

# **Multiple Job Holding of Farmers in New Zealand**

Paper presented at the Agrifoods X Conference

Akaroa, 21-24 April 2003

by

Nick Taylor - Taylor Baines & Associates

Heather McCrostie Little, Ruris

James Baines - Taylor Baines & Associates

James Newell - Monitoring Evaluation Research Associates

## *Abstract*

A body of research conducted in the 1990s confirmed and extended evidence within New Zealand of farm family pluriactivity, including multiple job holding through off farm employment, and non agricultural enterprises run by farm men and women. The 1990s research showed that multiple job holding is a key part of the strategy used by farm households to support their household incomes, and therefore their farm incomes. Furthermore, there was evidence of farm women in particular developing career paths in their chosen occupations, in addition to their important contribution to farm work. Pluriactivity is also important in the process of farm succession. National profiling of multiple job holding from the 2001 Census shows that farmer occupational groups rate highly for their level of multiple job holding, as do people in rural areas. However, there are important limitations posed by the questions asked about work in the census. Analysis of farm industry groups by factors such as sex, work status, age, ethnicity, and hours of work will provide further insights into multiple job holders verses non-multiple job holders. The national statistical profile is interpreted against the previous, in-depth research and scoping analysis based on a small number of in-depth interviews. The drive for many farm women and men to work off the farm, and/or develop alternative enterprises, may be stronger than ever, despite relatively high levels of farm income in recent years. Off farm employment is also driven by personal fulfilment, and the entrepreneurial ethos of farm families to fully utilise farm and household resources and labour.

## **Introduction**

### *Farm pluriactivity*

Research in the mid 1990s examined the importance of pluriactivity as an economic strategy commonly pursued by farm households. Sequential studies funded by MAF Policy investigated off farm employment by farm men and women in New Zealand (Taylor and McCrostie Little, 1995) and the involvement of farm households in work on farm but in alternative enterprises to farming (Taylor, et al., 1997).

In their study of off-farm employment in three districts of the South Island, New Zealand, Taylor and McCrostie Little (1995) considered the character and dynamics of multiple job holding amongst farm families, including its impact on the farm family, the individual workers, the farm business and the community. That research identified the importance of on-farm, non-agricultural enterprises run by farm families, some due to distance from labour markets, and some expressing entrepreneurial creativity to run a business apart from the farm itself. Subsequently, Taylor et al. (1997) completed their research on alternative farm enterprises, confirming and extending the evidence of pluriactivity, identified by Moran et al. (1989), Benediktsson et al. (1990) and Le Heron (1991). These studies showed off-farm employment had become an important source of income for families facing cyclical commodity prices, periodic rises in farm input prices and climatic events such as prolonged drought. In addition to multiple job holding amongst farm families, it is also evident in the wider rural economy, including meat processing workers (Shirley, et al., 2001) and specifically-skilled, casual, mobile, workers such as shearers and ski instructors, some of whom work in more than one international location (Hunt, 1996).

The research results provided in this paper are from a new programme<sup>1</sup> of research on multiple job holding in New Zealand, where agriculture is one of the sectors being examined in detail. The paper investigates the incidence of multiple job holding in rural New Zealand using 2001 Census data. It also discusses the implications of multiple job holding by farmers and the possibility of changes in attitudes towards off farm work since the 1990's research. The discussion section utilises the wider literature and qualitative data from in-depth interviews.

## **Research objectives and approach**

### *New research programme*

The current research programme aims to provide knowledge about the way individuals, families and communities are adapting to social and economic change through multiple job holding. The research began in 2001 and is broken into two main objectives. The work in these objectives is currently focussed on:

- developing a profile of multiple job holding (MJH) in New Zealand over recent years based on 2001 census data
- identifying the factors which encourage or inhibit multiple job holding and determine the impacts of multiple job holding on individuals, families and communities.

---

<sup>1</sup> The research is funded by the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology, contract TBAX0204

The research findings will contribute to the outcomes sought by FRST in their “Family and Community Well-being” portfolio. It is expected that the findings will be used by agencies and groups who support decisions about employment by individuals, families and communities as they respond to a range of social and economic changes.

### *Multiple job holding and flexible work*

Initial investigations in the research used data from the quarterly Household Labour Force Survey (March 1986 - Sept 2001) and the annual Household Income Survey supplement (June Qtrs). These data indicated national rates of multiple job holding increased over the period 1981-96 but this growth appears to level off over 1996-2001. There was a steady increase in the reported hours worked in “other” jobs over recent years.

The phenomenon of workers holding more than one job is associated with the casualisation of employment and more flexible work patterns in Western societies, a move away from so-called “standard” work. The apparent trend to “non-standard” employment is in effect a trend away from “full-time” work over a basic (37.5 - 40 hour) week. This change is attributed to processes such as economic globalisation and decentralised, non-unionised labour bargaining over terms and conditions (McLaren, 2001).

Motivations behind the trend towards multiple job holding vary for employers and workers. Employers obtain economic benefits from flexible employment arrangements. Employees are motivated primarily by the need to build a sufficient level of individual or household income. In particular, low-skill workers and households with low incomes hold multiple jobs to pay for necessities. However, multiple job holding also includes high-income, professional workers such as health professionals. In addition to building a higher income, they are motivated by the personal and family benefits from flexible employment (Chapman, 2000).

### *Profiling multiple job holding from 2001 Census data*

Census data were used in preference to the Household Labour Force Survey, which has a sample size of 32,000 individuals. As the Census of Population and Dwellings in effect covers the entire working population of 1,727,271 in 2001, it provides the greatest accuracy and confidence, particularly where detailed analysis and cross-tabulations are concerned. The Census also provides the opportunity to establish trends based on its five-yearly repetition, although there are many technical difficulties to this work.

The most obvious limitation of the Census data is in the questions asked about work. The central question asked is “In the 7 days that ended on ..., did you have one job or more than one job?”. While details are sought on the nature of the main job, no information is asked about the additional jobs (including unpaid work for a family business or farm). So if this work is not identified by farmers as their first job, it means the occupational and industry data (assembled on the basis of the first job) understates multiple job holding for farm men or women for whom work on the farm is their second job.

A further limitation from this Census question arises if the additional job took place outside the limited period of a week. Other research (Taylor and McCrostie Little, 1995) shows that seasonal work is an important dimension to rural multiple job holding. So if this work is not taking place at the time of the Census it is lost, further understating the multiple job holding of farmers.

Another issue for profiling multiple job holding from official statistics is the amount of casual employment taking place outside the formal economy, particularly in the rural economy. Multiple job holders may be reluctant to report cash income from casual employment for reasons related to tax, child support and benefit receipts (Averett, 2001).

Nonetheless, the analysis of 2001 Census data reported in this paper provides a useful baseline profile of the level and distribution of multiple job holding in rural and farm sectors in New Zealand. As an early step in the research programme it helps to identify relative levels of multiple job holding amongst various groups. The baseline profile provides information on the demographic characteristics of the individuals involved, their geographic locations and other empirical guidance to the research.

#### *In-depth interviews of farm men and women*

Two sources of in-depth interviews were used to update information obtained by Taylor and McCrostie Little (1995) from interviews with farmers in 1994.

The first source was interviews carried out in April 2002 with nine farm families in the Waitaki Valley as part of a previous study tracing the work histories of people in six natural resource sectors including farming (Fitzgerald, et al. 2002). These interviews were of the principal farm operator but also incorporated information from their partners, who joined the interview. The information from these interviews was re-analysed for content relating to multiple job holding. Not all the respondents held multiple jobs at the time of the interview - one male farmer had a seasonal off-farm job and six women had off-farm work, one with seasonal work.

The second source was in-depth interviews in April 2003 with six farm women in North Canterbury working in education occupations. These women were chosen because there is a high-incidence of multiple job holding amongst farm women, and because of the large number of farm women found working in the education sector in previous research. These interviews were based on a semi-structured schedule developed for scoping the research in preparation for more structured survey research later this year. The other scoping interviews included respondents in the cleaning, café and restaurant, and health sectors, and graduate students interviewed over the 2002-3 summer.

## **Profile of multiple job holding for rural areas, rural sectors and farmers**

### *The national base-line*

Analysis of the 2001 Census<sup>2</sup> found the average incidence of multiple job holding (MJH) across the entire working population of New Zealand was 9.7 percent. This figure establishes multiple job holding as a significant element of New Zealand working life and labour markets. It sets a reference level for comparing multiple job holding rates in different parts of the working population.

### *Incidence of multiple job holding in rural areas and territorial authorities*

Rural areas stand out for relatively high rates of multiple job holding compared to urban areas (Table 1).

---

<sup>2</sup>

The full national analysis is available in a working paper available on request.

**Table 1: Incidence of MJH by geographical area**

Category	# of workers	% MJH
Rural area	231,636	20.2
Rural centre	34,266	11.5
Minor urban area	130,197	8.9
Secondary urban area	104,355	8.6
Main urban area	1,226,301	7.9

The pattern for territorial local authority areas (TLA) reflects the presence of the rural sector in those areas as shown by selected local authorities in Table 2 following.

**Table 2: Incidence of MJH by illustrative TLA's**

TLA	# of workers	% MJH
Hurunui District	5,049	19.8
Southland District	15,984	19.4
Waimate District	3,384	18.6
Western Bay of Plenty District	17,178	17.7
Banks Peninsula District	4,029	17.3
Wellington City	90,150	9.5
Christchurch City	151,233	8.1
Auckland City	174,321	7.9
North Shore City	93807	7.4
Manukau City	117084	5.4

Similarly, rates of multiple job holding are identified for rural areas, with examples of some rural areas in Table 3. It is noticeable that in every instance, women recorded higher rates than men, and in some cases their rates are 30-50 percent higher than for men.

**Table 3: High incidence of MJH in selected rural areas**

Location	# of workers			% MJH		
	All	Women	Men	All	Women	Men
Chatton (Gore District)	1,017	435	582	28.7	31.5	27.1
Hinds (Ashburton District)	2,079	870	1,212	23.6	28.6	20.1
Pohonui-Porewa (Rangitikei District)	1,497	648	849	22.2	26.5	18.9
Hurunui (Hurunui District)	1,320	582	738	22.1	25.8	19.1
Kahutara (South Wairarapa)	2,295	1,044	1,251	19.4	23.3	16.1
Clutha (Clutha District)	2,712	1,104	1,608	19.2	23.6	16.1

*Incidence of multiple job holding by industrial classification and occupational group*

Analysis of 2001 Census data by industry classification and occupational group confirms what has been apparent from previous research on farm pluriactivity. The agricultural sectors of the New Zealand economy are leaders in the incidence of multiple job holding compared to the national average of 9.7 percent. Various types of livestock farming and mixed cropping farming have the highest levels of

multiple job holding by industrial classification. Dairy farming, while high from the overall perspective of the national workforce, is lower than the other forms of farming.

It is notable (Table 4) that as for rural areas the multiple job holding rate is consistently higher for women than for men in the farming sector industries, while the opposite is true for the more urban-dominated industries. The table shading indicates at a glance whether women or men are more likely at the present time to hold more than one job in each industry classification.

**Table 4: Incidence of high rates of MJH by industrial classification**

Category	# of workers			% MJH		
	All	Women	Men	All	Women	Men
Beef cattle farming	7,500	2,628	4,869	25.3	29.8	22.8
Deer farming	1,902	645	1,257	24.9	29.9	22.5
Mixed and other livestock farming	7,941	2,853	5,088	22.9	27.9	20.1
Sheep farming	26,124	8,199	17,925	22.2	29.3	19
Cropping and other farming	3,657	1,101	2,556	21.9	26.6	19.9
Central Govt Fire Service Administration	2,007	195	1,812	19.8	9.4	21
Live entertainment	1,707	843	861	19.5	18.3	20.7
Horse farming and breeding	1,131	558	570	18.7	22.2	15.3
Doctors, Group Practice Admin/Partnerships	9,729	7,584	2,142	18.6	17.3	22.9
Authors, Music Composers, indep. Artists	2,442	1,116	1,329	18.3	18.7	17.9
Physiotherapy Services	1,626	1,251	375	17.8	17.4	18.5
Veterinary Services	2,907	2,016	894	17.3	15.3	21.3
Fruit Growing	2,754	1,128	1,626	17.3	19	16.1
Tertiary Education	24,873	14,145	10,728	16.8	15.1	19
Residential property operators	2,394	1,158	1,236	16.6	14.1	18.9
Dairy farming	35,037	12,108	22,929	16.1	21	13.6

Analysis by farming-related occupational groups supports the findings from the analysis by industry sector in Table 5, following.

**Table 5: Incidence of MJH by farming occupational groups**

Category	# of workers			% MJH		
	All	Women	Men	All	Women	Men
Cattle farmer/farm worker	3,609	1,188	2,421	24.5	28.7	22.4
Other livestock farmer/farm worker	2,607	783	1,821	24.2	28.8	22.3
Sheep farmer/farm worker	8,493	2,292	6,201	22.7	29.5	20.2
Farm machinery operator/contractor	2,961	174	2,787	22.3	25.4	22
Crop and livestock farmer/farm worker	25,917	8,178	17,739	21.2	27.6	18.3
Mixed livestock farmer/farm worker	4,881	1,350	3,534	20.4	28.1	17.5
Field crop grower/related worker	1,506	426	1,083	19.8	22.7	18.6

### *Influence of workforce status on multiple job holding by farmers*

For females working in the main farming sectors the incidence of multiple job holding is higher for full-time workers compared to part-time workers in all sectors. For males working in the main farming sectors the incidence of multiple job holding is higher for part-time workers in the beef and sheep sectors, but not for deer farming (Table 6).

It should be remembered here that these results are for individuals declaring farming is their main job. The results for those who have farming as their second job remains a major gap in the official statistics.

**Table 6: Incidence of high MJH by larger farming sectors & workforce status**

Category	Workforce status					
	F FT	F PT	F FT&PT	M FT	M PT	M FT&PT
Beef cattle farming	32.5	26.8	29.8	22.4	24.5	22.8
Sheep farming	30.5	27.9	29.5	< 20	23.3	< 20
Dairy cattle farming	21.4	20.2	21	< 20	21.2	< 20
Deer Farming	33	26.5	29.7	23	< 20	22.5
Grain growing	30.2	27.5	28.9	< 20	< 20	< 20
Sheep and beef cattle farming	29.9	27.1	28.7	< 20	21.3	< 20

Note: F = female, M = male, PT = part time, FT = full time.

### *Other factors in multiple job holding by farmers*

Sheep farmers and farm workers were examined in more detail to see if there were additional factors evident in their rates of multiple job holding. For household composition, for instance, the overall rate of 22.7 percent for this group varied from a low of 20.5 percent for one-person households to 22.7 percent for a couple without children and 23.7 percent for a couple with children. The highest rates of multiple job holding amongst sheep farmers and farm workers are found for those in either full or part-time unpaid work on the family farm, and in this group couples with or without children predominate. But the overall numbers are small.

For dairy farmers and farm workers, in comparison, those in full or part-time unpaid work on the family farm are the only group in this occupation which displays rates greater than 20 percent. But again the numbers are small so the results have been treated with caution.

The analysis of census data being undertaken in the current research programme will enable us to explore in considerable depth and detail the variety of "stories" associated with the adoption of this mode of work by individuals and farm households. A key issue is the relationship between multiple job holding and farm-life cycles. How do the motivations and circumstances of people in the 15-17 years age bracket differ from those who are 40-60 years? Does the arrival of young families influence either opportunity or need for additional jobs, and does this need vary between different rural occupations? Furthermore, those with total working hours in the range of 20-29 hours may represent a different kind of story from those working 50 hours or more.

### *Other rural occupations*

Other rural occupations were examined for rates of multiple job holding, remembering some of these people will have farming as an (unstated) second job.

For agricultural consultants, the overall rate was 26.5 percent. Males make up 87 percent of this occupational group. However females (28.9%) are more likely than males (25.6%) to hold more than one job. The highest rates are amongst agricultural consultants who are full-time, self employed.

For the livestock buyer occupational group, the rate with more than one job is 28.3 percent and males make up 97 percent of the group. Similarly, the stock and station agents occupational group has 31.9 percent with more than one job and males make up 95 percent of this group. Farm machinery operators and contractors have a rate of 22.3 percent and males make up 94 percent of this occupational group.

There is also relatively high multiple job holding rates indicated amongst groups such as self employed musterers, nursery growers and workers, and self employed grape growers and wine makers.

## **Discussion**

### *Off-farm employment is a feature of rural life*

The data on multiple job holding from the 2001 Census shows the importance of more than one job for many people living in rural areas. These are significant findings that build strongly on earlier research. By the late 1980s, the farm “crisis” brought a critical review of the family farm, and sustainable farming by rural sociologists, who questioned the relationships between “the economy of food production and the ecology of the farming environment” (Fuller, 1990:362). Studies of pluriactivity in farming reflected a broad new orientation towards ecological issues and global perspectives, using a variety of research techniques and data types in an applied and multi-disciplinary research context (Fuller, 1990). New Zealand research confirmed and extended this international evidence, stimulated by interest in the impacts of restructuring in the rural sectors from 1984, successive climatic events such as severe droughts, and difficulties faced by farmers due to low commodity prices.

Researchers found farm families had diversified their sources of income from the core farm business operation to include off-farm employment and alternative enterprises (Benediktsson, et al., 1990; Fairweather and Gilmore, 1992; Le Heron, 1991; Rhodes and Joumeaux, 1995). This pluriactivity helped to maintain farm household incomes, while it defended farm equity and provided greater opportunity for retirement and family succession (Taylor and McCrostie Little, 1995; Taylor et al., 1997). Benediktsson et al. (1990) argued off farm work has been a feature of rural occupational patterns in New Zealand since pioneer times. Le Heron (1991) recognised, however, that a trend to greater off farm income is part of a general societal trend towards dual incomes, casualisation of work, and individualisation - even of the nuclear family household. It is probable farmers are moving closer to urban society in their social and economic aspirations, and therefore closer to New Zealanders as a whole. As an example, several farm woman in education interviewed about their multiple job holding mentioned working to pay for the education of their children, to develop their full potential, as a primary motivation for an extra job and source of income.

### *Employment and the division of farm labour*

Taylor and McCrostie Little (1995) found a “traditional”, gender based division of labour for farm and household. This gendered family structure appeared intransigent, patriarchal and uncompromising (McCrostie Little and Taylor, 1998:177-183). These studies found men performed the major role on the farm, women the major household role. While women commonly shared ownership of the farm with their husbands, they seldom either shared, or acknowledged sharing, responsibility for management of the farm. Rarely are they the principal farm operator. They act as a “sounding board”, especially in terms of marketing and production management where decisions are likely to reside with the principal

farm operator. However, farm women, especially those involved in “doing the books”, appear to have an increasing role in financial planning and decision making.

Conversely, males and females accepted joint responsibility for domestic tasks in only a minority of households. Recent in-depth interviews with farm men and women confirm this structure but indicated there may be slow changes. One woman, for instance, noted her superior skills in stockmanship, another her key role in farm management, drawing on management expertise gained in her off-farm job. Other women noted their husband had taken on more of the housework or care of their children since they went out to work, although the women appeared to retain the major household responsibility.

Typically though, the roles in 1994 and 2003 remain similar. Men undertake some household tasks including washing dishes, some cooking, and child care such as picking children up from the school bus. The role of women on farm is still commonly viewed, even by themselves, as an “extra pair of hands”, a euphemism for the hard and often invisible farm work they do (McCrostie Little and Taylor, 1998). Their stock work includes helping in the yards, feeding out, lambing, looking after lambs and calves, docking and shifting electric fences. They commonly also do farm accounts, GST returns and other administration tasks such as dealing with OSH. They typically maintain house and vegetable gardens and care for domestic animals. Household work includes feeding and washing work clothes for farm workers as well as family. Roles are specific and prescribed by convention and women took pride in their household work. Furthermore, in addition to their reproductive and farm roles, and other employment, farm women continue to make an important input to community life.

The 2001 census data show that both men and women are heavily involved in non-farm employment, although generally women are even more involved than men. In the absence of Census data on the nature of additional jobs, it is necessary to rely on earlier research (Taylor and McCrostie Little, 1995, Taylor et al., 1997) and recent qualitative data for information on the non-farm jobs people engaged in. The off-farm employment of farm men was dominated by work in the agricultural sector as shearers, agricultural contractors and truck drivers. For farm women, the occupations of teaching and nursing dominate their off-farm employment, with increasing numbers involved in tourism on and off the farm.

#### *The development of non-farm careers*

Previous research and the recent interviews with farm women show there is an important relationship between the non-farm work of farm women and the cycles of family and farm development. Interviews with teachers showed how they may have a full-time job before having children. Later, as they re-enter the workforce part-time work suits while they still have child rearing responsibilities. Many clearly become professional career women with a strong commitment to their profession, including ongoing professional development and professional groups and networks. Some reach management levels. In comparison, much fewer farm men take a career path off the farm, generally these are males with tertiary qualifications.

Women in education noted how they had developed, and in some cases redeveloped, their careers. They cited examples of re-entering the workforce in various ways, including voluntary work, relief teaching and part-time work. They emphasised how they were using their qualifications, benefited from their social contact outside the farm, developed community relationships, and strengthened their personal development. Farm men noted how their partners benefited from working off the farm. Education workers have also benefited from changes in the structure of education and organisation of schools. Changes in education provided more opportunities for part-time work for those re-entering the workforce. It has also opened up options to be involved in aspects of school management. Despite their careers, however, these women continue to do work on their farms.

These findings about the personal importance of the off-farm employment are consistent with overseas studies. Shortall (1992:438-439) found that women interviewed considered their off-farm employment provides a means for them to increase their independence, raise their status, and give them a sense of personal identity.

### *The ongoing importance of non-farm income*

Research in New Zealand and overseas has found a profound relationship between off-farm income and farm finances. Weersink et al. (1998), for example, concluded that multiple job holding is a flexible mechanism that helps dairy farm families in the USA (New York State) and Canada (Ontario) adjust to changes in the economic environment. They maintain that multiple job holding is a self-insurance activity that can minimise the impact of downturns in farm income.

During the farm financial "crisis" of the 1980s it became clear that the levels of farm debt in New Zealand were unevenly distributed across farms, with up to 30 percent of farms generally considered to bear the bulk of debt and up to 10 percent being financially "unsound, with farmers having little hope of survival under present conditions" (Cloke, 1989). Wilson (1992:8) found that for farms in the Gore District over half had moderate to severe debt, and this was in part related to the purchase of the farm in the late 1970s, early 1980s.

It is difficult to distinguish between farm and farm household income and expenditure. Off farm income used by the household allows farm income to be ploughed back into the farm. So both should be considered as components of total income and expenditure. A male farmer reported in a scoping interview that he carried out agricultural contracting for neighbours using his heavy machinery. He did not count such work as "secondary employment" merely an extension of his farm business. The income from this work was incorporated into farm income. This sort of example provides another potential source of under-reporting for off-farm income.

Taylor and McCrostie Little (1995) found for nearly two thirds of the off-farm employment households, the additional income was either very important or important to their farm finances. As a farm woman said in a recent interview, "*we can't do without it*" - her work was assisting the process of farm succession for two sons. Her husband was encouraging her to work for as long as possible. Another said "*my money comes in even if the cows die*". Off-farm income remains important for "extras" such as clothing, education, children's activities and holidays, and to the self esteem of individuals employed.

Whatever the financial position of farming, multiple job holding is now a feature of the future New Zealand rural scene. The major constraints will be the size and nature of the local labour markets and distances to work. Since 1995, however, there appears to be a structural change in farm business management. Today's farmers will own and manage a number of agricultural business mixes, all commodity production based, and integrated within the overall farm business. At the time of the 1980's deregulation, farmers frequently sought off farm work to complement marginal farm incomes. Today, the spread of farm businesses and income sources acts as an insurance against commodity price falls in any one sector. This deliberate reversal of the traditional farming pattern of single commodity production per farm business is a clear indication of the successful adoption of entrepreneurship by New Zealand farmers. That farming today is a business, rather than a "way of life", is no longer a debate argued in farming circles.

### *Attitudes to off-farm employment*

There have therefore been considerable changes in farming community attitudes to off-farm employment since the farm "crisis" of the mid to late 1980s. Before then both men and women met

resistance to their working off the farm. By the 1980s it was regarded as acceptable to work to “save” the farm. For younger farm couples with high debt loading it was the only feasible option to maintain household incomes. Today, off-farm employment is widely accepted, no matter the reasons for it. For example, the women interviewed noted the support there now is for working off their farms.

While off farm work may no longer be driven by the need to sustain farm income, the need many women have for working off the farm may be stronger than ever. Urban and rural society are no longer distinctly different social groupings, as telecommunications, mass media, improved road networks and modern transportation have all reduced the distinctions between town and country. Farming is increasingly seen as a business that needs expert management as well as basic farming knowledge, differing little structurally from many urban based businesses with an export or market component. Universally women today expect to continue their careers throughout their family lives - its no different for women on the land. Nor is the continued career of farm women any longer deemed remarkable by the community. A characteristic of off farm work, continuing farm work, has not dissuaded women from careers away from the farm.

### *Further research*

With acceptance of the normality of pluricativity by farm businesses and households, including multiple job holding, the focus falls on the type and number of jobs, and the type and styles of businesses, rather than the over riding necessity to provide secondary income for survival. Multiple job holding is a central research interest, studying the job types, their interdependence or dependence on the core farm business, and the response of the family and the community to the job holders.

The paucity of research into employment of farm families in New Zealand since the mid 1990's could lead to the assumption that this type of work is now so natural, so commonplace that it is no longer of research interest. Key questions remain, however, including the effect of emerging, less gendered farm business management structures on the employment options of women; and research comparing the amount and nature of off farm work by men and women over farm-life cycles. These sorts of questions will be addressed in the next phases of the research, including surveys of multiple job holders and longitudinal analysis of Census data.

## **References**

- Averett, S. L. (2001). Moonlighting: multiple motives and gender differences. *Applied Economics*, 33(11), 1391.
- Benediktsson, Karl; Manning, Sarah; Moran, Warren and Anderson, Grant. (1990). Participation of Raglan County farm households in the labour force. *Occasional Publication 27*, Department of Geography, University of Auckland.
- Chapman, David (2000). The rise and rise of the non-permanent worker. *Management August*, 78-79.
- Cloke, Paul. (1989). State deregulation and New Zealand's agricultural sector. *Sociologica Ruralis XXIX*, 1, 34-48.
- Fairweather, John R. and Gilmore, Soraiya (1993). Farming in Hurunui and Clutha Counties: current attitudes and practices compared to survey results in 1986. *Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit, Research Report 219*, Lincoln University.

- Fitzgerald, Gerard; C. Nicholas Taylor and Wayne McClintock (2002). The impacts of resource sector restructuring on occupational and community identity. Paper prepared for IAIA '02, the Annual Meeting of the International Association for Impact Assessment, Den Haag, The Netherlands, 17-21 June.
- Fuller, Anthony M. (Ed.) (1990). Pluriactivity and rural change in Western Europe. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 6(4).
- Hunt, Robin (1996). The brave new flexible workplace world. *People & Performance*. Sept., 7-12.
- Le Heron, Richard (1991). Perspectives on pluriactivity. In Margaret Alston (Ed.), *Family Farming, Australia and New Zealand, Key Papers No. 2*, Centre for Rural Social Research, Wagga Wagga:24-32.
- McCrostie Little, Heather and Nick Taylor (1998). Continuity and change - New Zealand farm women. Chapter 12 in Rosemary Dy Plessis and Geoff Fougere (Eds.), *He Pounamu Korero: Politics, Policy and Practice, Essays in Honour of Bill Willmott*, Sociology Department, University of Canterbury.
- McLaren, Eva (2001). The growing insecurity of work. *Working Paper No. 5, Labour Market Dynamics Research Programme*, Massey University, Albany and Palmerston North.
- Moran, Warren; Blunden, Greg and Gorenwood, Julie (1992). The role of family farming in agrarian change. Manuscript, Department of Geography, University of Auckland.
- Rhodes, David and Journeaux, Philip (1995). Off-farm income survey: 1992/93 financial year. *MAF Policy Technical Paper 95/6*, Rural Resources Unit, Wellington.
- Shirley, Ian; Patrick Firkin; Rolf Cremer; Philip Dewe; Chris Eichbaum; Anne de Bruin; Ann Dupuis and Paul Spoonley (2001). Transitions in the Hawkes bay labour market: unpaid work and paid work. *Research Report Series, Labour Market Dynamics Research Programme*, Massey University, Albany and Palmerston North.
- Shortall, S (1992). Power analysis and farm wives. *Sociologica Ruralis*, 32, 4:431-451.
- Taylor, Nick and Little, Heather McCrostie (1995). *Means of Survival: a study of Off-farm Employment in New Zealand*. Taylor Baines and Associates, Christchurch.
- Taylor Nick; Little, Heather McCrostie, and McClintock, Wayne (1997). Entrepreneurship in New Zealand farming: a study of farms with alternative enterprises. *MAF Policy Technical Paper 97/7*, Ministry of Agriculture, Wellington.
- Weersink, Alfon; Nicholson, Charles and Weerhewa, Jeeveka (1998). Multiple job holdings among dairy farm families in New York and Ontario. *Agricultural Economics*, 18: 127-143.
- Wilson, Olivia J. (1992). Farm household responses to agricultural deregulation: preliminary findings from a South Island case study. Paper presented at the Geography Association Annual Conference, Auckland.