager had done. And then the next two or three years made a few changes. (R).

I. How did you learn about management?

M. Through my discussion group. They get together once a month and we used to have a MAF advisor come in. And I grew to have a lot of confidence in the MAF advisor. I doubt whether I would have survived without him. (A)

Access to formal partnerships in family operations depended upon resolving claims of siblings and working out the transfer from parents. Many became partners with parents during the entry period. Those who entered farming directly did so through two routes: borrowing money to buy a farm, or working into farming through being the 'married couple' to management to ownership.

M. Shortly after I got back I became a 1/3 partner (father had 2/3) on the stock and plant. (P)

M. When we came back from the war we were given £150 a year to live on. And we were under supervision because we had all borrowed money. A lot of the supervisors were ex-farmers gone off in the depression and they helped us. (B)

M. Loans were no trouble. They were quite cheap. And the stock firm looked after us. (R)

2.2.2 Being 'Into It'

After several years living on their farms, all of the men were in charge of their farms. None relied on full-time hired help,

but many had spouses who worked with them. All had made some changes in their work, management and ownership from the entry period.

By the end of the entry period, all saw themselves as the major workers on the farm, although it took time to be confident about organizing the physical day-to-day running of the farm. Many felt that they were established when they were able to do less farm work and have the farm still be productive.

M. The physical day to day running, I probably felt confident at it in about 3 years. I don't think I was really handicapped in my farming knowledge. Well I made some awful mistakes but we all probably do. (A)

M. I used always to be busy on the farm. And now I probably spend half my time doing the farm work. I am better organized and the farm is running, idling now. (I)

M. I managed so that there were no ewes lambing on Saturday afternoons so that I could go to golf.

F. It was amazing (H&G)

Some whose farms were running smoothly looked for other work challenges both on and off-farm.

I. You run another business too, don't you? In addition to doing the farming.

M. Yes, it's built over the last three years. It takes about half of my working time. My cousin and I are partners in the business. He is certainly the entrepreneur. He's the one who's probably made it go as far as it has in such a short time. (I)

M. I was bored. When we first got the place we rushed in and fenced the whole thing. And we rushed around and improved everything in the first 3 years. And then I got bored. And then I sulked for a year. And then I decided to give myself a kick into gear and get into it again. And at the moment I'm burning along quite well. I'm enjoying it again. (Q)

By the end of the establishment phase, men were also senior or sole managers on their farms, although some had had management apprenticeships that lasted 20 years.

M. And after 5 years or so my father died. And I was the manager. (F)

F. Twenty years. (During that time) he didn't have any real say. Father decided what was to be done. He (husband) did the work. (C)

They had developed their own management styles and recognized what they did well, and how they liked to manage. Some had begun long-term planning when they took over the farm and were beginning to see the benefits.

M. I'm pretty conservative. One thing I don't do is rush into things and sometimes that can be costly. (K)

M. You've got to start planning from the day you come here. The way I think is you set the programme up and you follow it. You sit back and enjoy it and know it will all be right. All the thinking in this farm was done years ago. It's all been set up. (R)

M. I suppose the decisions about splitting the farm up into paddocks were mostly mine cause I knew how I wanted the stock to move round the farm and where we could get water. (R)

While some women felt that ownership was not an important symbol, for men it was, in part because ownership allowed them to farm independently. Most felt that had not truly entered farming until they were the owners.

M. What would have been the ideal I suppose if he'd said, right, I'm going. I'll lend you the money at so much interest and forget about all this having shares in the profit and the loss and things. But he just wouldn't let go. (P)

M. I suggested we divide the place (among the 3 brothers). Simply and cheaply as we possible could into three titles. Take one each. That was our strategy to be in control of this place by the fact that we had the facilities, the access and everything. But you pay for it in high rent for awhile. (R)

2.3 Choosing a Successor

F. Well you can't make farmers of your children if they don't want to be. But I just can't see that happening because I'm sure one of them would be keen to take over here. (J)

A key element to family transfer of the farm is the choice of a family successor. Succession is the traditional process by which the younger generation enter and the older leave farming. The designation of a successor is a lengthy process of decisions made by parents based on their own beliefs about succession and based on the interests of their children.

2.3.1 Attitudes Toward Succession

Each couple decides whether it is important to have a family successor. Beliefs about succession are influenced by personal attachment to the land, numbers of generations on the land, and the profitability of the farm. Attachment to the land was seen in a general commitment to farming or in a specific connection to their own farm. Those who felt this connection wanted to see a child continue on the farm, while those with little stake in the farm had little investment in family succession.

F. I think I've got as much love for this farm as (husband) because I've loved walking over the farm. I quite often walk over it. And I used to stand there and think I've got this freedom to stand here. And it's all ours.

I. So would you feel the same way about your children and grandchildren. Is this the life you would hope for them?

F. Yes, definitely. (D)

F. It wouldn't bother me at all (if the farm were sold).

I. It wouldn't?

F. No. It's just a form of capital. And you sell it and put the capital somewhere else. (O)

Families in which there had been several generations on the land had an especially strong commitment to family succession. There was a sense of obligation to generations past and to generations in the future. An important connection through time was continuity of the family name.

M. Well my grandfather came out here and worked as a shepherd in the back country. And he eventually bought his first farm. And my father took that over from my grandfather. And my grandfather would still arrive every day and dig the garden and potter around. And then I took it over. And now my son. So it's sort of been a continuation really. I would still like to see this place in the (family name). That's the way I see it. (F)

F.If you can't make a go of it you're actually letting everybody down. You know, it's still the family's farm.

I.You mean the generations before?

F.Yes and the immediate family. We're just keeping it for the next generation. It's not really ours. You know, we can improve and do things and that but basically we're just keeping it going for the next generation. (E)

Commitment to succession was seen in the willingness of parents to ensure that the farm was available for children so that there could be a family successor. Parents who felt a strong attachment to the land but whose farms were making only modest returns, also wanted a family successor but didn't see how it would be financially possible. Only those without a strong attachment to the land and who were also in financial straights, said that they did not want a child to succeed them in farming.

M. I wouldn't sell it until the children had a chance at it. I couldn't.

F. It's very, very tied up in the emotions of the whole family. This is their emotional upbringing, the farm. A lot of our incentive is being able to set them up. If they want to farm we'll try and set them up. So that's why we've got to make money so we can afford it. (Q&M)

F. We have been under a lot of stress with things financially on the farm.

I. So the difficult part is the pressure you feel as the keepers of the land to carry on no matter how hard it gets.

F. Yes. You know we feel that we have to maintain things because if we let them go it's part of the history gone. And if each generation maintains it then it continues on. (E)

M. Well I hope they don't want to go farming because we are going to have nothing to retire on. If they want to I don't know how we cope with that. It's probably the fairest thing to sell everything and when we die share it out. (MN)

2.3.2 Stage 1, Watching for Interest

For the majority of people interested in family succession, choosing the successor began when the children were young. The first stage was watching to see which of the children might have an interest or aptitude for farming. However, even if one showed more interest, no preferential treatment was shown children at this young age. All were encouraged to help out on the farm.

F. Even when he was four and five he knew every paddock on the farm and what was going on. (D)

F. It's the one that wants to go out with dad the most. By age 10 or 12 you can see. (C)

M. All the kids are good at farm work. They've all got a bit of guts as far as not moaning and that sort of thing. (K)

F. Well they all did a bit as children. They always helped us with tailing. (N)

2.3.3 Stage 2, Determining Eligibility

By the time children were in their teens, some decisions had been made about those who were likely successors and those who were not. Eligible children were those who showed a keen interest and were willing to do the work. Birth order did not affect eligibility.

F. You get some idea of whether he's going to be interested enough to be really keen on it. And if he's not, if he's only half hearted, I don't see he should have any right to it. It's the one who is prepared to stay home and work on the place. It should be theirs. (C)

M. No, I don't think that it's a general rule that the oldest son takes over the farm. A lot of sons say to hell with the farm and the younger one goes there. (B)

In most cases, it was not possible for all interested children to be able to farm on the family property. Many farmers worried about having more children interested in farming than the farm could support.

M. When our children were young people used to joke that you had only one farm to leave and two weddings to provide. I don't suppose I've ever thought of all three of them (wanting to farm). (K)

M. If both boys want to go farming I don't know how I can do it. (Daughter) seems interested as well. Well that's really making problems worse. (A)

Part of choosing the successor was narrowing the 'pool of eligibles'. Gender, health and aptitude for other work were criteria for reducing the number of possible successors. Girls were either excluded from eligibility, or came after sons who are given the first chance at being the family successor.

F. I was always brought up that I wasn't getting the farm. (My brother) would follow in my father's footsteps. It was never me. I was always sort of brought up that girls were second. (M)

M. Even (daughter) could farm if she wanted to and the boys don't. It's a bit chauvinistic but you tend to naturally think of the boys going farming and (daughter) will do something else. But if she wanted to, she shouldn't be deprived of the opportunity too. (A)

Others who were ineligible were those with health problems, especially allergies.

M. Well I don't think he could have come home (and farmed). If we went out on the hill and the cocksfoot was in flower he'd be just trying to breathe and his face would be out to here. So that was the reason he didn't come home, because of his health condition. (F)

Sons who were less skilled, less interested, did not get along with parents, or had other talents, were not encouraged to be successors if another son was suitable and available.

M. My father recognized that I was probably the most likely to go farming. I had a way with dogs and sheep and I can do things, and I was doing those things which farm boys do. I drove the tractors and I was always trying to do things before my time. Neither of my brothers did that. And there was no common ground between father and (brother). There was more common ground between father and me. (R)

F. The Xs had three sons and one daughter. One son's away in Canada and he'll never want to farm. Then another of their sons is ill. So they're only left with the one son who wanted to farm so that sort of worked out. (L)

F. Whoever takes on the farm and works on the farm is the one that should get the biggest share while the others are away making their fortune at something else. (C)

M. And he was reasonably bright and he got a bursary which took him to (university). And he did a doctorate there. So that was the reason why he didn't come home. (F)

2.3.4 Stage 3, Placing the Successor

A successor had often been identified by the time children are in their late teens or early twenties.

M. By the time they are all 25 I think by then there should be some sort of pattern of what is going to happen. (K)

There are three ways in which the successor was finally placed on the farm: a health crisis of the parent in which a child was brought home to farm; a child who decided he was the farmer and made sure he got the farm; a son who came home after a lengthy period away because it was time to settle down.

M. (Father) And I was having trouble to do any physical work on the farm so either (son) had to come home about then or somebody would have to look after the farm.

M. (Son) I didn't feel the pressure. Well, it suited me. The time seemed about right. (W& DM)

M. I was quite aggressive when it came to taking over the place. I was going to get it no matter what. And I did. (Q)

M. I thought well you've got to stick your feet down eventually. You know that it was time to stop. You've got to join the real world. (P)

From the perspective of parents, the ideal succession occurred after a child had had a period away from the farm to decide whether to return to farming. Often discussed as the OE (overseas experience), the purpose of this time away was to broaden their horizons and to make certain that those who returned to farming did so because they wanted to and not because of pressure or lack of alternatives.

F. I look round now at all the farmers; sons who go overseas for 3 years. I felt that (son) should have had the chance to go overseas. (D)

M. I know too many people in this area who tend to think the world ends at (nearest village). I'd like my kids to get out and see that there's more. I'd like them to see that there's other ways of working or enjoying yourself. Then if they want to work on farms wholly and solely, fine. (A)

M. You have to widen your horizons a bit. Not that farming is a narrow option, but that they are there by their own choice or preference and haven't confined themselves to this option. (R)

The attitude of leaving children free to choose farming or not, came from the experience of many current farmers who had felt pressure to be the successor. Some of these parents adopted a 'wait and see' attitude, while others actively encouraged sons to take up farming.

M. I can think of one or two round here who were sort of forced into it. They didn't want to but they did it because it was expected of them. That's how people my age came home and worked on the farm. (P)

M. I was told that if I didn't come home as soon as I left school the place was going to be sold. That's what I was told. (Q)

M. I don't want to end up putting any pressure on either of the boys. But I'd be quite chuffed if they wanted to. (A)

M. I wanted him to take over because we'd done all this work for 40 years. (B)

2.3.5 Stage 4, Letting Go

Parents and children both recognized the difficulty of finding the ideal timing of succession. What was ideal for children was too early for parents. A high level of stake in the farm made it more difficult for farmers to leave or to feel that the next generation would farm as well as they did.

F. And I think the biggest problem of carrying on the farm is fathers are really too young to retire. They're too young to retire and say well now you have a turn. And yet the son is getting older all the time and wanting to have a chance himself. (C)

M. What is tragic is that father and son and daughter stay there and dad won't give up. Or when dad does give up, there's not enough money to support retired dad. (R)

M. My generation farmers are finding that the younger ones, there are some very good ones, but they're not as dedicated as we were. (B)

F. Basically it (when you decide to retire) depends on how much this particular bit of dirt means to you and how keen your son or whatever is to carry on. (G)

Along with choosing a farming successor, parents had to make decisions about non-farming children. A real concern was how to be fair to those children without placing so many financial burdens on the farming son that he was unable to farm successfully. In most cases this meant that non-farming children did not receive an equal share of family assets. Non-farming children were compensated in other ways such as with professional training or money to help them become established in something else.

F. Unfortunately in this day and age you can no longer start off with the same amount because the farms won't support it to make it viable. There's usually got to be just one. (G)

M. If I was to cut it down the middle, well there is no way that (son) could farm. That's really what it amounts to. (F)

F. We told the girls they all had to have some training, they had to do something and they all did. (N)

F. My parents have always been very good to us girls. They've given us money on the spur of the moment when we needed it. (J)

M. Well I helped him through (university) and I helped him buy a house. (F)

2.4 Women's Exit from Farming

F. I didn't have to do things. Like cook for men. I could do my own thing, in my own time. Not have to do any baking. (N)

Women's exit from farming involved changes in family, homemaker and farm roles. The process of exit from farming for women required making a new place for themselves and for the succeeding generation. Women's exit from the business aspects of farming depended upon the nature of their involvement in the business.

The first phase of exit for women was a reduction in household work. This began as children were launched. However, the major change came in not having to do farm related household tasks such as cooking for shearers. Women appreciated the freedom that came with this change in work.

F. It got better after (son) was married. Before that he was still involved in rugby. An awful lot of washing. That was a busy time. Five nights a week for training often. Now I have my hobbies. That fills in the time that I'm no longer washing rugby clothes and things like that. (D)

F. Well you are not tied to a routine. You don't have to cook so much which is a big thing for me because I hate cooking. And if he's going fishing I can either go fishing with him or not. Just whatever I feel like for the day. (N)

F. Now that the farm's sort of winding down we're thoroughly enjoying it, having a bit longer to sleep in in the mornings. (L)

Part of exit from farming involved where to live. The choice of retirement residence was bound up with access to family, concerns about health and whether or not couples wanted to remain active in farming. There was no consensus on where was the best place to live. While some preferred to remain in the homestead or on the same property; others chose to move. None wanted to be far away. The two main reasons for wanting to live nearby were to stay on the land and to be near farming children. Staying on the land meant they could maintain an interest and purpose.

I. So you plan to retire on the property?

F. Not more than ten miles from here I wouldn't think. Make that five. My grandmother was still riding her horse into her eighties and still had the land around her and her animals. So that really appeals to me. You know I don't intend to whither away in a little house in the middle of the city. (J)

F. I think it's a mistake (to leave the farm and move into town). With some people who

have done that then their health's really packed up. They really haven't got enough interest and find it very traumatic. (L)

F. If you move right away you could so easily completely lose touch with your family. (N)

Being near farming children was seen positively by women at the exit stage. Yet many saw problems inherent in being too close. They saw the ideal exit as one in which the couple had a small piece of land they could work to keep them busy and not interfering with their children. Others continued to live on the farm, even in the homestead and felt they could keep adequate distance while still staying involved. Part of the task was to make room for daughters-in-law.

F. We want to be close to our kids but we can sort of see the problems associated with perhaps still trying to run things. And perhaps relying on them too much. Really it's tricky. It would be better if we had a piece of land we could work at. A small piece of land would be better than totally relying on coming back here and working every day and sort of living in our child's pockets. (E)

F. You're conscious and aware that your son has another woman who comes first in his life and you've got to take a back seat. I'm perhaps not as relaxed as I could be about it. Because I'm so scared of overstepping the boundary. (G)

The nature of women's exit from the farm business depended upon the way in which they were involved in the farm itself. Women who were primarily homemakers and helpers found their household work-load diminishing as children were launched and as their husbands began to reduce their work-load. The farm tasks they had done disappeared as their husbands eased out of work. One of the tasks of their exit was to find activities to fill in the time not taken up by household and farm-related duties. Keeping busy and finding new challenges was important.

F. Well I realize now, you know I hear so much about this retirement. And I think Heavens above, you've just got to be busy. You see I love the theatre and things like that. And I do get there occasionally. (D)

F. I got to the stage after I was 50 I thought now every year I'll have to find something a challenge to do and I have. Just as long as one's got something to get one's teeth into. (L)

Women who had been more active in farm work went through their own gradual process of reducing their work load. For many it was

difficult giving up something they enjoyed. And some felt that they had lost a sense of purpose when they no longer had farm work to do. But they felt they needed to both make a place for, and to ease the entry of the next generation.

F. I was rather amused at (hired man) one day. Because you know I'd worked in the woolshed when they were shearing. When he came in one day I was filling the wool press for (son). And (hired man) said, are you working your way out of the shed? The next one's out the door. (C)

F. In the busy times with lambing (daughter-in-law) and I would cook for shearers. She'd do one meal and I'd do another. (N).

F. I just suddenly felt I was useless. I wasn't contributing anything to anything. (N)

The ways in which women moved out of management also depended on the nature of their management role. Those who were 'silent partners' or 'sounding boards' were least involved in management decisions including decisions about exits. For them, exit from farming was their husbands' decision. Similar to biding their time to wait for their husbands to go into farming, these women had little influence on when he decided to leave farming. Some had regrets because their husbands waited too long.

F. There were occasions when I wanted to talk about what we were going to do when we retire. But we never got to talking it over. Women today want choices and you could look at that and say well really I didn't have much choice. So there's been a certain amount of compromise on my part. (D)

F. I miss out on a lot. I've been wanting to see (play in town). But I have to miss out. (L)

F. I think (husband) sort of put his blinkers on and thought when the time comes I'll think of something or do something. And I think when he finally had to have those knee operations and found that he can't do what he had to do then he started to change. He's gradually changing. But he's been forced to do it. (L)

Women who had been more active in farm decisions expected an active role in exit from the business. They looked forward to a very gradual exit, continuing to do what they enjoyed well past the 'normal' retirement age. Continued activity was important for them and for their husbands.

F. I want to go on doing things around here as long as I can. You know, my mother and father still get up at about 6:30 and their parents did before that even though they

were officially retired. It's probably bred in us a bit. To be the types that like to keep on going and doing with the farm. (J)
F. Suddenly you're retired to a grizzly old man who hasn't got anything to do and he doesn't even know how to knit. (N)

Women who were partners talked about exit from farming as a joint process. Planning or waiting for the right moment was done together.

F. We talked about our plans but we knew that we had to wait until (son) was old enough to make a decision about himself. We didn't really know until he had made that decision quite how we were going to retire. If he hadn't wanted to come onto the farm, we would have to have sold it you see. (G)
F. We would like our children to have less pressure financially than we've had. So we need to have something for our retirement. Probably the best thing that we would think of is to buy some property in the town, just totally as an investment. (E)

Women who were farming as sole managers had an exit process similar to that of men. Their major decisions were when to transfer the business, where to live after exit, what productive role could they continue to hold after retirement. Their comments are included in the section on men's exit from farming. None of the married women of the retiring generation had been owners of their farms. Thus we have no information on exit from ownership. Women who were involved in farm decisions had some influence on the timing of transfer of ownership to farming children. We have included in the next section the comments from a small number of women who had farmed after widowhood. There were too few to have a separate section and their exit process was similar to men's.

2.5 Men's Exit from Farming

M. I'd like to die in the paddock. I don't want to die on a yacht in the Bahamas or somewhere. (K)

Men's exit from farming was also a process of reducing involvement in work, management and ownership of the farm. It required creating a physical and psychological distance from farming children and from the farm. The beginning of the process occurred when the older farm man decided it was time to begin to move out of the business. The 'right time' depended upon parent's readiness to get out and children's readiness to take over.

M. I was more than ready to retire. I was ready. For years I did all the everything on the place. (B)

F. I didn't back off because suddenly I felt too old to do it. I just felt that I wasn't going to do the same to my son (stay on too long). In a farming situation you can't have two bosses. (C).

Although none described a 'right' age to retire, they had an idea whether exit was too early or too late. Many felt other farmers held on too long for their own good or for the good of children who wanted to get into farming.

M. Farmers don't retire when they should. It ought to be mandatory for farmers to retire at 55. I mean why wait until you're sort of burnt out. (B)

F. I have a friend who is 78 and he's still working on the farm. He took his sons into partnership and I said to him one day, when are you going to give up? And he said, why should I? This has been my life building this place up and I'm certainly not going to go into the village and carry the basket down for a loaf of bread every day. That really amused me because I couldn't visualize him doing that. (C)

Men of both the retiring and receiving generations recognized that the best timing for fathers was not always the best timing for sons.

M. I think that more often the younger son (takes over). It's too soon for retirement when the older son is ready to go. (F)

M. Dad didn't get control till he was mid-thirties. That was one of the big problems he had. (A)

A major exit decision was where to live. Many saw the ideal as staying on the farm. Those who stayed and were able to develop congenial working relationships with farming children felt they owed a great deal to the understanding and acceptance of children. Those who stayed without that acceptance paid a high price for their attachment to the place. It often caused friction with children or more work for those who stayed in the homestead.

F. I think that fact that we are still on the farm says a lot for (son). He's a wonderful person. I have heard where farmers have moved off and hoped to be able to go back and help their sons and they haven't been allowed to. I was born in this house, actually in the house and unless (wife) really wanted to go, I've got no intention of moving away from here. (F)

F. They (daughter and son-in-law) talked about coming here. But then that would mean

us getting out of this house and then that made (husband) very apprehensive. Where would we go? We started all those apprehensive feelings again. (Husband) thought it was a terrible idea so we've all stale-mated. (L)

F. Mum and dad still live in the home place. They thought they'd probably shift over there within a few years. But it hasn't happened and I think mum sort of feels now that she's 68 and dad's 69 that perhaps it's time they were beginning to move over there cause mum's still got most of the work with the shearers and people coming onto the farm for cups of tea and this sort of thing. (J)

Those who had left the homestead felt that that was necessary in order to give the next generation the freedom to farm without interference and more space to accommodate a growing family.

M. I know there is a great friend of ours who's mother was a real old tartar and he was managing a big place and doing it very well too. And he used to have to sort of sneak out and go fishing so his mother wouldn't know. It was a ridiculous situation. A bloke of 50 I suppose at the time. (B)

M. So we swapped houses.

F. Because the cottage was tiny and I could see it was driving (daughter in law) mad trying to cope. And it was silly for us to be rattling around in a big empty house while they squidged into a little cottage. (B&N)

F. Now that our son in law's taken over the stud, we're going to see our daughter in Australia because I said to (husband), you'd better get away otherwise you'll start having withdrawal symptoms. Because I thought he'll want to be breathing down (son-in-law's) neck and he's probably better just right out of it. (L)

One aspect of the issue of where to live was how to develop enough capital so that choices were available. Those with limited finances saw the wisdom of off-farm investment but had difficulty implementing their plans. Many felt that few farms could provide a good living for the entering and the retiring generation.

M. My aim is really, well I've done it. Is to take sufficient (income) off (the farm) to have a comfortable life and pour the rest back in. I'm at the stage in life now where you're thinking well, there are other things

to diversify the capital base, to build funds off the farm. And we've budgeted that block of trees out there which should coincide with our need for a retirement house. (R)

M. Now the bottom side of the road has a house on it. It would be possible to live there. It's a sort of a half farm, a retirement unit or a springboard unit. (K)

M. I should be looking at some sort of superannuation or investment. Buying flats in town or what I don't know. If only we could raise enough money to get a deposit on a house in town. But often that money is quite handy. You can put it into a little more fertilizer. So I don't know. I'm being a bit ostrich-like at the moment and I'm not doing anything. (A)

M. There's probably not two good livings on the place. If you wind the clock back into the 1950's, the place probably provided in those days three or four good livings. And you know, there were three men on the payroll here in those days. (K)

Men felt that the ideal exit from work was gradual reduction over a lengthy period of time. The beginning of exit from work occurred with a general sense of being tired or slowing down, or with the onset of health problems. The first change was in tasks that were most onerous or unpleasant.

M. Probably just cut it back every year. I'm slowing down now. I get tired from the physical work. So one day we'll decide there's more to life than chasing cows for three hours. (R)

M. I was reluctant to get out at seven o'clock in the morning because I was getting old. (B)

F. We gave up the stud for one thing. That was a lot of work. (D)

Several older farmers had chronic health problems. These forced them to change their work patterns. Changes in work sometimes were dramatic.

F. This illness came down upon (husband). It was basically I think a stress-related condition. Because the farm work was just getting a bit much. It was a hard time for him. It was an awful time for him. But he really was in too much pain and too crippled to take much part in the actual physical work. So he sat on a box and worked the dogs. (G)

F. In '78 (husband) had this terrible

accident with his leg. And here all of a sudden (son) just had to take things up.

M. That's right. Right in the middle of lambing. I was in plaster almost until November and (son) came home from school. He never had a dog that would work for him because my dog would only work while I was there. But within a fortnight he had one and he did all the lambing well and that was a wonderful experience for him because I couldn't go out and he had to do it. (F)

Some farmers who were in poor health were able to continue to farm by changing the nature of the farm or by involving children.

F. (Husband) has had one knee operation and has to have the other one done and he's not allowed to be in the pen with these big heavy sheep. But our son-in-law now is buying our stud sheep and we are just going into cattle because (husband) will find that easier to work. (L)

I. How did you go from running it full time to helping out a bit?

M. Probably the advent of more modern machinery. What used to take me back in the '40s, two days to work over a particular paddock with a certain implement. You'll now go out and do it in about five hours. (F)

The ideal exit from work was seen as a gradual process through which work ultimately became non-obligatory. However, while some withdrew from farm work entirely, most felt that the option to work should continue since work allowed continued productivity.

M. Probably just cut it back every year I'd say. (R)

M. So I wasn't obliged to be there. Yes, if you're shearing of course you'd turn up but if you wanted to sleep in one morning, sleep in. You know, someone else is going out around in the frost. (A)

M. I can imagine when I'm 80 I might get up at 9 o'clock, two hours later than now and go and grab a grubber and grub a few thistles. Do a few of those sort of things that make the place look tidy. (K)

Farmers who who stayed on the farm were able to gradually reduce their work as sons took over. These farmers gradually shifted from father doing the work and directing the son, to son being in charge and father being the helper. Finding the balance between helping and interfering was not always easy. All had stories of other farmers who couldn't leave.

M. And (son) does 90% of the work and I just help him out with what I can. (F)

I. After your son came back to farm, who was doing the work around the place?

F. (Son) was the boss and (husband) was the boy. (N)

M. Well there's dear old XX who goes out every day and his son says "is he ever going to retire"?. Climbing into the car at 20 to 8 in time to be on the doorstep at 8 o'clock every morning and yet he was telling everyone that he was retired. (B)

Handing over of decision making was the major task in exit from management. This aspect of transfer was seen as a way of letting the son have control of the business. Most older farmers felt that transfer of management responsibility was essential to the farming career of the next generation. However, not all felt that it was going to be an easy process.

M. Well the younger person has new ideas and if you don't let them experiment, they're not going to go anywhere. (F)

M. This uncle of mine doesn't want to hand over the reins. I'm sure if he did he would find a great sense of relief. But oh, he's dead scared to and he won't. (A)

Decision making was seen as part of a package of work, ownership and management. Those who did the work and owned the property should be the managers.

M. I might suggest one or two things but I leave the decision making to him. It's his property now. And I don't think you should have two people trying to make a decision on what should be done. There's one way to find out if you're doing the right thing. And if you make a mistake you don't do it a second time. (F)

M. I think that those who actually make the decisions should be those who are doing the physical work. (A)

F. Once he became the legal owner of the place I thought there's no room for two of us at the top. So I had to step down. Then I had to rush round trying to find something to occupy my mind. (C).

One symbol of the shift in management decisions from father to son was handing over the chequebook. As with other elements of transfer, handing over the chequebook was done gradually. However, staying involved in management might mean maintaining some decision-making control for a period of time.

F. Well I think that's when they feel they

really are managing. When they've got the books and the chequebook. (N)

M. When we came here I had to counter-sign cheques (with my son). I can't remember ever signing cheques after we came here, can you?

F. For a little while because I can remember him bringing the book down and getting you to sign a lot. (B&N)

M. Well we can both sign it so it doesn't make much difference. (F)

F. You've got to be very careful. I feel we've had a good relationship through it. Well he still comes and talks about what he's doing and what he's aiming to do. You know I feel that's as important as anything to me. (C)

The transfer of ownership was a complex process that required the older couple to take enough money out of the business for their retirement, a consideration of non-farming children, the financial ability of the farming child or children to take over the business. While women did not see ownership as an important symbol, men saw it as very important. The transfer of ownership often took several years. One reason to make transfer very gradual was to protect what you had built.

F. My father still farms in partnership with my brother and he and his wife have been married about ten years but they get on very well and things seem to work fine. (J)

M. So anyway we got to the stage where (son) bought my brother's half of this farm and then we just farmed it as one unit. And then I took (son) into a partnership and then 3 years ago I sold him the place. He got a small loan from the Rural Bank and I just left the other money sitting in for him. (F)

M. That's my greatest fear to be perfectly honest. The way the marriage property act works in NZ could actually ruin what has been built up here for three generations. I think I would need to farm in partnership with someone for at least a few years to make sure there wasn't too much asset on the son or the daughter that was involved. I would find it exceptionally hard to live with if someone took off after 2 years and 2 days after marriage and ended up with half the place which can happen. (K)

There were two views on the ideal transfer of ownership. The first was that transfer should be gradual, much the same as the transfer of work. One reason to gradually move out of ownership is to ease the financial burden for farming sons.

M. If we had a reasonably good year, I'd give him a bonus at the end of the year. But then when we came into a partnership, well he took a certain percentage and we took the rest. Well now it's sort of reversed itself. We just take what's left you might say. I do what I can to help. These young fellows have quite a hurdle getting started. I still own approximately half the stock on the place so I'm in a partnership arrangement with him still. But I don't own any land. I own some of the farm equipment and anything that's been bought since is bought in the partnership's name. (F)

Older farmers didn't see themselves hanging on to ownership too long. But sometimes their sons did. And some parents wanted to continue to have part ownership as their retirement interest and income.

M. I took him in as a partner, as a 1/3 partners and he worked for me and for a friend of ours. And he's a terrific worker. (Father) (B)

M. It's a long time from that first 1/3 share. If it hadn't been for (wife) working, we'd have been down the road long ago. Well gone. Maybe we should have, but that's beside the point. It took 20 years didn't it? (Son) (P)

I. What was the time that it actually took for the handing over process?

M. It must be 12 years because he left school in 1974. (F).

M. Part of the reason why we started off the cattle stud was that if we ever left the place and went to a smaller farm we could take the cattle with us. As our little unit. (K)

How did older men know when the exit process had been completed? From the perspective of older farmers, transfer was complete when financial and managerial responsibilities had been handed over. Exit did not necessarily mean the end of work. Work could go on much longer than ownership or management.

M. When I handed over the cheque book. I would say I would classify myself as retired when I sold or passed over my financial interests in farming. (A)

M. Well to me it meant I could do what I wanted to do in my own time. (B)

Transfer did not have a well defined beginning or end.

M. It's a phasing out period really. From full time. (F)

CHAPTER 3

DISCUSSION

Transfer of the farms in this study involved several interrelated cycles: entry and retirement of men and women; choosing a successor; and movement in and out of work, management and ownership of the farm. The ways in which family members related to one another, family and community rules about access to power in farming and of the place of men and women in the farm business, all affect the nature of transfer. Cohort differences between 'receiving' and 'retiring' generations suggest that rules about transfer may be changing.

3.1 Process of Farm Entry and Retirement

The process of movement into and out of the business occurred in three phases for both men and women. Each had an entry stage of 'making a place' in the farm and the family; a stage at which they were 'into' the business and consolidated their place; and a 'retirement' stage where they moved out of the business (Figure 1). Stages were delineated by transition events that were different for men and women.

3.1.1 Making a Place

For women, the transition event that allowed entry into farming was marriage. Marriage was the entry point even for women who had been raised in the community, had farming skills or had farming property which they brought into the marriage. There was no legitimate early entry into farming by any other means. This does not mean that there are no women farmers in Canterbury. It is theoretically possible for women to work their way up the farming ladder and eventually purchase farms; or to inherit family farms in their own right. However, we found no such women in this study. And at least one research project on farm labourers in New Zealand had to eliminate women from her analysis because there were so few (Loveridge, 1987).

In order to make a place for themselves, women were obliged to begin with the status which was conferred on them at marriage. Neither marriage nor having a farming background gave women the status of farmer.

Women's ability to make a place for themselves as homemakers depended upon their understanding of the role and willingness to accept it; and the perceived willingness of their mothers-in-law to make room for them. There was community pressure to assume the role. Success in making a place as a homemaker was often measured by rating women's cooking. 'Baking the perfect scone' required an assumption of the role in order to be part of the community.

Accession to the role of farm homemaker necessitated the exit from that role of its' previous occupant. Developing a relationship with mother-in-law was an entry task required by all women. Symbols in gaining access to the household are seen in the ways in which young women changed gardens and renovated kitchens. Young women felt the need to put their stamp on the

Figure 1

Process of Farm Entry and Exit

Women

Making a Place

- *(re-)entering the community
- *developing farm homemaking skills
- *beginning a farm role

Into it

- *being part of the farm community
- *consolidating the farm role

Retirement

- *deciding where to live
- *making a place for daughter-in-law
- *moving out of the farm role

Transition Events

- *marriage to a farmer

Transition Events

- *children in school
- *illness or death of husband
- *husband becomes sole owner
- *manager leaves

Transition Events

- *launching of children
- *illness of husband
- *son enters business

(44)

Men

Making a Place

- *becoming the farmer
- *(re-)entering the community
- *negotiating with parents and
- *developing farming skills

Into it

- *being the farmer
- *establishing the farm
- *being the owner/manager

Retirement

- *moving out of work and management
- *deciding where to live
- *transferring ownership

Transition Events

- *illness, death or retirement of father
- *decision of son that it's 'time' to go farming
- *purchase of a farm

Transition Events

- *'getting rid of dad'

Transition Events

- *son enters business
- *illness or injury
- *having sufficient capital to retire

household even if mother-in-law no longer lived on the farm or had died. These changes were not so much a matter of getting rid of overbearing mothers-in-law, but of a more symbolic throwing off of the perceived stake of the older generation in the homestead, in the farm, or in their farming son. However, all who entered family farms also worried about hurting their mothers-in-law by usurping their place. This feeling suggests a high stake in the relationship with the next generation.

As entry into the family and into the household was influenced by the way in which young women developed their relationships with their mothers-in-law, access to the development of a farm role was influenced by the nature of their relationships with their fathers-in-law and other men associated with the farm. Fathers-in-law were the gatekeepers who controlled access to the farm role. Farming was a male preserve and women were effectively barred from developing a farm role as long as there were other men working with their husbands on the farm. Fathers-in-law were often mentioned explicitly as having prevented or disapproved of their daughters-in-law working on the farm. At this stage, women only gained a farm role when there were no other men working on the farm. For women who saw the homemaker role as central, lack of access to farming was not seen as a serious impediment. Those who wanted a farm role were required to bide their time until the next series of events gave them the opportunity to be 'into it'.

Events that were entry points for men were quite different than those for women. Men entered farming through a transition event of their father's (accident, illness or retirement); or through a lifecycle event of their own (decision to settle down and begin a career). For men who were to take over family farms, the timing of entry depended on business and family 'readiness' to make a place for the next farming generation. For those who purchased farms, transition events included the decision that it was 'time' to go farming and the opportunity to purchase a farm.

By purchasing a farm or coming home to farm with parents, men also had a change in status. For them the new status was either that of full-fledged or apprentice farmer. This status was conferred regardless of men's farming background or marital status. Men in this study ranged from those who had no farming experience and entered farming through 'marrying the farmer's daughter' to those who were fourth generation on their farms. Like women, their background appeared to have little influence on their status. All men became farmers regardless of background or qualifications. No women became farmers regardless of their background or qualifications.

Parallel to women's task of assuming the homemaking role, is men's task of making a place for themselves as farmers. All men wanted to be farmers. Those entering family farms were dependent upon the willingness of their fathers and siblings to make room for them through the retirement of father and the willingness of siblings to forego their claim to an equal share of the farm. There were also 'access symbols' for men in becoming full-fledged farmers. These included making your mark on the farm: cutting down trees that father had planted, and adopting new farming practices. As young women felt some tension over finding their

place, young men felt the same tensions about making the farm their own. However, men's behaviour seemed more intent on throwing off the stake of parents than did women's.

Men and women each have ascribed roles at entry. Because women are ascribed the homemaker role, it seems that they are not invisible farmers (Pearson, 1979), but are not farmers at all. There appears to be no path into a farm role for women at entry. Certainly none entered in any of the 'high involvement' categories of work, management or ownership.

Men's ascribed status of farmer lead them into apprentice or full-time farming roles. Entrants into family farms began as apprentices, much like those in research by Selles (1988). They began doing tasks with least amount of influence such as farm labour and only later began to take on management responsibilities. Thus while women were denied access to farming, many men spent their entry gaining access to control over their farms. In a sense, many of them were invisible farmers until they became the managers.

Closely knit rural communities make it difficult for men and women at entry to deviate from these ascribed roles. Just as the neighbours were waiting for the young man to return with the wife who could bake the perfect scone, they were also waiting to see if he could raise 'great thumping sheep' like his Dad.

3.1.2 Into it

A second set of transition events occurred before men and women felt that they had really found their niche in the farm. For women these events included the departure of managers/siblings/parents so that their husbands were the sole managers. Other important transition events included children's entry into school and the illness or death of their husbands.

This second phase of the business differed from the first because women had more choice about the roles they would have on the farm. Whereas in the first stage, the homemaker role had been imposed, in the second stage women either chose to continue with that role as central, or seized the opportunity to develop a farm role. Those who retained the homemaker role as central felt that their role was important but recognized their vulnerability in not knowing about the operation of the farm. Their tenure on the farm was dependent upon the continued health and farming success of their husbands.

Those who adopted a farm role did so in order to decrease their vulnerability and to develop a more public status in the community as farmers. Having a farm role was also important in building self worth. Yet women did not have the option to develop the same kind of a farm role as men. Even the most involved women had less work and management responsibility than their husbands. However, women in the receiving generation were the most involved in farming. This suggests that there are cohort differences in interest among women in being farmers as well as (or in preference to) being homemakers.

During this stage some women assumed management responsibilities

and some became partners with their husbands in making decisions about the farm. A smaller number were partners in part or all of the farm. Here too a cohort effect was evident. While there were a few full partners in the 'receiving' generation, none in the 'retiring' generation had been full partners during this stage. The importance of ownership varied greatly with some women seeing ownership as a symbol of their interest in the farm and others viewing working with their husbands as the symbol of the partnership. Women who contributed financially to the establishment of the business or the ongoing maintenance of the business were no more likely to be owners than those who had made no direct financial commitment. In general, women at this stage had a high stake in the success of their 'farmer husbands' who had more control over the business.

A few women at this stage became full-fledged farmers abruptly because of the deaths of their husbands. These women who stayed on and became farmers are probably a minority of farm women since it is still the norm for women to leave the farm. Those who stayed on talked about the new lease on life that this gave them in the midst of their bereavement. However, they had to earn their status as farmers, especially with consultants who found it difficult to deal with women. Nonetheless, keeping the farm for a 'son who was not yet ready to take over' was seen as a legitimate and noble reason for a woman to farm. This was the public assumption about why women were doing a job that was not usual for them.

Men's transition event is symbolized by 'getting rid of Dad'. Important events were the settling of family claims to the farm so that the husband was the sole operator, siblings had left and Dad had retired. Negotiation with parents and siblings that had been the major task of the first stage and ended with the termination of their active interest in the farm. Although some parents remained involved as occasional workers and some siblings retained some ownership, husbands were fully in charge of managing the farm at the beginning of this stage. For some men there was residual resentment of the length of the first stage. While some completed the entry process in approximately three years, others said it took twenty years. Those who had long apprenticeships felt that it handicapped them in their abilities to develop their farms in the time left to them.

During this second phase of the business, men moved from working relationships with their families of orientation (parents and siblings) to their families of procreation (wives). Men now saw themselves as full-fledged farmers. They turned their attention to becoming competent managers and to developing their farms. Men exhibited a high stake in their farms at this stage. They enjoyed planning and development but also looked forward to a time when they did not have to work as hard as at the beginning of this stage.

Men talked less about their working relationships with their spouse than did women. Perhaps men felt some conflict over giving up their newly won control over the farm. Those who have spent 20 years as apprentices, might rather enjoy being in charge. On the other hand, men also acknowledged the importance of their wives' support. Those who's wives worked with them (as

the boy) also felt a lessening of the burden of responsibility since their wives could take over if they were 'crook' or if they were away.

The heterogeneity of women's roles at this second stage was unexpected. Women ranged from virtually no farm role to full time farmers. Although some were without management or ownership involvement, others had control over the whole business. Among the 'receiving generation' is a group of women who are full partners in all aspects of the business. If this is a cohort effect it provides some evidence that women's power is increasing. Some women also became full-time farmers during this stage. Although much admired, these women felt that their community image was one of keeping the heritage until children were ready to take over. The fact that some people refused to deal with them as managers, suggests that even though they were doing the same job, they did not have the same status as farm men. Further research with women who have become farmers through other means will be necessary to determine community views of women farmers.

Farm men were at the height of their farming careers at the second stage. It was at this stage that differences in men's approaches to farming became evident. Farm men knew where their skills were and how to compensate for those they did not have. Those who felt that their farm development had gone well appeared to feel that they had achieved the status which had earlier been ascribed. They were successful farmers who had smoothly running farms and time and assets to make off-farm investments. Others had not achieved what they thought was necessary to be good farmers. They were worried about having no off-farm assets, about maintaining the farm for their children and about not being as successful as other farmers of their generation.

It appears that even though men had a farm role waiting for them, they still had to 'earn' that role. Those who entered farming later in life, who spent a long time as apprentices or who took on heavy debt loads because of financial interests of siblings or parents, appeared to be disadvantaged at this stage.

3.1.3 Retirement

Transition events which began women's retirement phase of the business were all family events: launching of children, illness of husband or the entry of a son into the business. Loss of some aspects of both the homemaker and farm roles were part of the retirement process for women. Most had few regrets about the former but felt a loss of purpose and productivity at the loss of farm tasks. This suggests that women felt that their farm role was of higher status than their homemaker role. Women for whom homemaking had been their major work enjoyed the reduction in farm support work such as cooking for shearers. However, they felt that they had to fill their time with other activities. One of these was helping their husbands prepare for retirement. Those who were also exiting from farm work were more focussed on post-farming decisions such as how to work out the right amount of distance from children.

Women who had become full-time farmers had most regrets about

exit from farming. Because sole-farming women were seen as keeping the heritage for their sons, there was an assumption that they would retire as soon as the son was ready to return to farming. Women farmers found it difficult to pass over control of the farm but also accepted the public view that they were only keepers of the land. These farmers felt they retired earlier than their husbands might have done had they still been alive.

Transition events which began men's retirement phase of the business were illness or injury, entry of a son into the business and having enough capital to retire. These are similar to the transition events proposed by Anderson & Rosenblatt (1985). Retirement of those who suffered an accident or became ill forced a reduction in work sooner than was the ideal time. Many farmers dealt with this issue by finding a way to continue to be involved in the farm without doing all of the work. Retiring 'too early' was seen negatively by these men. The ideal exit was much more gradual. Similar to the ideal exit suggested by Keating & Munro (1989), men thought that the best retirement was to first reduce their work, then relinquish management and finally hand over ownership. Some maintained an investment in the farm after they had retired. The findings from the entry phase suggest that young farmers often find this gradual process takes much too long. There may be no ideal exit for both generations.

Most of the women at the retirement stage of the business had relatively low levels of involvement in the farm. This may be another example of a cohort effect, with more traditional women among the 'retiring generation'. With the exception of widowed women who were farmers, none of the women at the exit stage were joint owners or managers of their farms. Higher levels of involvement of 'receiving' women may result in rapidly increasing percentages of women as joint owner-managers in succeeding decades. Were the Gill et al (1976) study to be repeated in 1995, proportions of women owners and managers might be dramatically higher. In contrast, if other sectors of business are considered, little change can be expected in women's status in farming. Few women in business have reached senior management in New Zealand.

Men's retirement seems to be much more dependent upon health crises than previously acknowledged. The hard physical work of farming means that many men are faced with a type of compulsory retirement before they are ready. Whether most would ever be ready before an imposed transition is another issue. All of the men in the retiring generation in this study had left farming for health reasons. If the intentions of the next generation are translated into reality, there may be a cohort effect in attitudes toward retirement of that younger group. Although some expected to be involved in the farm until they died, others were planning for a life after farming and a voluntary exit from the farm.

Hypotheses:

This expanded model of the process of retirement provides some confirmation and expansion of men's process of entry and retirement; a preliminary discussion of women's entry and retirement; and the added aspect of transition events in the

process. Transition points which are gender segregated illustrate the fact that men and women enter farming with different roles and statuses. The following hypotheses arise from these transition points.

1. Women are more likely to enter farming by marrying a farm man than by inheritance or transfer of a family farm or by purchase of a farm.
2. Men are more likely to enter farming through transfer of a family farm than through purchase of a farm.
3. Men are more likely than women to enter farming through taking over a family farm.
4. Women's age is negatively related to their level of farm involvement.
5. Women's farm involvement is negatively related to the number of male workers on the farm.
6. Farm men are more involved in the farm business than their wives.
7. Farmers will be more likely to think of their retirement as premature than will their farming sons.
8. The more involved a farm woman has been in the farm business, the more she will feel the loss of her farm role at retirement.
9. Women will feel little loss of the homemaking role at retirement regardless of their previous level of involvement in that role.
10. Younger men will view 'early' retirement more positively than will older men.

3.2 Involvement in the Farm Business : Work, Management, Ownership

The process of entry shows that men's and women's involvement in the farm was not static. As they made their place in the business and ultimately retired, the nature of their work, management and ownership of land and stock changed as well. Figure 2 illustrates the various ways in which women and men were involved in each of the three aspects of the business.

3.2.1 Work

There were four levels of involvement in farm work. Least involved was the homemaker whose major farm work was farm support tasks such as cooking for hired help. Homemakers at times did minimal 'field' work such as 'watching the ewes' during lambing. For the most part, the work of the homemaker was different and separate from that of the farmer.

Next most involved was the half farm hand who did a limited range

Figure 2

Involvement in the Farm Business

Farm Involvement

Low

High

Work

Homemaker

- *household work
- *farm support work
- *minimal or no farm work

Half Farm Hand

- *limited range of farm tasks
- *farm work is supervised

The Boy

- *full range of farm tasks
- *works independently
- *self definition as farmer

Farmer

- *sole or chief worker
- *supervises all farm work

Management

Silent partner

- *supports decisions of manager
- *no active role in decision-making
- *little knowledge of day-to-day operation of the farm

Jury

- *responds to plans of manager
- *provides alternatives
- *knowledgeable about farm operation

Partner

- *equal in decision-making
- *ideas generated by either partner
- *decisions by consensus

Manager

- *sole decision-maker

Ownership

Non-owner

- *no legal involvement in the farm

Partial Owner

- *partner in some aspects of the farm such as stock

Joint Owner

- *partnership in all aspects of the farm

Sole Owner

- *no formal partners

of farm tasks under supervision of the farmer. This is the entry level or apprentice level of farm work. Tasks done by the half farm hand were seen as unskilled and include opening gates, feeding-out and placing fence posts. The half farm hand saw himself/herself as a helper to the farmer.

'The boy' did the full range of farm tasks and worked relatively independently without close supervision. She/he was knowledgeable about farm work and had a wide range of work skills. The boy defined herself as a farmer although she was not seen as a farmer in the broader community.

The farmer was the sole or chief worker on the farm. He/she supervised all farm work and decided what work needed to be done on the farm. The farmer was also defined as a farmer in the broader community.

A level of involvement that did not appear among respondents in this study but was that of the uninvolved person. This is someone who has no work involvement in the farm at all. People with full-time off-farm interests, or those on farms where there is hired household and farm help, might be completely uninvolved in farm work.

3.2.2 Management

Similar to work, there were four different levels of involvement in management. Least involved was the silent partner or sounding board. This person had no active role in decision making. She neither generated ideas about solutions to problems, nor provided alternatives to ideas proposed by the manager. The major role of the silent partner was that of being supportive of the decisions made by the manager.

The jury had a more active role in management. His/her role was to be knowledgeable about the farm and to provide informed alternatives to management ideas proposed by the manager. The jury did not initiate management decisions but was seen as an important member of the management team.

More involved than the jury was the partner who was an equal in management decisions. Decisions were made by consensus and each partner was free to propose a management idea or strategy. Partners were most often found among married couples after the entry phase of the business.

Like the farmer, the manager was solely responsible for management decisions. A manager might have a spouse or farming son who acted as sounding board or jury but did not share final decisions about management. This was the management position of most influence on a farm.

3.2.3 Ownership

Ownership of farms ranged from no legal involvement to sole ownership. Two intermediate categories were those of partial owner and joint owner. Partial owners often were partners in stock or equipment but not in land; while joint owners owned a proportion of the whole farm.

Levels of involvement in work, ownership and management provide a rough estimate of the amount of influence a person has in the business. Management and ownership provide the most access to business influence with greater levels of involvement indicating higher levels of influence. Ownership provides official and public acknowledgement as farm business person. The name on the stock at the ewe sale and on the title to the property is an important symbol of control of the business.

Management is somewhat less public since it includes the process of day-to-day and long term decisions about the farm. The manager was considered to be the person who had the chequebook and made financial decisions. The manager had the most 'inside the farm gate' influence in the business.

The most influential and congruent position for a farmer was to be both manager and sole owner. Being manager but not owner, or owner but not manager was an unstable position. Managers who were not owners felt constrained by the presence of an owner since they were not free to sell property, take in new partners or remortgage. Those who were owners but not managers felt that the control of their asset was out of their hands. These incongruities will be discussed in the section on generational issues in getting into and out of the business.

The amount of work or range of farm tasks done on the farm is not by itself, an indication of the amount of influence on the business. Workers are certainly more knowledgeable about the day-to-day operation of the farm, and 'the boy' and 'the farmer' are in a better position to make informed management decisions than the 'half farm hand' or 'homemaker'. However, workers are not necessarily given access to either management or ownership. Those with high work loads and low management or ownership responsibilities are also in unstable positions. Workers with no power over the business often resent their position. The ideal position in the business is to be the 'farmer' who is doing less physical work on the farm but is both manager and owner.

Hypotheses:

1. The more a farm man or woman is involved in management of the farm, the more she/he will have control over the work done on the farm.
2. The amount of work a farm man or woman does on the farm, is unrelated to his/her level of ownership or management on the farm.
3. The more work a person does on the farm, the more knowledgeable he/she will be about day-to-day operation of the farm.
4. Level of involvement in management is correlated with level of involvement in ownership.

3.3. Lifecycle Differences in Involvement in Work, Management and Ownership

Figures 3 and 4 show the level of involvement of both men and women at each of the three phases of the farm. Men and women had different levels of involvement at each stage, illustrating the different ways in which they took part in the running of their farms.

3.3.1 Entry

At entry, women had low levels of involvement in work, ownership and management. All entered at the lowest levels of management and ownership, as sounding boards and non-owners. Because all had a household role, all of the women had some farm work responsibilities. Those who entered with farm skills often served as 'half farm hands', especially if there was no hired help. However, even in cases where they were experienced at farm labour, their farm work was supervised by their husbands (Figure 3).

In contrast, men began their farm careers at a higher level of involvement than did women. None entered at lowest levels of work or management, although some spent a period of time as non-owners. Those who entered family farms did not come in as full-fledged farmers either. None of these entry-level men were 'farmers', 'managers' or 'sole owners'. However, those who entered farming through purchase of their farms did officially begin as farmers, managers and sole owners. However, the fact that these men were often inexperienced at farm work, relied heavily on farm advisors and had little equity in their farms suggests that they were farmers in name only.

Most men entered as apprentices on their farms. They were 'half farm hands' or 'the boy' and worked with parents, siblings or managers. They were the jury who responded to the plans of parents or siblings and waited for the opportunity to have more management control. And they had little or no ownership of the farm. Such partnership arrangements with fathers or other persons are often important in order for young farmers to get started in farming. From the perspective of the farm itself, it is irrelevant who takes part in land ownership, management and labour since they are combined in family farms (Salamon and O'Reilly 1979). But they are an issue if some family members do the work (i.e., sons or wives) while others get the returns in ownership and power.

3.3.2 Into it

As discussed earlier, by the consolidation stage, women's involvement in the farm varied tremendously. Full-fledged operators were rare and only included women who had been widowed and had taken over the running of the business. The status of full-fledged operator had been thrust upon them, although it was willingly accepted. Presumably those women who were unwilling or unable to become full-fledged farmers did not take on that task when widowed but left farming. The other women appeared to fall into two distinct groups with regards to their farm

Figure 3

Women's Involvement in the Farm Business

Farm Involvement

	Low			High
WORK	HOMEMAKER	HALF FARM HAND	THE BOY	FARMER
Making a Place	Some	Some *farm work supervised by husband	None	None
Into It	Some	Some *farm work supervised by husband	Some	Some *widow becomes farmer
Retirement	Some *reduction in household work *reduction in	Some *work is reduced as husband decreases his work	Some *work is reduced as husband decreases his work	Some *reduces work to allow entry of son
MANAGEMENT	SILENT PARTNER	JURY	PARTNER	MANAGER
Making a Place	All	None	None	None
Into It	Some	Some *responds to husband's plans	Some *partnership with husband	Some *widow becomes manager
Retirement	Some *encourages husband to retire	Some *responds to retire ment plans husband has developed	Some *exit plans are joint	None *widow shares management with farming son
OWNERSHIP	NON-OWNER	PARTIAL OWNER	JOINT OWNER	SOLE OWNER
Entry	Some *farm owned by husband or his family	None	None	None
Into It	Some *farm owned by husband	Some *owner with husband in some aspects of the farm such as stock	Some *joint owner with husband	Some *widow becomes owner
Retirement	Some *husband becomes partner with son	None	Some *widow becomes partner with son	None

Figure 4
Men's Involvement in the Farm Business

Farm Involvement

	Low			High
WORK	HOMEMAKER	HALF FARM HAND	THE BOY	FARMER
Making a Place	None	Some *farm work supervised by parents	Some	Some
Into It	None	None	None	All
Retirement	None	None	Some *husband becomes helper as son becomes farmer	Some *reduces work to allow entry of son
MANAGEMENT	SILENT PARTNER	JURY	PARTNER	MANAGER
Making a Place	None	Some *response to parent's plans	None	Some
Into It	None	None	Some *decision making shared with wife	Some *sole decision maker
Retirement	None	Some *husband is consultant to son	Some *decision making shared with son	None
OWNERSHIP	NON-OWNER	PARTIAL OWNER	JOINT OWNER	SOLE OWNER
Making a Place	Some *farm owned by his parent(s)	Some *partner with parent(s) in some aspects of the farm	None	Some
Into It	None	None	Some *joint owner with husband	Some
Retirement	None *(until end of exit phase)	Some *partner with son in some aspects of the farm	Some *joint owner with son	Some *retains owner- ship until son is ready

involvement. The first group retained the role of farm wife with strict segregation of tasks between themselves and their husbands. Most of these women were in the 'retiring' generation, suggesting a cohort effect of this traditional approach to farming. The second group of women took opportunities to become more involved in the farm. All did farm work and had some influence on management. All too had some legal involvement in the farm.

At the consolidation stage, there was little variation in men's involvement in the business. All were more involved than were women (with the exception of widows who were farming on their own). All of the men were 'farmers' in the sense of doing or being in charge of work on their farms, and were highly involved in management. Managers tended to be in the 'retiring' generation, and like their wives, to have traditional, gender segregated, roles. Those who did not take full control of management or ownership, shared those responsibilities with their wives. This is in contrast to the entry stage where management and ownership, if shared, are shared with parents or siblings.

3.3.3 Exit

Men and women at the exit stage were less involved in the farm than in the previous stage. For most men, movement out of the business was encouraged by illness or the need to make room for farming sons. One method was to assume farm roles typical of their own entry stage. Some men became 'the boy' while their sons became 'the farmer'; shared management with sons and began to include them as legal partners.

Exit of the least-involved group of women was triggered by their husband's movement out of the business. Thus homemakers found that farm support tasks such as cooking were much reduced as their husbands passed on the work of the farm. Those who did some farm labour found their labour was no longer needed when sons returned to the farm.

Widowed women who had been full fledged farmers moved out of control of the business and made their farming sons partners and joint owners early in the transfer process.

Figure 5 provides a summary of levels of involvement of men and women at each stage of the farm business. Women have low levels of involvement at entry with a much wider range of involvement once they are 'into it'. At the exit stage their involvement is lower, similar to the entry stage. The exception is widowed women. At the second stage they become full-fledged farmers, lowering their involvement at exit to allow for entry of farming sons. Men enter at a higher level of involvement than women and have high levels of involvement by the consolidation stage. They also reduce their involvement at exit, in order to allow for entry of farming sons.

The ways in which men and women are involved in their farms at various stages of the business illustrate some of the "not always fortunate" intersections of family and business pointed out by Bennett & Kohl (1982). As predicted from the generational stake, in family farms at the entry stage, control is in the hands of

parents. Some children not only worried about serving long apprenticeships but did spend upwards of twenty years before the farm was in their control. The fact that young men stayed through such an apprenticeship suggests their high stake in the farm and perhaps in the family heritage that the farm often symbolized. Daughter's-in-law had less influence and were dependent first on their parents-in-law and then on their husbands for access to farm work, management and ownership. Some of their apprenticeships were even longer than those of their husbands. Although many developed a high stake in their farms, others did not. Their willingness to wait suggests a very high investment in their marriages and in their spouse's happiness in his career.

'Retiring' farm men saw the ideal retirement much as hypothesized. They preferred a gradual exit from the farm, with a long enough period to ensure that the next generation was skilled enough to farm well. The fact that many felt their sons were not as good farmers as they indicates farmers own continued investment in their farms, even after retirement. Both men and women found retirement from farming was difficult. This seemed especially true for women who became farmers late in life and felt obliged to retire early to make a place for farming sons. An unanswered question from this research is whether men or women farmers have higher stakes in their farms.

Hypotheses:

1. Women at all stages of the farm are less involved than men at the same stage.
2. Highest levels of involvement in the business are at the consolidation stage for both women and men.
3. At the entry stage, men are more likely to be partners or joint owners with members of their family of orientation than with their spouse.
4. At the exit stage, partnerships are more likely to be between 'retiring farmers' and children than between spouses.

3.4 Choosing the Successor

The process of choosing the successor for the family farm is illustrated in Figure 6. Parents described the first two phases of the process as being influenced by native interests and talents of children. Parents saw themselves as being even-handed in providing opportunities for young children to do farm tasks. However, not all children remember early parts of the succession process in the same way. Women who came from farm backgrounds said that they knew from an early age that girls were not eligible to become farmers. They were not allowed to be out on the farm or were told that their brothers were to follow in father's footsteps. This may be an example of the generational stake in operation. Parents see themselves as treating children equally but children see themselves being edged out of possibilities for inheritance.

Figure 6

Choosing the Successor

Watching for
Interest

- *being good at farm
- *wanting to go out
- *working hard and
not moaning

Determining
Eligibility

- *interested and keen
on farming
- *prepared to stay
home and work

Eliminating
Ineligibles

- *girls
- *those with poor
health, especially
asthma
- *those with less
skill or interest
- *those with other
talents

Placing the
Successor

- *health crisis of
father
- *child 'chooses
himself'
- *child comes home
after the 'OE'

Letting Go

- *timing of
succession
- *adequacy of skills
of successor

Choosing a successor is an active process. Most couples felt that they could not establish all children in farming. Overt and covert moves by parents helped reduce the pool of eligibles. Daughters were eliminated but often encouraged to stay in farming by marrying a farmer. Sons with special talents were encouraged to develop them into careers. Children who had health problems were helped to establish themselves elsewhere.

This third phase of the process was pivotal. It was at this stage that children 'knew' whether they are likely to be farmers and the pool of eligibles became family knowledge. If the succession process was to proceed smoothly, there had to be family consensus on the appropriateness of the choice. In most families there was room for only one farming child. There was virtual consensus on the idea that it was impossible to be equal to children and still retain the farm in the family. Thus not only did parents need to value family succession, but children needed to accede to one sibling as the designated successor. In these families, ineligible children moved into other spheres and allowed the farming child to begin.

Acknowledging the successor and relinquishing claims to the farm did not always occur. One respondent in this study felt that his sisters 'had been robbed' in order for him to become the farmer. Another spent years of negotiating with his siblings, all of whom saw themselves as successors.

The placement of the successor on the farm depended upon the financial status of the farm. Farmers hoped that they could place one child but only the more affluent expected to be able to set up more than one. Wilkening (1981) argues that to the extent that farmland is transferred between generations, the price tends to be kept below market value. However, volatile real estate markets may mean that this provides less advantage than the timing of the transfer. The nature of the transfer and the share received by the son or daughter taking over the farm will affect the burden carried by the farming child and the perceived equity or inequity of the division of family assets among the siblings.

A norm among farming families appears to be that potential successors should have a period of time after they complete their education to work, travel or take part in activities away from home. The purpose of these activities is seen as giving the child a chance to make a positive choice to go farming and to give him something to fall back on. The OE (Overseas Experience) also serves an important function in the coordination of family and business cycles. Sons may have finished their education by age 18 or 20. In most cases, their parents consider themselves too young to transfer the business. Thus an OE of several years duration can allow for better coordination of business and family cycles and a better timing of parent's retirement.

There were a variety of attitudes toward family succession in farming. While most men and women in this study valued family succession, a few felt that it was either impossible or undesirable to encourage a child to take over the farm. It is not clear whether those who value family succession and those who do not, behave differently toward their children during the early

phases of the succession process. All couples talked about whether or not their children showed an interest in farming at a young age (watching for interest). And all could state which of their adolescent children might be an eligible successor by virtue of an interest in farming (determining eligibility). It may be at the third stage that differences begin to appear. Those who do not value succession do not talk to children about taking over. This is in contrast to those who do value succession and encourage even non-interested (but eligible) children to consider farming as a possible occupation.

Hypotheses:

The choice of a family successor begins when children are very young. Perceptions of when a successor is chosen differ between parents and children. Attitudes of both children and parents determine whether there will be a family successor. The following hypotheses are developed on data from the choice of a successor.

1. Children know who will be the family successor before parents know.
2. Girls are not considered as successors if there are boys in the family.
3. In an all-girl family, girls who marry 'farmers' are more likely to be chosen as successors.
4. Perceived ability of the farm to support a successor influences whether a successor is chosen.
5. Males who show more interest and farming ability will more likely be chosen as successors, regardless of birth order.

3.5 Conclusion

Findings from this study tell us as much about how farm men and women move through their business and family lives as they do about how farms are transferred from one generation to the next. Transfer is not an event. There is no equivalent of the gold watch and the trip to Europe to symbolize the end of farming. Just as families form and reform as they age, so does the entry and exit of generations require connections slowly formed and slowly broken.

Farming continues to be a family business. For the most part farm men and women in this study like the business they are in and would not trade it for another way of making a living. They recognize the difficulty of incorporating new members like daughters-in-law and of letting go so that the next generation has its chance. They know that farming is still a man's world, although women are developing new kinds of partnerships that their grandmothers did not have. They feel a connection to the land, as harsh and forgiving as it sometimes can be.

I must learn again
to praise, to bless this land
we come from, flesh or clay, this mother-
earth where our own mothers dwell.

I just learn to care for it
as a mother her child, a fox
her pups in the hidden den,
a man his broken body.

I must learn to place
my ear to the soil,
hear what the land is saying
in its several tongues

for its songs are the oldest songs,
songs of seeds and harvests,
gain and loss,
the stones with their sad lament

for the sweet lost singers
of the grass and the air.
This is the place to
begin. Looking to the earth

for our answers, not the sky.
Listening to the long
drawn-out vowels of the land
(for they are there,

I tell you) as it speaks
across the thin blue distance
we call time, across our own
brief histories of the heart.

.....from Time To Praise
Lorna Crozier
August 1990

REFERENCES

- Agriculture Canada. (1987), Family Farm Forum Report. Ottawa.
- Alexander, P. (1987), Text of address re 'up market farming' Sheep & Beef Farm Seminar at Richmond on 23rd April 1987. Unpublished manuscript. Christchurch, NZ.
- Anderson, R., & Rosenblatt, P. (1985), "Intergenerational transfer of farm land". Journal of Rural Community Psychology, 6(1): 19-25.
- Barnes, L. & Hershon, S. (1976), "Transferring power in the family business". Harvard Business Review July-August: 105-114.
- Bengtson, V. & Kuypers, J. (1971), "Generational difference and the developmental stake. Aging and Human Development 2: 249-260.
- Bennett, J. & Kohl, S. (1982), "Farm and families in North American agriculture". In John W. Bennett (ed.), Of Time and the Enterprise. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boehlje, M. (1973), "The entry-growth-exit processes in agriculture". Southern Journal of Agricultural Economics July: 23-32.
- Crozier, L. (1991), Time to Praise in J. Martin (ed.), Alternative Futures for Prairie Agricultural Communities. Faculty of Extension, University of Alberta.
- Department of Statistics (1990), The New Zealand Official 1990 Yearbook. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Fairweather, J. (1987), "Farmers' responses to economic restructuring: Preliminary analysis of survey data". AERU Research Report No. 187, Lincoln College, Canterbury, New Zealand.
- Gill, T., Koopman-Boyden, P., Parr, A. & Wilmott, W. (1976), The Rural Women of New Zealand: A National Survey. Christchurch: University of Canterbury.
- Glaser, B. (1978), Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded theory. Mill Valley, California: The Sociology Press.
- Guba, E. (1978), Toward a Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry in Educational Evaluation. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation.
- Hedlund, D. & Berkowitz, A. (1979), "The incidence of social-psychological stress in farm families". International Journal of Sociology of the Family 9, 233-243.

- Keating, N. & Munro, B. (1988), Farm women/farm work. Sex Roles, 19 : 155-168.
- Keating, N. & Munro, B. (1989), "Transferring the family farm: process and implications". Family Relations 38 : 215-218.
- Knipscheer, K. & Bevers, A. (1985), "Older parents and their middle-aged children: Symmetry or asymmetry in their relationship". Canadian Journal on Aging 4(3) : 145-159.
- Laband, D. & Lentz, B. (1983), "Occupational inheritance in agriculture". American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 65(2) : 311-314.
- Lincoln, Y & Guba, E. (1985), Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.
- Loveridge, A. (1987), "Studying the lives of farm workers: Some methodological issues". Paper presented to the annual conference of the New Zealand Sociological Association, Massey University.
- Loveridge, A. (1989), "Dad sold the farm and a job came up on the forestry: Class mobility in the New Zealand farm workforce". Paper presented to the annual conference of The Sociological Association of Australia, La Trobe University, Melbourne.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (1989), Designing Qualitative Research. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Magnuson-Martinson, S., & Bauer, J. (1985), "Family farm and estate planning: Some important considerations". The Rural Sociologist, 3 : 151-159.
- Marotz-Baden, R., (1988), "Income satisfaction and stress in two-generation farm families". Lifestyles, 9 : 331-356.
- Marotz-Baden, R., & Cowan, D. (1987), "Mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law: The effects of proximity on conflict and stress". Family Relations, 36 : 385-390.
- Martin, S. & Lee, W. (1990), "A general framework for considering risk management at the farm level". In R. Johnson (ed.), Management of Risk in New Zealand Farming. Rural Policy Unit, MAF Technology, Wellington, NZ.
- McDonald, L., & Wanner, R. (1990) Retirement in Canada. Toronto: Butterworths.
- N.Z. Planning Council (1982), "Rural Change : Farming and the Rural Community in the 1970s". NZPC No. 21, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Pearson, J. (1979), "Research note on female farmers". Rural Sociology, 44 : 189-200.

- Russell, C., Griffin, C., Flinchbaugh, C., Martin, M., & Atilano, R. (1985) "Coping strategies associated with intergenerational transfer of the family farm". *Rural Sociology*, 50(3) : 361-376.
- Salamon, S., & O'Reilly, S. (1979), "Family land and developmental cycles among Illinois farmers". *Rural Sociology*, 44(3) : 525-542.
- Selles, R. (1988), *The Process of Retirement among Dutch-Canadian Farmers in Neerlandia, Alberta*. M.Sc. thesis, Department of Family Studies, University of Alberta.
- Sparrow, M. & Young, B. (1983), "Problems and prospects for women on farms". *Studies in Rural Change*, No. 9, Canterbury, New Zealand.
- Tipple, R. (1987), "Labour relations in New Zealand agriculture". *Sociologia Ruralis*, 28 : 38-55.
- Titus, S., Rosenblatt, P., & Anderson, R. (1979), "Family conflict over inheritance of property". *The Family Coordinator*, 28 : 337-346.
- Weigel, R. & Weigel, D. (1987), "Identifying stressors and coping strategies in two-generation farm families". *Family Relations*, 36 : 379-384.
- Wilkening, E. (1981), "Family Aspects of the New Wave of Immigrants to Rural Communities", in R.T. Coward et al. (eds.), *The Family in Rural Society*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Yerex, D. (1981), "Farm purchase... What chance for the next generation?" *New Zealand Journal of Agriculture*. March: 33-41.

Appendix

Background to the Study

"Farmers are the largest group of independent business people in New Zealand. The farm family lives on the job, shares the work, hears and reads about the benefits and feels the overdraft. If they do well, they all prosper; if they fail they all suffer. They seldom brag because they know that things which look great today can look bad tomorrow as a result of weather, disease, markets and government. Out of all this comes a humility a deep faith, a readiness to accept disappointment and a reluctance to admit that sometimes things are going well" (Alexander, 1987)

Although agriculture has been seen as fundamental to the New Zealand economy, support to that segment of the economy has not always been parallel to that of the urban business sector. In fact, over the past six decades differential treatment of urban and rural sectors have often lead to tensions between town and rural people with one group seeing the other as favoured by current policy or subsidy.

The great depression of the 1930s affected all New Zealanders, particularly townspeople who experienced high rates of unemployment. Out of this event, urban New Zealanders looked to the government for protection through import licensing, pensions for public servants, development of unions and monopoly rights for trades from plumbing to medicine. Government provided little assistance to agriculture, although agriculture enjoyed reasonable world prices through the 1950s and 1960s. During this period technical change swept through the farming business. The hills blossomed as a result of aerial top-dressing; and output per worker increased rapidly as a result of investment in farm facilities such as the herringbone shed, streamlined woolsheds and farm fencing and tracks.

Farm exports declined in the 1960s and it became government policy to encourage farming with greater assistance directly from taxpayer funds. Unlike the protection of manufacturers and public servants with covert assistance, the subsidies to farming in the form of SMPs (Supplementary Minimum Payments) were highly visible. SMPs had mixed reviews. They were welcomed by many farmers because they provided a buffer against rising on and off-farm costs, inflation, high interest rates and shrinking and uncertain markets. Many farmers in North Canterbury and other farming regions maintained that they could not farm and survive without subsidies (N.Z. Planning Council, 1982). However, economists and some farming leaders argued that SMPs were distorting production and market signals to the detriment of successful long-term farming and thereby to the economy of the country. Support to farmers was also seen as preferential by townspeople who felt that their needs were not being similarly

recognized. Most townspeople were unaware of the privilege conferred on them by government intervention with protection from competition.

By the early 1980s there was a recognition that the economy of New Zealand required restructuring. During the first term of the Labour Government (1984-87), a deregulation and free market philosophy drove the restructuring process. The architect of the radical reforms was the Minister of Finance, Roger Douglas. His blueprint for reform, called "Rogernomics", encompassed free trade, the principle of user-pay, and genuine competition allowing commodities to find their own price and cost levels.

Agriculture was the first sector to be deregulated. Overnight subsidies were withdrawn and SMP's passed into history. This was done with severe impacts on rural life. From 1984, farm incomes declined, while interest rates and the cost of capital continued to rise. Because agricultural assistance had been capitalised into land values during the peak times of support assistance, when support was withdrawn farm values tumbled (Martin and Lee, 1990). Farmers came to resent what they saw as the relative comfort of their city business colleagues.

Some farming regions of New Zealand were particularly hard hit by deregulation because of concurrent drought conditions. While farmers in North Canterbury are known for their drought management skills, the droughts that ravaged the area in the 1970s while equally severe as those that followed in the 1980s were not as devastating because farmers then were in a healthier financial state to resist the depredations to stock and land. The droughts of the eighties together with withdrawal of financial support brought many farmers to their knees.

While there are some signs of improvement in the general economic conditions of agriculture, the recovery is far from complete and is certainly not universal. At the time this study was undertaken The New Zealand Wool Board followed Australian policy by announcing a drastic cut in minimum wool prices. Sheep farmers, like those in this study faced a 44% cut in their wool income for the 1990/91 season. Nevertheless in his farewell speech at the recent Federated Farmers conference the retiring president, Brian Chamberlin endorsed the now well-established agricultural policy of deregulation and warned against a return in any form to subsidisation.

It is against this economic background that no longer includes market stability or guaranteed prices that the retirement plans of today's farmers will succeed or fail. Every farmer we spoke with, irrespective of age or position in the exit/entry process, talked of the difficulty of planning a retirement strategy in this uncertain economic climate.

RESEARCH REPORT

- 178 **A Contractual Framework for Evaluating Agricultural and Horticultural Marketing Channels**, S.K. Martin, A.C. Zwart, 1986.
- 179 **An Integrated Framework for Analysing Agricultural Marketing Issues**, S.K. Martin, A.N. Rae, A.C. Zwart, 1986.
- 180 **Labour Mobility Between New Zealand and Australia**, R.L. St Hill, 1986.
- 181 **Survey of New Zealand Farmer Intentions and Opinions, November 1985-January 1986**, J.G. Pryde, P.J. McCartin, 1986.
- 182 **A Financial and Economic Survey of South Auckland Town Milk Producers and Factory Supply Dairy Farmers, 1984-85**, R.G. Moffitt, 1986.
- 183 **An Economic Survey of New Zealand Town Milk Producers, 1984-85**, R.G. Moffitt, 1986.
- 184 **An Economic Survey of NZ Wheatgrowers: Financial Analysis, 1984-85**; R.D. Lough, P.J. McCartin, 1986.
- 185 **The Effect on Horticulture of Dust and Ash: Proposed Waikato Coal-Fired Power Station**, P.R. McCrea, October 1986.
- 186 **A Study of the Determinants of Fattening and Grazing Farm Land Prices in New Zealand, 1962 to 1983**. P.G. Seed, R.A. Sandrey, B.D. Ward., December 1986.
- 187 **Farmers' Responses to Economic Restructuring in Hurunui and Clutha Counties: Preliminary Analysis of Survey Data**. J.R. Fairweather, July 1987.
- 188 **Survey of NZ Farmer Intentions and Opinions, October-December 1986**. J.G. Pryde, P.J. McCartin, July 1987.
- 189 **Economic Adjustment in New Zealand: A Developed Country Case Study of Policies and Problems**, R.G. Lattimore, July 1987.
- 190 **An Economic Survey of New Zealand Town Milk Producers 1985-86**, R.G. Moffitt, November 1987.
- 191 **The Supplementary Minimum Price Scheme: a Retrospective Analysis**, G.R. Griffith, T.P. Grundy, January 1988.
- 192 **New Zealand Livestock Sector Model: 1986 Version. Volumes 1 and 2**, T.P. Grundy, R.G. Lattimore, A.C. Zwart, March 1988.
- 193 **An Economic Analysis of the 1986 Deregulation of the New Zealand Egg Industry**, J.K. Gibson, April 1988.
- 194 **Assistance to the Tourist Industry**, R. Sandrey, S. Scanlan, June 1988.
- 195 **Milk Purchasing: a consumer survey in Auckland and Christchurch**, R.L. Sheppard, July 1988.
- 196 **Employment and Unemployment in Rural Southland**, J. R. Fairweather, November 1988.
- 197 **Demand for Wool by Grade**
A. C. Zwart, T. P. Grundy, November 1988
- 198 **Financial Market Liberalisation in New Zealand: an Overview**, R. L. St Hill, December 1988.
- 199 **An Economic Evaluation of Coppice Fuelwood Production for Canterbury**, J. R. Fairweather, A. A. MacIntyre, April 1989
- 200 **An Economic Evaluation of Biological Control of Rose-Grain Aphid in New Zealand**, T.P. Grundy, May 1989
- 201 **An Economic Evaluation of Biological Control of Sweet Brier**, T. P. Grundy, November 1989
- 202 **An Economic Evaluation of Biological Control of Hieracium**, T. P. Grundy, November 1989
- 203 **An Economic Evaluation of the Benefits of Research into Biological Control of Clematis Vitalba**, G. Greer, R. L. Sheppard, 1990.
- 204 **The Q Method and Subjective Perceptives of Food in the 1990s**, J. R. Fairweather 1990
- 205 **Management Styles of Canterbury Farmers: a study of goals and success from the farmers' point of view**. J. R. Fairweather, N. C. Keating, 1990
- 206 **Tax Shields: their implications for farm project investment, risk and return**. P. R. McCrea, T. P. Grundy, D. C. Hay, 1990
- 207 **Public Drinking and Social Organisation in Methven and Mt Somers**. J. R. Fairweather and H. Campbell, 1990.
- 208 **Generations in Farm Families: Transfer of the Family Farm in New Zealand**. N. C. Keating, H. M. Little, 1991

DISCUSSION PAPERS

- 114 **A Summary of the Financial Position of Canterbury Farms — mid 1987**. J.G. Pryde, November 1987.
- 115 **A Case for Removal of Tariff Protection**, R.L. St Hill, December 1987.
- 116 **Government Livestock Industry Policies: Price Stabilisation and Support**, G. Griffith, S. Martin, April 1988
- 117 **The NZ Sheepmeat Industry and the Role of the NZ Meat Producer's Board**, A. Zwart, S. Martin, March 1988
- 118 **Desirable Attributes of Computerised Financial Systems for Property Managers**, P. Nuthall, P. Oliver, April 1988
- 119 **Papers Presented at the Twelfth Annual Conference of the NZ Branch of the Australian Agricultural Economics Society**, Volumes 1 and 2, April 1988
- 120 **Challenges in Computer Systems for Farmers**, P. Nuthall, June 1988
- 121 **Papers Presented at the Thirteenth Annual Conference of the N.Z. Branch of the Australian Agricultural Economics Society**, Volumes 1 and 2, November 1988
- 122 **A Review of the Deregulation of the NZ Town Milk Industry**, R. G. Moffitt, R. L. Sheppard, November 1988.
- 123 **Do our Experts Hold the Key to Improved Farm Management?** P. L. Nuthall, May 1989
- 124 **Some Recent Changes in Rural Society in New Zealand**, J. R. Fairweather, July 1989
- 125 **Papers Presented at the Fourteenth Annual Conference of the N.Z. Branch of the Australian Agricultural Economics Society**, Volumes 1 and 2, October 1989
- 126 **Marketing Boards and Anti-Trust Policy**, E. McCann, R. G. Lattimore, 1990.
- 127 **Marketing of Agricultural and Horticultural Products — selected examples**, K. B. Nicholson, 1990
- 128 **Methven and Mt. Somers: Report on Socio-Economic History and Current Social Structure**. H. R. Campbell, J. R. Fairweather, 1991

Additional copies of Research Reports, apart from complimentary copies, are available at \$20.00 each. Discussion Papers are usually \$15.00 but copies of Conference Proceedings (which are usually published as Discussion Papers) are \$20.00. Discussion Papers No.119 and 121 are \$20.00 per volume and Discussion Paper No. 109 is \$29.70.