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Marriage and Motherhood

The Contradictory Position of Single Mothers

Abbey Hyde

Introduction

This article explores the relationship between marriage and motherhood based on the accounts of Dublin-based women who gave birth to non-marital children in 1992 and 1993. Data suggest that while these unmarried participants had developed a consciousness about their own potential to be exploited within marriage, their cognisance of possible exploitation was not linked to an explicit feminist agenda. Despite their awareness of the limitations of marriage, they were nonetheless propelled towards potentially patriarchal marriages through a need for personal and financial security. They were also influenced by discourses that elevate the dual heterosexual family above other family formations.

I will start with a brief review of existing literature on unmarried women’s views of marriage, and locate data within their social and historical context. The methodological stance adopted in the study will then be outlined briefly. Data presentation will begin by exploring women’s views on the relationship between motherhood and marriage, and their own mothers’ influence on their thinking. This is followed by data suggesting that, in spite of the women expressing resistance to an alignment between motherhood and marriage, they hold contradictory views on marriage and are ultimately drawn towards marriage. I suggest that along with women’s need for companionship, the death of options open to women beyond marriage and dominant discourses on the family underlie some of the women’s views.

Existing Literature

The propensity women feel towards marriage has been noted in a number of other (international) studies. Jarrett’s study of African-American single mothers indicated informants’ wishes for marriage, but in an idealized version, although they remained pessimistic about the materialization of this aspiration. McRobbie found that working-class girls in her British study found themselves in contradictory positions; while their identities were expressed in female and feminine terms in the school (that is, a heavy concern with marriage, family life, fashion and beauty), in the family they were aware that the notion of romance fell far short of its ideals. Despite this, marriage and children were still strongly envisaged for the future. Phoenix found that while many pregnant adolescents in her study were negative about men and marriage, some women married before, during or after the birth. Phoenix has proposed four main reasons why women married, namely:

- to satisfy normative expectations;
- to have a familiar and reliable partner;
- to improve their circumstances (that is, leaving the family home); and
- because marriage seemed an attractive option in the absence of career opportunities.

Cowan and Lees and Lees explored the place of marriage in the lives of young, British working-class women. What Cowan and Lees suggested was that, despite girls’ fairly realistic views on marriage based on their observations of it within their own families and social circles, marriage was seen to protect the girls from being categorized as ‘slags’. The authors found that any unmarried woman was at risk of being labelled a ‘slag’ by her former partner once a relationship ended, irrespective of her sexual behaviour. Getting married was thus rooted in a negative choice, to avoid the negative connotations of spinsterhood.

Marriage and Childbearing in a Social Context

Patterns of marriage and fertility have changed considerably in Ireland over the past three decades, as have attitudes to non-marital childbearing.

The 1960s and 1970s witnessed an alteration in Irish marriage patterns from the previous era, with more people marrying, and marrying at a younger age. The reason for the increase was seen to be based on an escalation in real incomes and better economic prospects. The rise in the marriage rate, and the proliferation in the number of young married couples in the population was accompanied by a fall in family size. By the 1980s, however, the age at marriage was again on the increase, as was the rate of non-marriage. From the registration of births in 1964 until 1970, the total number of non-marital births, and the number of non-marital births as a proportion of total births remained virtually
unchanged. A steady increase in births outside marriage as a percentage of all births began in 1970. In that year, 2.6 per cent of all births were to unmarried women. By 1995, the figure had reached 22.2 per cent.

Until well into the twentieth century, the only refuge for many single mothers was the workhouse, which had developed in the nineteenth century under the Irish Poor Relief Act of 1838. The 1970s witnessed the beginning of discussions about the hardships experienced by single mothers. The 1970s also saw single mothers supported in the national media, and the initiation of organizations such as Almy and Cherish that offered alternatives to institutional care for those women keeping their babies, and also lobbied on their behalf for better provisions.

It was not until 1973 with the introduction of the Unmarried Mother's Allowance that single mothers received some regular state support, although the level of this did not allow the mothers to rise above the poverty line. Furthermore, without childcare facilities, women claiming the allowance had no choice of entering paid employment, given the low level of women's wages compared to those of men. The Unmarried Mothers' Allowance was subsumed under the Lone Parents' Allowance in 1990.

Over the past decade, a contradictory set of discourses has emerged on non-marital motherhood. At one level, the Status of Children's Act (1987) removed the status of 'illegitimacy' and brought property and maintenance rights of non-marital children into line with those of marital children. Furthermore, the subsumption of Unmarried Mothers Allowance under Lone Parents' Allowance could be seen to reduce the stigma of non-marital childbirth by treating single mothers like other women and men parenting alone irrespective of the reason why they were single parents. However, the public depiction of single mothers evidenced in media representations has been varied in the 1980s and 1990s. Although the label of 'illegitimacy' has been removed, in the words of an Irish Times journalist, 'a more neutral, more politically correct stigma has risen up to take its place: the notion of births outside marriage not as a moral problem, but as a social problem. Recent accounts have expressed alarm at the growing number of non-marital births.

Newspaper reports in the late 1980s suggested a growing hostility towards single mothers. Rather than concerns about sexual morality which dominated in the previous era, the re-emergence of negative attitudes was seen to be rooted in economic concerns about the drain of resources on the welfare state in spite of a plethora of studies indicating that lone-parent families (which includes single mothers) are overrepresented in poverty statistics.

In addition to economic concerns, disquiet also began to be expressed in the media about the decline in the family and the role of fathers. A recent Irish Times article stated:

No doubt we will have a price to pay for this [single mothering] one day. What the price will be, I cannot say. I merely doubt that [sic] entire generation of socialised, hardworking young fathers of a future generation will emerge from the sort of extended, relatively manless families which are appearing.

A headline in the Star newspaper in 1992 read, The single women who condemn their children to misery, and went on to state:

For what does the future hold for the thousands of Irish children who will never know the love of a father, never know anything about the lasting relationship between a man and a woman?

... the child of a single-parent family, often a tired and overworked mother, is more likely to do less well at school, more likely to turn to drugs and crime, more likely to be anti-social.

These social transformations give some insight into the changing social context in which the responses of participants may be interpreted.

Methodology

Data to be presented here was gleaned as part of a wider study of unmarried women's experiences of pregnancy and the early weeks of motherhood in an Irish context. The ante-natal clinic of a large maternity hospital in Dublin was the site of sample selection. Entry criteria were that potential participants be unmarried to the father of the foetus, and be first time mothers-to-be. The process of selection was as follows. Following a discussion with the midwifery sister at the Out-Patient Department, it was suggested by me, having established that the person satisfied the inclusion criteria, midwifery staff would inform potential participants that a woman doing a study on 'motherhood and being single' was present, and would like to talk to them and give them further information about the study. Women were to be informed that the decision to participate or not need only be made after they had spoken to me and acquired the details. Ninety women were invited to participate of which seventy-eight women (86.6 per cent) agreed to take part, and fifty-one of these (65.3 per cent) were eventually interviewed. Women were lost to the study for a number of reasons: 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.

Prior to the pregnancy, all but four (92.1 per cent) women were in relationships with the putative fathers, although these relationships varied a good deal in length and quality. At least fourteen (27.4 per cent) women were no longer in relationships by the time of the birth and another relationship terminated shortly after the birth. The women's ages ranged from sixteen to thirty-six. In relation to the socio-economic
status, eighteen (35.2 per cent) women were unemployed, and a further
eleven (21.5 per cent) were in manual occupations. While twenty (39.2
per cent) were employed in non-manual occupations, the bulk of these
were low-paid clerical jobs. The remaining two (3.9 per cent) participants
were schoolgirls. Clearly, the majority of participants were in poorly paid
occupations with a large proportion unemployed.

In-depth interviews were held in women’s own homes in the vast
majority of cases, with a small number occurring in restaurants or public
houses. Participants were interviewed on two separate occasions, firstly
in the later stages of pregnancy, and secondly, between weeks six and
eight after the birth. Forty-six out of the fifty-one participants were
interviewed on a second occasion. Participants’ names were changed to
ensure anonymity.

In order to centralize women’s experiences, the study adopted a
qualitative approach from a pluralist feminist standpoint position. Based
on the notion that human activity structures and sets limits on under-
standing, the feminist standpoint perspective was initially developed by
writers such as Harrissok, Rose, and Smith. It is underpinned by the
notion that a partial and distorted understanding of events has resulted
from the dominance of conceptual frames based on male perspectives of
the social world; this distortion, it holds, can only be redressed by
uncovering an understanding of the world from the perspective of
women’s activities. Some writers such as Gelschporpe have argued for a
pluralist standpoint position to acknowledge differences in women’s
experiences in relation to class, race, sexual identity and so on, which
earlier theoretical models of patriarchy tended to understate. The pres-
ent analysis was conducted from a pluralist feminist standpoint position.

Data analysis was facilitated using a style of qualitative analysis
resembling a grounded theory approach, first introduced by Glaser and
Strauss, and later developed and refined. An interview guide indicating
the main areas of questioning was drawn up in advance of the interviews.
In relation to data to be presented in this article, questions that were
asked related to women’s views on marriage and motherhood, and the
place of these in their lives. Unforeseen issues emerging from the early
interviews which appeared to be of theoretical relevance were added to
the agenda of the interview guide. As data collection progressed, ques-
tions about topics become more and more focused around theoretically
relevant issues and concepts. A constant comparative mechanism was
utilized with like items of data clustered and later theorized.

The Marriage/Motherhood Split

Until the relatively recent rise in non-marital childbirth referred to
earlier, marriage and motherhood had been strongly connected, and this
served the interests of patriarchy in so far as the social organization of
reproduction is male-controlled. However, some women in the study
constructed motherhood and marriage separately, particularly in the
course of the first interviews. While the majority of women favoured
having a partner present for the events of childbearing and rearing, and
some revealed that they would prefer to have been married, motherhood
was seen by others as separate from marriage:

Kim: I don’t think marriage comes into it anymore. It would be different if
I hadn’t got a fellow.

(21-year-old cleaner, first interview)

AH: Did you always want children?

Carmel: Ask me now! I used to say I wanted loads of babies and no
daddies! I used to always say that! That’s what my ma always says, ‘Your
words came true.’

(18 year old, unemployed, first interview)

Just why women were rejecting marriage is clearly spelled out in some
accounts where participants were explicit in their views that marriage
signified subservience and loss of control in the face of male dominance,
and something which would restrict their freedom:

Veronica: Well when you think of it, it’s only a ring and a piece of paper,
and then he thinks he owns you. You’d never have a social life or any-
thing. I prefer the way I am.

(24 year old, unemployed, first interview)

Beth: Because the way it is, I think these men that get married think, ‘Ah
ha. That’s fine now I can do what I like now’

(27 year old, unemployed, first interview)

Susan: Well, I don’t know. It scares me. I’m afraid I’m going to end up like
me mother. I’m afraid that I’m going to end up in a marriage that I don’t
want to be in . . . He [participant’s father] used to beat her [participant’s
mother] an awful lot, and he gave us an awful time. And I think it’s
because I seen that.

(26-year-old cleaner, first interview)

What the above accounts seem to suggest is the women’s con-
sciousness about gender inequality and a need to avoid patriarchal
control. As in Susan’s case above, negative feelings about marriage were
often based on the experiences of participants’ own parents, friends or
relatives, which supports the findings of other studies on single women’s
perceptions of marriage. Mothers, in particular, seemed to influence
participants’ views on marriage. A number of mothers discouraged their
daughters from marrying without due consideration:

Nora: My mother will always say, ‘Never marry him until you’re sure and
until you’re both ready. Don’t rush into things.’

(21 year old, unemployed, first interview)
Rebecca: None of my sisters are married. Me ma would put you off marriage for life! Never get married! You can have as many kids as you'd like – don't get married! . . . Then when we went pregnant, 'Don't have any more kids, and don't get married!' She's good about it and all.

(22 year old, unemployed, first interview)

In Teresa's case below, her mother's hesitation at marriage was directly linked to the latter's reported exploitation within her own marriage:

Teresa: Me ma was saying that when her mother was alive and when she got pregnant it was kind of, 'Well you have to marry.' She was forced into marriage because she got pregnant when she was eighteen. And it was kind of, you do everything for the man, everything has to be done for the man. He has to be happy and the whole lot like, and you have to marry if you're pregnant. Like that's why she said she'd never force any of us into getting married 'cause she's seen what happened with her. She ended up marrying a fellow that . . . just it didn't happen.

(20 year old, unemployed, first interview)

On the whole, where participants reported their mothers' views, the latter were found to advise against marriage unless it was being entered into because of genuine commitment to the relationship rather than to satisfy normative expectations about childbearing. This viewpoint was strongly in evidence among participants themselves during the first interviews — that when they did marry, they would do so for the sake of love and companionship and not to conform to social norms. A generation before, things were considerably different. In eleven instances, participants reported that their mothers were pregnant at marriage, and a further two of the mothers had children before they married. One could speculate that at least some of these marriages were entered into under pressure to satisfy gender prescriptions in the social organization of reproduction, particularly given that the estimated number of pregnant brides-to-be was 15.5 per cent in the late 1970s.

The accounts relayed above might appear to convey a feminist consciousness among the women to reject gender prescriptions (such as being wives before becoming mothers) on the basis that marriage was potentially exploitative. However, in the small number of cases (four) where direct reference to a feminist agenda was made either by me, or introduced by the women themselves, it was rejected. Two examples of this are presented:

AH: So you would take a feminist stance on marriage (participant had already expressed views that women are exploited within marriage).

Teresa: Ah no, I'm not into that women's lib stuff, that's ridiculous. I wouldn't see myself as that . . . I'm not into that.

(20 year old, unemployed, first interview)

Suean: . . . I mean, I'm not a women's 'libber' or anything like, but men haven't a clue . . .

(26-year-old cleaner, first interview)

This suggests that an acknowledgement about exploitation or potential exploitation was not framed by the women in terms of a feminist consciousness.

The Lure of Marriage

Although a number of women openly criticized marriage for its potential to exploit women, there was a great deal of conflicting perceptions of marriage, even from the same participants. While on the one hand, as indicated, there was a view that marriage represented a 'trap', on the other was a sense that it provided security. Although many participants mentioned the drawbacks of marriage, there was a tension between these and the need for security associated with marriage:

Teresa: Well he'll talk about it [marriage]. He's always mentioning it, like that when we're twenty-five we'll get married, but eh, I like to hear him saying that, 'cause it does [pause], it makes me feel secure to hear him saying that, that he would marry. I like to hear him saying that, 'cause I know then there is some sort of future.

(20 year old, unemployed, first interview)

While participants were aware of the increasing instability of marriage in society, many believed that marriage provided stronger roots for a relationship than non-marital cohabitation, in terms of the likelihood of one of the partners leaving the relationship. The notion of security was variously described as 'not being on your own', 'knowing there's someone always there', and 'being supported on a long-term basis'. Thus, while marriage was seen to be a controlling institution on the one hand, it was also perceived to be a supportive one. As indicated, participants' separations were to meet caring and reliable partners. They were aware from their own experiences that these might be in short supply, but hoped to strike lucky in meeting a supportive companion. Data presented here tends to concur with existing literature in so far as participants indicated their realistic perceptions of marriage on the one hand, yet aspired to an idealized type of marriage for themselves on the other hand.

In a few cases, while the women involved believed that marriage offered little or nothing over and above the benefits of cohabitation, they nonetheless accepted the marriage proposals of their partners when these were offered.

When asked about the possibility of having other children, a strong feature of data that emerged in the second interviews in particular was the considerable number of women who conveyed the view that if they were to become pregnant again, they would prefer to be married:

Penney: Not being married with one child is fine, but I'd certainly never see myself with more than one and not being married . . . but I wouldn't like to
be unmarried and have two or three children. I don’t think that’s right . . .
. . . I don’t think I’d be able to cope on my own with loads of kids. I sup-
pose it’s part and parcel of what people would think . . . as well as I just
couldn’t see myself with a big load of kids and on my own . . .
(24-year-old receptionist, second interview)

Rachel: I always wanted a baby for myself. I always used to say, marry,
like, ‘I’d like to have a baby’, but not to be with the fellow like. Like
for it to be mine on me own. But I never thought it would come true . . .
. . . I’d even like another but not for a long time. Five years. I’d prefer to
be married. But now that I have [baby] I probably would’ve married if I
knew he (future husband) was going to be all right, but then you can’t tell
what’s going to happen.
(19 year old, unemployed, second interview)

A preference to be married for a subsequent pregnancy was voiced by
women even in situations where marriage was attacked for its restrict-
tiveness, oppressiveness, and failure to work, and where the women
expressed resentment in the support their families were currently
offering. When probed about whether the aspiration for marriage related
to a personal need for consistent companionship, or for financial
security, it seems that both aspects were important to participants:

Marie: I wouldn’t have another one [baby] ‘cause I haven’t got the fellow
there to rear her with me so that’s why I wouldn’t have another one.

AH: If you had a fellow?

Marie: Probably. If I was married . . . if I had a big house and plenty of
money [laughs]. . . Other than that now, I wouldn’t . . . I always wanted a
baby. I always thought about thirty (laughs) when I’m married. Being
married in a big house and all. That’s what I’m still planning (laughs).

AH: Is it more having the house and that, or say other things about
marriage?

Marie: Ah yeah, having someone there with you to take some of the worry
as well.

(20 year old, unemployed, second interview)

Participants’ class position is an important consideration here because,
as suggested, a large number were either unemployed, in unstable occupa-
tions or in low-paid, non-manual occupations. Furthermore, older,
better educated women whose employment was more stable tended to
express greater indifference about marriage than the younger women.
Caution must be applied in relation to this finding because of the small
number of women who were in their late twenties or older. Furthermore,
because the older women were generally in higher socio-economic
groups, it is difficult to distinguish the impact of age and class on their
views. In addition, a number of the older women were cohabiting with
separated partners, or had been married previously themselves, and this
may have influenced their perceptions of marriage. Very few women
were in occupations that remunerated sufficiently for paid childcare
one child, let alone another. A number of women reported the need
support they would require for the practice of childcare as a reason
for marrying in the future, suggesting that the high level of support
for families that most experienced in relation to the first pregnancy may
not be envisaged for a subsequent pregnancy.

When eliciting women’s views on marriage during the course of the
first interviews in the present study, the inevitability of marriage in the
lives was less strong than appeared to be the case in both McRobb
and Cowie and Lee’s studies, even among the younger working-class
women.14 As indicated, marriage and motherhood were often con-
structed as separate, and the inevitability of childcare was a strong
feature of the data than the inevitability of marriage. At the second
interview, however, a smaller proportion of participants reported if
they were indifferent about marriage if they were to have more children.
In the present study, a fear of the ‘slag’ category, identified in Cowie’s
Lee’s study, might well have played a part in some participants’ views
being married for future pregnancies. However, it was noted in the
(1978) study that issues of individual sexual behaviour and moral
were not of central concern either among participants, their parents, or
in public discourses.15 It would seem, therefore, that there were still
issues involved in women’s wish to marry, such as the need for person
and economic security referred to earlier. Additionally, and very sign-
ificantly, the ideology of the two-parent marital family as the ideal status
in which to raise children emerged as an important factor for participas-
when contemplating their future social circumstances.

The Ideology of the Two-parent Family

A considerable number of the women who favour marriage in the
future mentioned their need to provide a secure home for their child in
future children, and hoped for a stable family life.

AH: Would you recommend motherhood from what you’ve experienced
so far?

Antonette: If you were settled down, and married, and you know you
wouldn’t be moving around, and could give the child a good home and
that. I wish I had a waited now: Give him (baby) a better life.
(19 year old, unemployed, second interview)

AH: Do you think you’ll have a second child?
Beryl: Definitely not until I’m married if I ever get married . . . I’d have to
be married. Part of it is the stable environment, like a home for the child’s
security although you could have that if you were just living together. But
if you’re with someone and you’re not married, there’s nothing stoppin-
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them walking out. I know it’s the same when you’re married, but in a
marriage you have to make things work, I’d just like to be married the
next time I have a baby, if I do have another baby.

(23 year old, unemployed, second interview)

AH: Would you like to eventually get married?
Celine: Yeah . . . If somebody did come along it would be me and [baby],
not just me. If he [potential husband] took to the two of us I wouldn’t
mind, but not if he just thought ‘You, and I don’t want to know about
the baby.’ I’d like if I got married later on that somebody would look on him
[baby] as his own. It’s very important that the baby is secure and looked
after, so I suppose I would like to marry eventually.

(17-year-old school pupil, second interview)

Like single mothers in other studies,90 Una voiced concerns about the
absence of a ‘father figure’ for her child: Una: I want to marry . . . I’d like him [baby] to have a father figure.

Somebody there, you know. Especially when he’s young, cause then he’ll
think no different than any other child. Like I feel sorry for him [baby]
more than anyone else.

(19-year-old waitress, second interview)

What this indicates is the strength of the ideology of the two-parent
marital family as the most favourable environment for children. This, it
seems, created contradictions for some participants who were ambiva-
ent about marriage, yet who felt that their children were disadvantaged
by the lack of the ideal family life advocated in social discourses. It is
perhaps not surprising that women found themselves in irreconcilable
positions about marriage, given the publicity associated with the ap-
parent damage the absence of a father figure can do, as indicated earlier.91

As control over female sexuality in terms of women’s freedom to be
sexually active before marriage is relaxed somewhat, the ideology of the
two-parent family as the only suitable environment for raising children
is reinforced, with women bearing children outside of marriage, especially
more than one child, being seen as irresponsible and unfair to their
children. Chandler has noted how unmarried women live in the shadow
of ‘the family’, a shadow that has a dual influence in structuring their
experiences and their perceptions and analyses of those experiences.92

The quality of lone parenting, she contends, is often evaluated against
the yardstick of the ‘normal’ family, with differences seen as deficit. Any
notions that participants in the present study may have had about the
potential injustices of marriage, it seems, were countermanded by the
insecurities they felt outside of marriage, and an ethic of responsibility
they felt towards their children.

Summary and Conclusion

Based on the accounts of a sample of single mothers, the women’s ambiv-
alenct about marriage and motherhood has been explored. Data sug-
gest that, influenced by their mothers’ experiences, participants were awa-
of the potential to be exploited within marriage; however, this con-
sciousness was not identified with an unequivocal feminist agenda.

Spite of women’s cognisance of the likely drawbacks of marriage, the
were, nonetheless, drawn towards marriage because of feelings of inse-
curity, both personal and financial, outside of marriage. This elucidates the
vulnerability and contradictory position of women who wish to avoid the
constraints of marriage, yet feel exposed outside of it. As Walby notes:

. . . women marry because they think they will benefit, and for many,
though not all, this is almost certainly the case. Marriage is often the lesser
of the evils in the limited options open to women.93

This vulnerability is particularly acute in considering their children:
whom participants felt would suffer in the absence of a father. I have
argued that, in addition to the need for personal and economic security
which serve the interests of patriarchy, but were situated in terms of children’s rights, played on women’s ethic of responsibility to their children. Collectively, these factors drew them in the direction of potentially patriarchal marriages.
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**Feminism: Personal, Political, Unqualified (or Ex-Colonized Girls Know More)**

**Ailbhe Smyth**

*Unqualifying*

In a way, these reflections started out a while ago as a paper I intended to give at "Women's Studies establishment" conferences outside Ireland. Each time, when I was literally on my feet and the point of delivery, I lost my nerve. I knew that what I wanted to say was too personal, too political and awkward for these sophisticatedly rational public articulations of the academic status and credibility of Women's Studies.

Feminism - as worldview and politics - has been an absolutely central part of my life for a very long time, and I cannot talk or write about it without being personal - deliberately personal - and explicitly political. I became involved in Women's Studies in order to challenge the always intensely covertly political closures, exclusions and sublimifying strictures of the very powerful academy and its allied institutions, not to reproduce them. I still believe that to be a primary responsibility and function of feminist academics. It depresses me that in becoming 'established', so much of Women's Studies seems to have so readily abandoned the principles of a transformative and necessarily oppositional practice of knowledge-making. While I have never expected my feminist politics to conduct me speedily up the academic career ladder, it distresses me greatly that whenever I speak (or want to speak) personally and politically. I experience this as disqualifying myself from 'real' academic status within Women's Studies.

I also lost my nerve because I was angry at still always being programmed in 'National Something-or-Another' slots. Since I like 'being