

FAMILY AND THE WORKPLACE:
THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF WORK

by

Richard Whipp Margaret Grieco
SSRC Work Organization Research Centre
University of Aston in Birmingham

NUMBER 239

July 1983

This paper was prepared during the 1983 University of Warwick
Summer Workshop on Work Organisation sponsored by the SSRC.

This paper is circulated for discussion purposes only and its
contents should be considered preliminary.

The Relevant Unit of Study: Nuclear Family or Extended Network?

Within the literature on the family, we contend, there has been an over-concentration on the character of conjugal roles and upon the related issue of male authority, to the exclusion of a concern with the wider kinship structure (Bott, 1957; 1971 - Rapoport and Rapoport, 1976). This paper will demonstrate the implications of such short-coming for the understanding of work organization. Much of this concern with conjugal roles owes its explanation to the quasi-ecological focus on co-residence in both historical and contemporary accounts of the family. A focus on co-residence as the measure of family structure is not surprising, given the relative ease with which such data can be collected; relational data is more difficult to collect and has correspondingly received less attention. This data collection problem has resulted in an imbalance in the attention devoted to the cellular/nuclear family, with this type of family being portrayed as the predominant form at the expense of a proper consideration of the role of the extended family or the kin network in the modern world (Parson and Bales, 1956).

This tendency gained impetus from the American structural-functional school - in particular the modernisation theorists - and their use of a priori assumptions in arguing the disappearance of the extended family. These assumptions, we suggest, have neither theoretical nor evidential foundation or support. Using the work of Anderson (1971) to move away from co-residence as the single most important

factor in outlining family structure and relationships, we turn to a definition of family closer to anthropological understanding and focus upon kin network (Mitchell, J.C., 1968). When expanding the concept of the family to embrace the more general and extensive notion of kin network, our concern is not with analysing the family per se but in delineating the role of the family in shaping employment opportunities and in regulating toil both in terms of control and resistance through time. We wish to draw attention in particular to the flexibility of the family as a social form and its utility as a device for economic and social adjustment across a range of industrial contexts.

The Family and Work: Themes and Questions

We found ourselves puzzled by accounts of the employment relationship which gave no cognizance to the role of the family (Hill, 1981; Price, 1983). Such accounts were at variance with our own research materials and findings. We explored a little further. An apparently more promising point of departure was taken from the substantial statements delivered by Anderson (1971); Stone (1975); Goldthorpe (1969); Tilly and Scott (1975 and 1978), on the state of the family. The individual positions of these authors can be collectively summarised in the following way: the family was present in the workplace but now has lost its significance as an organizing principal or structure in the employment context. Although we do not wish to argue that these authors constitute a single school of thought they appear to have reached, by a variety of paths, this same resounding conclusion. The purpose of this paper is to question this conclusion from both a theoretical and empirical perspective. Whilst these

authors purport to have established a decline in the relevance of the family to workplace organization, their position is inadequately articulated and explained. On merging these accounts, we are left with the question: if industrialisation explains the tightening of kin linkages, what accounts for the decrease or supposed decline in significance of the family for the workplace in the modern period?

The stress on neo-classical notions of organizational efficiency contained in these analyses displaces empirical research from the real question of how people actually get jobs. We note that the conflict between organizational efficiency, ie. the operation of meritocratic recruitment procedures and the operation of particularistic vehicles (ie. the family) in allocating job opportunities is typically implied within a rationalist framework rather than demonstrated in an empirical fashion.

A review of classical labour market studies (Palmer, 1964; Rees, 1966; Sheppard and Belitsky, 1966) leads us to seriously question this collection of unnecessarily rationalist paradigms. These studies document the extent to which employers recruit precisely upon particularistic criteria, for family membership may provide useful information signals to an employer. Particularism is harnessed in the interest of efficiency: the old assumptions of conflict between particularism and efficiency may, in this context, be misplaced. Introducing the concept of information costs radically alters the picture. However, the labour market literature itself is insensitive to the fluctuations, alterations and indeed continuities in the relationship between family forms and work organization over time.

An insensitivity to the historical perspective is not confined to labour market studies alone; such insensitivities also exist within the literature which may be termed women's studies. Whereas labour market studies generally fail to address the historical dimensions, women's studies (Hewitt, 1958; Pinchbeck, 1969; Rowbotham, 1973; and Richards, 1974), with their understandably partisan approach, fall short of adequately documenting the historical experience of men: that interaction between men and women which is the family remains but partially assessed. Limiting the focus to the domestic and employment situation of women cannot reveal the specific relationship between the family and the control of male behaviour at work and in the home.

The literature on the labour aristocracy (Hobsbawm, 1964; Gray, 1976; Matsumura, 1976 and 1983; Foster, 1974) provides us with a sense of direction in understanding the mechanisms by which family control is exercised over male behaviour. This perspective directs us to two fundamental processes which are analytically separate, although often coupled together in reality, that of skill transmission and job inheritance. Although, convinced by this analysis in as far as it goes, we would maintain that these features are more general and pervasive than any one author has so far suggested. The process of social closure is not confined to the 'upper reaches' of the working class, it is a property of all levels of society and is to be found within all forms of selection.

Recent studies of managerial strategy (Wood, 1982; Littler, 1982) omit consideration of these processes. Similarly the occupational community literature (Salaman, 1971; Tunstall, 1962; Dennis, 1956; and Matsumura, 1983) - typically studies of the extreme occupations - though conscious of the relationship between the social and territorial, fails to identify the way in which kin groups appropriate job niches and modes of organization of work to themselves. We also wish to draw together a wide range of studies which are connected by their concern with ethnic employment and recruitment practices (Hareven, 1982; Wrench and Lee, 1981; Harvey, 1981; and Brooks and Singh, 1979).

Although this literature itself focusses upon the level of general recruitment to the organization, from the evidence presented the more specific relationship between recruitment practice and the precise placement of the individual in the production process can be ascertained. Networks not only determine entry to the labour force but also designate the actual job slot. Finally, our purpose, then, is to establish that control of employment opportunity cannot be understood from a one-dimensional perspective, but only through an appreciation of the interaction between employee (both collectively and individually defined) and employer interest.

Family, the Workplace and Trade Unionism

This section is derived from a study of work and trade unionism in the British pottery industry during the period 1900-1930 (Whipp, 1982 and 1983). The main contention is that the family and kin networks are

important means of understanding the organization and regulation of work as well as forming a central element in the social relations of pottery manufacture.

An analysis of the relationship between home and work, and of the bridge which the family formed between these two worlds, provides the basis for a fresh examination of collective organization and action in the workplace.

A 'map' of the manufacturing process and division of labour in the pottery industry reveals the intense sub-division of production and its separation into myriad workshops organized around small primary workgroups. The workgroup composed of family or kin relations took two main forms: the family group where parents employed their children or younger relations and the all-female or all-male groups and gangs made up a mixture of close and distant relations. These forms of working are traceable through the long-term and uneven transition of pottery manufacture from its cottage/handicraft stage to the factory based phase during the 18th and 19th centuries.

The family not only provided the social base and cohesive force for workgroups but was also the source of information and support covering a wide range of subjects and situations. Skill transmission, job inheritance and the creation and exploitation of employment opportunities were the most well-known examples. Yet family relations were also the key means by which children developed prior orientations to work and where new entrants to the labour force were socialized into the world of work and unofficially trained. The social ties of the family and

work-group's ability to generate customs and codes which defined practices, such as training, produced a form of shopfloor control albeit on an often localised scale and with a limited degree of strength. Moreover, an awareness of the family based workgroup and a recognition of the intersection of the worlds of home and work led to the discovery that men and women could co-operate in the routine management and operation of domestic or factory work. Whilst male and female potters lived in a society where gender relations were clearly shaped by cultural and legal conventions which embodied patriarchal values, the immediate reality of piece-work, fragmented production and the health problems connected with pottery work made it necessary for potters' families and kin to co-operate if their survival strategies were to succeed. The example of the potters when taken in conjunction with evidence from other industrial settings has two implications for the historiography: first, it criticises the traditional view which has seen women as essentially passive objects in the male dominated workplace; second, the model of family structure which preclude the co-operation between men and women over family tasks in the closely linked extended family is seriously questioned.

Having established the role of the family in the social organization of work, an investigation of the potters' union's composition shows that the family also played a key part in its shopfloor foundation. Workers joined and left the union as part of family units which were, in addition, the main vehicle for day-to-day industrial action and organization. An awareness of the informal mechanisms of family and kin allegiance could be usefully added to accounts of trade unionism which emphasise the workgroup as a principal reference point for collective action.

Employers could use family and kin relations at work as an integral part of managerial strategy. Family connections provided employers with sources of knowledge regarding the character and quality of labour as well as a means of acquiring skilled workers. Contemporary research on the auto industry confirms the pottery example which shows that the use of family sub-contract groups fitted in well with the simple, indirect methods of control which predominated in Britain's generally labour intensive industry (Whipp and Clark, 1983). Ideologically the image of the 'family firm' was a central component of the 'paternalism' in the context of 'laissez-faire' which has historically characterised British management labour policies (Joyce, 1980).

Analytically, the family can be seen as a salient component or contextual feature of the organization of work in three main areas: firstly, with regard to the intersection of the worlds of work and home; secondly, via the inter-penetration of the regulative codes of the workplace with the collective organization and action of workers, and thirdly, the pottery industry is a clear instance of the importance management assigned to family and their relations in their efforts to control their enterprises and production. (One might add a fourth dimension, in the Potteries or on a national level, where the family was a central element in the early 20th century debate over work and its regulation by the state (Whipp, 1983 Ch4.3). There is not sufficient space, however, to go into that area here.)

Let us take each of these three areas in turn:

Firstly, and arguably, the most important aspect of the family and work relationship, was at the everyday level of work and domestic routines. Historians are beginning to recognize the common experience of

a continuum which existed between home and work. As E.H. Pleck observes 'it is becoming more common to mesh two specialities, labour history and the history of the family because these topics embrace two of the more fundamental areas of human activity' (Pleck, 1976). In the potteries not only was there the strong immediate physical link between the worker's house and the potbank, but domestic work routines were synchronized in order that the large potters family could meet the requirements of a highly irregular production process, with its associated mix of seasonal rhythms and in the absence of formalised hours of work.

Successive government inquiries told the potters what they already accepted as common-place - that the family and kin relations remained the essential principal around which work was socially organized. As studies of dockers (Hill, 1976), miners (Samuel, 1977), steel workers (Grieco, 1982) and engineering workers (Young and Willmott, 1957) have shown in this country; as investigations of textile workers in New England have revealed (Hareven, 1982) and as the case of the potters demonstrates, work-groups could rely on family and kin as means of recruiting new members and to maintain job and skill succession. The family could also be a key means of developing work group control of production and be responsible for transmitting control mechanisms and customary practice as Carter Goodrich allowed for in his classic study (Goodrich, 1920), Such behaviour was entirely consistent within British industry where empirical knowledge was so vital a part of technology.

In general terms this leads us to agree with Humphries' argument that the persistence of the working-class family can be partly explained by its ability to reproduce labour power for employers (Humphries, 1977) but also because workers defended an institution which enabled them to both organize

and come to terms with work and to defend themselves against those forces which developed in the workplace to spontaneously divide workers (Reid, 1980).

In terms of family survival strategies the potters' experience echoes the findings of Christine Heward on Birmingham (Heward, 1981), Elizabeth Roberts on Jarrow (Roberts, 1977), or John Benson's study of so-called Penny Capitalism (Benson, 1983), where only because women and children worked (officially and unofficially) that working class families were able to subsist and overcome the periodic crises of intermittent male employment. The potters are therefore an example of the survival of important factors of family and kin within the workplace and add weight to Hareven's statement that the 'historical problem of the separation of family and work had not been consummated across the entire society' (Hareven, 1982). Moreover, putting the evidence of the potteries alongside S. Alexander's criticism (Alexander, 1979) of the census readings of female and juvenile work well into the 20th century, Tilly and Scott's assertion of unilinear historical change whereby 'increased productivity and high male wages permitted a sharper division of labour within the household or between home and work' is seen to be overdrawn: married women especially were not simply 'preferred as child-care and consumer specialists' (Tilly and Scott, 1978). On the contrary, it was via family work relationships that women could play an active role in shaping and helping to determine the forms of employment. In popular imagery the male may have remained the public head of the family or work group yet in reality women could often be the principal private organizers. On the evidence regarding industrial disease and the pottery work cycles, complete male dominance and female subordination or dependency cannot be taken as an accurate picture of the relations within the potters' work group or family. Indeed as Smith (Smith, 1976) or Moorhouse (Moorhouse, 1981), have suggested it was in the family that women could exert the greatest influence on working class behaviour and

and where attitudes and values towards work were most commonly generated.

Secondly, the potter's family was not only central to the organization of work but provided one of the logical foundations for collective action. The work group (based on family and kin relationships) was the first point of reference for not only job but union entry. Family relationships were one of the strongest threads in the social fabric of the union as the personal testimony of the collectors and the union registers and survey of the 1920s demonstrate. While studies of trade unions have recognized the relationship between the workplace and trade unionism, (the article by Child, Loveridge and Warner (1973) points to the relevance of the workgroup for work organization and trade union analysis) the contribution of the home and the family to that relationship has hitherto remained unexplored. Joanna Bornat (Bornat, 1977) has asserted that the close link of home and work maintained through dependence on, and exploration of, family ties provided the context for participation in trade unions yet she fails to investigate the way the family and kin ties at work could provide the specific basis for resistance and control in the workplace.

One of the features to emerge from the pottery study is that it was via the family-based work and union membership groups that women and men, either separately or jointly, could take action to regulate their toil or the conduct within their workshops, especially during the commercial upheavals of the 1900-1930 period. Using the conceptual framework which arises from the pessimistic tradition in the historiography of women and trade unions from Beatrice Webb (Webb, 1898) to Sheila Rowbotham (Rowbotham, 1973), it is possible to uncover evidence of subordination of

women at work and in unions. However, to be guided solely by the pessimistic view would mean we miss a whole world of female activity associated with the organization of work as Alice Kessler-Harris has demonstrated in American labour history (Kessler-Harris, 1976). The potters' example - similar to the findings of Tolliday (Tolliday, 1982) on the early auto industry - indicates the existence of a strain of small-scale collective action by women workers, both inside and outside the formal union organization. The attempts by women workers during the First and Second World Wars to exert control over their labour were seen as novel: in effect they were continuing, during a period of crisis, what they had routinely practised unofficially for years. Claims by Burgess and others (Burgess, 1975; Joyce, 1980) that the family in the textile industry was a means of containing conflict among workers which arose from the labour process, and made for passivity under patriarchal authority require, perhaps, more careful scrutiny. The relationship between family presence and control is, we have shown, not a simple one. One-sided accounts require cautious treatment.

Thirdly, the family may be a useful tool for understanding managerial behaviour. The pottery industry is yet another instance of the family as the social and psychological base of the firm, either public or private, well into the 20th century (Payne, 1974). It is especially notable in the pottery industry case how owners allied the social organization of the firm with their attempts at control by making use of the image of the family. Besides using the workers' family as a means of recruitment and indirect control of production via sub-contracting, pottery owners constantly sought to construct dominant images of the social relations of the potbank and thereby elicit the cooperation (if not the consent) of workers in the pursuit of profit: at the centre of this set of images was the family.

Members of the owners' family bestowed gifts on workers and vice versa; the succession of generations of workers employed in a firm was lauded. Moreover in such relatively small firms the symbiotic value of the family and its implicit authority relations for industrial relations was immensely high as Joyce has shown for Lancashire (Joyce, 1980) and Flandrin on a wider scale in France (Flandrin, 1979).

Kin Networks, Labour Force Recruitment and Workplace Control

The object of this section is to investigate the links between family structure and industrial employment in modern societies, paying particular attention to the mechanisms of information transfer and migration. Although one might have thought that the old debate about the effects of modernization on family structures and functions was over, this paper draws attention to some neglected ways in which modern societies and family relationships affect each other (Grieco, 1982a).

We argue that it is precisely the role of the family in channelling employment opportunities in complex industrial societies which best challenges Parsonian orthodoxy. We focus specifically on the working-class family and will emphasize, in particular, the role of employment information transfers and employment-related migration in maintaining, widening and intensifying kinship links.

According to the orthodoxy, kinship is seen as irrelevant to occupational choice and location; rather, the market is viewed as allocating individuals efficiently to occupational locations on the basis of achievement rather than ascription. However, it should be noted that at

the very least such a position runs counter to evidence from a number of sources, some of which have not yet been incorporated into mainstream sociology. Both current and historical evidence demonstrate the importance of family in the recruitment of labour to industrial vacancies (Manwaring, 1982; Arensberg and Kimball, 1940; Hareven, 1975; Wedderburn, 1965).

Employers have an interest in standardizing their labour forces, especially where the existing labour force is positively regarded. Recruitment through kin networks, we argue, enables the employer to accomplish standardization of the labour force at minimum cost and provides for continuing access to that labour source.

Many employers encourage employees to procure prospective employees from within their kin and friendship networks. The recruitment of new members of the workplace in many cases takes place solely by means of employee referrals. From the perspective of the company, family labour is homogeneous labour, and satisfaction with the existing work force leads to kin-based recruitment strategies. Such recruitment strategies expand domestic space beyond the home for the family as a result of these processes gains a presence in the work place. The recruitment of labour through the informal networks of the existing labour force is a widespread practice, and this practice we have explained on two major counts. Firstly, employee referral provides the cheapest method of obtaining labour. Secondly, employee referrals provide an efficient screening mechanism. But there is a third count which has consequences for the labour process debate. Recruitment through employees possesses potential as a form of control since responsibilities and obligations hold between workers so recruited: for if the sponsored

antagonizes the employer, the reputation of the sponsor himself will be damaged. Thus the new worker is constrained by the interests and reputation of his sponsor. Kin may be harnessed through the recruitment process as part of an explicit strategy of managerial control.

The recruitment of labour through kin networks, we note, is a feature not only of periods of economic expansion but also of periods of economic recession, and we discuss this more fully later in this section. This section concludes with a discussion of the interaction between kin presence in the labour force and managerial strategies of control in the workplace, with special consideration being given to this dynamic as it operates in one-industry towns. The oil, steel and fishing industries all provide evidence as to the existence of this set of relationships in contemporary industrial society. The arguments presented in this paper indicating the importance of the family in the allocation of employment opportunity in the present are based on three distinct sets of evidence derived from these industries.

The first data set was collected in 1976/1977 on the fish curing and processing sector of Aberdeen (Grieco, 1977a). It covered twenty companies, combining survey and in depth interview methods and had as its intention the identification of conflict between the oil and fish processing industries for female labour. An investigation of the recruitment practices of employers in this sector revealed a heavy dependence on the existing work force in the obtaining of new labour. Kin networks, the evidence revealed, served both as recruitment and training institutions for female labour in the fishing sector.

Employers were dependent on work force compliance in the skilling of new labour. Interviews (30) with fish workers were also conducted in the same period and these served to confirm the analysis generated through contact with management.

This sector of the fishing industry is characterized by a highly fragmented, small work place structure, this structure reflecting the extreme fluctuations associated with production in this sector. It is precisely this variability, with its rapid fluctuations in demand for labour, which provides the existing work force with a crucial role in labour recruitment. Much of the employment in this sector is casual in character. The structure of this sector and its social organization parallel in the contemporary period, that documented for the potteries historically in the previous section.

The second data set collected in 1977 on the oil-related engineering sector of Aberdeen (Hunt, Grieco, Millar, 1977) under the auspices of the local development agency - covered approximately 800 companies - that is every company advertising an oil-related or engineering presence in the city and Peterhead and was concerned to identify conflicts between oil and the traditional industries of the region. Here we were concerned primarily with the competition for male labour. Once again, the method used was a combination of survey and interviews. In response to questions on recruitment strategies, employers stressed the importance of their existing workforce as a recruitment channel.

Furthermore, employers reported the recruitment of labour through the kin network from as far afield as Corby. This labour was in fact return migrant though that dimension need not concern us here. Recruit-

ment through kin and friendship networks was, it seemed, not confined to the purely local level, but also operated over distance. Once again reports of work force involvement in the skilling of new labour were in abundance. Skilling furthermore was not confined as an activity to the workplace but also took place outside the gates (Acero, 1983*).

The impression gained from these two analyses was at fundamental variance with the prevailing orthodoxy in sociology - the family was clearly important in allocation of employment opportunity. Furthermore geographical mobility did not appear to result in the attrition of family ties, for precise information on particular employment chance was being communicated over geographical distance to kin members whose out-migration had taken place some considerable time past.

An unhappiness with the current understanding of the relationships holding between migration, information, employment and the family led to the collection of a third body of data though the evidence was gathered in a different manner altogether from the first two sets. The explicit focus of this study was in the identifying of the role of kin networks in supplying employment information in the migration process and upon documenting the resultant structure. Thus much of the literature assumes that migrants move as individuals or nuclear family units - despite the existence of an extensive literature on ethnic migration which should have generated an unease in the mainstream with such a simple assumption (Brooks and Singh, 1979). Evidence on group geographical mobility from the second data set suggested that the mainstream version of the process was inaccurate and too general in character. The research on working-class migration - more specifically upon the mass mobility of labour - required

* Acero provides comparable evidence on the development of home-skilling as a response to managerial initiative in the Brazilian textile sector.

extending. Evidence was collected on the major out-migration of labour from Peterhead to Corby and Luton in the 1950s and on subsequent migrations thereafter. Comparable data was collected on the simultaneous migration of labour from Glasgow and North Lanark.

The approach and methodology used are best described as anthropological. Key figures in organizing the out-migration were identified and interviewed at the outset - thus the labour exchange officers responsible for administering the transfer worker scheme, through which employers recruited labour en masse, were traced and interviewed in order to establish the approximate dimensions involved. Migrants were identified through enquiries of relatives in the community of origin who provided information on their location; by gaining access to the records of the electricity board in two locations; by name search using the electoral records and telephone directory; and by snowballing through the networks of migrants contacted on any other basis whilst living in Corby within the migrant community. This methodology was precisely concerned to reveal the connectedness of the Corby 'community' pre-migration and to reveal its continuing connectedness to its area of origin.

The evidence from Corby reinforces the understanding derived from the previous two data sets of the importance of kin in employer recruitment strategies - it also challenges the orthodoxy of the mainstream literature that geographical separation necessarily weakens kin ties. The population of Corby is in fact better connected into the employment recruitment channels of its area of origin than it is into its immediate hinterland. The anthropological evidence demonstrates a

pattern of labour circulation between Corby and Glasgow which shares more in common with the patterns of labour mobility found in the third world than any documented for industrial society (Wilkinson, 1982 *). Corby is a socio-industrial enclave and as such has special features which accentuate the degree of connection back into the area of origin but the general characteristic of continuing links between migrants with area of origin does not require such extreme conditions. The strength of kin ties over distance provided for a continuing source of labour for Corby, with follow up migrations providing sufficient labour for annual returns to the area by company recruiting teams. Kin advised kin about the timing of the drives - no advertisements appearing in the local press - with the result that Corby demonstrates a high degree of connection as a community. Recruiting drives, of course, provided a bridge of common interest between the two locations over and above affective ties. They reinforced the importance of kin in the allocation of employment opportunity over distance.

Kin's influence in channelling employment opportunities was not confined to the provision of privileged information on the date of recruitment drives but extended also the provision of guarantees as to the performance of the applicant. The reputation of a present worker affected or determined the opportunities of his relatives. 'Speaking for' applicants by the present work force was part of the recruitment drive procedure. Dennis Marsden (Marsden, 1982) in his work on unemployment noted the importance of network connectedness in gaining employment and provides illustrations of the 'speaking for' phenomenon in other industrial settings.

* Wilkinson's account of migration patterns in Lesotho shares many features with those documented for Corby.

Recruitment through kin also took place in Corby itself. Kin travelled to Corby outside of the recruiting drives and made application through the office or at the gates in response to present work-force knowledge about vacancies. Thus the anthropological approach fleshed out substantially the insights derived from the survey material. The anthropological study operated at both ends of the migration chain with the further twist that evidence was collected on the return migration from Corby to Peterhead and upon the re-integration of that labour into the local economy consequent upon redundancy in Corby and the development of North Sea oil. The data sets are then distinct but related.

All three sets of evidence revealed the role of kin and friendship networks in the search for employment and in its counterpart, the search for labour. Furthermore, all three sets of evidence revealed the significance of kin in the skilling of labour, both within and equally important without the workplace. At the commencement of the research, the field was sparse on the topic. Since then, there has been development, most particularly the work of Tony Manwaring (1982), on the extended internal labour market which lends support to our analysis. Most of the work on the topic has been confined to identifying recruitment procedures in the manpower planning mould rather than with theorising on and tracing its significance for the dynamic of control and conflict in the workplace - perhaps not surprisingly given the level of detailed work required.

Manwaring has confined his interest essentially to local recruitment dynamics but, we suggest, it is with the long-distance recruitment of labour that the strongest control effects are to be found. As kin is a major vehicle for achieving entry to the workplace (the extended internal labour market), employers, by recruiting long-distance labour which is not connected into the kin network of the locality, can effect in the immediate future barriers to labour mobility within the vicinity. Clearly, over time and under normal

circumstances, such long-distance labour will penetrate the local employment structure. The one-industry, one-employer character of Corby has prevented this natural dynamic. The consequence as already indicated has been a pattern of labour circulation

The development of a one-employer, one-industry town on the basis of a migrant work-force affords, we argue, employers extra degrees of control over the leakage of labour into the local economy, and over work force behaviour in the work place. Before proceeding to present some propositions on the relationship between kin networks, labour force recruitment and workplace control, we wish to draw attention to the fact that kin networks are used extensively both in situations of excess supply of labour and in situations of labour shortage. In situations of excess supply, recruitment through the present labour force provides for a lower administrative requirement than public advertising. In situations of labour shortage, such as those holding for our first two data sets, kin networks retain their importance and draw in labour from beyond the boundaries of the local labour market. We have discussed, elsewhere, the implications of this ability to recruit beyond the locality through the present work-force for the definition and determination of what precisely constitutes a local labour market (Grieco, 1982b)

Some Propositions on the Relationship of Family to Control in the Work Place

The purpose of this section is to relate certain of the understandings embodied in previous sections explicitly to the labour process debate. The propositions are presented in a more generalised form than statements made elsewhere in the paper in order to stimulate a more general debate upon the topic than that typically provided through case studies.

RESISTANCE

Informal Organization and the Restriction of Output: The Work Group

1. Kin networks are extensively used by employers as major recruitment channels
2. Counterpart proposition: individuals continue to make extensive use of kin networks in the search for employment.
3. The interaction of these two related dynamics has important consequences for the understanding of work organization.
The relationship between informal groups and restriction of output is well recognised in the literature.
4. The frequently associated assumption that informal groups are generated solely within the work place is ill-founded.
5. The generation of informal groups is a property of connectedness of the workforce: connectedness is a product of 1 and 2.
6. The division between internal and external forms of association is over-rigid.
7. Focussing on the restrictions of output purely through the internal arrangements of the work place is insufficient. External factors also determine the formation of informal groups within the workplace.

Formal Organization and Collective Resistance: Trade Unionism and the Potteries

1. Family and kin networks are important means of understanding the organization and regulation of work as well as forming a central element in the social relations of pottery manufacture.

2. The specific technology of the pottery industry generates a high degree of fragmentation with an accompanying intense subdivision of production and its separation into myriad workshops organized around small primary work groups. Such fragmentation facilitated the annexation of the individual workshop by the particular kin group: it generated the kin niche.
3. The very fragmentation of production and the segmentation of the work force precludes the ready identification of the small scale and informal form of collective organization and action.
4. The informal organization of shop floor control is best practised by the small group in the localized context: informal shop floor control is essentially a localized phenomenon.
5. The work group based around family and kin relations was the first point of reference for entry to the union and provided one of the strongest threads in the social fabric of the union.
6. The family was equally important in determining individual and group exit from the union: to put it at its most fundamental the family was capable of allocating or withholding the union membership fee from its members.
7. An awareness of the informal mechanisms of family and kin allegiance could be usefully added to accounts of trade unionism which emphasize the work group as a principal reference point for collective action.
8. Family based work and union groups formed the bridge between the collective actions of men and women.

9. The predominant view in the literature on women and work is pessimistic in its outlook and provides a poor guide to the depth and extent of female activity in and around the work place.

Incorporation

Management Strategy, Recruitment Policy and the Structuring of Labour Markets

1. Employers harnessing of the kin network has two dimensions, a technical aspect and a political aspect. Technically, kin provide an efficient information and recruitment system in the sphere of labour attraction.
2. Such connectedness has a political dimension in that it provides the conditions necessary for informal control.
3. To argue that a particular mode of recruitment provides for the establishment of certain properties of control is not necessarily to argue that such recruitment strategies have as their intention the construction of such power. Control need not be the product of intention - it may be the product of context and custom.
4. Control may be difficult to identify where it has become so routinized that it is accepted as a given - a natural state of the world - and hence not articulated. Control may reside in custom: it need not be explicit or articulated until a point of crisis.
5. Control of kin by kin may provide a basis for resistance or for incorporation by employers in the work place.

6. Long-distance recruitment can provide employers with extra degrees of control. The importance of kin networks as an employment channel can result in new migrants being poorly connected into the general employment structure of an area, their information links being with a specific employer and place of employment - hence the construction and development of the ethnic niche.
7. The relationship between employer control of housing and workplace control retains significance within the present though in an altered form. This relationship is most clearly visible in the context of mass long distance labour migration.
8. Recruitment through kin networks provides a mechanism for effecting segmentation in the labour market. The recruitment of like by like provides the necessary mechanism for indirect labour market discrimination.
9. Employer use of kin networks as a recruitment strategy generates information-based power within the politics of the family for the other gender. The allocation of employment opportunity is not determined by the male world alone even where the opportunity itself is confined to males, for information on employment opportunity passes across the bridges formed by the other gender within the network structure. Thus husbands pass information to wives, who as sisters pass information on jobs to brothers; brothers to sisters and wives to husbands, these are the routes taken by employment information. Relationships outside the 'market', as narrowly defined, condition opportunity within.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we trace the connections between our paper and other contributions delivered to this workshop.

Firstly, we would wish to draw attention to that work of Maxine Berg which demonstrates the importance of relations within the family to the organization of work. In particular her treatment of the role of women and her stress on their continuing industrial and economic importance beyond the stage of domestic manufacture, is both mirrored and confirmed by the evidence presented in the pottery industry. The second contribution from which we received analytical sustenance is the work of Bill Lazonic. He aptly indicates that Marx himself never truly grappled with the contest for control in the workplace or the role of the family in that process. Lazonic signals, in passing, that the family, far from being destroyed by capitalist development, persists through it and remains the basic unit for the material and cultural reproduction of the labour force. Within the papers presented, however, he fails to identify the significance of this robust structure - the family - for work organization. The thrust of our analysis is that not only does the family maintain itself in the manner suggested but more importantly the family can determine the precise features of the organization of work.

Thirdly, we are in accordance with Nolan and Edwards in their argument for a differentiated appreciation and understanding of control and conflict in the work place: attention to the role of the family

in the control dynamic, we suggest, represents one possible direction and basis for such differentiation.

Fourthly, we welcome the contribution made by those mainstream economists which recognises the importance of cultural and community variables in determining attitudes to work and their effect on work organization. Bradley, in his footnote, follows the direction taken by Lockwood and Colhoun in suggesting that 'community variables are important in forming specific images of society', and that 'further, community or extra-industrial variables, are important to industrial conflict theories'. This understanding is in exact accordance with our own stance that any explanation of work organization should not artificially segregate the work place from the home or the community; control is not bounded by the factory gates or the domestic hearth. On a theoretical basis, Cable and Fitzroy stress the significance of loyalties outside the work place, in determining the possibility of social cohesion within. Such a view is confirmed by our own work. We would, however, wish to take issue with their assertion that such loyalties are likely to be purely the properties of small and relatively distinct communities: this relationship we would strongly argue is not present in these types of communities alone but is more generally pervasive and is also typically characteristic of kin networks, as we have evidenced.

The way in which the family has been conceived of as an important dimension of control in the workplace is in the harnessing of the authoritarian and disciplinarian relationships presumed to exist

historically between the male head of the household, his spouse and offspring. Such analyses focus on the role of fathers as head of family, confuse social and legal definitions and impute all control and power both in the workplace and domestic arena to this single agent. This is an over-simplification of the relationship between family, employer and workforce control. The authoritarian characterisation represents, we contend, a stereotype rather than reality, emerging from an inadequately theorised position on the political processes involved in family decision-making on both task allocation and resource distribution. On a more concrete level, historical evidence demonstrates the inadequacy of such an approach. Family control is, the data suggests, not the property of one party but is embodied within the network of relations.

The range of individuals involved in exercising influence, power and control within the family is greater than the single category of male head of household. Kin members exert pressure, influence and control over the form taken both by industrial and domestic work, either directly or indirectly, individually or in alliance with other family members. Theoretically there exists a confusion within the literature whereby representation is seen as synonymous with control of the group: for example the head of a gang or workgroup who made the piecework contract was seldom in a position to impose unilateral control over the group membership or the mode of work. Simple downward models of control are as unacceptable at the micro level of employment relations within the family as they are at the macro level of employment relations in the organization or the general industrial setting. We contend, in

summary, that the production process is essentially conflictual but is mediated by structures and forms of which the family is both an agent and a product. The family is both potentially an active agent within this 'contested terrain' yet is at the same time a possible tool for managerial control.

References

- ACERO, L. (1983)
Technical Change, Skills and the Labour Process in a Newly Industrializing Country: a study of Brazilian firms and workers' perceptions in the textile sector. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Sussex.
- ALEXANDER, S. (1979)
Labouring Women, History Workshop, 8, Autumn.
- ANDERSON, M. (1971)
Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire
- ARENSBERG, C.M. and Kimball, S.T. (1940)
Family and Community in Ireland
- BENSON, J. (1983)
The Penny Capitalists. A Study of Nineteenth Century Working Class Entrepreneurs
- BERG, M.
Domestic Manufacture, Women and Community in the 18th Century. Paper presented to SSRC conference on Work Organization, University of Warwick. 11-29 July 1983
- BORNAT, J. (1977)
"Home and Work. A New Context for Trade Union History"
Radical America, Vol. 12, No. 5.
- BOTT, E. (1971)
Family and Social Network
- BRADLEY,
Age and Vintage Effects on Employee Attitudes.
Paper presented to SSRC conference on Work Organization, University of Warwick. 11-29 July 1983
- BROOKS, D. and Singh, K. (1979)
'Pivots and presents, Asian brokers in British foundries' in S. Wallman (ed.) Ethnicity at Work.
- BURGESS, K. (1975)
The Origins of British Industrial Relations: the nineteenth century experience.
- CABLE, J. and Fitzroy, F.
Work Organization Incentives and Firm Performance in the West German Metal Industries.
Paper presented to SSRC conference on Work Organization, University of Warwick. 11-29 July, 1983
- CHILD, J., Loveridge, R. and Warner, M. (1973)
'Towards an organizational study of trade unions, Sociology, Vol. 7.
- DENIS, N. et al (1956)
Coal is our Life.
- EDWARDS, P. and Nolan, P.
'Homogenise, Divide and Rule'. An essay on Segmented Work Divided Workers.
Paper presented to SSRC conference on Work Organization, University of Warwick. 11-29 July, 1983

- FLANDRIN, J-L. (1979 English Edition)
Families in Former Times. Kinship Household and Sexuality
- FOSTER, J. (1974)
Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution.
- GOLDTHORPE, J.H. et al (1969)
The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour
- GOODRICH, C.L. (1920. 1975 edition)
The Frontier of Control
- GRAY, G. (1976)
The Labour Aristocracy in Victorian Edinburgh
- GRIECO, M. (1977)
Information Networks and the Recruitment of Fish Girls. Mimeo
RGIT. Aberdeen.
- GRIECO, M., Hunt, D., and Millar, M. (1977)
Engineering Infrastructures in Aberdeen City. NESDA/RGIT. Aberdeen.
- GRIECO, M. (1981)
'The Shaping of a Workforce: A Critique of the Affluent Workers Study',
International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy.
- GRIECO, M. (1982a)
'Family Structure and Industrial Employment: the role of information
and migration', Journal of Marriage and the Family.
- GRIECO, M. (1982b)
Constructing a Labour Market. Mimeo. Work Organization Research
Centre, Aston University.
- HAREVEN, T. (1982)
Family Time and Industrial Time
- HARVEY, J. (1981)
The Process of Restructuring in the Foundry Industry and its
Implications for 'the Black Country' Workforce, M.A. University
of Warwick.
- HEWARD, C. (1981)
The Family and Schooling in the Birmingham Jewellery Quarter 1851-1881,
Mimeo, Education Department, University of Warwick.
- HILL, S. (1976)
The Dockers, Class and Tradition in London.
- HILL, S. (1981)
Competition and Control at Work.
- HOBSBAWM, E. (1964)
Labouring Men.
- HUMPHRIES, J. (1977)
'Class Struggle and the Persistence of the Working Class Family',
Cambridge Journal of Economics.

- JOYCE, P. (1980)
Work, Society and Politics: The Culture of the Factory in Later Victorian England.
- KESSLER-HARRIS, A. (1976)
Women, Work and the Social Order in Carroll, B.A., Liberating Women's History.
- LAZONICK, W.
Class Relations and the Capitalist Enterprise: A Critical Assessment of the Foundations of Marxian Economic Theory. Paper presented to SSRC conference on Work Organization, University of Warwick. 11-29 July 1983.
- LEE, G. and Wrench, J. (1981)
The Search for Skill.
- LITTLER, C. (1981)
Control and Conflict: the Development of the Labour Process in Britain, Japan and the U.S.A.
- MANWARING, A. (1982)
The Extended Internal Labour Market. IIM Berlin. Discussion paper IIM/LMP82.29.
- MARSDEN, D. (1982)
Workless: an exploration of the social contract between society and the worker.
- MATSUMURA, T. (1983)
The Victorian Flint Glass Makers 1850-1880. The Labour Aristocracy Revisited.
- MITCHELL, J. (1969)
Social Networks in Urban Situations
- MOORHOUSE, H.F. (1981)
'The Significance of the Labour Aristocracy', Social History, Vol. 6, No. 2, May.
- PALMER, G.L. (1954)
Interpreting Patterns of Labour Mobility, in Baake, C. (ed.) Labour Mobility and Economic Opportunity.
- PARSONS, T. and Bales, R.F. (1956)
Family, Socialization and Interaction Process
- PAYNE, P.L. (1974)
British Entrepreneurship in the Nineteenth Century
- PINCHBECK, I. (1930)
Women Workers and the Industrial Revolution.
- PLECK, E.H. (1976)
'Two Worlds in One', Journal of Social History, Vol.10, No. 2.

- PRICE, R. (1983)
The Labour Process and Labour History, Social History, Vol.8, No.1
January.
- RAPOPORT, R. and Rapoport, R. (1976)
Dual Career Families Re-examined.
- REES, A. (1966)
Information in Labour Markets, American Economic Review.
- REID, A. (1980)
The Division of Labour in the British Shipbuilding Industry 1880-1920,
unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge.
- RICHARDS, E. (1974)
Women in the British Economy, History, Vol. 59,
October.
- ROBERTS, E. (1977)
'Working-class standards of living in Barrow and Lancaster, 1890-1914'
Economic History Review, 2nd Series, Vol.XXX, No.2.
- ROWBOTHAM, S. (1973)
Hidden from History.
- SALAMAN, G. (1971)
Community and Occupation.
- SAMUEL, R. (1977) (ed.)
Miners, Quarrymen and Saltworkers.
- SHEPPARD, L.H. and Belitzky, A.M. (1966)
The Job Hunt. Job Seeking Behaviour of Unemployed Workers
in the Local Economy.
- SMITH, H. (1976)
Feminism and the Methodology of Women's History, in Carroll, B.A.,
Liberating Women's History.
- STONE, L. (1975)
The Rise of the Nuclear Family in Early Modern England, in
Rosenberg, C.E. The Family in History.
- TILLY, L. and Scott, J.W. (1978)
Women, Work and Family.
- TOLLIDAY, S. (1982)
Militancy and Organization: Women Workers and Trade Unionism
in the Motor Trades in the 1930s. Paper delivered to British Car
Workers Group, LSE, 29 October.
- TUNSTALL, J. (1962)
The Fishermen.
- WEBB, S. and B. (1898)
Problems of Modern Industry.

- WEDDERBURN, D. (1965)
Redundancy and the Railwaymen.
- WHIPP, R. (1982)
Some Aspects of Home, Work and Trade Unionism in the British Pottery Industry 1900-1920, paper to Anglo-Dutch Labour History Conference, Maastricht.
- WHIPP, R. (1983)
Potbank and Unions: A study of Work and Trade Unionism in the British Pottery Industry, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Warwick.
- WHIPP, R. and Clark, P. (1982)
The Design of Work Organization in the British Auto Industry. Mimeo, Work Organization Research Centre, University of Aston.
- WILKINSON, R.C. (1982)
Migration in Lesotho, some comparative aspects. Paper delivered to the DSA annual conference, 1982.
- WOOD, S. (ed.) (1982)
The Degradation of Work.
- YOUNG, M. and Willmott, P. (1957)
Family and Kinship in East London.