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MATRILOCALITY AND FEMALE POWER: SINGLE MOTHERS IN EXTENDED HOUSEHOLDS

ABBREY HYDE
School of Nursing and Midwifery, University College Dublin, Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2, Ireland

Synopsis — Based on a qualitative study of non-marital pregnancy and childbearing in the Republic of Ireland, this article reports on the gendered power position of unmarried women who return to their parental homes following their babies’ births. It is argued that in matrilocal households, centralised male power associated with the traditional nuclear family is diffused to some extent. Empirical evidence to support this notion is to be found in analysing the position of the putative father as ‘guest’ in the home of his partner and child (the matrilocal household) and also in exploring the relationship between the participant and her own father within that household. In relation to her own father, it was found that reproducing an offspring provided the women with some bargaining leverage vis-à-vis her own father within the family home. These reshaped relationships represent, to some extent at least, the undercutting of centralised male authority within the household. © 1999 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Non-marital childbearing in Ireland has increased sharply in the past 20 years (Central Statistics Office, 1974–1994, 1995, 1996), and there is evidence that many unmarried women who have children return to their parental home after the birth (Flanagan & Richardson, 1992; Richardson, 1992). This article reports on the experiences of a subsample of non-marital mothers who returned to their parental home after the babies’ births, and focuses specifically on their gendered power position within the parental home since becoming mothers. The matrilocal extended family involved a complex network of relations and, it is argued, was the location where traditional patriarchal structures were found to be undermined. Where relations with the putative father were sustained, the power status of the male partner vis-à-vis the participant and child within the matrilocal extended family was eroded to a considerable extent, compared with the power position traditionally held by the male as presumed head of household in the nuclear family. Even in those situations where participants were no longer in relationships with the putative fathers, their power position in the home vis-à-vis their own fathers was frequently altered in their favour with the birth of the baby.

The article will begin by outlining the methodological stance adopted in the study. This will be followed by an analysis of data on both participants’ and putative fathers’ positions within the matrilocal home. Participants’ relationships with their own fathers since the babies’ births will also be theorised. Since the focus of this article is on gendered power experiences within the home, the actual mothering experiences of the women will not be analysed other than where they mediate power relationships and are relevant to the central issue of the article.

In conducting the study, there was no a priori assumption that non-marital childbearing was problematic; however, the stigmatisation of this style of mothering in the past (Arensberg & Kimball, 1968; Darling, 1984; Kilkenny Social Services, 1972; O’Hare, Dromey, O’Connor, Clarke, & Kirwan, 1987; Smyth, 1992; Viney, 1964), women’s continued disadvantaged position within marriage (see Delphy, 1992; Smart, 1984; Walby, 1990), and the sharp increase in non-marital motherhood in Ireland (Central Statistics Office, 1974–1994,

**METHODOLOGICAL STANCE**

What follows was part of a wider study that explored unmarried women’s experiences of pregnancy and the early weeks of motherhood in an Irish context. Ninety women selected at the ante-natal clinic of a Dublin maternity hospital were invited to participate. While 78 women initially agreed to take part, 51 were eventually interviewed. Clearly, the sample was an urban one, and this may well have influenced the patterns that were identified in data.

Criteria for entry to the study were that potential participants would be unmarried to the father of the foetus, and be first-time mothers-to-be. Immediately before becoming pregnant, all but four women, were in relationships with the putative fathers, albeit these relationships varied considerably in length and quality. By the time of birth, at least 14 women were no longer in relationships and an additional relationship terminated shortly after the birth. The women’s ages ranged from 16 to 36 years; 12 participants were under 20 years old when they gave birth.

Semi-structured, in-depth interviews were conducted on two separate occasions; firstly in the later stages of pregnancy, and secondly, between weeks 6 and 8 after the birth. The interviews commenced in mid-1992 and all interviews were completed by the end of 1993. Interview data presented in this article were collected at the second interviews (data sets from first interviews have been reported on elsewhere (Hyde, 1996a, 1996b, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 1998, 1999). Participants’ names were changed to ensure anonymity.

In order to centralise women’s experiences, the study adopted a qualitative stance from a pluralist feminist standpoint position. Rooted in the notion that human activity structures and sets limits on understanding (Harding, 1989), feminist standpoint perspective was first advanced by writers such as Hartsock (1983, 1987), Rose (1983, 1986), and Smith (1979, 1987). It is underpinned by the notion that a partial and distorted comprehension of events has emanated from the dominance of male-orientated ways of thinking and knowing; this distortion, it holds, can only be amended by uncovering an understanding of the world from the perspective of women’s activities (Harding, 1989). Some writers have argued for a pluralist standpoint position to acknowledge diversity in women’s experiences in relation to class, race, sexual identity, and so on, which earlier theoretical models of patriarchy tended to understate (Gelsthorpe, 1992). The present analysis was conducted from a pluralist feminist standpoint position.

Data analysis proceeded using a style of qualitative analysis resembling a ‘grounded theory’ approach, initially introduced by Glaser and Strauss (1967), and later developed and refined (Glaser, 1978, 1992; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1994). As data collection progressed, questions about topics became increasingly more focused around theoretically relevant issues and concepts. A constant comparative mechanism was used, whereby like items of data were clustered and later theorised.

**Matrilocal extended families**

Three types of household styles emerged after the births, namely matrilocal extended, nuclear, and single-parent unextended. While family types are not fixed and stable categories, for conceptual purposes I have classified them thus. Twenty-three of the 46 re-interviewed participants belonged to matrilocal extended families, 17 participants formed nuclear-style family units (heterosexual couple and their child) and five women formed separate units of single-parent unextended families. The concern here, as indicated, is with the matrilocal household type.

The development of the matrilocal extended household depended to some extent on the existence, or quality of the relationship between the participant and the putative father, and on a participant’s own economic standing, or that of the partner where the relationship had been sustained. Unlike in the case of the nuclear family, where that family type relied on the relationship with the putative father being sustained, 13 of the 23 participants in matrilocal extended units were no longer in relationships with the putative fathers. The relationships had been upheld in the remaining 10 cases, but a number of factors tended to preclude the formation of nuclear families in these cases. One reason suggested in participants’ accounts was that the relationship with
the putative father was not sufficiently strong to merit the generation of a separate family formation. For some, therefore, living with their partners seemed to construct a relationship as serious, while living with parents defined it as uncertain in terms of longevity. A small number of others defined the relationship as serious, although they continued to live with parents. Living in the parental home for some of these was seen as a precursor to facilitating a separate unit with their partners. It allowed them opportunities to save money for their own separate home at some point in the future. Others had a preference for remaining at home because they valued the support they received from their families.

The age range of participants who returned to the parental home was 17 to 27 years. Nine out of the 10 adolescent (i.e., under 20 years) participants interviewed on the second occasion were among those in matrilocal households.

The decentralisation of male power in the home

The traditional ways in which males and females related to one another within the family was reshaped to the greatest extent in those situations where women were still in relationships, yet living with parents. Although the male partner often had a very close relationship with his female partner’s family, and in some cases spent several nights a week in her parental home, his position was relatively powerless. Rather than occupying the position of head of household, the male was now in the position of guest in the home of his child, and subjected to the authority of his partner’s parents. Regardless of how ‘at home’ participants claimed their partners were in the parental home, evidence suggested that they were not quite totally ‘at home,’ particularly in the presence of participants’ parents. They thus occupied an even lower position of power than participants did within that home:

AH: You were saying your boyfriend feels at home here. Would he feel relaxed enough to go and open the fridge and help himself to food if he was hungry?

Deirdre: Well, no, he’d be kind of, ‘I’d love something.’ And I’d be, ‘Go out and make it,’ and he’d be, ‘Ah no.’ And I’d be, ‘I’m not doing it for you. Go out and do it yourself.’ And he’d say, ‘Okay.’

. . . she’s [participant’s mother] gone on holidays and I really notice a difference. . . . In the mornings like she [mother] takes him [baby]. And I really feel the difference. It’s terrible, but he’s [partner] much more relaxed. He just goes out there [indicates toward kitchen] and gets what he wants, but I can do what I like anyway. When she’s [mother] here, I’m kind of more relaxed because I can go off where I want, ‘cause when she’s not here I have to bring him [baby] everywhere with me, but he’s [partner] more relaxed that she’s gone.

. . . when it boils down to it, it’s still me ma’s house. They’re always around. There’s always someone here and we haven’t really got much time to be on our own and whatever, you know. (22-year-old secretary)

Kim: [Partner] just walks in and out anyway. He always did.

AH: Would he help himself to food and that, or maybe put the TV on, that ‘at home’?

Kim: Well, if me ma was there he’d ask. Like he’d say to her, ‘Is it all right if I use the toilet,’ and she’d say, ‘Course. Don’t be so stupid.’ (21-year-old cleaner)

AH: How does your partner feel about calling round?

Stephanie: He’s relaxed here—very [laughs] very. He gets on well with everybody. There’s no atmosphere. There’s no tension.

AH: Would he feel ‘at home’ enough to prepare a meal or sandwich for himself?

Stephanie: No, not that much at home. He’d ask. Like he’d whisper it to me, ‘Do you want to make me a cup of coffee?’ (23-year-old, unemployed)

Instead of the woman being remonstrated by her parents-in-law over childrearing methods, as occurred a few generations earlier in Irish households when women moved in with their husbands’ families, both partners became sub-
jected to the advice and correction of participants’ parents. Participants found that instruction and discipline were easier for them to accept from their own parents than they might be from others, since unlike their partners, they were among familiar people in a familiar territory. This represents almost the antithesis of the situation in the more traditional extended family arrangement, where the woman was new and unfamiliar within the confines of her husband’s family:

AH: Do your parents offer advice about dealing with [baby]?

Pauline: Yeah. Always. Or even like my dad would be saying, ‘Wipe his mouth there. He’s dribbling.’ I’d say, ‘Relax. I’m doing it.’ But they’re always telling me what to do. I think it bothers [partner] a bit because it’s my family telling him. I think it would bother me if I was up at his house and his mam said to me, do this and do that. They’d say it to him as well. (20-year-old secretary)

Emma: My mother is always saying, ‘Don’t do this or you shouldn’t do that,’ or ‘That’s not the way you do that. You do it this way.’ She’s only trying to help though. Me dad’s like that as well. Me da will say, ‘You shut up and let her do it herself. She has to learn,’ but then me da would start, ‘You don’t do it that way, you do it the other way.’ Feeding, dressing—‘Ah you shouldn’t dress him in them. You should dress him up warmer.’ You know, what they used to do years ago. My ma is always saying it to [partner] as well. In the start when they were saying, ‘You should do that . . .’ I felt like letting a big scream. I have to learn like. Don’t keep telling. With [partner] it’s the same. It gets on your nerves when they keep repeating it, keep on saying it. Once or twice, I’d answer back.

AH: Would [partner] stay over here?

Emma: No. It would be embarrassing for me to ask them.

AH: Would he like to stay?

Emma: He probably would yeah. (19-year-old machinist)

Stephanie: He won’t go until I’m ready for bed in me night-coat and she’s [baby] already tucked up and everything is ready for the night. So he knows the two of us are comfortable, so he goes home happy.

AH: Would he ever stay the night?

Stephanie: No, he never stays. Well me da is very strict, you know that way. They wouldn’t like him to stay now, to be honest with you. (23-year-old, unemployed)

There was no case where a participant went to live with her partner’s family, and this is likely to have been rooted in the marital status of the women. One of the women who married during the pregnancy (and was withdrawn from the study on this basis) did commence living with her husband’s family after the marriage. This suggests that the selection of which family to live with continued to operate along traditional lines. The non-marital status of participants did, therefore, ensure that they remained in familiar territory interacting with those with whom they were already accustomed, unlike those first-time mothers in previous generations who were likely to have still been in the process of confronting their relatively new environment when embarking on motherhood.

Relationships between participants and their fathers after the birth

It has been noted elsewhere that fathers’ responses to their daughters’ pregnancies were
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more negative than those of mothers, and fathers took longer to recover from the news (Hyde, 1997a). However, participants' reports suggest that since the birth, their fathers had softened their attitudes to the situation a great deal. The contrast between fathers' negative responses to the pregnancy and their positive responses after the baby's birth was a strong feature of the data, particularly in those instances where the pregnancy had been most highly problematised by the father. Participants tended to note less of a change in the way their mothers interacted with them since the birth of the baby; but this was often reported to reflect the mothers' more supportive responses throughout the pregnancy. The mothers' positive responses after the birth were therefore less transparent than those of fathers, because the contrast with previous reactions was less marked. Celine describes her father's positive reaction to the baby and the improvement in their relationship:

Celine: I didn't know what way my dad would take him at the beginning especially after the way he reacted when I told mum and dad at the start, and as soon as he saw him he fell in love with him and he's brilliant. He'd sit and talk to him for hours lying on the floor and that. He's great. Dad and myself are getting on fine now. (17-year-old school pupil)

The predominant pattern was for fathers to become more respectful of their daughters after the baby's birth, although there was one instance where a daughter's social movements were controlled by her father in such a way that she felt she was being treated more like a child since becoming a mother, than she ever was prior to this. While this exception is noted, an understanding as to why the general pattern did not apply in this case was beyond the scope of study, as the participant herself did not know why her father was acting in this way.

What seemed to have some significance was that for a father, his daughter had more control over her baby than he had as a grandfather. The baby became a source of power for the women, because she could command respect as the baby's mother, and had the power to withdraw contact between her child and its grandfather if she felt she was being treated unjustly by her father. This bargaining power gained by participants with the birth of the baby is strongly suggested in both Eleanor's and Stephanie's accounts:

Eleanor: Ah me dad's way better now, he does spoil him, he does. He's totally softened up like.

AH: How is he towards you now?

Eleanor: Not a bother. He's not in bad form with me anymore.

AH: Is that since you had the baby or [interrupted]

Eleanor: Ya since I had him. I'd say he'd be afraid if he went on at me that I might go, get me own place and he wouldn't get to see [baby] . . . . (21-year-old, unemployed)

AH: How has your father been?

Stephanie: Oh great now since she came along. At one stage during the pregnancy, was I telling you?—I though I'd be kicked out, he was, like, that disappointed, and I didn't know how he'd be when he actually seen her, you know this is for real, but now, you know, he's great, mad about her.

AH: Would you say your father is still angry?

Stephanie: I don't know . . . he'd be slow maybe now to push me too far in case I stopped him seeing her but he knows I'd never do that. (23-year-old, unemployed)

With changing discourses on the male role within the family from that of provider to that of nurturer, a close relationship with his grandchildren may be seen by a grandfather as compensating for a more instrumental relationship with his own children. Cunningham-Burley (1987) noted in her study of grandfathers how participants perceived themselves to have had insufficient time to be with their own children, and felt that they would be able to spend a greater amount of time with their grandchildren. Similarly, Russell (1985) noted how grandfathers he studied frequently reported having experienced a lack of involvement with their own children, and attempted to compen-
sate for this through their grandchildren. Most participants within the present study reported that their fathers displayed a great deal of affection for, and a high level of interest in, the babies. Participants’ fathers were reported to talk to, sing to, and stimulate the babies and occasionally feed them; unlike their wives, however, they rarely changed diapers and washed clothes.

Whether the father’s change in attitude represented, to some extent, an acknowledgement of a change in the daughter’s status from child to adult is not entirely clear. It has been suggested by Sharpe (1994) in relation to adolescents at least, that the ‘unpregnant’ daughter reverts to being ‘daddy’s girl’ again following the baby’s birth:

It is interesting that some teenage mothers describe how angry and rejected their fathers were during their pregnancy, but how they were transformed into caring fathers after the baby is born. Perhaps when their daughter is back to her normal size they can ignore her sexuality again, and the new baby provides a non-sexual distraction and the novel experience of grandfatherhood. (pp. 89–90)

While Sharpe’s proposition may have some credence, there is also the important issue that the daughter, now a mother, has through her reproductive potential acquired a certain position of power in so far as she has control over who (including her own father) can have social access to the child. Her father has not appropriated the infant (although it usually takes his family name), and negotiating a harmonious relationship with his daughter is in his interest if he wants to ensure continued contact with his grandchild. This is not to suggest that the father’s fairly sudden turnaround in social interactions with his daughter after the baby’s birth is entirely strategic and devoid of affective content, but to acknowledge the power issues that are at stake when relations between fathers and daughters are negotiated.

A further explanation of the changed relationship between fathers and daughters after the births may be associated with the daughter’s new position within the domestic realm. Caring for a baby impedes the mother’s activities and movements in the public world of social and economic activities, and locates her more firmly within the home. Thus, while the daughter may have gained greater negotiating power by the presence of the baby, the father’s mellowed attitudes after the birth may be linked to the daughter assuming a nurturing role and its associated restrictions.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

This article reported on the experiences of participants in relation to their position in the matrilocal home during the early weeks of motherhood. It was noted that this style of organisation represented a transition in terms of male power within the family. In the traditional nuclear family, power within the family was concentrated in the position of male ‘head of household’ who has apparently fathered children within the family (although this biological relationship is not usually verified), and has appropriated such children as his, both legally and socially through a marriage contract. Within this type of reproductive arrangement, both mother and infants adopt his name. However, in the case of the matrilocal extended family units, the power base of the male patriarch who has biologically fathered the child and continued to remain in contact is reshaped, not just through the absence of the marriage contract, but through the specific spatial and often economic arrangements which undermine his power base to control the mother (of his biological child) and appropriate the child.

In the data presented, the undermining of male power was evidenced in the status of ‘guest’ rather than ‘head’ held by the male partner in relation to the household in which his biological child belonged. The ‘guest’ status meant that many of the privileges that the traditional male patriarch enjoyed as ‘head of household’ were denied, and the possibility to control the woman and child were reduced. This reproductive arrangement also resulted in free sexual access to the participant being denied to the putative father, and freedom to move and act within the matrilocal setting where the infant resided was frequently restricted.

Within the matrilocal extended family, gender relations were not only reshaped in relation to the putative father’s renegotiated position within the matrilocal household, relations between the participant and her own father were frequently redefined. In relation to her own father, the woman’s power in reproducing
an offspring provided her with some bargaining leverage vis-à-vis her own father within the family home. The latter, although still in a ‘head of household’ role did not automatically appropriate his non-marital grandchild, but had to delicately negotiate a position with his daughter so that the developing relationship between himself and his grandchild was not severed or threatened. The power position of the woman, however, was not complete and static simply because she was the gate-keeper of access to the youngest kin member; she continued to remain dependent to a large extent (though not totally) on the support of her family, without which her circumstances were likely to deteriorate. What the matrilocal extended family involves, therefore, is a diffusion of the centralised power of the woman’s father over his daughter, to a position where her reproductive power in producing an offspring that is not automatically appropriated by adult male kin allows her a certain amount of bargaining power for respect within the home.

The matrilocal extended family, therefore, does not simply represent a one-dimensional direction of power where women are subjected to the authority of the male ‘head’. What it represents is a complex web of relationships between the new mother and her family of origin, and between the new (biological) father, the new mother and her family. It does seem to denote, as indicated in the data, the undercutting of centralised male authority where, for example, a grandmother is likely to have a greater say in the raising of her grandchild than does the infant’s putative father, and where the daughter assumes greater control over her often coveted natural child than does her own father.

ENDNOTES

1. Although it has been noted that, in the Republic of Ireland at least, most non-marital mothers apparently marry within a few years of the birth (Whelan & Fahey, 1994), a study that followed up 109 randomly selected non-marital mothers 1 year after the birth found that 67% were living in the family home, while just under 15% lived alone with the child (Richardson, 1992).

2. An arrangement where a couple lives with or near the woman’s parents is called ‘matrilocal’ (Giddens, 1993, p. 392). However, matrilocal here refers to where the woman and child return to live in the woman’s parental home, and may or may not be still in contact with the putative father.

3. It is acknowledged that the automatic assumption of the male as head of household has begun to have difficulty being sustained in the last couple of decades because of changes in what constitutes the ‘breadwinner’ (Pahl, 1988). This has occurred because of the increase in redundancy, unemployment, and early retirement among men, along with the growth in participation rates of women in formal paid employment (Pahl, 1988).

4. The wastage was accounted for through withdrawal from the study before the arranged interview date, not presenting themselves on the day of the interview, change of address, marriage during the pregnancy, and premature births. This wastage rate compares well with other studies where participants were being interviewed in their own homes (Phoenix, 1991).

5. While all women were unmarried to the father of the foetus, two had previously been married to other men. All women were becoming mothers for the first time, though at least two participants had abortions previously and at least one had had an early miscarriage.

6. Three women became pregnant as a result of ‘one-night-stand’ sexual encounters and in another case the putative father was an occasional sex partner although the couple were not in a relationship.

7. Six women were not available for the second interviews. While the majority of infants were aged between 6 and 8 weeks, a small number were slightly younger or older.

8. Feminist standpoint epistemology is rooted in Hegel’s analysis of the master/slave relationship, and Marx’s development of this into the proletarian standpoint.

9. For a detailed account of data analysis see Hyde (1996a, Chapter 4).

10. The age of women is given as their age at birth of the baby. Their employment status in all cases is that at the beginning of the pregnancy, although a number of those in seasonal or temporary employment became unemployed during the pregnancy and a small number of women resigned from stable employment because of the pregnancy. Some occupations have changed to similar ones within the same socio-economic group according to the current Irish 6-point scale. This is to protect the anonymity of participants.

11. Although it has been frequently cited that unmarried young women experience a transition to full adult status once they become mothers with the passage from childhood to adulthood marked by motherhood (Ineichen, 1986; Irish Independent, 1993; Wilson, Daniel, Pearson, Hopton, & Madeley, 1994), evidence from the wider study (Hyde, 1996a) found little empirical support for this notion, at least within the home. Although, as indicated here, many women noted an improved relationship with their fathers, particularly where this had become problematic during the pregnancy, data from the wider project suggested that the status of adolescent was retained in a number of respects where participants lived in the parental home.

12. I am grateful to an anonymous referee for this idea.

13. Participants in matrilocal households were predominantly supported through Lone Parents’ Allowance, with a small number in paid employment. In 5 of the 10 cases where participants were still in relationships with the putative fathers, the latter did make some financial contribution to childcare, but this was almost always irregular and variable in quantity, and participants were not solely or even largely dependent on it.
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