

**INTENDING SMALLHOLDERS' AND
EXISTING SMALLHOLDERS'
PERCEPTIONS OF THE RURAL LIFESTYLE
AROUND CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND**

John R Fairweather

Research Report No.220

August, 1993

**Agribusiness & Economics Research Unit
PO Box 84
Lincoln University
CANTERBURY**

**Telephone No: (64) (3) 325 2811
Fax No: (64) (3) 325 3847**

ISSN 1170-7682

AGRIBUSINESS & ECONOMICS RESEARCH UNIT

LINCOLN UNIVERSITY CANTERBURY, NEW ZEALAND



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 1993

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

(Professor of Farm Management)

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 1993

Director

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

Assistant Director

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

Senior Research Officer

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

Research Officers

C. M. Scully, B.A.

K. M. Hanson, B.Sc. Cert. Ed.

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

G. F. Thomson, B.Com.

Secretary

J Clark

CONTENTS

| | | |
|------------------|---|-------|
| LIST OF TABLES | | (i) |
| PREFACE | | (iii) |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | | (v) |
| SUMMARY | | (vii) |
| CHAPTER 1 | BACKGROUND ON SMALLHOLDING IN NEW ZEALAND | 1 |
| | 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| | 1.2 Overseas Literature | 1 |
| | 1.3 Motivation for Smallholding in New Zealand | 2 |
| | 1.4 Rural Symbols and Images in New Zealand Culture | 4 |
| | 1.5 Objectives of the Research | 5 |
| CHAPTER 2 | METHODS AND THEORETICAL APPROACH TO SMALLHOLDING | 7 |
| | 2.1 Theoretical Background and General Approach | 7 |
| | 2.2 Basic Design, Sampling and Interview Schedule | 8 |
| | 2.3 Q-method Analysis of Rural and Urban Attitudes | 9 |
| | 2.4 Limitations of the Research | 9 |
| CHAPTER 3 | RESULTS | 11 |
| | 3.1 Data on Smallholdings in Canterbury | 11 |
| | 3.2 Sample Size and Smallholding Size | 11 |
| | 3.3 Intending Smallholders | 14 |
| | 3.3.1 Background Dissimilarities and Similarities | 14 |
| | 3.3.2 Primary Goals | 14 |
| | 3.3.3 Lifestyle Values | 15 |
| | 3.3.4 Q-sort Data | 16 |
| | 3.3.5 Summary | 19 |
| | 3.4 Existing Smallholders | 20 |
| | 3.4.1 Background Dissimilarities | 20 |
| | 3.4.2 Primary Goals | 20 |
| | 3.4.3 Lifestyle Values | 22 |
| | 3.4.4 Q-sort Data | 22 |
| | 3.4.5 Reasons for Selling | 25 |
| | 3.4.6 Summary | 26 |

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| CHAPTER 4 | CONCLUSION | 27 |
| 4.1 | Main Points | 27 |
| 4.2 | Overall Summary | 27 |
| 4.3 | General Discussion | 28 |
| 4.4 | Smallholding in Ideal Type Terms | 29 |
| 4.5 | Constraints to Smallholding Viability | 30 |
| 4.6 | Smallholding as Part of a Development Process | 32 |
| | LIST OF REFERENCES | 33 |
| APPENDIX 1 | LIST OF Q-SORT STATEMENTS | 35 |
| APPENDIX 2 | KEY QUESTIONS - INTENDING SMALLHOLDERS | 39 |
| APPENDIX 3 | KEY QUESTIONS - EXISTING SMALLHOLDERS | 43 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Freehold Open Market Sales of Smallholdings for Canterbury, 1987-1992 | 12 |
| 2. Number and Sizes of Smallholdings in the Sample, by Location | 13 |
| 3. Number of Smallholders Interviewed, by Location | 13 |
| 4. Frequency of Intending Smallholders' Goals | 15 |
| 5. Frequency of Intending Smallholders' Lifestyle Values | 16 |
| 6. Intending Smallholders' Normalised Factor Scores for Factor 1 | 17 |
| 7. Frequency of Existing Smallholders' Goals | 20 |
| 8. Intended and Current Land Uses of Existing Smallholders | 21 |
| 9. Frequency of Existing Smallholders' Lifestyle Values | 22 |
| 10. Existing Smallholders' Normalised Factor Scores for Factor 1 | 24 |
| 11. Reasons Given for Leaving the Smallholding | 26 |

PREFACE

As part of the AERU's ongoing interest in research on farming and rural society, this report addresses the topic of smallholding. While smallholding is a popular activity around many New Zealand cities there has been little recent study since research in the late 1970s. This research report takes up the topic again by way of a preliminary study of perceptions of the rural lifestyle and how these change over time. This report will be of value to policymakers concerned with smallholding, and to interested observers of contemporary developments in New Zealand primary production.

A C Zwart
DIRECTOR

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has been funded by the Canterbury Regional Council. Mr Max Barber, Planning Manager, Canterbury Regional Council provided effective liaison and helpful guidance throughout the project. Jenny Ridgen, Mary Davenport and Robert Skinner provided assistance with selecting names of smallholders from Council archives. Helpful comments on an earlier draft were received from Dr Simon Swaffield and Dr Rupert Tipples, Departments of Landscape and Horticulture respectively, Lincoln University.

SUMMARY

In this qualitative study of smallholders around Christchurch a total of 58 people on 33 smallholdings were interviewed to learn about perceptions of the rural lifestyle. Intending smallholders, those who had just obtained building permits, were a diverse group in terms of ages and type of family. Their primary goals were to obtain income from the land, typically from horticultural land use, and to enjoy a lifestyle which valued privacy, clean air, freedom and quietness, and which was good for raising children. Data from a Q-sort of statements about urban and rural values showed preferences for wilderness values and some farming and agricultural values, and disagreement with statements reflecting negative aspects of rural living. There were no strong anti-urban sentiments. Existing smallholders, those who obtained building permits five years ago, were also a diverse group and their primary goal was country living. They had undertaken horticultural and animal land uses but their economic expectations had not been met, and the land uses not developed to the extent that they had hoped. They enjoyed lifestyle values of openness, quietness, clean air, animals and lowered pressure. Q-sort data were similar to intending smallholders but existing smallholders more highly rated being close to nature and positive aspects of rural living. Data on reasons for selling the smallholding showed that few had left out of dissatisfaction and returned to the city. The discussion focuses on explanation of smallholding in terms of meanings, and includes analysis of constraints to smallholding viability.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND ON SMALLHOLDING IN NEW ZEALAND

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an introduction to the research on smallholding around Christchurch by way of a literature review which draws on both overseas and New Zealand literature. While a certain amount of information is available on smallholders it will be shown that there is little research which focuses on perceptions of the rural lifestyle and how these may change over time. Not included in this review is literature on the theme of the city and the country.

1.2 Overseas Literature

Generally, there is not a large international literature on smallholders. A number of reasons are relevant. First, the 'smallholders' keyword leads to literature on relatively ordinary farms in Europe which are small in size when compared to New Zealand farms and on which full-time farming can occur. The keyword also leads to 'peasant' farming in third world research, that is, full-time but not intensively economic farms as in developed countries. The literature does note some aspects of smallfarming which are relevant to the situation in New Zealand such as migration and second homes. The phenomenon of urban to rural migration has occurred in both Europe and North America. In Europe this trend is considered to be a major factor in changing rural living space (Berlan-Darque and Collomb, 1991), and some see the migration as a result of sustained low levels of fertility in recent decades (Serow, 1991). A related phenomenon is the occurrence of second homes. In Europe, there is conversion of farmsteads into housing used for businesses, which is partly due to urbanisation processes and partly due to changes endemic in rural society (Van der Vaart, 1990). Typically, in the Netherlands at least, most of the owners of converted farmsteads are local people. In Canada, Samson (1991) has described second homes around Montreal and Quebec and these introduce new and distinctive features into rural areas such that second homes are an extension of the city into the country.

Literature from North America is more relevant to the smallholding phenomenon, although there appears to be no specific studies. Partly relevant is Williams and Jobes (1990) who provided a detailed survey of in-migrants to the Gallaten Valley, Montana, USA. They examined relative importance of quality of life as opposed to economic motivations. They found evidence to support the view that there was a new ethic in which occupation and income considerations were regarded as secondary or incidental to quality of life motivations among some persons. This study included a rural town and was not focused exclusively on smallholders. However it reminds us that in the US there has been in recent decades a population 'turnaround' in which there has been a movement of people to rural areas. Anti-urbanism is an obvious factor in this process (Blackwood and Carpenter, 1978; Ilvento and Zuloff, 1982).

It seems then that people have favourable views of the rural lifestyle, and this has been examined by Willits et al. (1990). Telephone and mail surveys of a random sample of rural, suburban and urban Pennsylvanian residents focused on images of rurality. Results showed

that there were five factor analysis factors that underlay a list of 35 statements about rural and urban life, namely, 'positive rurality', 'negative rurality', 'antiurbanism', 'agrarian values', and 'wilderness values'. There were statistically significant differences in the frequencies of respondents agreeing with the statements depending on whether the respondents were rural or urban. However, all respondents were willing to ascribe virtue and goodness to things, people and places called rural. The authors called this imagery the 'rural mystique', involving an aura of treasured and sacred elements, and they note research on residential preference shows that more people voice a preference for rural living than are living there.

The return to smallholdings does occur in the USA. Fitchen (1991:91) describes this return migration to rural communities as consisting of former 'rural residents' returning home to jobs, young adults of lower socioeconomic status returning as unemployed, and new migrants who are year round residents. The latter come from nearby metropolitan areas and purchase houses in the countryside or villages. Many travel away to work each day. Some of this group become 'backyard farmers' who have professional occupations that they conduct out of offices in their homes, some are making mid-life career changes, and others are retiring early from urban professional occupations. Fitchen notes that as a group they are choosing rural quality of life advantages rather than high urban incomes, while their children are still young enough to enjoy the benefits of rural living. Second home development is also common in the North Eastern states. These recent demographic changes have led to tensions occurring between 'farm people' and 'city' people, manifesting in competition for housing and land, and demands for services beyond local capacities or wants.

The international literature shows that the phenomenon of smallholding subdivision in New Zealand has parallels in North America only. It is likely that this phenomenon is occurring in Australia. Smallholding subdivision is part of a broader demographic pattern of urban to rural migration and it involves favourable views of the rural. The decision to settle on a smallholding seems to reflect an emphasis on quality of life considerations. Smallholding subdivision in New Zealand is unique by world standards and provides an opportunity to study a distinctive phenomenon which can tell us much about perceptions of the rural lifestyle.

1.3 Motivation for Smallholding in New Zealand

In the late 1970s smallholdings were the focus of considerable research attention in New Zealand. The Paparua County Council surveyed smallholders in 1979 and published a three volume report (Lawn et al. N.D.), the Town and Country Planning Division of the Ministry of Works published a three volume study of smallholdings in New Zealand (Jowet, 1976; Gardner, 1978), and the Geography Department at the University of Auckland published a four volume study of smallholdings in the Auckland region in 1980 (Moran et al. 1980). These items of literature, while not a comprehensive selection, can tell us something of the motivation behind smallholding.

Lawn et al. (N.D.:16) found that most of the smallholders previously resided in Christchurch or in rural towns in Canterbury, and they were motivated by the appeal of the rural environment and associated lifestyle, including clean air and open spaces. Farming and agricultural interests ranked relatively low as a motivation for moving into a rural environment. It was reported that very few of the smallholders were dissatisfied with their

rural lifestyle. Just over one half of the smallholders had had some association with farming in the past and some had been born and raised in a rural environment. The average size of smallholding was eight hectares. Many respondents said they would have preferred a larger property. Agricultural production on the smallholdings developed on one subdivided farm was, at the time of survey, equal to the original farm production and trending upwards. The companion survey of smallholdings showed that more smallholdings were being utilised at average or above average efficiency than were being utilised at below average efficiency.

Lawn et al. (N.D.) provided a picture of smallholding in the late 1970s. At that time the smallholders were typically family aged (that is, not less than 30 years or over 57 years). Most people had professional, managerial or skilled work typically located in Christchurch. There were 18 per cent retired, 20 per cent full-time and 62 per cent part-time. Their holdings were on average six to eight hectares in size. The random sample of smallholdings in Paparua County showed a variety of land uses. However, 47 per cent of the sample had a main land use of stock, 14 per cent were 'diversified', and there were 11 per cent respectively for mixed cropping and livestock, and horticulture. The intensity of land use ranged from smallholdings that were purely residential to some that were highly intensive horticultural or factory farms. More of the full-time smallholders engaged in factory farming or diversified land uses, and fewer engaged in stock or crop land uses. Horticulture was the most frequently noted anticipated new land use.

Jowett (1976) surveyed smallholdings nationally to find that there were about 27,000 rural holdings between about one and ten hectares, occupying a total of 100,000 hectares. These smallholdings were commonly used for residential purposes with just under one half of the total number used as a source of income. However, for most of these less than one quarter of household income was obtained from the land. Gardner (1978:119) further analysed the above survey data and noted the level of satisfaction with present living place compared to previous living place. Seventy six per cent of respondents selected 'more satisfactory', indicating fairly high levels of satisfaction with the rural lifestyle. Two thirds of respondents also indicated that they would almost certainly be living on their current property in five years' time.

Moran et al. (1980:1:25) directly address the issue of motivation behind smallholding on properties between one and ten hectares. They reported that both full-time and part-time smallholders have a basic family-orientated motivation to live in a rural environment away from the city, seeing this as a more suitable environment in which to raise children. Both full-time smallholders (those working full-time on their properties) and part-time smallholders rated important 'to avoid living in an urban environment' and 'to live in a rural environment yourselves'. Full-timers only rated 'to grow and sell horticultural crops' as important, while part-timers gave strongest support for 'to raise children in a rural environment'. Moran et al. also note that the principle motivations for rural living have remained constant over time. The locations of previous residence were also studied. About one quarter of households came from within the smallholder areas, including rural townships. However, 62 per cent came from Auckland city.

Yerex (1988) makes some observations on the motivations of smallholders. He notes that some people prefer the semi-rural setting once they have started a family, seeing it as a healthier, freer life for children. Also important is taking pleasure in the natural world and leading an active independent life. In short, the rural lifestyle appeals to individualists who

can work by themselves. Some smallholders are 'rural jet setters' - the wealthy professional and business executives who build expensive new homes and are sometimes first in on new types of farming such as deer or goat farming. Sometimes they are intending to develop a retirement unit. Other smallholders are self-employed consultants or writers. Finally, some smallholders adopt country living for philosophic reasons or are alternative lifestylers who reject some aspect of contemporary urban society.

The New Zealand literature to date, only partly reviewed here, provides some detailed information on smallholding, in particular the planning aspects, the needs for services and general characteristics. The impression from this slightly dated literature is that smallholders come from urban areas, seem to stay on their holdings and, if they were to move, to move to another smallholding. They value living in the countryside and see it as good for raising children. They have appeared to be satisfied, not disillusioned, with their rural lifestyle. Not closely examined is the rate of turnover of properties, or changes in attitudes over time. There is no recent literature on smallholding.

1.4 Rural Symbols and Images in New Zealand Culture

The international and New Zealand literatures show that lifestyle is an important motivation for smallholding. Smallholders have perceptions of a rural lifestyle and these perceptions are part of the symbols and images associated with 'the rural'. These perceptions are a reflection of a nation's culture. To illustrate this point, the following discussion focuses on rural symbols and images expressed in such mundane media as television advertising, television programmes, and the popular press.

Images of land and the symbolism of land are portrayed frequently in television advertising. This observation has been pursued by Carter and Perry (1987) as they analysed three rural-based advertisements designed to sell frozen vegetables, sport shirts and personal computers. The time constraint of each advertisement requires that potent images and symbols be used in order to generate a message that sells a product. One ad featured a productive countryside in which growing and processing vegetables was part of the natural world. Another portrayed a rural setting characteristic of Footrot Flats on which is superimposed rural versus town competitors in a tug-of-war. The final advertisement showed rural characters coming to terms with an Apple computer in ways that were designed to appeal to urban business owners. Carter and Perry concluded that the countryside portrayed in the three ads presupposes that land is a commodity, and on which exists an inclusive, harmonious rural community. Also, Len Potts claims that rural humour makes his ads more 'New Zealand' (The Press, Saturday, May 8, 1993). Potts won the Axis Award from the advertising industry for such ads as 'Scotty and Crumpy', 'Welcome to Our World', and 'Sailing Away'. He uses the dry, understated humour that he hears in conversations at rural towns and rural service stations. Clearly, the rural imagery used in these television ads is successful in appealing to urban consumers.

Part of urban appreciation of rural life is the popularity accorded 'Country Calendar', one of New Zealand's longest running television programmes providing information and images of rural life. Frequently presented are rural characters, often individuals who farm by themselves and impress us with their hardy independence. One recent presentation featured an attractive young woman managing a high country farm by herself who appreciated most

the beauty and quietness of the remote countryside. As Jane Bowron described it in the Sunday Times (April 4, 1993) "the natural elements are tamed, the toiler fashions recalcitrant nature into economic units ...". Bowron goes on to say that "Nothing can hurt you watching Country Calendar; it's like warm milk when you can't sleep ..." and she says "I love Country Calendar, it's like time out in the float tank on a slow Saturday".

The soothing, recuperative elements of the countryside are not merely symbolic. Recently established near Christchurch is a retreat which offers a wide range of health-based activities to help visitors to learn to put their lives into perspective (The Press, April 28, 1993). Not surprisingly, the location is a rural retreat near Leeston called "Woodlands Country Retreat: for wellbeing and relaxation" with a "natural woodland" near the house. Visitors will be able to enjoy farmyard animals. Townies' interest in the countryside is illustrated by the membership characteristics of the Canterbury Branch of the New Zealand Tree Crops Association. A 1993 survey of members shows that 50 per cent of them live in Christchurch. Many of these people are interested in purchasing smallholdings. Presumably, the urban interest in smallholdings is supporting training courses for smallholders. Courses are provided by Christchurch Polytechnic and at Rangiora.

New Zealand culture is imbued with rural symbols and images. Many people value things that are rural and this status, value and popularity of rural images sustains interest in actually experiencing the rural life first hand. It is likely that smallholders will articulate strong rural values.

1.5 Objectives of the Research

The main objective of the proposed research is to study changing perceptions of the rural lifestyle. It is hypothesised that urban people moving to a smallholding have a romantic view of the rural lifestyle. After a few years they will develop a revised perception of the rural lifestyle that will either be acceptable and they will persist, or it will be unacceptable and they will move, or prefer to move, away from smallholding. It is further hypothesised that the romantic view of the rural lifestyle entails a negative view of the urban lifestyle.

Specific research objectives are as follows:

- (1) To describe urban perceptions of the smallholding lifestyle
- (2) To assess the motivations of and reasons for people moving into smallholdings
- (3) To describe urban perceptions of the urban lifestyle
- (4) To describe the changes over time, if any, in perceptions of rural lifestyle among those who have stayed and those who have departed
- (5) To describe rural perceptions of the smallholding lifestyle and to compare urban and rural perceptions of the smallholding lifestyles
- (6) To discuss the implications of the findings.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS AND THEORETICAL APPROACH TO SMALLHOLDING

2.1 Theoretical Background and General Approach

Max Weber has set out concepts and techniques useful in the conduct of social science research (Weber, 1978). For Weber, sociology is a science that attempts to develop an interpretive understanding of social action, that is behaviours oriented to or influenced by other people. In this study the act of setting up a smallholding is not an isolated action but one that is directly influenced by the existence of other people, whether as reaction to city life (a product of social activity) or as an orientation to one's own family. Smallholding is social action. Interpretation of social action requires description and explanation of the meanings that underlie social action, with particular care being given to elucidate actors' meanings. The interpretation of social action requires action and motivation to be accounted for in ways that show the causal links between meaning and action. Correct causal interpretation is based on an adequate grasp of meaning. In this study it is essential to understand what the act of smallholding means to its participants, taking into account variability in meaning.

Weber also provided a classification of types of social action, depending on general orientation. First, instrumentally rational social action occurs when behaviour is determined by attainment of rationally pursued and calculated ends. Second, value rational social action occurs when there is conscious belief in values, for their own sake. There is conscious formulation of ultimate values governing action, and the meaning of such guided actions does not lie in achieving a result but in carrying out the action for its own sake. Weber gave examples of duty, honour, pursuit of beauty, religious calling, personal loyalty or some cause but, in the present case, the value is the ongoing experience of the rural lifestyle.

Finally, Weber provides an account of the use of 'ideal types' as a technique to comprehend social reality. An ideal type is an idealised or purified, somewhat extreme model of social action and meaning which precipitates out the essential aspects of the topic being studied. The ideal type is theory (explanation) of the action and meaning which is subject to study. The task then is to describe ideal type(s) of meaningfully adequate patterns of smallholding behaviour.

In focusing on ideal types and patterns among different types of smallholders it is possible to generate an account of smallholders' perceptions of the rural lifestyle, and of their motivations and expectations. This mode of research is largely qualitative in nature in that it emphasises patterns of meaning. The task of this research is to make known what smallholding means to the people involved. It may be that the meanings are consistent or varied, or in fact more likely, a blend of some common elements with some distinctive elements. This type of research is not a quantitative survey in which a random sample is used to represent a population. In quantitative research the focus is on the characteristics of the sample and in learning about the population from knowledge about the sample. Such research typically fails to address the issue of meaning. Qualitative research is suitable for the study of meaning and has relevance to understanding a social phenomenon (such as

smallholding) in the population as a whole but it cannot account for population characteristics, such as average age or voting attitude or the proportions of different ideal types in the population. Such issues can only be addressed with quantitative research. As such this research is an essential starting point for the study of smallholding. Detailed issues relating to population characteristics can only be addressed in follow-up research. If, for example, this research were to find three patterns of meaning among smallholders, either intending or existing, then this research can only conclude that there are three patterns of meaning in the population. The precise population proportions await further research. It may be that the findings show fairly uniform patterns of meaning among smallholders which would lessen the need for quantitative research.

2.2 Basic Design, Sampling and Interview Schedule

The principle objective of the research is to examine changes in perception of the rural smallholding lifestyle. Part of this objective requires assessing whether change is occurring over time. It is necessary to study two groups of smallholders: those who are intending to build and live on a smallholding, and those who have lived on the smallholding for a number of years. If perceptions change then the results will show any changes when the two groups are compared. Further, because the focus is on perceptions and meanings associated with smallholding it is necessary to interview smallholders rather than send a questionnaire. To these ends two groups of smallholders were interviewed. Arrangements were made to interview in their home both members of the couple involved in the smallholding.

Lists of names of smallholders were taken from the relevant district and city council records of building and other permit applications. The areas included the Waimakariri District Council, the Christchurch City Council and the Selwyn District Council. Names were chosen which had a Christchurch or town address for the applicant for land areas of one to eight hectares. Typically, the list contained names from early 1993 going back about one year to yield about twenty names for each of the council areas. A total of 59 names of intending smallholders were obtained. For the existing smallholders the starting point of March 1988 was chosen as a point five years ago. For each council area about 25 names were selected, but because the rate of permit applications was slower five years ago, the list of names covered a longer period of time, going back two or more years. A total of 72 names of existing smallholders were obtained. It can be noted now that the rate of new dwellings was slower in 1988 in all districts so that to obtain a similar number to the intending smallholders required covering a longer time period. Not all names on the lists were used, and the main focus was on names that occurred within one year from the starting date.

The interview schedules for intending and existing smallholders were a one page list of questions covering background information and perceptions of smallholding (see Appendices 2 and 3). Smallholders were asked to review briefly where they had lived over the course of their life and to state whether they were urban or rural in background. They were asked to describe their type of employment (wage and salary or self employed), number and ages of children, and details of intended or actual land use. Then the interview opened into discussion about how smallholders came to decide on smallholding and what they saw as the advantages and disadvantages of the rural lifestyle. They were asked about the process of

getting on to a smallholding and why they chose their location. Final questions focused on how long they intended to stay on the smallholding and the relative importance of land use versus lifestyle. Existing smallholders were asked most of the above questions as they were relevant to them as intending smallholders, and then asked similar questions in the light of their experience. Particular attention was given to the viability of the land use at present and whether their perceptions had changed over time.

2.3 Q-method Analysis of Rural and Urban Attitudes

Quantitative data were gathered to complement the interview data. The Q-method was used to elicit responses to a series of 33 statements about urban and rural attitudes. The Q-method is well suited to intensive studies of relatively small groups of subjects and it allows people to express their viewpoints in a non-directed way in order to show in detail subjective perceptions of a given phenomenon (Brown, 1980; Fairweather, 1990). Each smallholder sorted a pile of 33 statements into a forced normal distribution ranging from agree to disagree. Computer analysis of the sorting data identified groups of people who sorted the statements in similar ways and then printed out average arrays of statements that best represented that group. Close inspection of these average arrays leads to an interpretation of that group's view about the subject matter in question.

In this research the statements were taken, with some slight modification, from Willits et al.'s (1990) study of popular images of rurality. These statements reflect positive and negative rurality, urbanism, agrarian values and wilderness values. The statements themselves were raw material for the smallholders who used them to create their own word picture of urban and rural life. The Q-method then was an ideal complement to the interview data because it allowed for people to express their own views about rural living, views which may not have been discussed during the interview.

2.4 Limitations of the Research

The basic design of this study of smallholders rests on comparison between intending smallholders and existing smallholders. The method entails comparing these two groups and seeing if expectations match the observations of those people who have experienced smallholding for five years. This comparison can indicate what effects the experience of smallholding may have but it does not prove that the experience caused any changes in attitude and behaviour because the group of existing smallholders is not necessarily the same as the group of intending smallholders. Putting it another way, there may be changes independent of the experience of smallholding. In the absence of ongoing research that would follow up smallholders each five years, the results of this study are an indication of likely changes due to the experience of smallholding. The study is also limited as noted above, in that it is not based on a quantitative survey that can describe population characteristics accurately. Another limitation derives from the particular groups studied, which do not include smallholders who bought properties with houses already on them. The results here relate to smallholders who have had a house built. Finally, since much of the data are derived from interviews, the accounts of smallholding rely on smallholders' views which may include rationalisations of behaviours. The study does not involve in-depth and critical evaluations of all the viewpoints expressed.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 Data on Smallholdings in Canterbury

There are two sources of data available: Valuation New Zealand data on property sales and Canterbury Regional Council data on planning applications. Valuation New Zealand data are shown in Table 1. For the six months ended December 1992 there was a total of 360 smallholdings sold on the freehold open market in Canterbury. Most of these, 224 or 62 per cent were improved smallholdings, that is, ones that included a dwelling. The total number of smallholdings sold in Canterbury has shown a general increase since December 1987 with a distinct blip downwards in December 1988 and June 1989 in response to the sharemarket crash. By December 1989 and June 1990 there was a rebound with the highest ever half yearly totals of 401 and 363 holdings respectively sold. Since then there has been a steady level of about 350 holdings, although there is a slight increase to December 1992 which at 360 holdings sold is the highest since the post crash blip. The average size of improved smallholdings shows a fairly even trend while for vacant smallholdings there has been a slight decline in the last year.

Valuation New Zealand data show that generally the turnover rate, the number of sales divided by the total number of properties, ranged from 1.9 per cent to 3.2 per cent across all areas in New Zealand. For Canterbury the figure is 2.1 per cent. Horticulture and specialist livestock farms have a New Zealand wide turnover rate of 4.0 per cent. Compared to these figures the turnover rate for improved smallholdings in Canterbury was 4.0 per cent, while for vacant smallholding was 7.0 per cent. For all Canterbury, the all smallholdings turnover rate was 4.0 per cent. Thus, the smallholdings turnover rate matches the rate for horticulture and specialised livestock, but is slightly higher than the overall Canterbury rate.

Green Belt Planning Applications data from the Canterbury Regional Council show a steady increase in the number of approvals between 1985-86 and 1990-91 (Canterbury Regional Council, 1992). For the last two years the numbers were 60 and 75 respectively. These numbers reflect new houses built on either land subdivided or on vacant smallholdings, that is, land already available and suitable for building a dwelling. There appears to be no information on the relative proportions. Over the last six years the average size of smallholdings on which applications to erect a Green Belt dwelling were approved was seven hectares. This is slightly larger than the average size of vacant smallholdings in the Canterbury area.

3.2 Sample Size and Smallholdings Size

Lists of intending smallholders and existing smallholders were drawn, going back one year at least, from an arbitrary date starting at approximately March 1991 and March 1988 respectively. Fairly complete data on the samples were available from Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council. Table 2 shows the number of cases in each list, and the average size of holding for lists going back one year. Table 3 shows the numbers

Table 1
Freehold Open Market Sale of Smallholdings for Canterbury, 1987 to 1992

| Half Year | Dec 1987 | June 1988 | Dec 1988 | June 1989 | Dec 1989 | June 1990 | Dec 1990 | June 1991 | Dec 1991 | June 1992 | Dec 1992 | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--|
| <u>VACANT</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. of Sales | 76 | 85 | 34 | 85 | 151 | 132 | 151 | 122 | 135 | 145 | 136 | |
| Average Sale Price (\$) | 60,695 | 49,915 | 58,587 | 56,581 | 55,598 | 62,500 | 69,865 | 63,515 | 70,201 | 68,884 | 81,281 | |
| Average Area (Ha) | 11.28 | 5.61 | 7.96 | 6.91 | 6.86 | 6.87 | 7.27 | 5.74 | 6.76 | 6.37 | 4.93 | |
| Average Sale Price per Ha (\$/ha) | 11,780 | 15,856 | 4,960 | 8,188 | 9,260 | 9,103 | 0,615 | 11,067 | 10,391 | 10,812 | 16,472 | |
| <u>IMPROVED</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. of Sales | 174 | 169 | 58 | 64 | 250 | 231 | 194 | 211 | 209 | 210 | 224 | |
| Average Sale Price (\$) | 148,818 | 141,173 | 127,281 | 135,746 | 137,589 | 172,254 | 163,885 | 170,837 | 165,290 | 185,353 | 184,384 | |
| Average Area (Ha) | 14.76 | 5.21 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.97 | 4.93 | 6.35 | 5.39 | 4.75 | 5.97 | 5.56 | |
| Average Sale Price per Ha (\$/ha) | 24,534 | 33,794 | 27,676 | 28,821 | 32,401 | 32,927 | 25,808 | 31,717 | 36,174 | 31,046 | 33,155 | |
| <u>TOTAL</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. of Sales | 250 | 254 | 92 | 149 | 401 | 363 | 345 | 333 | 344 | 355 | 360 | |
| Total Sale Price (\$000) | 305,071 | 281,010 | 93,724 | 134,971 | 427,928 | 457,307 | 423,433 | 437,954 | 440,227 | 489,123 | 523,562 | |

Source: Valuation New Zealand

Note: Prior to half year ended June 1990 the averages in this table are derived by averaging the figures given for North, Central, and South Canterbury respectively.

in each list and the number of smallholdings actually visited, giving an account of the reasons why not every smallholding was visited. Generally, the sample covers Selwyn District quite well for intending and existing smallholders, but fewer were visited in Waimakariri District and Christchurch City. Broad coverage of council areas is not a requirement for this study because with qualitative research the objective is to describe general patterns, not subtle variations that may be due to location. The general patterns of meaning described here can be expected to occur in all three council areas. The main unit of analysis in this study is the smallholding, each of which typically involved two people and is referred to here as the 'family'. There were 21 intending smallholding families and 13 existing smallholding families, totalling 34 smallholdings that were visited and, where possible, both men and women were interviewed. There were a total number of 58 people interviewed.

Table 2
Number and Sizes of Smallholdings, in the Sample by Location

| | Intending | Existing |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Selwyn District | n = 25, 5.6 ha. | n = 12, 7.6 ha. |
| Waimakariri District | n = 20, 4.0 ha. | n = 15, 6.6 ha. |
| Christchurch City | n = 14, - | n = 8 (estimated) |

Table 3
Numbers of Smallholders Interviewed, by Location

| | Intending Smallholders | Existing Smallholders | Total |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| Selwyn District | n = 25 | n = 12 | 37 |
| 4 P O Box only | | | |
| 1 untraceable | | | |
| 1 refused | | | |
| 1 away | | | |
| <u>3</u> not subdivided | | | |
| 10 | ∴ 15 visited | 10 visited | 25 |
| Waimakariri District | n = 20 | n = 15 | 35 |
| | 2 visited | 3 visited | 5 |
| Christchurch City | n = 14 | n = 8 (estimated) | 22 |
| 2 too busy | | | |
| 3 no 'phone | | | |
| <u>5</u> not contacted | | | |
| 10 | ∴ 4 visited | 0 visited | 4 |
| Total families | 21 | 13 | 34 |
| Total number of people | 37 | 21 | 58 |

3.3 Intending Smallholders

3.3.1 Background Dissimilarities and Similarities

The intending smallholders were a diverse group. They ranged widely in terms of age and family structure. The families included those who had not yet had children, those with young children, those with teenage children and those with adult children living their own lives. Some couples were recently married while others had 'retired' from their earlier employment and worked full-time on their smallholding. Of the 37 people included in the interviews there was only one single man undertaking smallholding. The intending smallholders had either rural or urban backgrounds, in roughly similar proportions. Thus, this group was not primarily urban, even though most of them were previously living in Christchurch.

Some common background characteristics did occur. Most of the smallholdings were small in size. In many cases both members of the couple were in full-time paid employment. Employment was either as a wage or salary earner or as self employment, although the latter was probably more frequent here than in the general population. Another broad similarity was the intended or initiated land use. In all but one case the land use was horticulture: the other case was horse training. The horticulture was wide-ranging, although flowers were a popular choice, followed by orcharding. Nearly all of the subjects did not have horticulture experience.

3.3.2 Primary Goals

Interview data were used to identify the primary goals of the intending smallholders and these are shown in Table 4. Of the 21 families studied there were 12 who emphasised the goal of retirement income, supplementary income, diversifying income, self employment or self sufficiency. The remaining families had a financial orientation but mentioned other goals. There were three families who emphasised jobs for children and three families who emphasised lifestyle. Finally, there was one family where the main motivation was to return to farming and two families where the smallholding was an adjunct to another business (builder and forestry contractor). Clearly, smallholding has a primary goal of generating income. The stated aim was to develop an alternative, productive activity. It was alternative because getting into a smallholding is a costly exercise for most people so that intending smallholders were working hard in other employment to fund the activity. The smallholding activity typically was in the process of being developed. For many of the intending smallholders the developed activity was to be the source of income in retirement. These smallholders were thus between two worlds: they were strongly linked to off-farm sources of income to sustain the venture, and they intended to break with these sources of income in future and retire on the property. Smallholding represented the essence of survival in today's world, with independent income associated with a satisfying lifestyle.

Table 4
Frequency of Intending Smallholders' Goals

| | |
|---|----|
| Retirement income, self employment, supplementary income, diversifying income, self sufficiency | 12 |
| Return to land | 1 |
| Jobs for children | 3 |
| Lifestyle | 3 |
| Part of business | 2 |

Retirement income means independence for these intending smallholders. Whether they are close to it or actually doing it, or intend to retire in the distant future, successful smallholding means financial independence, often referred to as 'self sufficiency'. But this is not a 'back to the land' self-sufficiency of the 1960s. It refers to economic activity linked to markets to make a profit. The focus on self sufficiency is no doubt supported by changes to superannuation in New Zealand whereby it is unlikely that younger adults can be assured of adequate pensions. This change makes the ideal of establishing a productive activity on land attractive, and for the younger couples is an important factor.

In the process of smallholding, the intending smallholders have had another primary goal: to overcome the barriers to entry. The two main barriers are cost and regulation. Cost is the relatively 'easy' barrier to overcome in the sense that the problem is clearly defined and addressed by hard work of both members of the couple. As noted before most members of the intending smallholder couples were in paid employment. During interviews the barrier of cost was not emphasised as a problem in the smallholding process. However, the other barrier, regulation, was noted as a major problem by nearly all subjects. Regulations regarding economic activity, building permit, house size, resource use (regarding septic tanks and wells for drinking water) were seen as a major problem. That these problems were overcome, with expenditure of time and money, speaks to the determination of intending smallholders. In some cases the intending smallholders came to the point, through recognising the costs involved in establishing a smallholding, that they would recommend buying an existing smallholding.

3.3.3 Lifestyle Values

The general objective of smallholding was retirement income. However, closely linked to this goal is a rural lifestyle. For these intending smallholders the most frequently mentioned aspect of the rural lifestyle was the privacy of open spaces away from close neighbours. Important was the relative isolation of smallholding from other people. Of the 21 families interviewed some aspect of privacy was mentioned 20 times (Table 5). Also mentioned frequently was the clean or fresh air and absence of smog which characterised the smallholding lifestyle, and how smallholding was good and healthy for children. The latter aspect was frequently, but not exclusively, mentioned by women. Finally, the remaining frequently mentioned aspect was the freedom associated with smallholding, typically in terms of applying one's own creativity to developing the property, and meeting the challenge of

doing this successfully. An important aspect of smallholding even for these intending smallholders was that rural activity in the weekend was a great stress reliever from regular work. This was expressed before the house was built.

Table 5
Frequency of Intending Smallholders' Lifestyle Values

| | |
|---|----|
| Quietness, peace, tranquillity, no noise | 5 |
| Privacy, open space, no neighbours, isolation, escape | 20 |
| Healthy, better pace of life | 3 |
| No smog, clean air, fresh air | 13 |
| Good for children, pets | 10 |
| Freedom, challenge, creative | 7 |
| Animals | 2 |

For each smallholding the couple were asked: "Which is most important, lifestyle or land use?" Responses were either lifestyle, land use, or both (where both activities were seen as important or one person expressed the opposite of the other). Of the 21 intending smallholder families there were nine cases of lifestyle first, five cases of land use first, and seven cases of both. When asked how long they intended to stay on their smallholding, 18 said they would stay as long as possible, two gave a qualified answer indicating that they might move and one was not asked the question.

3.3.4 Q-sort Data

Initial analysis of the Q-sort data yielded a number of potential factors. However, inspection of these factors showed that they had correlations of 0.75 and 0.70 and there were, at a minimum, 17 (52%) consensus statements, that is, statements that did not distinguish between factors. Thus, the factors were quite similar and the differences merely subtle suggesting that a single factors solution would be most useful. The unrotated centroid factor analysis solution was used to prepare an analyses based on one factor which reflected the consensus among intending smallholders. Table 6 shows the distribution of statements, ranging from those most strongly agreed with at the top to those most strongly disagreed with at the bottom. The table shows the statement number (randomly assigned to each statement), the normalised factor score (Z score) and the characterisation of each statement as provided by Willits et al. (1990). Each statement thus represents one of five sets of values. We would expect that intending smallholders would disagree with statements about negative rurality, but it remains to be demonstrated how they would rate statements about agrarian values or wilderness values.

The top five statements illustrate familiar themes: open country, wilderness, peace and quiet, raising a family and serenity. The table shows that among the top six statements chosen by nearly all intending smallholders are four statements reflecting wilderness values. The key words are 'open country' (statement 7), 'serenity of the countryside' (statement 3) and

Table 6
Intending Smallholders' Normalized Factor Scores for Factor 1

| No. | Statement | Code | Z-Score |
|-----|--|------|---------|
| 7 | Open country is beautiful and an inviting place to be | W | 1.8 |
| 22 | Rural areas have more peace and quiet than do other areas | +R | 1.6 |
| 1 | Wilderness areas are an important part of our nations heritage | W | 1.5 |
| 32 | The farm is an ideal place to raise a family | A | 1.5 |
| 3 | People need to experience the serenity of the countryside to balance the hectic pace of the city | W | 1.1 |
| 2 | The solitude that is possible in the open country brings peace to people who go there | W | 1.0 |
| 33 | Farmers embody the virtues of independence and self sufficiency | A | 0.8 |
| 25 | There is less crime and violence in rural areas than in other areas | +R | 0.6 |
| 20 | Agriculture is the natural and good life for people | A | 0.6 |
| 16 | Rural communities are the most satisfying of all places to live, work, and play | +R | 0.5 |
| 17 | Neighbourliness and friendliness are more characteristic of rural communities than other areas | +R | 0.5 |
| 30 | Cities are crowded, dirty, and noisy environments in which to live | -U | 0.4 |
| 5 | Because rural life is closer to nature, it is more wholesome | +R | 0.3 |
| 27 | Urban life is complex, fast-paced, and stressful | -U | 0.2 |
| 21 | Life in rural communities is less stressful than life elsewhere | +R | 0.2 |
| 15 | Rural families are more close-knit and enduring than are other families | +R | 0.1 |
| 6 | Rural people are more likely than other people to accept you as you are | +R | 0.1 |
| 4 | Rural life brings out the best in people | +R | 0.1 |
| 31 | Crime and violence characterise city life | -U | 0.0 |
| 19 | Farming is the basic occupation upon which the rest of the economy depends | A | -0.1 |
| 29 | Cities are artificial settings which separate people from nature | -U | -0.2 |
| 13 | Rural life is characterised by backbreaking labour | -R | -0.2 |
| 28 | Urban living is too centred on the quest for money and status | -U | -0.2 |
| 8 | Being close to nature makes people better | W | -0.3 |
| 18 | Farms and farming provide the moral core of our society | A | -0.7 |
| 14 | The relationships among people in urban areas are impersonal | -U | -0.8 |
| 11 | Rural people are provincial and narrow in their thinking | -R | -1.1 |
| 12 | Rural communities provide few opportunities for new experiences | -R | -1.2 |
| 26 | Rural people are suspicious and prejudiced toward anyone not like themselves | -R | -1.2 |
| 10 | Rural communities provide few opportunities for the individual to get ahead in life | -R | -1.3 |
| 24 | Living in rural areas means doing without the good things in modern society | -R | -2.0 |
| 23 | Rural life is monotonous and boring | -R | -2.0 |
| 9 | Rural people are crude and uncultured in their talk, actions, and dress | -R | -2.0 |

Notes: W = Wilderness Values
 +R = Positive Rurality
 A = Agrarian Values
 -U = Anti Urbanism
 -R = Negative Rurality

'solitude and peace' (statement 2). Further, wilderness is valued to the extent that wilderness areas are seen as an important part of the nation's heritage (statement 1). The one remaining wilderness statement is disagreed with slightly. This is statement 8, 'being close to nature makes people better', so it is not mere association with nature that is important but it must have the specific characteristics of openness, serenity, solitude and peace. Also among the top six statements was statement 22 referring to peace and quiet. This is an aspect of positive rurality which is absolutely crucial to intending smallholders' perceptions of the rural lifestyle. Finally, there is statement 32 which refers to the smallholding as an ideal place to raise a family. In essence then intending smallholders value the wilderness aspects of the country where wilderness is defined in terms of openness, serenity, solitude, peace and quiet that is ideal for raising a family. It must be noted that this view of wilderness is applied to farmed countryside not undisturbed nature. Some interviewees did mention their love of mountains and native bush. Perhaps the label of 'wilderness values' could be replaced with 'countryside values'. Clearly, there is consistency between these results and the aspects of the rural lifestyle noted during the interviews and shown earlier in Table 5 where quietness and open space were frequently mentioned.

The next six statements agreed with, but not as strongly as the top six, show a mix of agrarian values, positive rurality with one anti-urban value. The two agrarian value statements relate to farmers as independent and self sufficient (statement 33) and to farming as the natural and good life for people (statement 20). This indicates that intending smallholders readily accept important values about farmers, perhaps because in quite a few cases the intending smallholders were self employed. Approval of these values also shows that farming is seen as quite compatible with wilderness values, that to some degree contemporary farming embodies the wilderness values of peace, tranquillity and openness. At this stage of the interpretation the remaining agrarian value statements can be considered. Both of them are disagreed with. Intending smallholders give slight disagreement to statement 19 regarding farmers as the backbone of the economy, perhaps not surprising since these smallholders typically are engaged in the urban economy for their source of income. Similarly, intending smallholders do not see that farmers have any moral superiority, consequently they have modest disagreement with statement 18. There are three statements about positive rurality in this second group of six statements agreed with by intending smallholders. In their view there is less crime and violence in rural areas (statement 25), more satisfaction in rural living (statement 16), and more neighbourliness and friendliness (statement 17). Finally, there is the first reference to negative aspects of city life by agreement with the view that cities are crowded, dirty and noisy (statement 30).

Turning now to the statements strongly disagreed with, the table shows that the top seven statements contain seven out of the eight negative rurality values. That is, intending smallholders strongly disagree with statements which describe rural life in negative terms. Perhaps because they see themselves as becoming rural people they strongly disagree with statement 9. Perhaps also they identify with rural people and see them in positive terms. Other statements show that intending smallholders disagree that rural life is monotonous and boring (statement 23), that there is any sacrifice in living standards (statement 24), or in new experiences (statement 10), or in opportunities (statement 12). Finally, they disagree with the idea that rural people are provincial (statement 11) or suspicious and prejudiced (statement 26). The one remaining negative rurality statement is disagreed with less intensely: this is the idea that rural life is characterised by backbreaking labour (statement 29).

There are two statements moderately disagreed with, one of which is an agrarian value indicating that farmers have moral superiority and is statement number 18 referred to above. The other refers to the idea that relationships among people in urban areas are impersonal and uncaring (statement 14). Clearly, these intending smallholders, most of whom live or have recently lived in Christchurch do not accept this view and perhaps are close to urban life and believe that it needs defending on this point.

The remaining statements in the table which have not been discussed all receive low scores and can best be described as relatively insignificant to intending smallholders. Conspicuous in these remaining statements is a set of five positive rurality statements. Because the scores for these statements are low they indicate elements of rurality which are not important to intending smallholders. Unimportant are closeness to nature (statement 5), rural life as less stressful (statement 21), rural families as close knit (statement 15), acceptance by rural people (statement 6) and rural life as bringing out the best in people (statement 4). In other words, intending smallholders do not value the social aspects of rural life, or see it as widely different from urban life. As noted earlier it is the quality of the experience of the wilderness values, particularly those values experienced individually. There is only slight agreement that life in rural communities is less stressful than life elsewhere (statement 21) which is surprising since the statements strongly agreed with refer to the palliative effects of countryside as wilderness. Perhaps rural life provides a different type of stress. While intending smallholders acknowledge that rural life is less stressful, they also agree, to the same extent, that urban life is fast-paced, and stressful (statement 27).

Also notable in the group of remaining statements with low scores is a set of four anti urban statements, most of which receive slight disagreement. Statement 27 referring to urban life as stressful has just been discussed. The remaining three statements are disagreed with. Unimportant with respect to city life are crime and violence (statement 31), the artificiality of the city (statement 29) and the quest for money and status (statement 28).

3.3.5 Summary

Available data showed that sales of smallholdings in Canterbury were significant in number and increasing over time. The turnover rate for smallholdings matches the national figure for horticulture and specialised livestock, and is slightly higher than the overall Canterbury rate. Interview data showed that intending smallholders had a number of dissimilarities because they were a diverse group but they also were quite similar in that considerable off-farm work was needed to fund both a house and the land use, and that horticulture was the popular land use. Their primary goals were to generate income (especially for retirement), to achieve a lifestyle, to obtain jobs for children or to use the smallholding in conjunction with another business. But closely tied to these goals was the anticipated rural lifestyle which was characterised in terms of privacy, clean air, being good for children, freedom and quietness. Lifestyle was rated somewhat ahead of land uses. Q-sort data showed that a consensus viewpoint prevailed among intending smallholders. Highly rated were the wilderness values of open country, serenity and solitude but not closeness to nature per se. Preference for the rural lifestyle was not defined in terms of anti-urban values but in terms of agrarian values which reflected smallholders' identification with the farming values of independence and a good life. There was no support for the fundamentalist agrarian values of farmers as the backbone of the economy or as morally superior. Strongly disagreed with were statements reflecting negative rurality. Receiving neutral scores were statements

reflecting positive rurality values showing that intending smallholders did not value highly the social aspects of rural life or see it as widely different from urban life.

3.4 Existing Smallholders

3.4.1 Background Dissimilarities

As was the case for intending smallholders, the existing smallholders were a diverse group. There were couples who began their smallholding without children and who had since started a family, couples who had children of varying numbers and ages, and couples who had retired onto their smallholding. Of the 13 families included in the interviews there was one case of a single man and one case of a widow. There were people from urban and rural backgrounds. Intended land uses, when the smallholding was established, were varied, and while horticulture was popular there was a similar number intending some kind of livestock activity.

3.4.2 Primary Goals

Interview data were used to identify the primary goals of existing smallholders and the main goals are shown in Table 7. Of the 13 families studied there were seven which emphasised rural or country living, and four which emphasised retirement income. There were some other goals mentioned only once in each case, such as living off the land, escape from the city, space for hobbies or rabbit production. For existing smallholders it is the country living that predominates as the main goal.

Table 7
Frequency of Existing Smallholders' Goals

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Rural or country living | 7 |
| Retirement income | 4 |
| Living off the land | 1 |
| Escape from the city | 1 |
| Space for hobbies | 1 |
| Rabbit production | 1 |

The existing smallholders began with plans for land uses which were quite diverse. Table 8 shows the frequency of intended land use and the frequency of actual land use at the time of interview. The first point to note is the variety of land uses intended. Horticulture was tried in most cases and horses were also popular. Other intended uses included goats, rabbits and fitch. The second point to note is that while horticulture retains its importance among

current land uses, horses and goats are less popular and there is some recent interest in pigs, beef and mixed animals.

Table 8
Intended and Current Land Uses of Existing Smallholders

| | Intended | Current |
|-----------------|----------|---------|
| Horticulture | 8 | 4 |
| Horses | 4 | 2 |
| Goats | 2 | 0 |
| Rabbits | 1 | 1 |
| Fitch | 1 | 0 |
| Grazing | 1 | 1 |
| Diverse animals | 0 | 2 |
| Pigs | 0 | 1 |
| Beef | 0 | 1 |
| Organic crops | 0 | 1 |

There were considerable differences between intended and actual levels of intensity of land use. When existing smallholders first began their smallholding most of them (eight families out of eleven asked) expected the land use to require one full-time labour unit. There was one case where two full-time labour units were expected to be required and two cases where one half-time labour unit was expected. However, after five years the actual level of labour use was typically one half-time (six out of eleven cases) or one quarter time (five out of eleven cases).

The experience of smallholding has included the effects of the sharemarket crash in 1988. Some existing smallholders were directly affected by this: for example, horse prices slumped and mortgage rates increased. Other stock declined in value over this time too, including goats and fitch. There were many cases reported of horticultural crops grown which received very low prices. These changes in the fortunes of existing smallholder land use have led to new land uses being tried or considered. Table 8 shows that pigs, beef and organic crops are current land uses. In some cases, existing smallholders have diverse animals, that is, the mix of popular animals kept for their own sake and household production. Because of the vicissitudes of markets, and other factors, existing smallholders have maintained paid employment when they began smallholding and at the present time there were seven out of thirteen families where both adult members were in paid employment. The only change has been where two people were in paid employment but at the present time work only on the smallholding in their retirement.

3.4.3 Lifestyle Values

Existing smallholders referred to a variety of values associated with the rural lifestyle. Table 9 shows the frequency with which various lifestyle values were mentioned by existing smallholders in the course of conversation about the advantages of the rural lifestyle. Of the 13 families interviewed open space or absence of neighbours was mentioned 11 times. Also mentioned was the lowered pressure and relaxing nature of country living, the quietness, peace and tranquillity of smallholding and the clean air. Some other values were mentioned occasionally (such as animals, freedom and children) and a few values noted by only single cases (such as being outdoors, producing something and way of life).

Table 9
Frequency of Existing Smallholders' Lifestyle Values

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Open space, no neighbours | 11 |
| Quietness, peace, tranquillity | 5 |
| Clean air, fresh air | 4 |
| Animals | 3 |
| Freedom. | 2 |
| Good for children | 2 |
| Less pressure, relaxing | 6 |

All existing smallholders were asked if their perceptions of the lifestyle had changed and nearly all said that their perceptions had not changed. There were four families who mentioned changes in perception. These included one family admitting that smallholding could be stressful, one family that expected more income and two families which noted that smallholding involved more work than expected.

Each existing smallholding family was asked: "Which was most important : lifestyle or land use"? as they began smallholding. Of the 13 existing smallholder families there were seven cases of lifestyle first, two cases of land use first, and four cases of both. At present the distribution has changed with eight cases of lifestyle first, no cases of land use first and five cases of both.

Other data show that existing smallholders were well-satisfied with their lifestyle and situation. Eight families out of thirteen said that they intended to stay on the smallholding for as long as possible when they began five years ago, and currently six out of thirteen families said they would stay as long as possible. Of the remaining families, some were considering either larger or smaller properties and others were unsure of how long they would be able physically to stay on their smallholding. Generally, there were no families looking to leave smallholding and return to the city.

3.4.4 Q-sort Data

As for the intending smallholders the existing smallholders sorted the statements in similar ways and the best solution was a single factor which expresses the consensus aspects of each

person's Q-sort. Table 10 shows the distribution of statements, ranging from those most strongly agreed with at the top to those most strongly disagreed with at the bottom. Beside each statement is a sign to indicate what type of value is expressed by the statement. Also shown in the table is the statement number in appropriate order as obtained from intending smallholders. The angled lines indicate which statements are in a different position and facilitate comparison between intending and existing smallholders. The following interpretation focuses on the existing smallholders' Q-sort and on comparisons to intending smallholders Q-sort.

The top four statements, each with a standard score of greater than 1.0 emphasise the farm as an ideal place to raise a family (statement 32) and this statement receives a higher score than intending smallholders. Peace and quiet (statement 22) receives a high score as did the wilderness values of open country and beauty (statement 7) and wilderness areas as important for the nation's heritage (statement 1). These top four statements are the same for both intending and existing smallholders. As before, the two other wilderness value statements (statements 2 and 3) are valued highly, but the idea of being closer to nature making people better (statement 8) gained a low positive score whereas for intending smallholders it received a modest negative score. Clearly, the experience of living in the country has in some way aided in the appreciation of nature.

However, while wilderness values are important for existing and intending smallholders, there are differences among the order of other remaining statements with a high score. Alongside the wilderness value statements (numbers 2 and 3) are three positive rurality statements, including the satisfaction of living in rural communities (statement 16), the wholesomeness of rural life close to nature (statement 5), and the lower stress of rural living (statement 21). Each of these positive rurality statements receives a higher score than in the case of the intending smallholders, and they reflect positive experiences of country living. For the intending smallholders, after the first six highly rated statements the second tier included agrarian value statements of independence and self-sufficiency (statement 33) and agriculture as the natural and good life for people (statement 20). Apparently, existing smallholders prefer positive rurality values first, in the light of their experience, but next they value the two agrarian value statements and they are rated quite high and immediately below the positive rurality values just considered.

Examining the next group of statements which received only modest support shows that existing smallholders were not so positive about crime and violence: statement 25 is ranked with a score of 0.518 compared with 1.056 from the intending smallholders. Existing smallholders also had a different view on the role of farming as the basic occupation on which the rest of the economy depends (statement 19): it received a score of 0.418 compared to 0.105 from the intending smallholders. Some other comparisons are illustrative of the effects of experiencing smallholding for five years. Statement 27 refers to urban life as complex and fast-paced and existing smallholders gave it a lower score than intending smallholders, presumably because the rural lifestyle is also busy. Similarly, existing smallholders were not so confident that neighbourliness and friendliness are more characteristic of rural communities: statement 17 received 0.136 while for intending smallholders it received 0.451. Neither do existing smallholders see rural families as more close-knit and enduring than other families: statement 15 received -0.218 while for intending smallholders it received 0.136. The remaining statements were ranked in similar positions by both intending and existing smallholders. Most notably similar were the lowest scored bottom seven statements, all referring to negative rurality.

Table 10
Existing Smallholders' Normalized Factor Scores for Factor 1

| No. | Statement | Code | Z-score | No. |
|-----|--|------|---------|-----|
| 32 | The farm is an ideal place to raise a family | A | 1.6 | 7 |
| 22 | Rural areas have more peace and quiet than do other areas | +R | 1.6 | 22 |
| 7 | Open country is beautiful and an inviting place to be | W | 1.6 | 1 |
| 1 | Wilderness areas are an important part of our nation's heritage | W | 1.3 | 32 |
| 16 | Rural communities are the most satisfying of all places to live, work, and play | +R | 0.8 | 3 |
| 2 | The solitude that is possible in the open country brings peace to people who go there | W | 0.8 | 2 |
| 3 | People need to experience the serenity of the countryside to balance the hectic pace of the city | W | 0.8 | 33 |
| 5 | Because rural life is closer to nature, it is more wholesome | +R | 0.7 | 25 |
| 21 | Life in rural communities is less stressful than life elsewhere | +R | 0.6 | 20 |
| 20 | Agriculture is the natural and good life for people | A | 0.5 | 16 |
| 33 | Farmers embody the virtues of independence and self sufficiency | A | 0.5 | 17 |
| 25 | There is less crime and violence in rural areas than in other areas | +R | 0.5 | 30 |
| 19 | Farming is the basic occupation upon which the rest of the economy depends | A | 0.4 | 5 |
| 30 | Cities are crowded, dirty, and noisy environments in which to live | -U | 0.4 | 27 |
| 6 | Rural people are more likely than other people to accept you as you are | +R | 0.3 | 21 |
| 8 | Being close to nature makes people better | W | 0.3 | 15 |
| 27 | Urban life is complex, fast-paced, and stressful | -U | 0.2 | 6 |
| 17 | Neighbourliness and friendliness are more characteristic of rural communities than other areas | +R | 0.1 | 4 |
| 31 | Crime and violence characterise city life | -U | 0.1 | 31 |
| 29 | Cities are artificial settings which separate people from nature | -I | 0.1 | 19 |
| 4 | Rural life brings out the best in people | +R | 0.0 | 29 |
| 15 | Rural families are more close-knit and enduring than are other families | +R | -0.2 | 13 |
| 13 | Rural life is characterised by backbreaking labour | -R | -0.4 | 28 |
| 18 | Farms and farming provide the moral core of our society | A | -0.5 | 8 |
| 28 | Urban living is too centred on the quest for money and status | -U | -0.5 | 18 |
| 14 | The relationships among people in urban areas are impersonal and uncaring | -U | -0.9 | 14 |
| 26 | Rural people are suspicious and prejudiced toward anyone not like themselves | -R | -1.2 | 11 |
| 12 | Rural communities provide few opportunities for the individual to get ahead in life | -R | -1.2 | 12 |
| 10 | Rural communities provide few opportunities for new experiences | -R | -1.2 | 26 |
| 11 | Rural people are provincial and narrow in their thinking | -R | -1.7 | 10 |
| 9 | Rural people are crude and uncultured in their talk, actions, and dress | -R | -1.8 | 24 |
| 24 | Living in rural areas means doing without the good things in modern society | -R | -1.8 | 23 |
| 23 | Rural life is monotonous and boring | -R | -1.9 | 9 |

Notes: 1 W = Wilderness Values
 +R = Positive Rurality
 A = Agrarian Values
 -U = Anti Urbanism
 -R = Negative Rurality

2. The last column of numbers shows the order of statements for intending smallholders

Thus, in comparative terms, existing smallholders and intending smallholders share the same strongly held values regarding the wilderness aspects of smallholding, with its peace and quiet and suitability for raising children. After this there are some similarities and differences showing that the experience of smallholding appears to modify viewpoint. The main differences between viewpoints is that existing smallholders rate some aspects of positive rurality more highly than do intending smallholders. In particular it is satisfaction of living in rural communities, being close to nature and lower stress aspects of positive rurality that are significant, not the neighbourliness and friendliness, or the close-knit families nor the rural life bringing out the best in people. It seems then that the more idealised aspects of rural living are partly rejected in the light of the smallholding experience. More important is the appreciation of nature and the individual-based aspects of living in the country. Along with these changes is a greater identity with some agrarian values namely the importance of farming to the economy, although there is less approval of the idea that farmers embody the virtues of independence and self sufficiency.

The above comparisons can tentatively indicate differences in the respective populations of smallholders. In qualitative research the experience of smallholding and the derivative meanings are emphasised and it is the experience which is taken to account for the patterns of meaning. Thus, the Q-sort results are derived from the experience of smallholding and are not due to the particular group of people involved in the sample. It is expected that another group of existing smallholders would have a consensus Q-sort that was very similar to that reported here. For those working within a quantitative approach this expectation will be unacceptable and a larger, random sample will be required before satisfactory inferences to the population can be made.

3.4.5 Reasons for Selling

The following data report the outcome of moving off the original smallholding for the list of 17 names not presently on the rates roll for Selwyn District and Waimakariri District. Table 11 shows financial reasons and other reasons for moving as given by either the people themselves or by the new owners. While neither source need necessarily provide an accurate account of the precise reasons for selling the smallholding, they do give a general indication. In fact of the 17 cases, four did not establish a dwelling because either they did not obtain a building permit or because they did not complete the dwelling. This leaves 13 cases who actually established a dwelling. There were two cases who left for financial reasons and eight cases who left for other reasons. There were three cases not accounted for in any detail because they were unknown or untraced. Of the ten known cases, five moved to another rural property and were still experiencing the rural lifestyle. Some of these were still smallholders but some had moved on to larger properties having used the smallholding business as a stepping stone. There were remaining five cases who had left smallholding and these, combined with the three untraced smallholders, makes a maximum of eight smallholders who exited from smallholding. This is 15 per cent of the total 52 existing smallholders who applied for building permits before March 1988.

Table 11
Reasons Given for Leaving the Smallholding

| | |
|---|----|
| Financial Reason | |
| Could not afford to complete dwelling | 2 |
| Forced to move to another smallholding (older house) | 1 |
| Marriage breakup/financial pressure | 1 |
| Other Reason | |
| Did not get building permit/changed mind | 2 |
| Moved to another smallholding (heavier land) | 1 |
| Moved to larger property | 3 |
| Family reason (schooling, relative unwell, travelling time, marriage) | 4 |
| Untraced | 3 |
| TOTAL | 17 |

3.4.6 Summary

Existing smallholders were also a diverse group and they had primary goals of rural or country living and retirement income. They had pursued a variety of land uses, although horticulture was most popular. Their expectations of the level of intensity of land use were not met by reality and most existing smallholders retained off-farm work. However, they enjoyed lifestyle values of openness, quietness, clean air, animals and lowered pressure, and rated lifestyle ahead of land use. Q-sort data showed a consensus among existing smallholders, and this consensus was similar to that of the intending smallholders but also showed modifications in the light of their experience. Existing smallholders rated highly the wilderness values and showed greater appreciation of the idea of being close to nature. They also rated more highly than intending smallholders statements referring to positive rurality and placed these ahead of agrarian value statements. They appear to have modified their viewpoints on the idealised aspects of rural living. Finally, data on reasons for selling the smallholding showed that few have left smallholding out of dissatisfaction and returned to the city.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

4.1 Main Points

The main points from this study are that there was no evidence found to support the hypothesis that some smallholders were dissatisfied with their rural experience. On the contrary, levels of satisfaction with the rural lifestyle were very high and widespread among existing smallholders. Nearly all smallholders intended to enjoy the lifestyle for as long as possible. There was no significant migration back to the city. Further, despite a diversity of backgrounds and family structures there was remarkable consistency among intending and existing smallholders. The values expressed showed up as a consensus pattern, although there were modifications to the viewpoint in the light of five years' experience of country living.

4.2 Overall Summary

The literature review showed that there are parallels to New Zealand smallholding subdivision in North America and that there are few detailed studies of smallholding. The available literature suggests that quality of life considerations are very important in the decision to settle on a smallholding. New Zealand literature is somewhat dated now and covers planning aspects, needs for services and general characteristics. Research shows that smallholders are satisfied with their lifestyle and productive in their use of land. A brief review of some television ads, television programmes, and other rural activities shows that rural images are an important part of New Zealand culture.

The approach adopted for this study of smallholding was to see it as a social phenomenon in which the objective was to uncover causally adequate meanings that accounted for behaviours, and to describe these meanings as ideal types. As such the approach is an example of qualitative research oriented to patterns of meaning rather than population characteristics. Relatively small samples of intending and existing smallholders were obtained from respective council records and each family was interviewed in their own home. A short open-ended interview schedule was used and the interview data were complemented with Q-sort analysis of statements about urban and rural life. A total of 33 smallholdings were involved in the study and 58 people were interviewed.

Available data showed that sales of smallholdings in Canterbury were significant in number and increasing over time. The turnover rate for smallholdings matches the national figure for horticulture and specialised livestock, and is slightly higher than the overall Canterbury rate. Interview data showed that intending smallholders had a number of dissimilarities because they were a diverse group but they also were quite similar in that considerable off-farm work was needed to fund both a house and the land use, and that horticulture was the popular land use. Their primary goals were to generate income (especially for retirement), to achieve a lifestyle, to obtain jobs for children or to use the smallholding in conjunction with another business. But closely tied to these goals was the anticipated rural lifestyle

which was characterised in terms of privacy, clean air, being good for children, freedom and quietness. Lifestyle was rated somewhat ahead of land use. Q-sort data showed that a consensus viewpoint prevailed among intending smallholders. Highly rated were the wilderness values of open country, serenity and solitude but not closeness to nature per se. Preference for the rural lifestyle was not defined in terms of anti-urban values but in terms of agrarian values which reflected smallholders' identification with the farming values of independence and a good life. There was no support for the fundamentalist agrarian values of farmers as the backbone of the economy or as morally superior. Strongly disagreed with were statements reflecting negative rurality. Receiving neutral scores were statements reflecting positive rurality values showing that intending smallholders did not value highly the social aspects of rural life or see it as widely different from urban life.

Existing smallholders were also a diverse group and they had primary goals of rural or country living and retirement income. They had pursued a variety of land uses, although horticulture was most popular. Their expectations of the level of intensity of land use were not met by reality and most existing smallholders retained off-farm work. However, they enjoyed lifestyle values of openness, quietness, clean air, animals and lowered pressure, and rated lifestyle ahead of land use. Q-sort data showed a consensus among existing smallholders, and this consensus was similar to that of the intending smallholders but also showed modifications in the light of their experience. Existing smallholders rated highly the wilderness values and showed greater appreciation of the idea of being close to nature. They also rated more highly than intending smallholders statements referring to positive aspects of rural living and placed these ahead of statements reflecting farming and agricultural values. They appear to have modified their viewpoints on the idealised aspects of rural living. Finally, data on reasons for selling the smallholding showed that few have left smallholding out of dissatisfaction and returned to the city.

4.3 General Discussion

The results of this research accord with North American observations that quality of life considerations are important in the motivation for smallholding. Further, there is a similarity in the rating of statements about urban and rural values. As in the North American study there was fairly consistent viewpoints concerning the variety of values expressed in the statements, and there were favourable views about rurality and rejection of negative images of rural life. The results of this research also accord with findings from the New Zealand studies, in particular the view that smallholders are well-satisfied with their situation.

Beyond these similarities the results show that rural imagery is an important part of New Zealand culture. Many of the smallholders were from urban backgrounds but had "always wanted" to own some land. While there was some dissatisfaction with urban life this was not strong and not a principle factor in motivation for smallholding. Rather, it was attraction to a rural ideal of country living that was the main factor. Wilderness or country values were most important, in particular those values of peace, quietness, tranquillity. It is as though this form of wilderness was an escape from the city of noise, bustle and commerce and yet not rejection of the city because it was crucial to sustaining the lifestyle. Perhaps this is why smallholding is often referred to as the best of both worlds. In any case, it is a rural world for the individual or the family to experience not a small community of

neighbours in a rural village. Given the views of smallholders it is not surprising that the idea of rural villages is unpopular.

4.4 Smallholding in Ideal Type Terms

In ideal type terms smallholding is a process whereby intending participants seek to establish an income from the land to achieve independence in retirement. The productive activity is expected to provide income directly, or it can provide work for children. Associated with this goal is the lifestyle to be enjoyed while the goal is being achieved. This lifestyle emphasises values of privacy, peace and tranquillity in a clean, smogfree environment well suited to raising children. However, not all intending smallholders intended to retire on the land. Some had other businesses, as both wage and salary and self employed, that would be continued regardless. These people would do the farm work themselves on a part-time basis or employ a manager to do it. For others, there was uncertainty about the degree of involvement in the land use in the next few years and uncertainty about whether the link to off-farm income would be severed. In a few cases there were other business activities which would be the primary focus but which were related to smallholding. For example, space for storage. For some, the land use was an option for the woman to develop. Again, there was uncertainty over the role the man would play related to the uncertainty about the actual income that would be produced from the land. While establishing an income is a major goal this is strongly modified by the pursuit of a rural lifestyle. Clearly, retirement income is not a causally adequate factor in smallholding because retirement income could more easily be sought elsewhere with urban investments. It is the possibility of retirement income plus the lifestyle that is causally adequate to explain smallholding motivation.

The actions of intending smallholders are dedicated to overcoming the barriers to entry of cost and regulation. Achieving their objectives is an example of instrumentally rational action, that is, behaviour oriented to achieving an end. The process was rational with the means being adjusted to achieve the end. The action was not value rational: it was not carried out for its own sake. Instrument rationality is replaced, in part, by value rational action when intending smallholders settle on their land. At this point smallholders are able to experience the ongoing value of the action, or experience, of smallholding. Instrumentally rational action is still required however because existing smallholders have to keep working off farm to sustain their lifestyles, and this endeavour, while it may have intrinsic rewards, is largely instrumental in that it is to achieve the goal of income to be used to support the smallholding lifestyle.

It is in recognising the value of the lifestyle to smallholders that can be seen perhaps the origin of their naive approach to commercial production. Smallholders would like their production activity to be bountiful, that is, for the abundance of nature to provide an income. Few of them realise that it is not nature alone that produces adequate income. Many emphasised that land should be productive. Smallholders say they would like to combine production and consumption on the smallholding. However this is difficult to achieve and it may further be limited by an inherent difficulty in combining production and consumption at the one place. Consider hypothetically a successful smallholding business. It is likely that this very success would impose pressures on the lifestyle and make it difficult to enjoy both aspects. Presumably such an activity would change the lifestyle and make it much the same as working anywhere. Holidays would be needed away from the smallholding. Clearly there

would be tensions arising from commercially successful smallholding. Such smallholders would not be able to come home and escape the pressures of their business world which is an important feature of the smallholding lifestyle.

4.5 Constraints to Smallholding Viability

One of the main findings from the interviews with existing smallholders is that they had not been able to obtain the level or intensity of economic activity they had expected. The data clearly show that original expectations included, typically, one full-time labour unit when land use was developed. After five years, the level of activity was one quarter or one half a labour unit, and off-farm work by one or both members of the couple was essential to maintaining the smallholding land use. Some existing smallholders commented that their activity was "living off capital", "a hobby", "other investments supported it", "they had to maintain work to pay for the land" or that smallholding was "an expensive hobby". Existing smallholders' main goal was country living which contrasts with intending smallholders who emphasised the primary goal of generating income. It is not clear whether people have now changed so that intending smallholders are more conscious of income. Perhaps council emphasis on land use has sharpened attitudes. More likely is the greater emphasis now on individual responsibility for retirement income which makes intending smallholders more conscious of this feature. Perhaps also, existing smallholders have forgotten the emphasis they may have put on income when they were undergoing the rigours of getting settled on their land. It seems plausible that existing smallholders would emphasise country living in the light of the difficulties experienced in getting income from their land.

Interview data showed up a number of factors at work which led to this outcome of less than convincing economies of production from smallholdings. First, as mentioned earlier, the five year period from 1988 to 1993 included the sharemarket crash and major changes to stock prices that negatively affected a number of animal land uses. In this sense smallholders had to weather adjustments in primary production that other farmers have experienced. Second, successful applications for building permits typically entailed conditions for development on the property that were intended to insure that land use was undertaken. Frequently reported was the claim that these requirements added to the financial burden of the land use and were a major factor in minimising financial returns. These burdens were significant when the requirements led to a commitment to a land use that was later found to be poor economically, and, in part, prevented change to more profitable land uses. It may be the case that council conditions were blamed as a cause of economic difficulties to cover up deficiencies in management. This study has not examined this issue in detail. However, the smallholders' criticism of conditions was expressed frequently and in the light of changes in land uses that have occurred, may have some substance.

More important was a third factor: the capital-time constraint. Most existing smallholders had maintained their employment and begun to develop their land use. Many had reached a delicate point, after doing the initial work, of recognising that to obtain a full-time income from their land they would require a large sum of capital to intensify production. They better appreciated now the risks involved in the land uses and presumably still had commitments to loans outstanding on their new house or were unwilling to take on new borrowings. Faced with this situation the best policy was to retain reliable income from off-farm work. Not only was capital a constraint but so was time. While doing full-time work

it was impossible to put a lot of time into developing the land use. (There were two cases of existing smallholders having shift work and this allowed time in the daylight hours for work on the smallholding.) Again, smallholders face a considerable risk if they stopped paid work and invested time in a land use that may not make a good return and would not do so quickly.

Part of the capital constraint derives from the fact that most of the smallholders had built new homes (the remainder moved houses on to the property). Regardless of family size these homes have at least three bedrooms and involve significant amounts of capital. To experience the rural lifestyle, which is a major goal of smallholders, a house is necessary and this limits the capital available. In contrast, a land use developed in a business sense would put capital into production and build a house when and if profits were made.

Another constraint to smallholding viability is size. In some cases the source of the difficulties in making sufficient return was seen as lack of size. Smallholders face considerable diseconomies of scale. Some existing smallholders were considering, or would like to consider, moving to a large property. Often noted was the 20 hectare size as one which would give suitable returns.

Not mentioned by existing smallholders was the constraint of lack of knowledge. Interview data showed that few had experience in the intended land use. No one admitted that they had underestimated the level of technical knowledge needed to run a smallholding successfully. Some did admit that it was more work than expected but typically the source of the problems was seen as lying elsewhere. While external factors clearly are important in economic viability it must be recognised that technical knowledge is relevant too. A clue that the level of technical knowledge may be less than exemplary rests on the observation that most existing smallholders were focused on production rather than marketing. Few seemed to appreciate the cyclical nature of returns from primary produce and most were genuinely surprised when crops were valued at disastrously low prices. This marketing outcome is an intensified problem on a smallholding when there is limited space, time and capital to produce a range of products to better withstand market cycles. In one case where demand for the product was buoyant the next increase in production would require a major capital input which was prohibitive, especially in the light of steady expansion in the self-employed, off-farm business.

A final constraint to smallholding viability is based on biological factors. Raising a family takes time away from production and some existing smallholders had young families to begin with, or had begun their families after establishing their house. Some existing smallholders were retired couples who were constrained by their physical capacity for outdoor work. Further, there were three people who mentioned that they had hurt their back and this limited their ability to do physical work.

The existence of constraints to smallholding viability has a major effect on the level of intensity of land use and leads to a variety of responses. In most cases the constraints mean that development does not proceed as intended. Some existing smallholders still hoped to make a break from their present modest levels and boost production. Another response is one of changing land use or considering a land use that appears to have more viability. Another related response is moving closer to processing and marketing. For example, one pip fruit grower had built a packing shed. A few existing smallholders adopted a low

budget, live-off-the-land policy. Finally, the other response is to lease the land for grazing or cropping. In all cases, despite the responses made to the constraints on smallholding viability, the existing smallholders were enjoying a satisfying lifestyle.

4.6 Smallholding as Part of a Development Process

This study of smallholding has shown how smallholding is part of an ongoing process of evolution in land use. Interview data from intending smallholders showed that some of them were reacting to changes in the city. Increased subdivision of existing urban sections, the closeness of new houses, and the lack of space for children to play were cited as factors that encouraged people to consider buying a smallholding. To some degree the urban environment has changed so that its 'rural' values have diminished. Further, some intending smallholders had at an earlier time lived on the edge of the city and enjoyed the country atmosphere. Since then the area had become a suburb. For these and other reasons people bought smallholdings. However, in seeking the peace and quiet of the countryside - a major aspect of the lifestyle values - they were becoming part of a significant movement which was itself generating similar conditions in the countryside. When asked about subdivision, some existing smallholders said they understood why people did it but were concerned that the properties were getting too small and the houses too close. In other words, continued subdivision leads to the one thing anathema to most smallholders and that is neighbours. And yet individual wishes for privacy seem impotent in the light of continued demand, pressures on traditional farmers and smallholders to sell, and services which profit by providing for the needs of intending smallholders. It is possible then, as in the city, that the enjoyment of a lifestyle is not guaranteed forever but is dependent upon where one is located during a process of ongoing change.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Berlan-Darque, M.; Collomb, P. (1991), "Rural Population - Rural Vitality". *Sociologia Ruralis* 31(4):252-261.
- Blackwood, L.G.; Carpenter, E.H. (1978), "The Importance of Anti-urbanism in Determining Residential Preferences and Migration Patterns". *Rural Sociology* 43:31-45.
- Brown, S.R. (1980), *Political Subjectivity : Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Canterbury Regional Council (1992), *Annual Monitoring Report*.
- Carter, I; Perry, N. (1987), "Rembrandt in Gumboots : Rural Imagery in New Zealand Television Advertisements: Pp61-72 in Jode Phillips (ed.), *Te Whenua, Te Iwi : The Land and the People*. Allen and Unwin/Port Nicholson Press : Wellington.
- Fairweather, J.R. (1990), "Management Styles of Canterbury Farmers". AERU Research Report No.205. Lincoln University.
- Fitchen, J.M. (1991), *Endangered Spaces, Enduring Places : Change, Identity and Survival in Rural America*. Westview Press : Boulder, Colorado.
- Gardner, Win (1978), "Small Rural Properties : Part III : Provision of Public Services and Rural Residential Living. Town and Country Planning Division of the Ministry of Works and Development.
- Ilvento, T.W.; Zuloff, A.D. (1978), "Anti-urbanism and Non-metropolitan Growth". *Rural Sociology* 47:220-233.
- Jowet, John H. (1976), "Small Rural Properties : Part I : A Survey of Distribution and Uses". Town and Country Planning Division of the Ministry of Works and Development.
- Lawn, K.G.; Burrige, H.G.; Bergins, A.S.; Keating, R.D. (no date) "Small Holdings in Paparua County". Three Volumes. Town Planning Division of the Paparua County Council.
- Moran, W; Neville, W.; Rankin, D.; Cochrane C. (1980), "Rural Smallholdings in the Auckland Region" Four Volumes. A Report to the Planning Division of the Auckland Regional Authority, July.
- Samson, M. (1991), "The City in the Country?". *Teoros : Revue de Recherche en Tourisme* 10(1):26-28.

- Serow, W.J. (1991), "Recent Trends and Future Proposals for Urban-Rural Migration in Europe". *Sociologia Ruralis* 31(4):269-280.
- Van der Vaart, J.H.P. (1990), "Conversion of Farmsteads : Hidden Urbanisation or a Changing Rural System?". Pp123-129 in G.M.R.A. Van Ort et al. (eds.) *Limits to Rural Land Use. Proceedings of Commission on Changing Rural Systems, International Geographical Union (IGU), Amsterdam, Netherlands, 21-25 August.*
- Weber, M. (1978), *Economy and Society : An Outline of Interpretive Sociology.* University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Williams, A.S.; Jobs, P.S. (1990), "Economic and Quality-of-Life Considerations in Urban-rural Migration". *Journal of Rural Studies* 6(2):187-194.
- Willits, Fern K.; Bealer, Robert C.; Timbers, Vincent L. (1990), "Popular Images of Rurality : Data from a Pennsylvania Survey". *Rural Sociology* 55(4):559-578.
- Yerex, David (1988), *The Best of Both Worlds : A Guide to a Semi-Rural Lifestyle.* GP Books : Wellington.

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF Q-SORT STATEMENTS

1. Wilderness areas are an important part of our nation's heritage.
2. The solitude that is possible in the open country brings peace to people who go there.
3. People need to experience the serenity of the countryside to balance the hectic pace of the city.
4. Rural life brings out the best in people.
5. Because rural life is closer to nature, it is more wholesome.
6. Rural people are more likely than other people to accept you as you are.
7. Open country is beautiful and an inviting place to be.
8. Being close to nature makes people better.
9. Rural people are crude and uncultured in their talk, actions, and dress.
10. Rural communities provide few opportunities for the individual to get ahead in life.
11. Rural people are provincial and narrow in their thinking.
12. Rural communities provide few opportunities for new experiences.
13. Rural life is characterised by backbreaking labour.
14. The relationships among people in urban areas are impersonal and uncaring.
15. Rural families are more close-knit and enduring than are other families
16. Rural communities are the most satisfying of all places to live, work, and play.
17. Neighbourliness and friendliness are more characteristic of rural communities than other areas.
18. Farms and farming provide the moral core of our society.
19. Farming is the basic occupation upon which the rest of the economy depends.
20. Agriculture is the natural and good life for people.
21. Life in rural communities is less stressful than life elsewhere.
22. Rural areas have more peace and quiet than do other areas.
23. Rural life is monotonous and boring.
24. Living in rural areas means doing without the good things in modern society.

25. There is less crime and violence in rural areas than in other areas.
26. Rural people are suspicious and prejudiced toward anyone not like themselves.
27. Urban living is complex, fast-paced, and stressful.
28. Urban living is too centred on the quest for money and status.
29. Cities are artificial settings which separate people from nature.
30. Cities are crowded, dirty, and noisy environments in which to live.
31. Crime and violence characterise city life.
32. The farm is an ideal place to raise a family.
33. Farmers embody the virtues of independence and self sufficiency.

APPENDIX 2

KEY QUESTIONS - INTENDING SMALLHOLDERS

1. (a) location on map (b) size (c) intended/actual land use (d) present residence (in Chch or town/on smallholding).
2. Urban or rural background (each person). Brief history.
3. Present work (self-employed, other). Security of job. Commuting time.
4. Number of children and age(s). Age of each adult.
5. Details of intended/actual land use:
 - number of people to be employed, who will work where
 - past experience with activity
6. How came to decide on smallholding?
 - advantages of rural lifestyle
 - disadvantages of rural lifestyle
 - advantages of urban lifestyle (Chch)
 - disadvantages of urban lifestyle (Chch).
7. What have you done to get a smallholding?
 - any problems in process
 - why new house and not existing smallholding?
8. How chosen where to smallhold?
 - who has given advice.
9. How do you see the rural lifestyle?
 - which is more important : lifestyle or land use?
10. Time intended to remain on smallholding?
11. Any environmental problems with septic tanks?
12. Heard about \$5,000 sewage treatment system? Acceptable to you to have it checked by local authority for fee of \$200.
13. Any environmental problems with drinking water? Acceptable to you to have local authority take samples of your water.
14. Want copy of report? Postal address.

APPENDIX 3

KEY QUESTIONS - EXISTING SMALLHOLDERS

1. (a) Location (b) Size (c) Land use (briefly)
(d) Time on land.

2. Going back to taking up smallholding:
 - (1) Urban or rural background. Brief history.
 - (2) Employment. Job security.
 - (3) Children's ages.
 - (4) Intended use (details):
 - numbers to be employed FT
 - past experience.
 - (5) How came to decide on smallholding?
 - advantages of rural lifestyle
 - general expectations
 - attitude to urban lifestyle then.
 - (6) What done to get smallholding:
 - any problems? (conditions/caveats)
 - consider buying existing smallholding?
 - (7) How did you choose where to locate?
 - (8) Which was most important, lifestyle or land use?
 - (9) Time intended to remain on smallholding?

3. Your views on smallholding now:
 - (1) Employment off farm.
 - (2) Actual use - numbers FT.
 - viability of land use now
 - intentions/hopes re. full-time work on smallholding
 - (3) Advantages of rural lifestyle? What's good about the rural lifestyle?
Disadvantages of rural lifestyle?
Attitudes to urban lifestyle?
 - perceptions changed?

- any observations or comments on smallholding?
- security?

(4) Which is most important now, lifestyle or land use?

(5) Time intended to remain on smallholding.

4. Want copy of report? Postal address.

5. Sent Agricultural Statistics survey?

6. Q-sort.

RESEARCH REPORTS

- 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
- 209 **Determination of Farmland Values in New Zealand: the Significance of Financial Leverage**, G. A. Anderson, G. A. G. Frengley, B. D. Ward, 1991.
- 210 **Attitudes to Pests and Pest Control Methods** R. L. Sheppard, L. M. Urquhart, 1991.
- 211 **Administered Protection in the United States During the 1980's: Exchange Rates and Institutions**, D. A. Stallings, 1991
- 212 **The New Zealand Consumer Market For Cut Flowers in the 90s**, C. G. Lamb, D. J. Farr, P. J. McCartin, 1992
- 213 **Agrarian Restructuring in New Zealand**, J. R. Fairweather, 1992.
- 214 **Actual and Potential Computer Use by a Group of Primary Producers**, P. L. Nuthall, 1992.
- 215 **A Tree Model for Hawkes Bay Farmers' Tree Planting Decisions**, J. R. Fairweather, 1992.
- 216 **History of the New Zealand Milk Board**, S. Gilmour, 1992.
- 217 **Changing Export Markets for New Zealand Sheepmeat: 1983-1991**, L. Storey, 1992.
- 218 **An Economic Evaluation of Changes in the Allocation of Water for Irrigation from the Ashburton River**, G. Greer, G. Rae, 1992.
- 219 **Farming in Hurunui and Clutha Counties: current attitudes and practices compared to survey results in 1986**, J. R. Fairweather, S. S. F. Gilmour, 1993.
- 220 **Intending Smallholder's and Existing Smallholder's Perceptions of the Rural Lifestyle around Christchurch, New Zealand**, J. R. Fairweather, 1993.

DISCUSSION PAPERS

- 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
- 129 **Proceedings of the Rural Economy and Society Section of the Sociological Association of Aotearoa (NZ)**, April 1991
- 130 **Evolutionary Bargaining Games**
J. K. D. Wright, May 1991
- 131 **Papers Presented at the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the N.Z. Branch of the Australian Agricultural Economics Society**, August 1991.
- 132 **Topics for Rural Social Research**, J. R. Fairweather, 1992.
- 133 **Papers Presented at the Seventeenth Annual Conference of the NZ Branch of the Australian Agricultural Economics Society**, August 1992.
- 134 **Capital Budgeting and Policy Evaluation using Option Pricing Theory**, P. Seed, November 1992.
- 135 **New Zealand Agricultural Policy Change: Some Effects**, R. L. Sheppard, July 1993.