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ABSTRACT

The main aim was to look at the kitchen from the woman's perspective. The study is based on in depth interviews with fifty-four middle and working class women, with at least two children, in Guildford, Surrey, in 1977. Respondents were drawn from dwellings with three basic variations in ground floor layout, in order to examine the effect of the number of other rooms on the ground floor and the communication possible between these rooms and the kitchen. As part of the preliminary work, a topological system was devised for representing the communication possible between rooms.

The women's attitudes towards the kitchen are investigated in terms of a series of functional and socio-psychological parameters. Three orientations towards the kitchen are revealed: (1) The kitchen as a 'family' room; (2) As the woman's 'own' room; and (3) As 'a' room. Orientation to the kitchen is found to be independent of the quality of the environment, as assessed by a range of functional features, with the exception of kitchen size.

Orientation towards the lounge and aspects of family behaviour are also investigated and reveal two groups of women, those who demand separate areas for activities and those who do not demand physical separation for the same criteria. This is termed positive and negative 'separation of function' and is utilised as an indicator of lifestyle.

The women's identification with the domestic role, the marital role relationship, division of labour and marital satisfaction are found to be crucial factors in the determination of orientation towards the kitchen. These factors, together with 'separation of function' and the houseplan, kitchen size and socio-economic group are used
in a case study approach to break down the sample into eight sub-
groups in order to explain differences amongst the women in orienta-
tion to the kitchen. Based on this analysis, a causal model is
proposed to explain women's attitudes towards the kitchen.
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GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THIS STUDY

Houseplan: Determined by the ground floor layout of the dwelling.

Ground Floor Layout: Three alternative divisions of space on the ground floor are used in this study:

1. Kitchen-diner. (and separate lounge) Dwelling designed with no barrier between the kitchen area and the dining area.

2. Lounge-diner. (and separate kitchen) Dwelling designed with no barrier between the lounge area and the dining area.

3. Separate kitchen, lounge, dining room

Living Rooms: (Referred to as dayrooms in Building Research Station Studies). Lounge. (Also referred to by respondents as parlour, drawing room, sitting, front room, other room, living room).

Dining Room. (Also referred to by respondents as living room, back room). Additional ground floor rooms used as study or den.

Ground Floor Living Area: Living rooms plus kitchen.
SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction.

Chapter One. The Development of the Kitchen in Mass Housing.

Chapter Two. Review of Research Related to the Domestic Kitchen.
Introduction

The characteristics of housing make it an important area for research. The purpose of the house is to provide an environment in which a wide range of functional and social needs may be met. Lee (1) stresses the fundamental nature of these needs, such as the home as a basis for personality development and the social structures of marriage and parenthood. The home becomes an extension of the self and of the family's personality.

The distinguishing features of a house are its high capital cost and extreme durability. The average house has a lifespan of sixty years, during which time it may have to cater to the needs of several different types of household, or the same one over different stages of its life cycle. In the mass housing of today, architects rarely come into direct contact with the occupiers of the dwellings they design. It is essential that research is undertaken to provide information about the requirements of the range of individuals and households that will occupy dwellings.

Rapoport (2) proposes a 'loose fit' approach to design, where the dwelling is designed to be as adaptable as possible to allow the expression of individual differences and preferences. However, there are severe economic constraints on the house form and layout that can be provided. Variety of ground floor plan and internal flexibility using moveable partitions of sufficient quality to satisfy privacy, would mean increased expenditure, or reduction in the number of houses built, the effect of fewer, more expensive houses being felt particularly at the lower end of the social scale, by those in lower income groups with less mobility. Therefore, it is extremely important that the best possible designs are selected to be built. This is particularly
true regarding the internal planning of the kitchen, where furniture and fittings are increasingly integral to the house and need to be specified, if not designed directly, by the architect.

Examination of the development of the domestic kitchen in England since, 1850, in Chapter One, reveals a strong politico-economic influence on housing standards. These standards appear to be based on progressive improvement of past standards rather than definitive research. Although behaviour is now considered to be the starting point for design, the review of research (Chapter Two) shows there is a lack of systematic evidence on how families use houses.

Research on the domestic kitchen has focused predominantly on its functional aspects, as a workroom. Whilst it is not in dispute that attention should be paid to the physical aspects of design of the kitchen as an efficient workplace, it is contended that previously under-investigated socio-psychological aspects should be taken into account.

The home environment, particularly the kitchen, is of especial importance to women. This has been emphasised by changes in women's roles since industrialisation (1750-1850) and the persistence of the domestic role for women.

It has been estimated that the housewife, defined by Hunt (3) as 'the person in a household who is mainly responsible for domestic duties,' spends an average of four hours per day working in the kitchen (4). It is also estimated that 85% of all British women aged 16-64 are housewives in terms of responsibility (5). Thus, housework is a daily experience in the lives of most women and a significant amount of their time is spent in the kitchen. The roles of housewife and mother are frequently constrained within the residential setting, making the home and immediate locality of great importance to them.
In 1977, 51% of married women were engaged in economic activity outside the home (6), combining the work role with the domestic role. Both the constraints operating on women with children and women's changing roles emphasise the importance of investigation of their feelings about their residential environment.

The absence of research specifically on women has been noted. Sullerot (7) asserts 'woman has never been truly viewed as an individual ... but as part of the family unit.' The majority of studies outlined in Chapter Two focus on the household as the unit of investigation. It is true that information is frequently collected by interviewing the housewife, but Tivers (8) suspects that women are very convenient questionnaire fodder and queries whether 'it is women per se who are the object of interest in these studies, or even whether their particular attributes as women are included in any explanation of behaviour.'

Therefore, due to the observed lack of research on the interaction between women and the residential environment, the main aim of this study is to look at the domestic kitchen from the women's perspective. A review of the literature (Chapters One and Two) suggests that a study of women's attitudes towards the kitchen should encompass the interaction between physical factors such as kitchen size, its relationship to and the amount of space in the rest of the dwelling and the social factors of social class; stage in family life cycle; past housing experiences and the respondents' identification with the domestic role. Individual household members do not possess a common lifestyle; nevertheless their behaviour is interrelated. Therefore, the study of family living patterns is also relevant.
Little is known about the precise form of effect of women's attitudes towards the kitchen. This investigation is one attempt to make a contribution towards the understanding and alleviation of 'the problems which face women in their efforts to accommodate the myriad of roles and responsibilities they must fulfil during their daily lives' (9).
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1.1. Introduction

This chapter documents influences on the design of the kitchen in the present housing stock in England. Mass housing is defined as that occupied by the working class and lower levels of the middle classes in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and provided predominantly by speculative builders and local authorities. The estimated age distribution of the housing stock in 1977 (Figure 1) illustrates that a third of the current housing stock was constructed prior to 1919; thus, this account will review the types of accommodation available to the population between 1850 and the present day.

Figure 1.

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING STOCK OF ENGLAND
December, 1977

In order to examine the interrelations between changes in domestic architecture, the technology of the home and women's roles, the chapter is divided into three parts:

1.2. Housing Policy
1.3. Kitchen Design
1.4. The Situation of Women
The first two parts are divided chronologically into three sub-sections: 1850-1918; 1918-1944; and 1944 onwards. Within each part, middle- and working-class housing are dealt with separately, since different issues are involved in each. Part 1.4 is also divided into three sections: pre-industrialisation; industrialisation; and post-industrialisation.

1.2. Housing Policy

This section briefly reviews those changes in housing policy that have affected the design of the kitchen. It is outside the scope of this thesis to undertake a thorough examination of the economic and social history of housing. The reader is referred to Burnett (1) for a more detailed account.

1.2.1. 1850-1918

Working-Class Housing

The nineteenth century housing problem was seen as one of the health of towns. Overcrowding was the chief index of housing quality, and the amount of space in the dwelling correlated directly with income, the middle class living at substantially lower density than the working class.

Until government intervention in 1918, housing for the working classes consisted of tied or rented accommodation plus a small amount provided by philanthropists. The rural labourer's cottage was the forerunner of the urban industrial worker's home and, despite the efforts of a few model landlords, continued to represent the lowest levels of shelter during the nineteenth century. In the first national inquiry into the condition of rural labourers' housing, in 1864, Hunter (2) found that 41% of the 5,375 cottages investigated had one bedroom and calculated an overall average of three persons per room.
This period was one of rapid urban growth, with the population becoming concentrated in a relatively small number of large cities and conurbations. The proportion of the population classed as urban rose from 54% in 1851 to 79% in 1911 (3). Although the overall ratio of persons per dwelling declined over the period, from 5.46 persons per dwelling in 1851 to 5.05 in 1911 (4), overcrowding persisted in inner city areas. This resulted in the public health movement, which started in the 1830's and brought about legislation to promote a healthy environment via the Public Health Acts. The first type of housing standards in the form of building regulations and byelaws of 1875 onward were also directed towards this aim.

Official recognition was not afforded internal space standards, although consideration was given to the environmental aspects of planning of dwellings for the labouring classes by a few enlightened architects, notably Birch (5) in 1860's. In addition, Birch pointed out the economic viability of his improved designs. His work was, of course dependent on commissions from the landed gentry.

The awakened concern over slum housing, pioneered by Octavia Hill, Booth and Rowntree, made housing the most debated social concern from the 1880's onward. The period saw the development of model communities like Port Sunlight and Bournville and housing tenement blocks by Peabody and Guinness with great attention paid to internal planning. The movement has been described by Pevsner (6) as 'humanitarian in pretensions yet depressing in its results.' Nevertheless, it was influential in the development of improved housing standards.

Concern over moral and sanitary matters leading to the general adoption of building controls, regulations and byelaws brought major improvements and marked the first significant attempt at urban planning.
By the 1890's, most dwellings had an individual piped water supply and Byelaw housing at the turn of the century had more bedrooms, w.c.'s, increased light and ventilation, and better provision of fireplaces, sinks, coppers and cooking ranges. For many of the working class, this period saw the start of major changes in the pattern of home and family life. An increase in real earnings made higher standards of nutrition, furnishing and comfort possible, and better paid workers, buying houses in the suburbs, enjoyed middle class standards of space and hygiene. The working class family started to acquire the idea of their dwelling as a home composed of different rooms with different functions and the idea of family life as private and child-centred.

The building industry was still small scale, traditional and un-revolutionised, and due to fluctuations in its output could not meet the housing needs of a steadily increasing population. By the end of the period, market forces had caused the cessation of speculative building for the labourer.

**Middle-Class Housing**

Due to expanding employment in the professions, commerce and public administration, the middle class rose from approximately 15% of the population in 1851 to 20% by 1900, leading to the development of a tier of sub-classes. All, however, were characterised by some margin of income over necessity, a non-working wife, domestic help in the home and the belief that home and family were central to life. This conviction was reflected by intense interest and pride in the home, coupled with an increasing concern for comfort and luxury within it. The home performed the important function of reassurance of social status.

The majority of the middle class lived in the suburbs, reflecting the separation of work from the home, improved transportation systems and their desire to live away from unhealthy inner city working-class areas. Whilst the predominant house style continued to be detached
or semi-detached, the growth of the middle class, decrease in family size and decline in availability of domestic help caused a decrease in the number and size of rooms.

1.2.2. 1918-1944

Working-Class Housing

The pre-war decrease in housebuilding, particularly of low-cost dwellings, meant the lower paid worker was most affected by the post-war housing shortage. It was realised that it was beyond the capabilities of private enterprise to provide enough housing of the superior standard now expected by the working classes at a price they could afford. Thus, the well-documented effect of war in precipitating changes in society and social policy led to government intervention in housing. A national housing programme popularly known as 'homes fit for heroes,' with an emphasis on quality as well as quantity, became the pivot of post-war social policy.

The recommendations of the Tudor Walters Committee in 1918 (7) on the standards of post-war local authority housing constituted a major innovation in social policy. They also had a large effect on the future character of working-class life.

The committee was set up by the Local Government Board: 'To consider questions of building construction ... of dwellings for the working classes.' The objects of the report were: 'To profoundly influence the general standard of housing in this country' and to encourage the building of houses of such quality that they would remain above acceptable minimum standards for at least sixty years.

The recommendations were innovative and far-sighted, covering the siting and layout of working-class homes as well as the houses themselves. It was recommended that there should be a variety of types
to suit needs and localities. Considerable attention was paid to the planning and layout of estates from both practical and aesthetic considerations, suburban estates being seen as, without doubt, the best way of housing the urban working class. The Committee's proposals became operative via the Local Government Board's 1919 Housing Manual, which was even more generous in its space recommendations.

The Tudor Walters Report marked the first real attempt at the definition of housing standards. For the first time, mass housing benefited from professional design, since under Addison, the first Minister of Health, a number of architects were appointed to the Ministry of Health, Housing Department, to draw up plans for the guidance of local authorities.

Unfortunately, until the second World War created a similar revival of social conscience, inter-war housing standards reflected politico-economic involvement rather than the existing needs of the population. In the climate of economy which prevailed throughout the inter-war years, no progressive increase in floor space was made. For example, the 1927 Housing Manual stated that where a parlour was provided it need be: 'little more than a recess opening from the living room.'

The growth of suburban estates from 1919 onward had a marked effect on standards of working-class housing and living. Houses necessarily tended towards standardisation of space and design. Two-thirds of all inter-war local authority dwellings had three bedrooms, and flats formed only 8.5% of dwellings built.

Throughout the 1920's, the policy behind local authority housing was that it should 'bridge the gap' between what private enterprise could provide and the housing needed in an area. Therefore, it was meant to fulfil general needs, not only those of the poor. The average
council tenant of the inter-war years was a man in a sheltered manual job, not seriously jeopardised by the depression, who earned slightly more than the average national wage and who had a family of two young children. There were obvious variations between estates, some aimed at housing larger families and some at income groups slightly above or below average. Not until the 1930's were housing policies specifically directed towards the poorer sectors of the working classes.

Middle-Class Housing

The expansion of the middle class continued during the inter-war period, those in non-manual occupations making up thirty percent of the population by 1951. Many wished to adopt a life-style that emphasised their separation from respectable poor from which they had risen. Hence the popularity of the semi-detached suburban villa, with its associations of achievement and security. In the pre-war period, larger houses, private education and domestic help had been the strongest characteristics of the established middle class. However, post-war inflation, increased taxation and economic depression reduced their wealth with consequent effects on their standard of living and expenditure patterns. The trend towards smaller family size continued, as the costs of private education rose. Domestic help was reduced to a minimum, as opportunities of alternative employment opened up for women in shops, factories and offices. Thus, more and more similarities emerged between the traditional middle class and its newer members, reflected by the evolution of increasingly standardised housing, suitable for a small family with little or no domestic help.

Most new houses were designed by builders without the help of architects and consisted largely of variations on a standard plan, dictated by the size of the building plot and cost. By the 1930's,
there was a trend amongst the larger, more reputable firms to employ a panel of architects. Architects frequently complained that fierce price competition amongst builders fighting for contracts at the lower end of the market forced down the quality of work and materials. For example, gimmicks like Tudor beams and pebble-dash were added, often at the expense of cavity walls and good workmanship.

But not all housing was 'jerry built,' and competition for business led to the development of higher standards in design and equipment, new materials and advanced methods of construction. For example, Costains introduced cavity walls in their houses in 1924 and Bergs pioneered the hall-to-hall semi and the integrated garage. In 1937 the National Housebuilders Registration Council (NHBRC) was formed by speculative builders to monitor standards. Services and fittings increased in their importance to the purchaser, thus reducing the proportion of the total cost spent on the structural components of the dwelling. By 1930 services and fittings accounted for one-third of the cost of the house, or half combined with the cost of the land.

1.2.3. 1944-Present Day

Working-Class Housing

The housing shortage of 1918-1939 was aggravated by the extensive war-time destruction of property, together with the increase in the number of households requiring accommodation due to the rise in the number of marriages and in the birthrate. The government no longer deliberated over its involvement in housing. Its post-war housing policy was part of the grand concept of the Welfare State and, despite setbacks due to the state of the economy and political intervention, made a much bigger contribution to public housing than it had done in the inter-war years. Post-war public housing surpassed pre-war council
or speculative housing in terms of layout, design and the use of space. This was achieved through the recommendations outlined in the M.O.H. Design Manuals and the increased employment of architects by local authorities.

The 1944 Dudley Report (8), the recommendations of which were embodied in the 1944 Housing Manual, was the first government report on the design of post-war dwellings. Its terms of reference were: 'to make recommendations as to the design, planning, layout, standards of equipment for the people throughout the country.' In spite of the license granted by 'the people,' the Dudley Committee confined its consideration to local authority housing, bearing in mind that its permanent powers under part V of the 1936 Housing Act were restricted to the provision of 'dwellings for the working class:'

Nevertheless, the standards we recommend are equally applicable to all types of housing, and we feel that steps should be taken to ensure that the development of public enterprise does not fall below them.

Although these recommendations promised a fresh start in housing standards, there were setbacks as previously mentioned. The pattern of events bore a depressing resemblance to the inter-war period, and the years following 1944 provide an excellent example of political influence on housing standards. In 1944 the Housing Manual reduced the Dudley minimum of 900 ft\(^2\) area for a three-bedroom, five-person house to a 800-900 ft\(^2\) maximum. In 1945 the Labour government, with Aneurin Bevan as Minister of Housing, raised the minimum area to its full Dudley standard. However, standards were again drastically reduced under economic pressure in the 1949 Housing Manual and its 1952 supplement, which detailed the ways in which economies could be made.

Initially, a conservative attitude towards housing types prevailed, and the three-bedroom, five-person semi continued to be the most common
building type. However, later, economy measures encouraged a revival of terraced housing. With the revival of urbanism in the 1950's, new types of housing layouts were built which abandoned the orthodox street frontage. In addition, local authorities also began to build more flats in 'high-rise' developments. 'High-rise' development declined after 1968 due to changes in governmental subsidies. They were unpopular, especially among families with young children. This was despite considerable attention being given to their design in terms of space, layout, the design and equipment of kitchens and facilities for clothes drying, and refuse disposal.

The second post-war report on housing standards was that of the Parker Morris Committee in 1961 (9), the recommendations of which remain operative at the present time. The report was potentially far-reaching compared to its predecessors, since it recommended standards for all housing, irrespective of tenure, and aimed to relate housing needs to post-war social and economic trends. Its brief was:

To consider the standards of design and equipment applicable to family dwellings and other forms of residential accommodation whether provided by public authorities or private enterprise and make recommendations.

The committee saw as its chief task the consideration of standards of internal design and their approach as one of the needs of the occupants rather than the economic viability of the design. Houses were more than shelters providing an adequate separation of functions in a sanitary environment:

The starting point for thinking about houses and flats must be the activities that people want to undertake in them.... To meet the needs of the future, there should be space for activities demanding privacy and quiet; for satisfactory circulation; for better storage generally; space to keep the new household machinery and kitchens arranged for easy housework with room to eat at least some meals.

By 1965 only 20% of local authority dwellings fully incorporated Parker Morris recommendations. Their slow voluntary adoption prompted
the Labour government to make them mandatory for public sector housing in New Towns in 1967 and local authority housing in 1969, although the standards were interpreted as maxima rather than the minima intended by the Committee.

Although it was intended that the more generous space allowance in Parker Morris housing would encourage flexible planning, economic considerations and the rise of industrialised building produced their own kind of standardisation. The typical Parker Morris house of the 1960's tended to be three-bedroom terrace with a large through living room and a kitchen big enough to eat in.

**Middle-Class Housing**

With the expansion of the middle classes and the rapid post-war growth in owner occupation (Table 1), the house as a status symbol and the home-centredness of social life diffused more widely through British society.

Public and private housing increasingly converged in terms of space and amenity, due to the deliberate raising of quality in the public sector and economics dictating that private housing should satisfy the needs of the mass market. More and more private houses started to be built in the 750-1,000 ft² total area range, the size associated with public housing since its inception in 1919 with the Tudor Watters Report. This led to the exploitation of minor differences to denote status, one example being the expensive kitchen appliances and 'fitted kitchens' displayed in magazines.

In the 1970's inflation, causing escalating costs of land, labour, materials and financing for new housebuilding has led to the reduction of fixtures and fittings in the lower end of the speculative market. For example, white instead of coloured sanitary ware in bathrooms and fewer, lower quality, units in kitchens.
Table 1.

TRENDS IN HOUSING 1951-1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private and Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dwellings U.K. (rest dwellings G.B.)
1.3. Kitchen Design

This section reviews changes in kitchen design since 1850. As the kitchen cannot be considered in isolation from the provision of space in the rest of the dwelling, overall space standards are also discussed. A brief description of the pre-industrial home is also relevant.

The changing function of the kitchen has broadly reflected changes in economic and social structure, in particular technological development and changing social attitudes. The Oxford dictionary definition of the kitchen is 'that part of the house where food is cooked.' For centuries cooking was done at the hearth. In the pre-industrial home, family life revolved around the hall and hearth. Space in the home tended not to be demarcated into areas for particular functions, and cooking, eating and relaxing all took place around the hearth. Other rooms were called 'chambers,' indicating their use for general rather than specific purposes, and little privacy existed, since without corridors, one room led on to the next. Integration of the cooking area - the kitchen - with the rest of the dwelling was reflected in the communal life style of the family.

1.3.1. 1850-1918

Working-Class Housing

The kitchen as a separate room was not common in working-class housing until the turn of the century. The majority of homes consisted of a kitchen-living room with a coal range used for cooking, space heating and possibly water heating, plus a scullery with water and a sink and possibly a copper for clothes washing. With the addition of a tub, the scullery also functioned as a bathroom. A 'parlour' - a second living room, was rarely provided in labourers' cottages.

There were no Government recommendations for space standards
in existence during this period. However, Birch's (10) plan for labourers' dwellings (awarded the Society of Arts Medal in 1865) provide an example of space recommendations by an enlightened architect at that time, and of the facilities considered necessary in the working-class home.

Each dwelling contains a living room, three bedrooms, entrance porch, scullery, pantry, fuel store, piggery, privy, cesspit and ashpit ... Each scullery is fitted with a washing copper, sink and a fire clay baking area. The sculleries are also fitted with towel rails and plate racks and the pantries have store shelves and galvanised meat hooks.

Birch recommended space standards in cubic feet for these dwellings. Taking the height of the ceilings as 8 feet (advised by the model byelaw of the period), the floor area of individual rooms may be calculated. This provides a useful yardstick for comparison with later housing standards. Table 2 shows the space standards for a three-bedroomed dwelling proposed by Birch.

Convenient baths, wash houses and laundry buildings were arranged at the rear of the dwellings; therefore, if a 50 ft² allowance is added, the total area would be 778.5 ft².

By the turn of the century, the general adoption of building controls, regulations and byelaws had brought improvements in working class housing, which gradually expanded to separate rooms with different functions. As described by Burnett (11), a 'respectable' house in the South, considered 'superior' in the North of England, available to skilled workers with good wages, emulated middle class standards. It had a front door leading into a small lobby or passage, a 12' x 9' front parlour, which
could be set aside for special use, a 12' by 9' kitchen and a 10' by 9' scullery, thus giving the desired separation between washing in the scullery, cooking and living in the kitchen and display in the parlour. The introduction of the gas cooker in the 1890's and its installation in the scullery meant that the room became a dual purpose area used for cooking and washing, becoming a kitchen, whilst the kitchen-living room became solely a living room. This spatial division between cooking and living functions was common even in simpler working class housing by the end of the period.

Middle-Class Housing

The idea of the kitchen as a separate space evolved amongst the gentry towards the end of the 16th century. Kitchen design in the middle class dwelling remained basically unchanged until the turn of the century. A typical 19th-century house owned by wealthy Londoners would have a basement kitchen run by servants, equipped with a range, table, dresser, larger and a scullery with a sink for vegetable preparation and washing up. On the first floor would be the dining room and the butler's pantry, where the glass and silver would be washed.

The kitchen of the middle-class house during the early part of the period tended to be situated away from the centre of the house, possibly
Table 2.

SPACE STANDARDS FOR THREE BEDROOM DWELLING
PROPOSED BY BIRCH 1864

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation of space</th>
<th>Area (Square Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scullery, pantry, etc.</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living room</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom 1</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom 2</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom 3</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcony, lobby and stairs</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>728.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in a basement or a wing, and was designed with the servant in mind. With the decline in domestic help, the housewife found herself in charge of an area which had not formerly been her province, and the centre of organisation of the household changed from the drawing room to the kitchen. This led to the kitchen being placed in a more central position in the house. Consequently, since 1912, increased attention has been paid to kitchen design.

Most houses continued to have a minimum of 3 reception rooms: dining room, morning room and drawing room. However, their use changed. The dining room became used only for meals rather than as a family living room, whilst family life centred on the morning room during the day and the drawing room, previously only used by adults for entertaining, at night. Thus, Edwardian houses had larger drawing rooms and smaller dining rooms, and rooms were often connected by folding or double doors so that two rooms could become one large one, giving greater flexibility of use. On the other hand, the Victorian narrow passage hall was enlarged in Edwardian homes as a display area to advertise to visitors the household's taste and social status. Overall, it was now felt that rooms should be light and cheerful, in contrast to the Victorian heavy curtaining and furniture.

1.3.2. 1918-1944

Working-Class Housing

By 1919, gas cookers were in common use, and the changing lifestyle of the working classes was noted by the Tudor Walters Committee (12), who set the standards for working-class dwellings:

It is evident that working-class occupants generally are more and more wishful to eliminate from the living room the dirty work and particularly the cooking of meals ... the tendency is to require a scullery in which cooking, washing up and all other similar work is carried on. The kitchen
becomes the living room in the ordinary sense, which may be kept for use as a sitting room, a meal room and for the cleaner activities of the family.

The Committee saw the division between living room and scullery as the key to internal planning, this division being dependent on where cooking was going to be done. Table 3 shows the five plan types proposed in order of ascending cost.

Planning was based on the premise that rising living standards would be accompanied by increasing desire for the separation of functions: cooking in the scullery, eating in the living room and bathing in a separate bathroom rather than in the scullery or in front of the fire. A third living room was considered a reasonable and proper expectation. In fact, 40% of local authority houses built based on the report contained parlours.

Space recommendations were generous compared to previous standards. The overall area recommended was 855 ft\(^2\) for a three-bedroom non-parlour type and 1,055 ft\(^2\) for a three-bedroom parlour type, excluding fuel and other stores. The living room was given as 180 ft\(^2\), though it could be reduced where a parlour was provided. A parlour of 120 ft\(^2\) was considered adequate for the purposes envisaged - a quiet room for reading and writing; for an elderly or invalid relative; for receiving visitors not of the family and for occasional formal entertaining. The scullery was 80 ft\(^2\) in both house types. These space standards were increased in the 1919 Housing Manual to overall areas of 900 ft\(^2\) for three-bedroomed non-parlour houses and 1,080 ft\(^2\) for three-bedroomed parlour types. Individual minimum room sizes recommended were 180 ft\(^2\) for the living room; 80 ft\(^2\) for the scullery; 12-16 ft\(^2\) for the larder and 15 ft\(^2\) for the coal store. Every house was to have an internal w.c. and a bath.
Table 3.

GROUND FLOOR LAYOUTS FOR WORKING CLASS HOMES

PROPOSED BY TUDOR WALTERS COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layout Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Living room with a range for most of the cooking and a scullery with a gas cooker for occasional use, sink copper and bath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Smaller living room for cooking and smaller scullery allowing the provision of a separate bathroom and parlour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Grate in the living room suitable for limited cooking. Scullery with gas, or small cooking stove and grate for drying purposes; separate bathroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>Plan II with a parlour and upstairs bathroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>No provision for cooking in the living room. Scullery (equipped with copper, sink, cooking range and gas cooker where available), large enough for all work connected with meal preparation, upstairs bathroom, internal w.c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tenants were pleased with these conveniently planned, light, easily run houses with bathroom, internal w.c. and third bedroom, even though the provision of some services still lagged behind, such as gas lighting, no hot water supply to the bath and heating still by solid fuel fires only.

A 1923 inquiry by the Women's Committee of the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association (13) noted a growing tendency amongst tenants to use the living room/kitchen purely as a sitting and dining room and to do all work in the scullery, 'the modern workshop.' The Committee felt that this trend should be taken into account in planning larger and better-fitted sculleries with more storage facilities and better heating and ventilation. They also recommended, for the same reason, that cupboards and dressers in the living room were unwanted and the combination range was an expensive anachronism.

However, the 1923 Housing Act introduced by Chamberlain as Minister of Health in the new Conservative Government was a complete reversal of the 1919 Labour Government's policy of encouraging local authorities to become major producers of working-class housing. In the Act, the 900 ft$^2$ average area proposed in the 1919 Housing Manual was reduced to 620 ft$^2$ minimum-950 ft$^2$ maximum, resulting in a decline in standards during the inter-war years.

Just before World War II, Mass Observation conducted an inquiry into people's homes (14). They found satisfaction in homes centred around 'convenience,' especially in kitchen and in facilities for children. The preferred size of a house was one with two living rooms in addition to the scullery/kitchen, with three bedrooms on a separate floor.
A growing preference not to eat in the room where cooking was done was noted. People increasingly wanted a 'sitting room' away from the living/eating room, and this, together with the possession of a bathroom, was a major social dividing-line. Satisfaction was lowest with kitchens, which many believed should be larger, better fitted and better ventilated. The new domestic equipment marketed in the inter-war period, such as refrigerators and electric washing machines, were prohibitively expensive for the working classes. Even in 1942, about 70% of the working class did their washing at home in a copper heated by coal or gas or by heating up water in pans.

**Middle-Class Housing**

In the design of middle-class housing, emphasis was placed on the fitting and convenience of the kitchen, now that, without domestic help, it was becoming the middle class housewife's domain. Houses were expected to be brighter, cleaner and easier to run. In 1934, a New Ideal Homesteads Type K house for £595 had a kitchen tiled to dado height, fitted with a sink, draining board, kitchen cabinet, larder and two gas points. The kitchen in a 1935 A.W. Curtons £1,200 detached house came equipped with a gas washing machine. Even low-priced speculatively built houses were expected to contain fittings that before 1914 would have been found only in expensive architect-designed houses. By 1939, 75% of housing was wired for electricity, compared to 2% in 1918, and of this 75%, 30% of the occupiers owned a vacuum cleaner and 80% an electric iron. 'All electric' kitchens became a popular feature at the end of the 1920's. Refrigerators for domestic use were introduced in the 1920's and electric spin washers in the 1930's. However, their use was not widespread as their cost remained high throughout the inter-war years.
The functionalist approach of the 'Modern Movement' encapsulated in Le Corbusier's description of the house as a 'machine for living in' did not find a following amongst the middle classes, who were becoming increasingly home-centred. Nevertheless, there were changes in the use of space. Family life tended to centre on two or three rooms, instead of the drawing room, dining room, morning room and study, and the kitchen began to be used for eating meals.

The decline in formality meant guests were increasingly entertained in family rooms, breaking down the former separation between public and private space in the house. Children joined in with the family and with the increasing emancipation of women, the female morning room and male study were regarded as old-fashioned and eccentric.

The home continued to be the most important mark of social differentiation and symbol of social status. As housing became more standardised, greater emphasis was placed on services, equipment and furnishing. The conspicuous consumption of refrigerators, washing machines and other elaborate equipment displayed in women's magazines announced the wealth and taste of the owner.

1.3.3. 1944–Present Day

Working-Class Housing

The emphasis placed on kitchen design in the Dudley report (1944) (15), which set the standards for post-war public housing, represented a marked step forward. The Committee recognised that since 1919 there had been 'changes of outlook and habit affecting the design and the equipment of the houses themselves.' By these, they were referring to the rise in the standard of living along with an appreciation of labour-saving equipment and convenience and an increased demand for this by women, especially those working outside the home. In addition, the Committee
The wide extension of public services ... piped water, electricity and gas, has brought changes in our domestic habits, particularly as regards appliances for cooking and the selection and planning of the room in which it is to be done. As the internal planning of small dwellings is very largely dependent on the arrangements for cooking, this factor has an important influence on design.

The report acknowledged the removal of cooking from the living room to the scullery, due to the widespread extension of gas and electricity, and that the scullery was far too small to hold all the kitchen equipment and for families to take weekday meals there. With its recognition of the lack of variety in dwelling types and that the living space was too cramped and sometimes not adapted to modern needs, the report contained considerable insights into contemporary living.

Three alternative divisions of space for the ground floor of a three-bedroomed, five-person house were proposed (Table 4), reflecting their knowledge that families increasingly wanted to take some meals where the cooking was done and wanted a comfortable living/sitting room away from kitchen noise and smells. There was still deliberation over the provision of a parlour, the feeling being that they should be provided in smaller numbers for larger families that might require a sitting room - a small, quiet room. The bathroom was moved to the first floor, primarily from planning considerations, although convenience aspects of this relocation were recognised.

Overall, the changes recommended mirrored the changing patterns of middle-class living, perhaps because of the advice sought from women’s organisations, which tended to reflect middle-class, rather than working-class, views on kitchen arrangement. The Committee gave weight to the views of the consumer and even recommended that local authorities should co-opt suitable women to their housing committees. The outstanding
### Table 4.

THREE ALTERNATIVE DIVISIONS OF SPACE FOR THE GROUND FLOOR OF

A THREE BEDROOM, FIVE PERSON HOUSE

DUDLEY COMMITTEE, 1944

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division 1</th>
<th>Division 2</th>
<th>Minimum-aggregate area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living room</td>
<td>Living room with dining space</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen for meals</td>
<td>Working kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated</td>
<td>Unallocated</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum aggregate area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division 2</th>
<th>Minimum-aggregate area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division 3</th>
<th>Minimum-aggregate area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen living room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scullery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum aggregate area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
improvement following from the Dudley Report was the general raising of services and equipment. Possibly the attention given to kitchen facilities and layout was a result of this increased consultation. For the first time, recommendations were made as to the provision of fittings and work sequence in the kitchen:

The fittings should be arranged in a sequence convenient for working. The following sequence is suggested:

Larder, worktop, draining board, sink, draining board, cooker, storage fittings.

Larder sizes were reduced from 12 ft\(^2\) to 5 ft\(^2\) in urban, and 18 ft\(^2\) to 10 ft\(^2\) in rural houses. However, the report considered for the first time the necessity for the provision of other types of kitchen storage, for food, utensils and cleaning materials 'in built-in cupboards properly fitted with shelves' plus a small amount of open shelving and included detailed specifications.

The possibility of the later provision of built-in domestic appliances in the kitchen as a result of mass production, was another example of the forward-looking thinking of the Dudley Committee. In the subsequent Housing Manual (1944) however, the fact that the structure should be able to accommodate innovations during its 60-year life was neglected.

'We doubt the advantages of dishwashing machines for small houses.' Also, there was only tacit agreement in the Housing Manual to Dudley's recommendations that laundry and dirty household work should be separated from the cooking and eating functions of the kitchen.

Through the 1940's and 1950's, political influence and economic pressures combined to reduce the standards set by the Dudley Report. For example, in the 1949 Housing Manual, the Dudley minimum space standard of 900 ft\(^2\) was relaxed, providing that the 'aggregate living areas' were not reduced, which lead to a reduction in size of lobbies, passages and landings and minimum room sizes becoming the maximum. After 1952,
a large number of three-bedroom, five-person houses were built within the pre-war range of overall sizes of 750-850 ft$^2$. To some extent, attempts were made to retain space at the expense of the reduction of fittings. In economy plans, the larder was often the only storage provision that remained.

The 1961 Parker Morris Report (16) raised standards once again in public housing and also affected private housing. Their recommendations differed from past reports in that they were based not on minimum room sizes but on functional requirements and levels of performance, with minimum overall sizes for the dwelling related to the size of the family. For a five-person family, the Parker Morris Report recommended house was 900 ft$^2$ in area plus 50 ft$^2$ of store. It was stressed that the recommended areas were to be regarded as minima.

Referring specifically to the kitchen, the Parker Morris Report stressed the importance of its design as an efficient work area, recommended a work sequence, and emphasised the necessity for an adequate number of drainers and worktops. It recommended space near the sink for a washing machine and space to accommodate additional appliances of the future. 80 ft$^3$ was recommended as kitchen storage for a family house with a cool cupboard provided, even though refrigerators made a larder unnecessary.

Domestic equipment was now common in working-class kitchens, and ownership of consumer durables has continued to grow, as Table 5 shows.

Middle-Class Housing

Externally, the private house could be distinguished from the rather bland, functional appearance of the local authority dwelling by its tendency to reflect (more quickly) current fashions, for example Neo-Georgian, colonial, scandinavian.

Fittings, furnishings and equipment, rather than fundamental design differences, were distinguishing marks internally. A preference for
Table 5.

OWNERSHIP OF CONSUMER DURABLES BY TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Durable goods</th>
<th>Percentage ownership by tenure</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owner occupiers 1972 1976</td>
<td>Local authority tenants 1972 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing machine</td>
<td>74 76</td>
<td>65 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator</td>
<td>85 93</td>
<td>63 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum cleaner</td>
<td>94 96</td>
<td>80 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>95 96</td>
<td>95 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

two 'reception rooms,' even if only 12' x 12', survived the 1950's. With one large lounge, the 'L' shape design, allowing screening of the dining area, was popular. The fitted kitchen would have a stainless steel sink, laminated units and cupboards and possibly a hatch to the dining area. Even on small developments, the purchaser could often choose between several internal layouts and make small changes, unlike the lack of choice of the local authority tenant, symbolizing the discretionary power of ownership.

In 1966, the Building Research Station (17) made a comparison of 80 houses on sale by four large building firms and local authority housing built to Parker Morris standards. The pertinent differences found, regarding the internal planning, were that proportionally more space was given to the living rooms than in local authority houses, presumably because of the important status symbolism of a large 'entertaining' room. On the other hand, kitchens tended to have an area of 75 ft² compared to the local authority 90-100 ft², and although the fittings were frequently more expensive in 50% of the plans, they did not satisfy the Parker Morris recommended kitchen work sequence. Burnett (18) comments, 'whether these differences represented differences in living patterns, or selling points directed more towards social differentiation, real or imaginary, is a matter for debate.'

In medium-priced housing of the late-1960's, there was a trend towards the disappearance of the dining room in favour of a lounge-diner and kitchen with breakfast space. In more expensive housing, extra space was often given to providing a service area to function as a utility room, or a study as a quiet area away from the all-purpose lounge. The 'luxury' house, typically a detached development of a dozen or so, would have a drawing room, dining room, study (an indication
of the owner's professional occupation), a 150 ft\(^2\) kitchen and a utility room.

A study done by Attenburrow in the late 1960's provides further information on kitchen design in the private sector. Attenburrow (19) conducted informal, free-ranging discussions with builders in the private sector of the housing market, to obtain an understanding of the factors that influence their design decisions. His findings demonstrate the interrelationship between space, quality of finish and price in the private sector.

'Bread and butter' houses for first purchasers from the largest sector of the market and the prices of such houses are tailored by the firms to fit the purchasers pocket. When seeking economies of space in these low-cost houses, it is normally kitchens and bedrooms that suffer. For example, as one builder reasons:

House buyers will put up with restricted conditions in kitchens and bedrooms if they can have a living room big enough to impress visitors. Although the kitchens in our 'bread and butter' houses are fairly small, we put a lot of work into them. We fit them out well, give a good (work) sequence and make them look attractive. We offer with a smallish kitchen a big living-dining room. Although two living rooms would probably be better for family living, we cannot put them in at the price.

Builders saw second purchasers making a substantial capital gain on the sale of their old house, and others not so concerned about price, as more particular about house design. To quote another builder:

To attract them, the house must have good overall design, well-finished with good, clean lines and well-shaped rooms and contain no obvious basic faults to create a sales resistance. Inside the house, the kitchen is a most important feature. It has to be well laid out, with plenty of worktops and storage, contain space for a table and a refrigerator and, unless there is a separate launderette or a utility room, for a washing machine and spin dryer.

Attenburrow examined plans of 182 dwelling types offered by the builders, to see how they conformed to Parker Morris recommendations.
The dwelling types ranged from two to four bedroomed, detached, semi-detached and terraced, houses and bungalows. Since the Parker Morris recommendations are phrased in terms of family/household size, Attenburrow used size and number of bedrooms in order to estimate the family/household size each dwelling type was expected to accommodate.

Attenburrow found that in terms of overall space, two-thirds of the bungalows and three-quarters of the houses had total areas which satisfied or exceeded the recommended overall area. The Parker Morris Committee recommended that at least one room in the living area in a home for four or more people should be provided that could cater for activities needing privacy and freedom from disturbance.

Regarding the kitchens, just over one-third were above $100 \text{ ft}^2$ in area and thus were large enough to provide the recommended 'space where two or three people can sit down and eat.' 8% of these kitchens also had a separate dining room or space. Of the remaining majority of the kitchens under $100 \text{ ft}^2$, just over a quarter had a separate dining room, or dining space related to the kitchen rather than the living room.

To summarise, most of the plans of 182 dwelling types examined were of or above the overall area recommended by Parker Morris. However, those that fell short were in the range of dwelling types for low-priced housing, the sector that makes up the bulk of the builders' sales.

One builder described the dilemma as such:

We'd all like to build to Parker Morris standards, but not every purchaser can afford them. We're up against the building societies yardstick of $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 times the man's income being the maximum advance. If we build to Parker Morris, we cut off a very large portion of potential house purchasers. When price is the overriding consideration and we find a sensible economic design works out below Parker Morris, we ignore Parker Morris. It would be fair to say we take note of Parker Morris and we don't ignore its recommendations lightly.

Table 6 provides a summary of changes in recommended space standards in public housing from 1860 to the present day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Living room</th>
<th>Scullery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Recommendations for Labourers' Dwellings. Birch</td>
<td>168 sq. ft.</td>
<td>112 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Tudor Walters Committee</td>
<td>180 sq. ft.</td>
<td>80 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Housing Manual (20)</td>
<td>180 sq. ft.</td>
<td>80 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Dudley Report</td>
<td>160 sq. ft.</td>
<td>110 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Housing Manual (21)</td>
<td>160 sq. ft.</td>
<td>50 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4. The Situation of Women

Another major influence on the evolution of the kitchen, from the hearth to its present form, has been the situation of women. This section reviews changes in women's roles stemming from industrialisation.

1.4.1. The Pre-Industrial Period

In pre-industrial society (referring here to the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries), family life was communal. The interests of individual members and the nuclear family were subordinate to those of the extended family. Work was integrated with family life, since the unit of production was the unit of kin relationships and work was located in, or close to, the home. All adults worked and status in the community was derived equally from identification with the family and from the type of work done. Thus, the role of the adult woman was that of productive worker.

This situation had the effect of producing less discrimination in marriage between the roles of husband and wife. For example, married women were expected to continue with productive work (although less so amongst the upper classes by the end of the seventeenth century). This meant they remained economically independent, supporting themselves and their children, which was not considered to be their husband's duty. Housework, such as cooking and cleaning, was not seen as the specific responsibility of the woman, but was integrated with the main work of the family.

In addition, concepts of child care differed from those of the present day. Both the birth rate and the infant mortality were high, thus placing the value of individual children at a relatively low level. Less emphasis was placed on motherhood, and children were of peripheral importance in the family. Childhood was short, with children
expected to help with household tasks and the care of younger children. They became servants or apprentices as young as eight years old and were married in their early teens. Therefore, most housework was done by unmarried boys and girls supervised by their mother, who frequently worked in the family industry.

Oakley (22) asserts that overall in the pre-industrial period women's activities were independent of their position as wives and mothers. The legal position of women employed in trade gave them the same rights and responsibilities as men in equivalent positions. Within marriage, their legal rights were also considerable.

1.4.2. The Effects of Industrialisation, 1750-1850

The industrial revolution had far-reaching effects on the situation of women, due to the separation of the family from the economy. The factory replaced the home as the centre of economic production, the home became a private place for the family and the tradition of family labour and a family wage was abolished.

Initially, women and children continued to work outside the home; however, the removal of work to the factory led to protective labour legislation first for children and then for women, limiting their hours of work and employment opportunities. This resulted in a division of roles in the family, with the man becoming the sole wage earner and the status of the whole family depending upon his job. He supported his wife, who became an economically dependent, non-employed housewife. This situation became part of middle-class ideals in the early nineteenth century, with the leisured lady, in emulation of the aristocracy, a mark of prosperity for the middle-class male.

The separation of the workplace from the home meant men had far less contact with family life whilst women had more. When factories
stopped employing the family, women had to stay at home and look after
the children. Consequently, housework and childcare became isolated
from economically productive work. Thus, industrialisation led to the
dominance of the housewife role for women and the restriction of the
housewife-mother to the home.

The role of the child in the family also changed from that of
a contributor to the family income to that of a dependent at the centre
of the family. This differentiation between adult and child roles was
brought about by the laws against child labour, plus the decline in
infant mortality and birth rate leading to children being seen as
individuals. The demand from industry for educated people prompted the
introduction of state education schemes. The increased time spent
in education kept children separated from the adult world for a longer
period of time. Thus, industrialisation created the role of the child
in the family with which we are familiar today.

1.4.3. Post-Industrialisation, 1850-Present Day

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the ethos of woman's
natural domesticity and her place in the home had begun to permeate the
working classes. From 1840-1914, there was a decline in the number
of married women working outside the home, as the social stigma of
working spread down through the classes. Many working-class women
chose the role of non-employed housewife even where their employment
would have meant much needed improvements in the family standard of
living.

However, there was a big difference between housewifery for middle-
class women and working-class women in that, as they employed domestic
help, middle-class women did not do their own housework. This fact
was reflected in attitudes towards the kitchen. For example, Mrs. Ellis
advices her readers in The Women of England (23):

It can never be said that the atmosphere of a kitchen is one in which a refined and intellectual woman ought to live; though the department itself is one which no sensible woman would think it a degradation to overlook.

Ravetz (24) from her research into the sources of innovation and change in nineteenth century kitchens, comments:

All concern for rational housewifery was left to conventional middle-class women and 'domestic science' whose underlying purpose was to make better types of servant.

Also, little interest was shown by the feminist movement, whose origins lay in the middle-class drawing rooms of the period. Therefore, with the ready availability of domestic help fostering such attitudes, it was not surprising that domestic technology made slow progress. The early work on labour-saving kitchen layouts to help the middle class, pioneered in the USA in 1869 by Catherine Beecher, had no impact on the design of the British kitchen of that era.

With the decline in the availability of domestic help from the 1870's onwards, the roles of middle-class and working-class women became more alike. The middle-class woman changed from being housewife and supervisor to housewife and houseworker and the working-class woman gave up paid work to become a full-time housewife/houseworker. By 1912, more interest had begun to be shown in kitchen design, demonstrated by the first English time-and-motion studies on kitchen work, done by Christine Fredericks.

From 1914 onwards, the housewife role for women has been consolidated. However, there has also been a trend towards the combination of the housewife and productive worker roles. This has had particular impact on the lives of middle-class women, who had formerly never been considered part of the work force. The First World War resulted
in a sudden rise in the value of female labour, the doctrine of domesticity was challenged and women got the vote and equality in education. The Second World War gave a similar impetus to female labour, and the trend is continuing with a rise in the number of married women engaged in economic activity from 44% in 1971 to 50% in 1976.(25). This trend is being aided by the increasing provision of protection under Equal Opportunities Acts.

However, traditional ideas about woman's place persist and the structure of the modern family is built on gender differentiation between the roles of male and female. Researchers like the Rapoports (26) have found little evidence of traditional ideas about women's domestic role changing, despite trends towards equality of opportunity in paid employment for women. The housewife role has become institutionalised as the primary role for women and acts as a psychological barrier between her world and a man's, even though she might work. As observed by Peckham Rye Women's Liberation Group (27): 'Our window on the world is looked through with our hands in the sink.'

1.5. Summary

A wide range of economic and social factors have influenced the development of the English kitchen over the past century and a half. There has been considerable overall improvement in the housing stock, and overcrowding has dropped, from 5.11 persons per dwelling in 1861 to 2.97 in 1966. In contrast to the mid-nineteenth century, almost all households now have sole use of basic amenities such as an inside w.c., bath and water supply. Whilst there is still a positive correlation between space and income, the difference between the social classes has markedly decreased.

Since 1850, working class housing has evolved by expansion and differentiation of functions. The minimum shelter and separation
of the rural labourer's cottage or urban back-to-back has dramatically improved through to the space and amenities of a separate parlour, living room, kitchen, bathroom and garden of semi-detached, suburban, low-density developments. This is largely due to state involvement, commencing in 1918 with the Tudor-Walters Report and maintained by the rising standards set by subsequent committees. Regarding the development of the kitchen, the most significant change in the working-class home has been the separation of the cooking area from the family living area. With the advent of the gas stove, cooking moved into the scullery, which became the kitchen, leaving the kitchen-living room to be used exclusively for family living.

No extreme change has taken place in the housing preferences of the middle class. The tradition of the private, self-contained, detached or semi-detached, suburban or semi-rural dwelling has been maintained. Its evolution since 1850 has been through contraction; for example, the disappearance of the morning room and the reversion to more generalised space usage. This change is due to the expansion of the middle class to include lower income groups, a decrease in family size and the gradual reduction in domestic help.

For many years, the middle-class kitchen has been a separate room, but isolated from the family living area. A major change during this period has been that the kitchen has moved to a central location in the house and has become a room used by the housewife and her family. Comfort and convenience have increased in importance. However, even small houses have continued to represent symbolic values at the expense of functional considerations, with more room given to the status areas of hall and lounge, whilst the kitchen has suffered in size and quality of work sequence and layout.
Advances in domestic technology have affected living patterns in both the working-class and middle-class kitchen. Two groups of forces, one economic, one social, have led to the mechanisation of the home. The introduction of electricity, an active inter-war house-building programme and the growth of the household appliance industry, have worked in conjunction with the decline of domestic service, the movement for better housing and an increased general sensitivity to dirt. As has been explained, the introduction of the gas cooker broke down the kitchen-scullery separation in working-class homes. The refrigerator has reduced the need for a larder and food-storage cupboard and affected shopping patterns, reducing the need for frequent trips. The middle-class practice of sending clothes to the laundry and working-class use of the public laundry have declined due to the introduction of the washing machine. Laundry is now done by the housewife in the kitchen. More recently, the dishwasher, home freezer and microwave oven have started to affect living patterns and kitchen planning.

Interrelated with the development of the kitchen have been changes in women's roles. The period of industrialisation, 1750-1850, brought about separation of work from the home and led to the dominance of the housewife role for women and the restriction of the housewife-mother to the home. By the early twentieth century, the doctrine of women's natural domesticity, already well-established in the middle classes, had filtered down to the working classes. Thus, class differences narrowed as working-class women became full-time housewives and the disappearance of domestic help forced middle-class women to change from supervising to doing their own housework. Consequently, more attention has started to be paid to kitchen design. Despite women's re-entry into the workplace after the First World War and the increased equality
of opportunity, the housewife role remains the primary role for women and the kitchen is primarily thought of as her domain.
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Introduction

The first part of this chapter discusses the need for research into dwelling design. Parts 2.2/3 review research to date concentrated specifically on the kitchen. Parts 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 review related areas of research: time-budget studies; environmental psychology; and the domestic role, respectively. Findings in these areas make a relevant contribution to the planning of further research on the kitchen.

Each part of Chapter Two is summarised individually.

2.1. Research Into Dwelling Design

The tenant of the rented house and purchaser of the new house are rarely able to influence the design of the dwelling, even if they understood their own living habits sufficiently to be able to do so, and as a rule they are not able to recognise the effects of dwelling design on their patterns of living, or to detect the origin of their domestic and economic frustrations. Chapman (1955) (1)

Chapman's comment illustrates the fact that in the mass housing of today, the client with whom the architect deals is rarely the eventual occupier of the house he designs. The aim of research into dwelling design is to provide information about the requirements of the people who will live in new dwellings, to compensate for the lack of direct contact between the designer and the user.

Social surveys are often considered to be an important source of information bearing on architectural decisions. However, both architects {York Conference (1968) (2) R.I.B.A. seminar (1979) (3)} and social scientists {Horton (1967) (14)} have called for more information on user needs, commenting that although there 'seemed' a surfeit of this type of data, for studies in depth it was generally found too elementary and unsophisticated.

Evidence exists to suggest that because of this, the architect tends to rely on his own life experience when making design decisions, which is often inadequate or inappropriate. Edwards (1974) (5),
investigated architects' anticipations of the activities and furniture within the living rooms of a particular local authority house type, plus the actual ways in which a sample of these houses were used and found a significant discrepancy. Only four of the twenty-eight architects taking part in the study consulted published data like 'Spaces in the Home' (6) for information, which Edwards interprets as supporting the suggestion that designers are disenchanted with sociological feedback.

Edward's evidence also provides grounds for the rising public opinion that architects are failing to pay sufficient attention to user needs. Hall, writing in the The Guardian (1976) (7), feels:

Architects and planners working with spatial relationships, sometimes seem to forget psychological distances about what makes people happy ... The failure to take account of life-styles of the intended inhabitants has resulted in ... building houses with small kitchens and large dining rooms for families accustomed to eating main meals in a large kitchen and keeping the parlour as something special.

To summarise, the need for research into dwelling design is therefore felt by both architects and users. Such research must be carefully directed in order to ensure its relevance to user needs and its use by architects and others concerned with the planning of the home environment. For example, Hall (9) feels little is known about the choice of rooms for various activities, the amount of variation found and how frequently activities in the home coincide. Research in these areas is essential, since the Parker Morris Report (10), on which current public and private housing standards are based, considers the starting point for room design is knowledge of the way it will be used, the activities which will go on and the furniture which will be kept in it.
2.2. The Kitchen

The Start of Kitchen Planning. Architects became involved in kitchen planning in the 1920's. The decline in domestic help meant the middle-class housewife started to do her own housework; consequently, labour-saving in domestic tasks became of prime importance and the kitchen replaced the drawing room as the centre of organisation of the household. Therefore, the kitchen started to be considered as a subject for design. The main problem was how to make life without servants look respectable, as explained by R. Randal Philips, the editor of *Country Life* in 'The Servantless Home' (1920) (11). In the same year, 'Scientific Management in the Home' was published in Britain by Christine Fredericks (12), who first applied time-and-motion study methods in the home.

Housing Standards and Kitchen Planning. The importance of kitchen planning has been recognised by the government committees and the N.H.B.C. (13) who devise mandatory standards for public housing and recommended standards for private housing. The Dudley Report (1944) (14) was the first to recognise the importance of the consumer's opinion and the first to make recommendations about kitchen work sequences and fittings. The Parker Morris Report (1961) (15) proposed that the kitchen, because of the multitude of requirements it meets and the basic nature of its contained activities when related to the life of a family, should be chosen as the starting point of internal design, and made further recommendations on work sequences in the kitchen, storage and the provision of space for eating there. However, it is difficult to differentiate between standards which are merely a progressive increase of previous standards and those which are based on definitive research.
Foreign Research on Kitchen Planning. Much more research into kitchen design has been done in countries other than Britain, encouraged by the absence of a longstanding tradition of domestic help. Whilst it is inadvisable to base British design on data from countries where climate and lifestyle differ, these studies have frequently been influential in directing British research. Scandinavia has been particularly active, in particular the Swedish Kunglbostadsstyrelsen (16), and Finnish Kotitalouskeskuksen (17) have instigated much research. The contribution of Scandinavian and European research to kitchen planning is reviewed by Grandjean (1969, 1973) (18). In general, the literature shows a wider consideration of social, in addition to functional, design aspects in relation to the kitchen, and this occurs at an earlier stage than in British research. For example, the Dutch Bouwcentrum study in 1957 (19) was a comprehensive survey of housing needs in response to the realisation that housing must meet the needs of differing social patterns. By the end of the 1960's, German (1968) (20) and Danish (1969) (21) studies had started the investigation of the effects of the position of the kitchen in relation to the rest of the living area.

Of the work done in the United States, one of the earliest reports of interest is by Gilbreth (1930) (22), who outlined many of the basic elements of design, environmental conditions and the advantage of arranging fittings in accordance with an efficient work sequence. American research up to 1968 is comprehensively reviewed by Steidl and Bratton (23), who concluded that relatively little research provided definitive information about the effects of layout in homes on patterns of work and play and of relative satisfaction with such effects. American research on kitchen planning is increasingly taking family activities into account. However, the only consideration of socio-psychological
factors found in the literature to date has been in a 1952 study by Glen Beyer 'The Cornell Kitchen' (24), in which four types of kitchen are distinguished:

1. Family centred living: The housewife while working in the kitchen has her family following their own pursuits within sight.

2. Social standing: The housewife enjoys having her kitchen as a showplace with the latest colours and appliances to show to the neighbors.

3. Physical convenience: Space and storage arranged to conserve time and energy. Form follows function.

4. Aesthetics: Colour, texture, line and form are attractive for her pleasure.

British Research on Kitchen Planning. Overall, there has been less British research on the kitchen and studies have been more narrowly focused on its functional aspects. The Building Research Station (B.R.S.; later the Building Research Establishment, B.R.E.), and the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (M.O.H.L.G., amalgamated with the Department of the Environment in 1971), have been influential in pioneering user studies.

The B.R.S. {Bateson and Whyte (1953 (25), Bateson (1954) (26), Bateson, Noble and Attenburrow (1954) (27)} carried out a series of experiments during the 1950's to study the relationship between the design and layout of dwellings and their usage by occupants, with reference to the housewife's use of her house in the performance of routine household tasks. Although functionally oriented, dealing with housework, the discontinuation of these studies was unfortunate, as they were innovative.
Realisation that the kitchen was not just for the functional purposes of food preparation and cooking came initially through the discovery of its increased use for eating meals. The 1955 'Meals in Modern Homes' survey by C.O.S.M.I.T.H. (28) showed that the use of the kitchen for serving meals was very common amongst housewives interviewed in houses built by local authorities between 1945-52.

Throughout the 1960's, the M.O.H.L.G. Research and Development group carried out a number of user studies. These were usually in conjunction with a housing programme or redevelopment scheme to ascertain both the characteristics of the population and their expressed needs, or were studies of user response to a particular type of house and/or equipment as feedback to the designer. Noble and Nash (29) describe the methods used in these surveys and a summary of the appraisals from 1953-69. Current recommendations on kitchen design are published in the D.O.E. 'Spaces in the Home' (1972).(30).

These studies show how research on the kitchen broadened from a concern solely with its efficiency as a workplace, to the acknowledgement of its use for other activities. The studies included a number of kitchen appraisals, in order to test the recommendations of the 1961 Parker Morris Report on the design of dwellings. The ease with which the kitchens accommodated the activities recorded as taking place in them was documented as one of the measures of satisfaction, in line with the Parker Morris dictum that activities should form the focus of dwelling resign. However, it was not investigated whether such activities took place in the kitchen from choice or from necessity.

The use of the kitchen for meals was firmly established during the 1960's. Illustrated by Joan Walley in her book, 'The Kitchen' (31):

Although it is true that a kitchen exists primarily for the preparation and cooking of meals, it may also be used in some households for other purposes, such as clothes washing, ironing, flower arrangement, silver and shoe cleaning, etc.
In addition, from time to time it will be used for eating as well as cooking meals. Needless to say, these activities greatly affect the planning ... The main consideration for the British housewife is whether or not the kitchen should be large enough to accommodate a dining table so that some meals can be served there. In many homes, it is often considered preferable that breakfast, at least, should be served in the kitchen. Walley (1960)

An investigation of eating habits by Hole and Attenburrow in 1966 (32) showed that the proportion of people using the kitchen for meals increased with the size of the kitchen. They concluded that the kitchen seemed to be the preferred place to each in, although this was only evident when the kitchen was large enough.

The accepted wider use of the kitchen was confirmed in the 1970's by questions on its use appearing in the large-scale O.P.C.S. General Household Survey (33). Analysis of data from 12,000 households in the 1971 survey showed that only 11% of households had small kitchens (assessed as under 6 ft wide). 27% of these used their kitchens for purposes other than cooking, compared to 60% amongst those households with larger kitchens. Size of family appeared to have no bearing on the use to which rooms were put, but number of other rooms did. The data showed that households with six or more rooms more often confined their kitchen to cooking purposes than did those with fewer rooms, and this was true irrespective of kitchen size. The General Household Survey stresses the importance of the identification of areas where the needs of people can be proven, in order to enable standards to be constructed on human needs.

In recent years, there has been evidence to suggest that research into kitchen planning is slowly broadening further to acknowledge the relevance of socio-psychological factors. For example, women's values and attitudes in relation to the use of the kitchen are given consideration by Senior, in 'Workstudy in the Kitchen' (1975) (34). She makes
the following observations:

The way you feel about jobs in the kitchen directly affects the way you do them. We generally feel the tasks we don't like doing are harder compared to the ones we enjoy. If you are satisfied with your work, you tend not to feel tired ... The amount of satisfaction a woman gets from her work may depend on the value she attributes to it. The attraction today of a good career and jobs and more public questioning of the role of the woman in modern society makes it easy to forget the contribution of women to the family.

2.3. Ergonomics and Kitchen Planning

During the last decade, ergonomists have turned their attention towards the application of ergonomic principles to the design of the home, in particular the kitchen. A range of studies have been published (Ward (1970) (35), Ward and Kirk (1970) (36), Saville (1969) (37), Ward (1971) (38), Thompson (1974) (39), Ward (1974) (40)) on the determination of optimum work surface heights in the kitchen, kitchen storage and kitchen design.

In 1974, a comprehensive survey of kitchen environments, layout and equipment was undertaken by Ward et al. (41). Its objective was to examine the degree to which the working environment of 262 kitchens in private and public housing met the requirements of the user and current recommendations, regulations and standards.

Kitchens under 12.0 m² were found to be considered inadequate by respondents. Kitchens were extensively used for meals in the public sector, the main reason for their use being that they were easy to keep clean. Where meals were not taken in the kitchen, the main reason was lack of space. When the inadequacies of existing kitchens, based on users' complaints, were arranged in order of priority, the spatial environment was awarded first place in the private sector and second place in the public sector. Ward et al. conclude that:

Space cannot easily be increased in present houses and must inevitably be costly. In future housing schemes, however,
it appears essential to consider providing increased space in the kitchen even at the cost of sacrificing space in, or provision for, other rooms, e.g. the dining room.

They feel that urgent attention should be directed towards this problem from a research and implementation point of view.

Ward (1974) (42), considering critical ergonomic factors in domestic kitchen design, feels that ergonomists should turn their attention to the home, since the housewife is in a working environment, and as increasing numbers of women take up employment outside the home, their role as housewife needs easing.

**Summary.** Research has shown overemphasis on the functional, rational aspects of user needs at the expense of socio-psychological aspects. Since 1920, the kitchen has gained recognition as part of the house used by the family instead of by servants. However, research on the kitchen has concentrated on the functional aspects of its interior design, as the housewife's workroom and the kitchen has largely been considered in isolation from other living space in the home. The gradual recognition of the kitchen as part of the general living area, through evidence establishing its use for eating meals, marked the first step in the consideration of its social functions. In addition to pointing out the wide range of activities that the kitchen is increasingly required to accommodate, further research, especially that of the B.R.E., has shown that the size, shape and internal arrangement of rooms is of great importance to the occupiers. Overall, these studies support the concept that spatial layout and family activities could be major determinants of attitudes towards dwelling space. Research is needed in this area.

Hole (43) feels user research must be linked to more generalised knowledge of human behaviour and of the processes of social change.
in order to effectively predict user needs in the future. It is hoped that such studies would facilitate communication between architects and sociologists.

2.4. Time-Budget Studies

Time-budget studies are another source of data concerning activities and space usage in the home, with reference to the position of women in society, the division of labour and use of the kitchen. Both those studies covering general lifestyles, such as Szalai's U.N.E.S.C.O. sponsored multinational time-budget project, and those specifically devoted to housework, reviewed by Grandjean and Hole and Attenburrow, provide interesting information on the amount of time spent on housework and the division of labour in the home.

2.4.1. Time Spent on Housework

Grandjean, in his summary of European studies, estimates the basic working week of a full-time housewife as 50-55 hours. Hole and Attenburrow's review shows agreement between all studies that preparation and serving of meals absorbs the highest proportion of the housewife's time, despite different research methods, standards of space and home equipment and dietary habits. In fact, labour saving technological equipment has not significantly reduced the time spent on housework. American research (Margolis, Walker) has found that in 1924 the average full-time housewife devoted 52 hours a week to household chores, whilst in 1966 the average was 55 hours. Grandjean thinks it is interesting that the housewife's working week has remained largely unchanged over the last few decades whereas occupations in general have shown a tendency towards shorter hours.
Goode's (49) opinion is that:

Labour-saving devices merely raise the standards of cleanliness and general performance, permitting more work to be turned out, but do not reduce the hours of work.

In 1926, American women devoted about 23 hours a week to food preparation and cleaning up. By 1968, this figure had declined to 18 hours. General home care increased from 9½ to 12½ hours over the same period, and despite the widespread use of washing machines by 1968, laundry time increased from 5½ to 6½ hours. Russian data (Patrushev and Kolpakov (1971) (50), Strumlin (1961) (51)), making comparisons between 1924, 1956 and 1965 for urban employed women shows the same trends. Margolis (52) puts the increases down to Parkinsons Law (53): 'Work expands to fill the time available for its completion.'

Walker (54) shows that American housewives going out to work spend less time on housework. Zander (55), in a German survey, indicates they spend the same amount. Insufficient data exists for comparison between British working and non-working housewives.

2.4.2. The Division of Labour

The division of labour shows strong cross-national consistencies. For example, despite differences in composition between Szalai's 1969 multinational sample and Young and Willmott's (56) more specialised one of 1970 (regional (London); only married people 30-49 years old, therefore fewer older people whose attitudes must have been formed in a social and physical context quite different from today's), the division of labour between the London men and women is almost exactly that of the multi-national average. Cullen (57) believes this tends to suggest that for domestic work a 'hard core' of household chores seems to remain as a distinct group of activities. Regardless of the gadgets available, these chores take up considerably more time than household maintenance and are traditionally regarded as 'women's work.'
In the absence of British data, strong cross-national consistencies make Szalai's data of interest. On average, housewives in a modern urban society spend 8.8 hours on paid work, housekeeping and child care, 11.4 hours sleeping, eating and attending to personal needs, and have 4 hours of free time per weekday. Working men spend 10.6 hours working, 9.9 hours sleeping and eating and have 3.5 hours free per weekday. On Sunday, the average housewife work for 6 hours, sleeps and eats for 11.7 hours and has 6.3 hours off. On weekdays, the average man devotes one hour of his working time per day to household chores. At the weekend, this increases to 2.3 hours plus 0.3 hours of child care. The working woman puts in 7.9 hours paid work weekdays against the 9.4 hours paid work of a working man. However, she also does 3.3 hours of housework and 0.4 hours of child care, compared to his one hour. Her entire working day at 11.6 hours is an hour longer than that of a man. She has 9.9 hours for sleeping, eating and personal needs and only 2.5 hours of free time. At the weekend, she works for 6 hours, has 11.9 hours for sleeping and other needs and 6 hours free time.

It is interesting to note that the division of labour in countries where equality between men and women is more advanced is little different from countries where more traditional attitudes towards sex roles exist. In a typical small town in America, a working man spends 0.5 hours a day on household chores, averaged over the week, and a working woman 3.6 hours. In a typical small town in Yugoslavia the periods are 0.4 hours and 4.3 hours, respectively.

Table 7 gives an indication of the sharing of one household task, the washing up, between British husbands and wives. The majority of British wives in 1974 did most of all of the washing up.

Szalai's work did show that the higher the socio-economic status and 'education,' the more infrequent the 'traditional' division of labour. However, men devoted less time to housework and selected only
Table 7.

SHARING OF WASHING UP BETWEEN HUSBAND AND WIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All by wife</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly by wife</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done equally</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly by husband</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All by husband</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

those tasks in which they were willing to participate.

To summarise, housework, a major proportion of which is done in the kitchen, occupies the housewife, whether she is working outside the home or not, for a significant amount of time each day. The time spent on housework over the last fifty years has remained fairly stable and despite changes in women's situation there have been no dramatic changes in the division of labour, tending to support the idea that the 'domestic role' for women persists. Szalai feels:

"The plight of the employed woman pervades all our time-budget records ... substantial inequalities in the division of labour by sex remain everywhere."

2.5. Environmental Psychology

A more recent research discipline relevant to the design of dwellings is environmental psychology. Environmental psychology is concerned with the investigation of the interaction between man and his physical environment. Moore and Golledge (1976) (59) state:

"Environmental cognition is the study of the subjective images, impressions and beliefs that people have of the environment, the ways in which these conceptions arise from experience and the ways in which they affect subsequent behaviour with respect to the environment."

This lends further support to the premise that the investigation of the use of space in the home and family interaction patterns are relevant in a study of housewives' attitudes towards the kitchen.

Koppe (60) asserted in 1955:

"If we are to understand the problems of family life that centre about housing and furnishings, we must first survey the common ways families behave in their homes. This is, we must survey the home behaviour settings."

Despite such statements, almost no systematic evidence exists of how families use houses.

The general hypothesis that living or working space arrangements condition interactions that occur amongst participants has been
validated in situations other than the family. Studies on the relationships between space, layout and interpersonal competition, work relationships, social interaction and territorial behaviour are reviewed by Sommer (1967, 1969) (61) and Altman (1972) (62).

The literature on the family relevant to the home environment in terms of the use of space and the impact of environmental features on social interaction can broadly be divided into three types. There have been a number of accounts of home environments which have been primarily descriptive. This is particularly true in cross-cultural studies by anthropologists, sociologists and psychologists (Canter (1971) (63), Caudill and Plath (1966) (64), Michelson (1970) (65), Lewis (1959, 1961) (66)). Beyond comparative studies, research can roughly be divided into two areas. One set considers specific aspects of family life in the environment (use of bathrooms, Kira (1966) (67); family rituals, Bossard and Boll (1950) (68); privacy, Davis and Oleson (1971) (69); leisure activities, Chapin and Hightower (1966) (70)). The other concerns relationships between the amount and nature of space and social pathology. Implicit in much writing on home environments is the hypothesis that insufficient privacy leads to individual maladjustment, difficult in family functioning and a variety of social pathology indicators such as crime, delinquency and unsocialized behaviour. However, research results tend to be equivocal as it is difficult to unravel the cause-and-effect relationship between environmental conditions and pathology. Nevertheless, a number of authors have concluded that poor, overcrowded housing is associated with a variety of detrimental outcomes (Chapin (1938, 1951) (71), Schorr (1963) (72), Loring (1956) (73)). Much of this work has been done in the USA.
One study concerned with man-environment relationships in the home, relevant to the kitchen, is the investigation of the use of space in the home in relation to family behaviour patterns by Altman et al. (1972) (74). The study, of 147 lower-middle-class families, collected descriptive data on the home environment and information on patterns of spatial behaviour across various parts of the house, including the kitchen and identified similarities and differences among family types. The data was used to suggest the existence of two characteristically different family types reflected in certain consistent behaviour patterns. Type A families were described as exhibiting an 'open,' 'accessible,' 'informal,' 'shared,' 'socially active' style of family life. Type B families exhibited the opposite types of characteristics and generally had firmer boundaries between members of the family, less accessibility to one another's areas and activities, a more formal approach to the use of space, and a lesser degree of family interactions and role sharing.

These patterns cut across a wide variety of levels of interpersonal behaviour: the use of space, activities and roles. For example, Type A families left their bedroom doors open for a variety of activities and made their special rooms (studies, dens) readily available to each other, more than Type B families. Type A families engaged in more social interaction, visiting one another's bedrooms frequently and having more conversations after dinner in free time. Type A families also seemed to have fewer interpersonal boundaries around individual members, with overlapping job roles and job responsibilities in areas such as maintenance of the home and cleaning rooms. Thus, Type A families shared activities and seemed to do things with one another to a greater extent than Type B families.
Type A families also showed greater informality in activities and use of space in relation to the kitchen. The kitchen was used for eating dinner and entertaining guests and rooms seemed to have less strictly defined functions, for example the kitchen was used for a multiplicity of purposes besides eating. Whereas in Type B families eating was done in the dining room and rooms seemed to have specific non-overlapping functions.

Altman commented that the areas and activities that seemed most important to family style differences concerned bedrooms and kitchens/eating. He concluded that the data showed that:

Small groups and interpersonal relationships operate as a complex ecological system at many levels of functioning and involve a systematic interplay between the group and the environment.

It was suggested that the next stage in research should be the investigation of the underlying factors affecting such behaviour patterns.

To summarise, the importance of the perception and use of space has been emphasised by environmental psychologists. There is a need for further studies relating this to the home environment in order to discover how families use houses. Altman's work indicates activities concerning the kitchen are important indicators of family lifestyle differences. His findings, therefore, emphasise further the value of research centred on the kitchen.

2.6. Roles - The Domestic Role Identity

A role is defined by Banton (75) as 'a set of rights and obligations, that is, an abstraction to which the behaviour of people will conform in varying degree.' McCall and Simmons (76) say role identities are not purely idiosyncratic but are largely based on social expectations of role performance appropriate to specific social positions. Thus, masculine and feminine role identities are views of the self as belonging to one or other gender. Gender - masculinity and femininity -
refers to complexes of attitudes, personality qualities and ways of behaving based on the criterion of sex status.

Evidence from cross-cultural studies, reviewed by Oakley (77) demonstrates that the domestic role of women within the family unit is not sex differentiated since it is not directly related to the function of biological motherhood. Rather 'A set of myths (division of labour by sex, motherhood) about women's place in society provides the rationale for the ideology of gender roles in which femininity and domesticity are equated' (78). Thus, the female role is a cultural phenomenon and the implicit assumption of the legitimacy of existing family role differentiation is a powerful force on the lifestyle of women, confirming their domesticity and maintaining the home centredness of their identity. 'It is still the woman who is expected to carry the main responsibility for the care of her children.' (79) Evidence that even amongst women strongly oriented towards work a 'symmetrical' family arrangement, such as described by Young and Willmott (80) does not develop. Palm and Pred (81) conclude:

The typical household is by no means characterised by an enlightened husband and an equitable division of labour. Typically, the working wife's prescribed or agreed 'role' includes performing a disproportionately large share of the housekeeping and shopping duties and almost all of the 'in-house' childrearing.

A number of sociological studies, notably those of Myrdal and Klein (1965) (82), Rainwater (1959) (83), Ginzberg (1966) (84), Gavron (1966) (85), Komarovsky (1967) (86), Yudkin and Holme (1969) (87) and Lopata (1971) (88), have examined women's domestic role. Oakley (1974 (89), in her study of work attitudes and work satisfaction of housewives found dissatisfaction with housework predominated and that women's identification with the housewife role was found to be a critical factor in their approach to housework. No relationship
was found between the technical environment (in terms of the provision of domestic equipment) and housework satisfaction.

Environmental psychologists have extended the concept of role, suggesting that it can be used to look at interactions between people and parts of their environments.

Norberg-Schulz (90) suggests that the work 'role' implies a particular orientation to the environment. For example, the role 'doctor' calls to mind the idea of hospital. Results of studies by Canter (1977) (91) indicate that a person in the 'doctor' role will use and think of a hospital in different ways than the person in the 'cleaner' role. Canter concludes:

A particular person's role will, in large part, cause him to be found in a particular place. Thus, roles are singularly appropriate social differentiators for linking people to places.

Thus, to summarise, the examination of literature relevant to the situation of women as housewives and the emerging concept of the environmental role suggest that the housewife's definition of her role could affect her expectations in relation to her home.

2.7. Summary

This review of the literature highlights the lack of research into the interaction between women and the domestic kitchen. However, from the examination of related research, it would appear that the study of women's attitudes to the kitchen should encompass the interaction between physical factors such as kitchen size, its relationship to and the amount of space in the rest of the dwelling and the social factors of social class; stage in family life cycle; past housing experiences and the respondent's identification with the domestic role. Individual household members do not possess a common lifestyle
nevertheless their behaviour is interrelated. Therefore, the study of family living patterns is also relevant.

Margaret Stacey (q2.) comments:

Hypotheses which are worth testing can only be developed in areas about which a good deal is known, that is where a great deal of empirical field data has already been collected. Before this stage most research is of an exploratory nature ... it is only after much empirical data has been collected and a series of simple relationships close to reality have been established, that either precise hypotheses can be enunciated for testing, or theory derived inductively from empirical data.

Since little information exists in the area of women's attitudes towards the kitchen, it was felt that preliminary qualitative investigations were needed to explore the range and variability of the behaviour and attitudes of women towards kitchens, in order to clarify the aims of the main study. Chapter Three gives an account of this preliminary work.
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3.1. Objectives

The objective of this phase was to gather information on the attitudes of women towards the kitchen. However, since a review of the literature indicated the relevance of space in the rest of the dwelling, the scope was broadened to include information on the living rooms.

3.2. Procedure

Information was obtained by means of group discussions. Women were asked to talk about the kitchen and living rooms in their homes. The group discussion method was chosen as a small scale, unstructured flexible method of research was needed, in order to obtain a large amount of information about the range and variation in women's attitudes towards the kitchen and living rooms in their homes. The discussions were unstructured, to enable information to be gained on the groups' concerns and frames of reference, from the nature of the topics discussed and the amount of time devoted to each of them. A detailed account of the procedure is appended (Appendix I). Six group discussions were held, three with women living in local authority housing and three with those in private housing. A total of forty women took part.

3.3. Findings and Interpretations

Briefly, the women in these groups appeared to judge their houses in terms of their suitability for family activities. They demonstrated their concerns with a number of values; for example, 'cosyness,' contact' and privacy.' These values could be interpreted as showing concern with one of the four factors: autonomy, isolation, togetherness, or conflict. The discussion also revealed that all the ground floor rooms including the kitchen, had multiple uses and
that the possible uses of each room appeared to depend on the number of rooms in the house, their location and accessibility.

Therefore, it appears that the women's comments on activities could be described in terms of a conceptual framework which deals with the situation where different activities are taking place in the same space, and for our purpose the multiple use of a room could be regarded as an illustration of an overlapping situation as defined by Lewin (1). Lewin describes overlapping situations as points along a continuum, from a high degree of congruence, or consonant situation, through compatible and interfering situations to antagonistic situations with a low degree of congruence. Applying this theory to several activities going on at the same time, we see that interfering or antagonistic activities are the candidates for separate spaces in the home, while consonant or compatible activities may take place in the same room. Returning to the values expressed by the housewives, their use of the term privacy expresses their need for autonomous space. This can be regarded as the positive aspect of separated activities. The negative aspect of separated activities in separate spaces is isolation from the rest of the family. Similarly, the positive aspect of combined activities is family togetherness where activities are consonant or compatible, whilst the negative aspect is conflict arising between family members when their activities are interfering or antagonistic. Thus, the following framework may assist in the assessment of the suitability of the house for separated and combined activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Separate</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive aspect</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Togetherness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative aspect</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three main conclusions were drawn from all of the women's comments in the preliminary group discussions: The premise that the kitchen could not be considered in isolation from other rooms in the house, particularly those on the ground floor, was strengthened. A relationship between family activities, the amount and division of space in the home and women's attitudes to the kitchen was suggested. A framework for the investigation of activities was developed during the analysis and its application to the data highlighted areas of significance in the investigations of activities.

Therefore, further investigation of family activities was incorporated into the aims of the main study. Since the importance of the amount and division of space in the home was indicated, it was decided to investigate the differences in the use of and attitudes towards the kitchen between women with families living in the dwellings with a range of variations of the internal planning of the ground floor. Possible parameters are: the size of the kitchen, the number of rooms and the communication patterns possible between these rooms. The methodology for these investigations is outlined in Chapter Five. Since the women's comments on activities seemed to fit a framework of the four factors: autonomy, isolation, togetherness and conflict, questions in the interview schedule were designed based on this framework. The data was also used to select the activities for investigation in the main study. These were: mealtimes; the entertainment of visitors; use of the kitchen by husband and children; ironing; use of the bedroom and use of the lounge.

In addition, it was planned to investigate the respondents' attitudes towards their lounge. At the same time that the group discussions were held, methods of obtaining a record of activities were investigated.
The influence of these two pieces of preliminary work on the assessment of family activities is discussed in more detail in Chapter Four: The Design of the Interview Schedule.
Survey Aims

Since little conceptual development existed in the area of attitudes towards the kitchen, this survey was conceived as an exploratory study.

The survey aimed:

1. To explore the nature of the domestic kitchen and women's attitudes to the kitchen.

2. To examine these attitudes in relation to a number of variables, which a review of the literature and preliminary investigations suggest may be meaningful. Chiefly:
   I. Physical parameters. Kitchen size, the number of rooms on the ground floor and the communication possible between the kitchen and these rooms.
   II. Social parameters. Social status, stage in the family life cycle, past housing experiences, the marital role relationship and identification with the housewife role.

3. To collect data on family activities in the home in order to examine further the relationship between family activities, the amount and division of space in the home and women's attitudes towards the kitchen, suggested by a review of the literature and supported by the preliminary investigations.

4. To suggest possible hypotheses to explain differences between housewives in attitudes towards the kitchen.
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4.1. General Design

The project was conceived as a qualitative study of a small sample, in order to identify the range of behaviour, attitudes and issues in connection with women and their kitchens and to explore and provide an understanding of similarities and differences found. The J.M.R.S. (1) notes:

The examination of attitudes in qualitative work often provides a depth of understanding that is of considerable value in itself, quite apart from its contribution to the design of a large, structured survey.

Similarly, Grebernik and Moser (2) feel:

Verbal descriptions of individual cases, institutions and the like can often give a more vivid, richer and in a sense deeper picture of life than the statistical tables to be found in conventional survey reports.

The value of the qualitative approach in giving insight into what is happening and in the evaluation of people's reactions has been demonstrated in many studies, for example, Young and Willmot (3), Gavron (4) and Oakley (5).

The interview schedule was designed to retain the unstructured flexible approach as used in the preliminary group interviews, to allow the widest possible exploration of views and behaviour patterns, but at the same time gather some quantifiable data in order to facilitate comparison between respondents. For this reason, the schedule was semi-structured, with the majority of questions open-ended and responses probed in detail. A copy of the interview schedule is appended (Appendix II).

Particular attention was paid to the flow of the interview. As Cannell and Kahn (6) point out, the functions of any schedule are two fold: (I) to translate the research objectives into specific
questions and (II) to assist the interviewer in the motivation of the subject to respond with the required information. The J.M.R.S. (7) also advises that non-sampling errors caused by monotony, yeasaying and fatigue are minimised by the design of the schedule to encourage maximum involvement of the subject in the interview. Therefore, the schedule opened with straightforward questions on meals, in order to relax the respondent and build up rapport. The early establishment of relaxation and rapport was important, since the projective sentence completion test on the kitchen had to be administered before any direct questioning on the kitchen.

The remainder of this chapter covers a number of methodological points in the assessment of three specific areas in the interview schedule: attitudes (4.2); activity patterns (4.3); and the domestic role (4.4).

4.2. The Measurement of Attitudes

The second section of the interview schedule focused directly on the kitchen and opened with a sentence completion test. This test formed part of the series of questions on which the assessment of respondents' attitudes towards their kitchens was based.

Respondents were asked:

Could you please complete the sentences on this card, all starting with 'My kitchen ...,' to show what your kitchen means to you. Try to give the answers as though you were answering the question to yourself, not to somebody else. Just write down what occurs to you, don't stop to think about it.

No time limit was set. Respondents were encouraged to complete as many of the ten responses as they were able to, being reminded to 'just put down what comes into your head.' When the respondent indicated she had finished, the interviewer probed for further clarification of each response.
This attitude test was adapted from a test of self-concepts developed by Kuhn and McPartland (8), an abbreviated form of which was used by Oakley (9). The test was designed to overcome the one weakness of direct questions, which is, as Newcomb (10) explains:

that they provide no way of measuring the salience of an attitude. We never know whether the attitude would have been expressed at all or in the same way, apart from the direct question.

Salience, Newcomb states:

refers to a person's readiness to respond in a certain way. The more salient a person's attitude, the more readily will it be expressed with a minimum of outer stimulation. It seems reasonable to assume that a very salient attitude - one expressed with a great amount of spontaneity, has more importance for the person expressing it than does an attitude which he expresses only after a great deal of prodding or questioning.

With these responses, it is reasonable to believe that we have far more solid knowledge of women's attitudes towards their kitchens, rather than if, on a checklist and amongst other questions, we had asked:

'Do you think of your kitchen as a workroom?'
'Do you think of your kitchen as a family room?'

The value of projective techniques in the study of attitudes is generally recognised:

Projective techniques and attitudes are far less reliable procedures for assessment, but they do allow more scope for characteristics particularly relevant and significant to the individual to express themselves. (11)

Oppenhejlm (12) regards projective techniques as useful in the penetration of the individuals social facade: the desire to present oneself in a favourable light; social taboos and the barrier of awareness - people are frequently unaware of their own motives and attitudes. He stresses their value in evoking and outlining stereotypes, self-images and norm percepts.
One drawback of sentence completion is that less intelligent/educated people may not be sufficiently articulate to complete this kind of test. Another, from the researcher's previous experience in obtaining dietary records from elderly people (13), is the reluctance of subjects to write on an imposing, clean sheet of paper. Perhaps they feel their opinions are too insignificant, or they are ashamed of their writing or spelling. For these reasons, the test was carefully pre-piloted and piloted on women similar to those forming the final sample. All respondents tested were able to make some written response, which varied in length between one word and several sentences. The interviewer was instructed to probe each response and shyer respondents were found much more willing to elaborate verbally. The tape recorder was of immense use. Comments were recorded and later transcribed verbatim, which allowed the interviewer to concentrate on building up rapport with the respondent. This was important as:

That data is collected in the respondent's own language and in a free atmosphere is an important factor in the minimising of non-sampling errors. J.M.R.S. (14)

4.3. Activity Patterns

The review of the literature suggested that activity patterns are an important consideration in looking at the interaction between the individual and the environment. As part of the preliminary investigations of women's attitudes towards the kitchen a variety of methods for recording movement patterns in the home were reviewed and several piloted.

Table 8 considers the advantages and drawbacks of some methods applicable to the monitoring of movement patterns in the home by family members, with particular reference to the kitchen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce a record over time.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record activity of each family member.</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy and safe to use.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple to set up.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum disturbance to household.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum privacy for subjects.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum inconvenience to subjects.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a clear record of results.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recall, diaries, observation, sensitive floors and time-lapse photography (methods 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6) are all familiar to research workers. Method five, involving switches at the doors, operated by subjects and monitored by an event recorder, was designed by the author. The equipment was built by the Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Surrey, and piloted in several homes. The feasibility of the use of personal transmitters (method 7) was investigated in conjunction with the Department of Electrical Engineering. Unfortunately, however, time and cost of construction prohibited trials of this system.

Preliminary work refined the objectives of the study and indicated which activities were of specific interest in the examination of the interaction between family living patterns and women's attitudes towards the kitchen. In addition, preliminary group interviews and individual interviews at the pre-pilot and pilot stages, showed that women were able to provide information concerning the use of the kitchen in sufficient detail to provide data on family living patterns. Therefore, the mechanical methods of assessing user patterns, perhaps more of a time and motion study approach, were discontinued in favour of recall and questioning, which was felt adequate for the attitudinal approach of this study.

Questions were funnelled, moving from the examination of broad issues, for instance:

'What sort of things does the family use the lounge for?'
down to the specific examination of the aspects of autonomy, isolation, togetherness and conflict, for example:

'Is there ever any disagreement between Mum and Dad and the children over what to do in the lounge?'

'Is it important to you for the family to be together at mealtimes?'

In addition, orientation to the lounge was investigated using a
projective sentence completion test. This was followed by a
general question on the arrangement of the lounge and then the
specific investigation of conflict between the lounge as a 'clean'
area and as an area for family activities:

'Some people like to keep one room as a best room, do you?'

4.4. Identification with the Housewife Role and the Marital Role

Relationship

4.4.1. The Housewife Role

Initial group discussions, pre-pilot interviews and background
literature suggested that orientation towards the kitchen and satis-
faction may be dependent on the value to the individual of 'being'
a housewife (wife and mother). Locke (15) elaborates on the im-
portance of intervening variables:

The essential point is that in all cases, an individual's
evaluation of an object or situation will be a function of the
perceived relationship between what he believes and what
he values.

To examine the values held by the women about domesticity,
ty were asked the following questions:

1. 'Do you ever feel isolated or cut off from the rest of
   the family when you're in the kitchen?'

Feelings of social isolation and work dissatisfaction have been
linked in other studies, plus the general importance of 'on the
job' social relationships (Herzberg (16)). The kitchen is the
base for housework, which Oakley (17) considers a work task.

2. 'Do you ever feel the need to be alone?'

Gavron (1966) (18) shows that such feelings of captivity are an
important source of dissatisfaction in middle class and working class
housewives.
3. 'Would you tell me what you did in the house yesterday, starting with when you got up.'

The interviewer guided the respondent through her previous day's activities. The use of aided recall gave a fuller description of the housewife and her family's home life. This account was examined for spontaneous mention of a housework routine and the nature and flexibility of this routine. Previous studies (Oakley, 1974) suggest that a high specification of standards and routine shows high personal identification with the domestic role and tends to be symptomatic of a search for housework satisfaction.

The domestic role encompasses that of housewife, wife and mother. Due to limitations of time and the possible questioning of the relevance of discussing marriage and child care by the respondents, no direct questions were asked on these topics.

4.4.2. The Marital Role Relationship

In order to make an assessment of the 'jointness-segregation' dimension in the marital role relationship, after Bott (20), Oakley examined (1) the division of labour between husband and wife in the home and (11) the organisation of marital roles in the areas of leisure tasks and decision-making. However, Oakley found that the patterning of the domestic division of labour between husband and wife may differ from the organisation of roles in other areas of the marriage. This raised the question of whether 'jointness-segregation' is a general dimension of the marital role relationship.

Data on the level of husbands' participation in housework was collected as part of the section on use of the kitchen.

How often does your husband come into the kitchen when he is at home (1) to help you; (2) to do something by himself?
Probe: Tasks/frequency

This information was used to assess the division of labour in the home.

The organisation of marital roles in leisure time was examined in section 4 of the interview schedule on evening activities and in the aided recall of the days activities (section 2). Again, due to the limitations of time and respondent's questioning of relevance, no questions were asked on decision making in areas of family finance et cetera. Relevant spontaneous comments made during the interview were included in the data on which the assessment of the marital role relationship was based. Because of the incomplete assessment of areas of the relationship generally used to determine the organisation of the marital role, a rigid classification was not made. Rather, the women were described as having a tendency towards jointness or segregation relative to other women in the sample.

4.5. Pilot Studies

Pre-pilot and pilot studies were conducted in the proposed survey localities, to aid in the formulation and testing of the interview schedule. Quota samples of twenty (pre-pilot) and ten women (pilot) were selected. The quota method was used to ensure the schedule was piloted on a range of combinations of working and non-working women, with children under and over five years of age, living in local authority and owner-occupied housing. A third pilot study was also undertaken. This was a review and trial of methods for recording activity patterns in the home and is discussed in 4.3.
4.6. Interview Procedure

Interviews were conducted in the spring and autumn of 1977. These periods were chosen in order to avoid the effects of very hot or very cold weather on behaviour patterns, for example, the taking of meals outdoors on hot days. School holiday periods were also avoided for similar reasons of anticipated disruption to family life.

Respondents were contacted personally by the interviewer. Calls were made until contact was established and cooperation obtained, or otherwise. Interviews lasted approximately one and three-quarter hours, consequently an appointment was frequently made at the initial contact for a time convenient to the respondent. Since a major part of the schedule was designed to allow free response, interviews were tape recorded using small, portable cassette tape recorders. Care was taken to place the cassette and microphone where it was inconspicuous, and to change the one hour playing time tapes during natural breaks in the interview. Respondents were asked whether they minded the tape recorder being used. The reason given for its use was that it avoided the labour of writing down the respondents' answers. The tape recorder is in common use in modern homes and no resistance to its use was met, or consciousness of being recorded noticed. Interviews were transcribed verbatim.

4.7. Analysis and Interpretation

As explained at the beginning of this chapter, this is an intensive, exploratory, qualitative study. Specifically, it aims to describe women's attitudes towards the kitchen; examine the relationship between attitudes, houseplan, family composition and activities; and to develop an explanatory hypothesis of women's attitudes.
towards the kitchen. A sample of fifty-four, although small, is considered sufficient for goals of this nature (21). A qualitative approach to analysis bears obvious relevance to these aims, where meanings, causes and relationships are being sought through interpretation, understanding and insight into the data. However, qualitative and quantitative research is complementary and in this analysis, several statistical measures, notably the chi-square test of significance, have been employed. Contingency table analyses and 't' statistic evaluations were performed using a Texas Instruments programmable calculator (TI-59) with applied statistics solid-state software. Two-tailed significance limits of the Student's 't' distribution were obtained from standard tables (21) and exact probabilities of $\chi^2$ values were generated by the programmable calculator. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ is used throughout the project. There is no statistical evidence to preclude the use of such tests on a small sample of fifty-four persons, although the probability that any result is due to chance is more likely to be lower as sample size increases. The benefits of the quantitative approach is that data is standardised, visible and easy comparisons may be made between data in numerical form. In addition, the reassurance of classical survey statistics is provided. However, the failure of this approach can lie in the way the analysed data is used. The statistical tests used in this analysis are used only as aids to interpretation. It should always be remembered that excessive emphasis ought not to be placed upon statistical tests of significance, as Moser and Kalton (23) have stressed:

When all is said and done, what is usually of importance is the magnitude of effects (e.g. the size of the difference between proportions in the population) rather than a test of whether the difference is statistically significant or not.
As survey practitioners have noted (24) attempts to quantify subjectively based perceptions or concepts with sophisticated and advanced measurement techniques result in the destruction of these same concepts.

As Moser and Kalton (25) conclude, the interpretation of the research data and the results of statistical tests applied to them is the responsibility of the researcher:

There is after all more to a piece of research than can be seen from the tables, and the researcher in interpreting his results is inevitably — and rightly — influenced by all that has gone before, by his acquaintance with the raw material behind the figures, and by his own judgement ... The researcher who cautiously confines his conclusions to those strictly justified by the data may be safe from criticism, but he is not making his own full potential contribution.
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PART I. THE SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

5.1. The Dwellings

The study aimed to examine the effect of (I) kitchen size; (II) number of other rooms on the ground floor; and (III) the communication possible between these rooms, on attitudes towards the kitchen. In order to design a sampling frame that would take into account such variations in the internal planning of the dwelling, it was first necessary to establish the range of ground floor layouts in existence. Therefore, an investigation into the variation in the internal layout of dwellings, with reference to kitchens and living rooms, was undertaken in the local housing stock. A detailed account of this investigation is presented in Appendix III. The classification of dwelling with respect to internal layout of the ground floor developed from this investigation is outlined in 5.2. The sampling frame subsequently designed is outlined in 5.3.

5.2. The Classification of Dwellings With Respect to Internal Layout of the Ground Floor

A sample of seventy-one plans of dwellings built in the Borough of Guildford was drawn from the files of Guildford Borough Council. The sample spanned 1900-1975, to reflect the age of the current housing stock. Examination of these plans revealed that the dwellings could be divided into four groups, ranging from 'closed' to 'open' plan, depending upon the amount of communication possible between areas with different functions. This classification is presented in Table 9. Examples of a typical ground floor plan for each of the four groups are shown in Figure 2.

This classification can also be applied to just one room, to show the communication possible between that room and the rest of the ground floor. (Figure 3).
EXAMPLES OF 'CLOSED', 'INTERMEDIATE CLOSED', 'INTERMEDIATE OPEN' AND 'OPEN' PLAN DWELLINGS.

TYPICAL GROUND FLOOR PLAN. TOPOLOGICAL REPRESENTATION. (1)

1. 'CLOSED'.

2. 'INTERMEDIATE CLOSED'.

3. 'INTERMEDIATE OPEN'.

4. 'OPEN'.

KEY
D= Dining room. H = Hall.
K= Kitchen. S = Staircase.
L= Lounge. — = Front entrance.

(1) See Appendix III.
EXAMPLES OF 'CLOSED', 'INTERMEDIATE CLOSED', 'INTERMEDIATE OPEN' AND 'OPEN PLAN KITCHENS'.

1. 'CLOSED'.

The kitchen is a separate room. Access to kitchen only via hall.

2. 'INTERMEDIATE CLOSED'.

The kitchen has access to the hall and also to the dining room. However, it can still be used as a separate room.

3. 'INTERMEDIATE OPEN'.

Here the kitchen serves as an access route to the dining room. Therefore although it is a separate room it cannot be used as such.

4. 'OPEN'.

Here there is no barrier between the kitchen and dining area.

TYPICAL GROUND FLOOR PLAN.  

TOPOLOGICAL REPRESENTATION. (1)

KEY.  
D = Dining room.    H = Hall.  
K = Kitchen.        № = Staircase.  
L = Lounge.         —→ = Front entrance.  

(1) See Appendix III.
5.3. The Sampling of Dwellings With Respect to the Internal Layout of the Ground Floor

The preliminary inspection of houseplans showed:

(I) The existence of a wide range in kitchen size, bearing no strong relationship to age of house, or variations in design, such as number of bedrooms or internal layout.

(II) With regard to the number of rooms on the ground floor, three basic types can be distinguished:
   1. kitchen/diner plus lounge
   2. lounge/diner plus kitchen
   3. separate kitchen, lounge, dining room

(III) The existence of a range of internal ground floor layouts, which can be classified into four groups, according to the amount of communication possible between rooms:
   1. 'open'
   2. 'intermediate open'
   3. 'intermediate closed'
   4. 'closed'

(See Figure 2)

In order to provide further guidelines for the design of the sampling frame, some pre-pilot work was undertaken. This involved interviews in houses selected at random, further examination of local authority and private builders' plans; information from estate agents and local knowledge. In addition, a trial survey was undertaken to see if it was possible to determine the internal 'communication' classification ('open'- 'closed') from the inspection of a dwelling from outside.
This work proved the detailed four-way 'communication' classification unwieldy as a field sampling tool. The internal design of local authority housing was easily classified from plans made available by the Borough Council. However, the classification of areas of private housing relied more on information gleaned from a combination of the sources and techniques outlined above. It was found that minor alterations, for instance hatches, could not always be predicted from outside inspection and even from the examination of plans. This is not surprising given the popularity of home improvements. However, the presence of a hatch altered the classification on the 'communication' scale.

The pre-pilot work showed the three basic ground floor layouts: (I) kitchen/diner plus lounge; (II) lounge/diner plus kitchen; and (III) separate lounge, kitchen, dining room, could be assessed with relative ease from plans and inspection of the dwelling from outside. This three-way classification of ground floor rooms is much more informative than the 'one, two dayroom plus kitchen' division used by the B.R.E. (1), which does not reveal the architect's decisions as to the planned use of space for family activities, chiefly the taking of meals. The latter is obviously an important consideration in a study focused on the kitchen, as recognised in the division used by Ward et al. (2). However, their classification omits consideration of the lounge area.

Therefore, it was decided to use the three-way classification of ground floor plan as the sampling frame and use the four-way 'communication' classification on the sample obtained, to assess the communication between the kitchen and other rooms, instead of all the rooms on the ground floor (Figure 3). It was expected to obtain a range of kitchen sizes from the sample.
5.4. The Respondents

The study included in its aims the examination of the effects of (I) social status and (II) stage in family life cycle, on women's attitudes towards the kitchen.

In order to compare the attitudes between middle-class and working-class women it was decided to draw half the sample from classes I, II, III and half from classes IV, V and VI, using a collapsed version of socio-economic grouping, adapted from the Registrar General's Classification of Occupations (1970) (3), as used in the General Household Survey (4). In practice, half the sample was selected from owner occupied housing and half from local authority housing. The sample was then checked to ascertain whether each group conformed to the expected socio-economic divisions.

Traditional grading of socio-economic group according to the husband's occupation was used to ensure comparability with other surveys. However, as this study is focused on women, respondents were checked to ensure that their occupations placed them into the same social group as their husbands and up- or down-graded where necessary, following the procedure of Newsom and Newsom (5).

Preliminary investigations and the review of the literature indicated that age of children might have an effect on women's attitudes. Also whether or not the women were employed outside the home. The survey was limited to women with two or more children living at home to obtain some degree of homogeneity and allow the investigation of family living patterns. It was hoped that a spread of mothers with children under five and those with children over five would be obtained, in order to compare their attitudes. This was based on the assumption that the behaviour patterns of a family
with children under five at home all day would differ from those with older children at school. For similar reasons a spread of working and non-working women was hoped for.

5.5. Selection Procedure

Because of the exploratory nature of this study, a small number of depth interviews was considered the most worthwhile approach. This was further confirmed by consideration of the constraints on time and resources. Focusing on a small number of individuals makes possible the intensive study of the interplay of multiple variables. The need for and usefulness of this approach has already been emphasised in the literature review and preliminary investigations.

As explained in sections 5.1 and 5.2, in order to examine the effects of the physical parameters of kitchen size, the number of other rooms on the ground floor and the communication possible between these rooms and the social parameters of social status, stage in family life cycle and employment outside the home, it was decided to select dwellings of three contrasting layouts: kitchen/diner plus lounge; lounge/diner plus kitchen; and separate kitchen, dining room and lounge. Half of each type of layout was to be selected from owner occupied swellings and half from local authority dwellings. Only those respondents with two or more children living at home would be interviewed.

In order to satisfy these requirements, a stratified probability sample was drawn from housing in the Borough of Guildford. The procedure was as follows:

Three areas of local authority housing and three areas of owner-occupied housing in the Borough of Guildford were selected where it was known from prior investigation (fieldwork, plans, information
from estate agents, 12 years local knowledge) that family housing representing each of the three layout types predominated. The selection of six different areas was necessary (a) to ensure enough houses of the three contrasting layout types were obtained and (b) to avoid bias incurred by limiting the selection to any one local authority housing estate or any one price range. The six areas selected were as follows:

The Areas Surveyed

Owner Occupied Housing

Area 1

A small estate of three-bedroomed, two- and three-storeyed terraced housing, built in the early 1960's very close to the town centre. Houses are priced at the lower end of the market. The estate is quiet, with one circular road running round it and access at one end. Houses have open-plan front gardens and small back gardens. Garages are provided in blocks. Internally, there are two variations in design: kitchen and lounge/diner in the three-storey terraces and kitchen/diner and lounge in the two-storey terraces. The latter were selected for use in the sampling frame.

Area 2

A group of houses in an established residential suburb about one and a half miles from the town centre. Dwellings are detached, with garages and front and back gardens and are on the medium to upper end of the price market. Varying in age from 1900-1960's, the houses are individually designed, the majority having separate lounges, dining rooms and kitchens.
**Area 3**

A large, new estate about two and a half miles from the town centre. Dwellings are a mixture of three and four bedroom, detached and terraced styles, with a variation in internal layout between kitchen/diner plus lounge, lounge/diner plus kitchen and three separate rooms. Prices range from the lower-middle to middle sector of the market. Houses have small enclosed back gardens, open-plan front gardens and most have adjoining garages. The estate is laid out as a series of through roads and cul de sacs.

**Local-Authority Housing**

**Area 4**

A large, well-established housing estate about two miles from the town centre, with tree-lined roads and a spacious, pleasant layout. Houses are predominantly post-1945, three bedroom, five person dwellings with three separate rooms. There is a smaller 1970's development of three bedroom, five person terraced housing with three separate rooms and two bedroom terraces with kitchen/diner plus lounge layouts.

**Area 5**

Two areas of new local authority housing built in the early 1970's on the edge of, and now assimilated into, a large established estate where development started in 1919. The estate is two miles from the city centre. Two dwelling types were surveyed. The first a group of three bedrooomed terraced houses with kitchen/diner plus lounge, small back gardens, open plan front gardens and no garage. The second a group of three bedroomed terraces with lounge/diner plus kitchen, small back garden, no front garden and no garage.
Area 6

Two groups of local authority housing very close to the town centre. The first group are 1970's three bedroom/five person terraced houses with kitchen diner plus lounge, a small enclosed garden at the rear, open plan at the front and no garage. The second group are older three bedroomed semis with lounge/diner plus kitchen, enclosed garden, front and rear and no garage. The area as a whole is mixed with other privately rented and owner occupied properties.

A sample which provided a minimum of six respondents in each of the six cells (three ground floor layout variations x two variations in tenure) was considered necessary, in order that comparisons between each group could be made. To ensure this, it was estimated that a sample of thirteen respondents per cell would be required. The thirteen respondents were selected in the following way. Using the Electoral Roll, a list of every house in each of the six areas was compiled. From each of these six lists, a probability sample was drawn, using a table of random numbers to give every house an equal chance of being selected. This gave a total sample of seventy-eight dwellings. Occupants of the seventy-eight dwellings were contacted and women with two or more children living at home, who had resided in their present house for at least one year, were asked to participate in the study.

Thus, the selection procedure controlled house layout, social class (tenure) and the selection of families with at least two children. Within the six cells, it was hoped to obtain some variation between women with children under five and those with children older children, and working and non-working women, in order to compare the effects of stage in family life cycle and employment status.
PART II. THE RESPONSE

5.6. Introduction

It is unlikely that a sample of fifty-four women and houses will be entirely representative of all women and all house types. This is especially true since stratification was employed in the selection procedure and as a further constraint, women with two or more children living at home were sought. Part Two of Chapter Five provides a brief description of the sample characteristics and discusses, where relevant, how representative it is of the population from which the sample was drawn.

5.7. The Response

Of the total sample of seventy-eight dwellings drawn, eighteen respondents in these dwellings were ineligible (Table 10). Six of the sixty eligible refused, leaving a sample of fifty-four respondents. The high response rate amongst those eligible (90%) was not surprising, since people are interested in the subject of housing, especially their own.

5.8. The Dwellings

As expected, the age distribution of dwellings in the sample (Table II) does not reflect that of the housing stock of England (Chapter 1.1). Fourteen (47%) of the owner occupied dwellings and 14 (58%) of the local authority dwellings were built after 1969. This is primarily due to the bias in the stratification procedure towards areas of post-1960's housing, in order to obtain dwellings of the three variations in layout required.

From 1961 onwards, local authority housing was expected to comply with the recommendations of the Parker Morris Committee (6), which became mandatory for local authorities in 1969. Also in 1969, the NHBC (7) requested that its members comply with Parker Morris
requirements. The age divisions used in Table 11 were therefore selected in order that any differences due to the influence of the housing standards in use at the time would be reflected in the analysis.

Two thirds of the dwellings had three bedrooms. Just over half were terraced and almost a third were detached dwellings (Table 12). The majority of the terraced houses were post-1969 (Table 13).

The distribution of the sample by houseplan and tenure is shown in Table 14. 30 (56%) of respondents were from owner occupied dwellings and 24 (44%) from local authority dwellings. There was a fairly even distribution of dwellings amongst the three variations in ground floor plan. However, the sample is not distributed equally between the six cells, although the criterion of at least 6 respondents per cell was satisfied (Table 14). The disproportionate number of owner occupiers in dwellings with a ground floor layout of three separate rooms is accounted for by a discrepancy between the architects plan of six houses, consulted at the stratification stage of the sampling, and their layout in situ, discovered at the interview. These six homes were planned with a layout of lounge/diner, plus kitchen and study on the ground floor. However, whilst building was in progress on the estate, some of the first purchasers asked for hatches between the kitchen and the study to facilitate its use as a dining room. This was done and subsequent buildings of this house type included a hatch as an integral feature. Therefore, the classification of these houses altered from the lounge-diner section to the three separate rooms section. Kitchen size was examined by dwelling age, type and tenure (Tables 15, 16, 17). Two-thirds of all of the kitchens were 4-8 m² in area (the 'kitchen' area only of kitchen-diners was counted). There was little relationship
between tenure and size of kitchen. Three-quarters of all kitchens in the terraced houses were 4-8 m\(^2\) in area, compared to half and just over half in the semi-detached and detached dwellings. Three-quarters of all the kitchens built 1961-1969 and post-1969 were in the 4-8 m\(^2\) area range, compared to one-third of the pre-1961 kitchen.

The relationship of the kitchen to other ground floor rooms, using the four-way 'open-closed' classification system to determine the amount of communication possible between the kitchen and the other rooms on the ground floor (Chapter 3) is shown in Table 18.

5.9. Case Studies of Three Kitchens

Three kitchens and their owners are described.

Case Study Number One

Respondent 9's kitchen is a kitchen-diner in a local authority, three bedroomed terraced house, near the town centre, built in the early 1970's. She has lived there for two years. There are four children in the family, one boy aged twelve and three girls aged eighteen, fifteen and seven. In addition, the eldest daughter has a year-old baby. The respondent works part-time, helping to prepare food at a local pub. Her husband is a plasterer.

The ground floor layout and internal planning of respondent 9's kitchen are shown in Figure 4. The kitchen-diner is clearly divided into two parts by dark brown fitted carpet in the dining half. The round table is covered with a thick blanket cloth, a pile of magazines is neatly stacked on the stool. The decor throughout is white with darker beige doors. The entire area is spotlessly clean. There are no decorations on the walls in either half. In the kitchen half, above the work surface, the wall is half-tiled with yellow
tiles, added by the respondent, who also added the wall cupboard and took out a work surface on poles, where her freezer is now. She comments:

I took the small work surface on poles out as it kept falling down and not only that, it was quite ugly. I now have the freezer there. I believe some of them (n-eighbours) have still got them there. They've got their fridges tucked underneath. The Housing Inspector came round and said 'Where's that gone?' I said, 'It's in my cupboard and if I ever go, I'll put it back.' Very shoddy.

Case Study Number Two

Respondent 46's kitchen is in a three bedroomed, detached house built in the early 1970's, on a private estate two and a half miles from the town centre. In addition to the kitchen, the house has a separate lounge and dining room. Respondent 46 has two boys aged 6½ and 5. Her husband is a chartered surveyor, who commutes to London daily, and she is a full-time housewife. They have lived in their house for two years.

The ground floor layout and internal planning of Respondent 47's kitchen is shown in Figure 5. The overall impression of her kitchen is very arty and ultra-modern, created by interesting decor; lots of plants and pictures; two large mirrors and many personal possessions around, including her make-up. Regarding her kitchen, respondent 47 comments:

It's decorated to my personal taste, to make it more of a living room, not a kitchen. I don't believe in it being a workroom. It's not particularly tidy at the moment, but I certainly don't like to see it like my mother-in-law's house, full of bits here and bits there that she's going to do, but leaves around. It drives me nutty if my kitchen's not in some sort of order, but it doesn't have to be immaculate. I loathe doing housework.

I want to put bright red blinds in there to help the atmosphere.
I do everything in there. I always have done. I've always had mirrors in the kitchen: (a) to make it look bigger and (b) when the children were smaller, with my hair and everything else. If I had to go upstairs to to that, then I couldn't keep my eye on the baby. Consequently, I had to do it downstairs, so they could play and I could keep an eye on them through the mirror.

It's cosy, it lends a little security. As I said, I find the living room big and cold. So on my own, which I am most of the time, I tend to sort of remain in the kitchen. I don't come in here (lounge) to watch television much, or go upstairs. I stay in the kitchen and fiddle about, do my hair or whatever.

The kitchen was planned by the builders. The respondent would have liked to have been able to have chosen the position of the units and the colour scheme (magnolia). She feels restricted in planning the kitchen, seeing the only solution as knocking the walls down.

On planning, she comments:

I wanted the little table up by the side where the hatch is because that's handy for my kids. The other wall is bare and I've put my fridge, freezer and tumble dryer there. I use the tumble dryer as a work surface for doing my hair et cetera, as it's away from the cooking stuff and the sink.

Case Study Number Three

Respondent 21's kitchen is in a three-bedroomed, terraced house designed as a lounge/diner plus kitchen, built by the local authority in the early 1970's. She has two boys, both toddlers. Her husband is a park patrolman and she is a full-time housewife, formerly a computer programmer for thirteen years.

Figure 6 shows the ground floor plan and kitchen plan. The kitchen has been altered substantially from the local authority design. Louvre doors have been added to increase space; cupboards altered to fit in domestic equipment and a table and additional work surfaces fitted. The room is carpeted and curtained, with a television; a clock radio mounted on one wall; a budgerigar; a specially constructed home for the dog under one work surface.
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and pictures of the family, cookery books and memos on the open shelves. A lot of time and trouble has been taken by the respondent. The room looks comfortable, yet it is an efficient workroom, stylish and yet a well used place. Outside the backdoor, the family have added a porch to keep the children's bikes and toys dry. Respondent 31 is in the middle of planning to substantially alter the kitchen again, to divide it into a 'working' bay and an 'eating' bay. Her main complaint is the small size of the kitchen, due to the constraints this imposes on her planning.

5.10. The Respondents

5.10.1. Socio-Economic Status

Table 19 shows assessment of the sample according to the collapsed version of socio-economic grouping of the Registrar General's Classification of Occupations 1970 (8), as adapted for use in the General Household survey (9). Based on husband's occupation, 30 (56%) of the respondents were classed as middle class (all owner occupiers) and the remainder (24, 44%) were categorised as working class (all local authority tenants).

In two cases, the respondent's occupation, or former occupation, was higher than her husband's. (1) A former computer operator married to a park patrolman and (2) a night nurse married to the foreman of a gang of men (doing contract work for the Gas Board), both living in local authority houses. In one case, it was lower: the wife of a chartered quantity surveyor in an owner occupied house, doing part-time work as a shop assistant. However, in all three cases grading according to husband's occupation was thought to reflect more accurately the status of the household, although these differences were taken into account in the parts of the analysis where the women were being considered as individuals.
Because of the correlation between socio-economic groups and tenure in the sample (shown in Table 20), owner occupier will be taken as synonymous with middle class, groups I, II, and III, and local authority as working class, groups IV, V and VI, for the rest of this thesis. Although the distribution of socio-economic groups is not equal in all six cells of the sampling frame, the condition of at least six respondents of each class per houseplan type has been satisfied (Table 14).

5.10.2. Family Structure

The distribution in family size amongst respondents by tenure is examined in Table 21. The majority had two children. This distribution reflects that of data from the G.H.S. (10), where figures for 1976-1977 show that, of families with two or more children, 67% have two children, 23% have three children and 11% have four or more children. The greater number of families with two children amongst the respondents may be accounted for by the bias towards middle class owner occupiers in the sample. Data from the 1971 National Census (11) comparing the distribution of household sizes in local authority housing and all housing in England and Wales shows a higher proportion of larger families in council property. These differences arise largely from selection policies which, at least in the past, have given priority to families with children and to old persons.

The sample was biased towards respondents with a child under five in the family. Two thirds of respondents had one child under five (Table 22), compared to 40% of respondents in the G.H.S. (12) (Table 22). No families with all 'grown-up' children (over 16)
were interviewed. This is not viewed as a disadvantage, since it makes the sample more homogeneous. The aim of this survey was to study differences in stage of family life cycle in terms of mothers who had a small child at home all day, compared to those with school age children.

The relationship between family structure, tenure and layout of the ground floor of the dwelling is examined in Table 23. There is an even distribution amongst respondents in different stages of the family life cycle, between the three variations in dwelling ground floor layout. When this distribution is examined in terms of tenure, the distribution is not as even. However, each cell has respondents with at least some, if not all, children over five, enabling differences in family patterns due to children's ages to be examined and discussed.

Two thirds of the women were under thirty-five (Table 24).

5.10.3. Economic Activity of Respondents

Of the respondents who were economically active (22, 41%) 2 (4%) were in full-time employment, 13 (24%) were employed part-time and 7 (13%) home workers. The remainder of the women (32, 59%) were full-time housewives (Table 25). Figures for Guildford Municipal Borough for a 10% sample from the 1971 National Census (13) indicate that 43.3% of married women aged 15 and over were economically active in the Borough. This is close to the G.H.S. overall figure for the U.K., 1971, of 44% for married women over 16 engaged in economic activity (14). The 1979 G.H.S. indicated that in Great Britain in 1977, 51% of married women over 16 were economically active.

Almost half the respondents had finished full-time education at age fifteen (Table 26). Only 6 (12%) had continued with further education beyond the age of eighteen. Only two women were in full-time
employment, one as a health visitor and the other as a doctor's practice manager. An interesting point to note is the number of homeworkers, spanning all socio-economic groups: a language teacher; music teacher; translator; bookkeeper for self-employed husband's business; home hairdresser (an illegal thriving business); computer coder and telephone canvasser. Thirteen women were part-time workers, classified as those working outside the home for a minimum of eight hours a week. This group consisted of: one hospital radiography technician; one lecturer; one night nurse; four cleaners; two punch-card operators; one shop assistant; one pub helper; one insurance agent and one woman with two part-time jobs, one cleaning and one two mornings a week as a school helper. The spread of employment in relation to tenure (socio-economic group) and houseplan is shown in Table 27. Although the distribution of economically active women in the sample deviates from the ideal specification, at least there are some working wives amongst respondents in each cell.

5.11 Summary

The conclusions drawn from the analysis of these data apply only to the research sample. However, there is no reason to believe that the sample is unrepresentative in any way. The sampling frame used does not cover the whole population of houses; despite this, there is no evidence that it represents a particularly unrepresentative sub-sample of the population. A random method was used to select houses from the sampling frame. There was a very low refusal rate of 10% (6 out of 60) amongst those women selected who were eligible to participate. These factors help to establish confidence in the representativeness of the women studied. In addition, as outlined in Chapter 4.1, the interview schedule was designed to minimise
non-sampling errors. The cohesion and consistency derived from a single perspective was an advantage of this piece of work being undertaken by one researcher. However, a disadvantage is that in the interpretation of interview responses and use of rating scales, accuracy is reduced by the use of only one judge.

Therefore, whilst these results strictly apply only to the sample of fifty-four women interviewed, it is important to draw connections between these findings and the conclusions of other related research. Nevertheless, the crucial test is whether further research duplicates the findings from this exploratory study.
Table 9.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE GROUND FLOOR LAYOUT OF DWELLINGS ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF 'OPEN-CLOSED' PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Closed'</td>
<td>Access to each room only via the hall. All rooms separate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Intermediate closed'</td>
<td>All rooms have access to the hall, but some rooms are interconnected by a door or a hatch. All rooms can still be used as separate rooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Intermediate open'</td>
<td>Rooms are interconnecting and all rooms do not have access to the hall. Thus, some rooms have to be used as access routes to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Open'</td>
<td>Designed with no barriers between areas with different functions. For example kitchen-diner; lounge-diner; hall and staircase in lounge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.

THE RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of dwellings contacted</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents ineligible:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- house empty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- just moved in</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 0 or 1 child living at home</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of eligible respondents</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents eligible but refused</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents interviewed</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Pre-1961</th>
<th>1961-1969</th>
<th>Post-1969</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>11 (37)</td>
<td>14 (47)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>7 (29)</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>14 (58)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>12 (22)</td>
<td>14 (26)</td>
<td>28 (52)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrace-mid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace-end</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
<td>36 (67)</td>
<td>12 (22)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
<th>Pre-1961</th>
<th>1961-1969</th>
<th>Post-1969</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrace (mid and end)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>12 (22)</td>
<td>14 (26)</td>
<td>28 (52)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE BY HOUSEPLAN AND TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Houseplan</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen-diner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge-diner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate rooms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.

DWELLING AGE AND SIZE OF KITCHEN (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen size</th>
<th>Pre-1961</th>
<th>1961-69</th>
<th>Post-1969</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-8 m²</td>
<td>4 (11)</td>
<td>11 (31)</td>
<td>21 (58)</td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16 m²</td>
<td>8 (44)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
<td>18 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>12 (22)</td>
<td>14 (26)</td>
<td>28 (52)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 'Kitchen' area only of kitchen-diners measured.

Table 16.

DWELLING TYPE AND KITCHEN SIZE (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen Size</th>
<th>Terraced</th>
<th>Semi-detached</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-8 m²</td>
<td>22 (16)</td>
<td>4 (11)</td>
<td>10 (26)</td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16 m²</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
<td>4 (22)</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
<td>18 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>29 (54)</td>
<td>8 (15)</td>
<td>17 (31)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 'Kitchen' area only of kitchen-diners measured.
Table 17.

TENURE AND KITCHEN SIZE (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen size</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Tenure Local Authority</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-8 m$^2$</td>
<td>19 (63)</td>
<td>11 (37)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16 m$^2$</td>
<td>17 (71)</td>
<td>7 (29)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>36 (67)</td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 'Kitchen' area only of kitchen-diners measured.

Table 18.

THE AMOUNT OF COMMUNICATION POSSIBLE FROM THE KITCHEN USING THE 'OPEN-CLOSED' COMMUNICATION CLASSIFICATION AND TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen Classification</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Tenure Local Authority</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Open'</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Inter-open'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Inter-closed'</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Closed'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21.

TENURE AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Tenure Local Authority</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22.

AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD FOR RESPONDENTS IN THE SAMPLE AND MARRIED COUPLES IN THE G.H.S. 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Youngest Child</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23.

TENURE, AGE OF CHILDREN AND HOUSEPLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Houseplan</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Age of Children</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Under 5</td>
<td>All Mixed Over 5</td>
<td>All Under 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen-diner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge-diner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate rooms</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24.

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Respondent Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
<th>Respondent Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Part-Time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeworker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Housewife</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26,

TERMINAL EDUCATION AGE OF RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.E.A.</th>
<th>Respondent Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27. DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY TENURE (SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS), ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND HOUSEPLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Houseplan</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>Full-Time Housewife</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>Full-Time Housewife</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen-Diner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge-Diner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Rooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.1. **Introduction**

This chapter looks at the functional aspects of the kitchen environment and the relationship between its quality and the woman's attitude to the efficiency of her kitchen as a workplace. The amount of involvement respondents had in the planning of their kitchens is examined in 6.2. This is followed by the respondents' evaluations of the convenience of their kitchens for the performance of six functional tasks (6.3). Six aspects of the physical environment are then assessed to provide an evaluation of the kitchens as work areas (6.4). The relationship between the standard of kitchen facilities and respondents' attitudes towards their kitchen as a workplace is then discussed (6.4).

6.2. **Respondents' Involvement in Kitchen Planning**

Respondents were asked: 'Who planned the kitchen like this?' to ascertain what changes they had made to their kitchens. The majority of the sample (35, 65%) had made alterations to their kitchens. Eight of these 35 kitchens had been completely replanned; of these, one respondent had commenced another full replan and one other said another replanning was under consideration. The remainder (27) had been modified. The most common modification concerned storage space (15 respondents), followed by domestic equipment (10 respondents), work surface (9 respondents), floor covering (8), access (7), provision of breakfast bar (4), and electric sockets (2). With regard to storage space, 8 respondents had put in extra storage and 4 repositioned storage facilities; 3 had reluctantly lost storage space in order to fit in their domestic appliances. With regard to domestic equipment, 5 respondents had altered their kitchens in order to fit in domestic equipment.
Respondent 18:

We had to alter it to get the washing machine and freezer in. We took out the high cupboard to get the freezer in and cut down the size of the work surface adjacent to the sink unit to get the washing machine in. We also put in extra socket outlets.

Another 4 had relocated domestic equipment to maximise space in the kitchen.

Respondent 48:

The only thing we've moved is the fridge. The fridge was meant to go on the left-hand wall, but we found it cut out space. And there was a little cupboard on the wall where the fridge is now, which we found useless as we couldn't get much in it apart from dusters. So we took it out and put the fridge in. Although it's not ideal there as it does cost a lot more to run as its near the cooker.

The remaining respondent of the 10 had been allowed a choice of positions for domestic equipment by the builders of her new house.

Four respondents had built in extra work surface, three had altered the position of existing work surface and two had had to lose existing work surface to fit in domestic equipment. Two respondents in the access category had altered doors to give more space in the kitchen. The remainder had increased communication between the kitchen and the dining room by the addition of a hatch or the removal of a door. Four respondents had built in eating facilities in the form of breakfast bars. Three of these also functioned as room dividers in kitchen-diners. Several respondents who had moved into new dwellings mentioned that they had been able to instruct the builders to make the alterations referred to.

For example, the installation of a hatch (Respondent 38), the re-positioning of a wall cupboard (Respondent 23), and the installation of double-electric socket outlets (Respondent 40). Attitudes were favourable towards this cooperation. Respondent 46 expressed her disappointment that no collaboration had been possible between the
builders of her house, regarding choice of appliance position and colour scheme.

With regard to the nineteen (35%) kitchens where no modifications had been made by the respondents, four had been replanned by previous owners and four respondents were in the throes of replanning decisions.

Characteristics of Respondents and Their Level of Involvement in Kitchen Planning

Respondents were divided into four groups according to the level of their involvement in the planning of their kitchen. The groups ranged from (1) no involvement through (2) minor alterations, (3) major alterations to (4) those who had completely replanned their kitchen. Alterations classified as 'minor' were, for example, the addition of one extra cupboard or work-surface. 'Major' alterations were those where the respondent had done several things, for instance: the alteration of the position of domestic equipment, addition of worksurface and installation of room divider/breakfast bar.

The relationship between level of alteration and tenure (Table 28) shows involvement in kitchen planning was not limited to those respondents owning their own homes. An equal number of home owners and local authority tenants had made no alterations or only minor alterations to their kitchens. At higher levels of alteration, as might be expected, local authority tenants confined themselves to major alterations rather than completely replanning their kitchens.

There is no strong relationship between the level of alterations made to the kitchen by respondents and their length of residence (Table 29).
Of the respondents making changes to their kitchens, in the majority of cases the replanning decisions involved collaboration between husband and wife. However, two respondents said their husbands had taken complete responsibility for the alterations and three indicated that they had made planning decisions by themselves. Interestingly, the kitchens of these three respondents had been completely replanned.

6.3. **Respondents' Assessments of the Convenience of Their Kitchen for the Performance of Six Functional Tasks**

Respondents were asked about the convenience of their kitchen for the performance of six tasks, which were selected to cover functional aspects of the kitchen:

1. Food preparation and cooking.
3. Washing up; drying up and putting dishes away.
4. Cleaning the kitchen.
5. Washing using a washing machine.
6. Washing by hand.

Two operations were put together in (1) and three in (3), instead of being considered as separate issues, in order to create more realistic task sequences to aid the respondents in their recall of kitchen activities.

**Food Preparation and Cooking**

When asked about the convenience of their kitchen for food preparation and cooking the majority of respondents replied in terms of the amount of work surface in their kitchens and the position of the work surface in relation to other facilities, chiefly the sink and cooker. Table 30 summarises their comments. 31 respondents
expressed dissatisfaction with their kitchen on one or more accounts, for food preparation and cooking. 17 commented on the lack of work surface and 11 commented on the poor layout of the kitchen for this task. 9 felt that, in general, there just wasn't enough room in the kitchen, which made them feel 'squashed.' Only one respondent felt she had too much space. One respondent complained about poor lighting. On the positive side, 39 respondents felt their kitchens had some good points regarding the task sequence of food preparation and cooking. 18 comments referred to the good layout of the kitchen, 6 referred to the kitchen being compact, and 12 comments referred to good provision of work surface.

**Using Electrical Appliances**

Comments on the use of electrical appliances centred on the provision of socket outlets (Table 31). The majority of respondents were satisfied with their kitchens in this respect. 8 respondents mentioned they had had more socket outlets fitted, (two during major modifications and six during complete replanning of their kitchens.)

**Washing Up, Drying Up and Putting Dishes Away**

The majority of respondents were satisfied with the convenience of their kitchen on this account (Table 32) as they had 'everything to hand.' Negative comments centred round poor positioning of sink and draining board and the lack of space at the sink and the desire for a double drainer. Five of the seven dishwasher owners specifically mentioned that the appliance contributed to their satisfaction with the kitchen for this task sequence.

**Cleaning the Kitchen**

Most respondents had no problems cleaning their kitchens (Table 33); a small kitchen was seen as an advantage for this task.
Dissatisfaction centred round the difficulty of cleaning some flooring materials and difficult in moving domestic appliances to clean around the sides and back of them.

### Using the Washing Machine

Most respondents found their kitchens convenient for using a washing machine. 13 mentioned that this was because their machine was 'plumbed in.' Negative comments referred to not being able to use the sink for other tasks whilst using the machine, and the kitchen being small. (Table 34).

### Washing by Hand

The majority found the kitchen convenient for washing by hand; this included the 7 respondents who did not own a washing machine. 11 respondents mentioned they did very little hand washing (Table 35).

### Amount of Dissatisfaction with the Kitchen for the Performance of Six Functional Tasks

In order to obtain an overall measure, the amount of dissatisfaction expressed by each respondent was rated from 0 (no dissatisfaction expressed about any task) to 6 (kitchen found unsatisfactory for all six tasks). The scores are shown in Table 36. The majority of the sample expressed dissatisfaction with their kitchen for one or two tasks. Several women complained about it for four or more of the tasks and eight had no complaints at all.

### The Kitchen as a Work Area

The functional criteria for kitchen design have been, and continue to be, well researched and the recommendations of many surveys are embodied in the report of the Parker Morris Committee (1). For this reason and because Parker Morris standards are currently in use,
the assessment of the kitchen as a work area was based on their design recommendations. Briefly, referring to the kitchen as a work area, these are that:

1. Organisation of the work area - sink, worksurfaces and cooker - should be an uninterrupted sequence.
2. One work surface should be large.
3. There should be space near the sink for a washing machine.
4. Space should be left near the working area for domestic appliances of the future.
5. Adequate storage, assessed at 80 ft$^3$ for family houses, should be arranged bearing in mind how it is to be used, that is near the work surface and kitchen table. Some may be placed elsewhere, bearing in mind that besides food preparation, cooking, dishing up and waste disposal, other activities likely to take place in the kitchen, for instance cleaning and washing and ironing, also involve storage.

The assessment of the functional environment was only part of this study, the primary purpose of which was the investigation of women's attitudes towards the kitchen. Therefore, detailed measurements, such as those taken in studies dealing specifically with functional aspects were not taken. Thus, the functional environment of the kitchen was evaluated from the following:

- Layout
- Size
- Provision of space for washing machine
- Storage
- Work surface
- Ownership of domestic appliances
Kitchen Layout - The Work Sequence

The principles of kitchen layout in respect of the work sequence are summarised by Walley (2):

It is essential that the distance between cooker and sink should be no more than one or two steps, because this is where there is most traffic. The cooker and the sink should be linked by a working surface and there should be working surfaces on the other side of both cooker and sink.

This standard work sequence is recommended by the Parker Morris Committee (3):

Or the same in reverse order. Unbroken by a door or other traffic way in a straight line or an 'L' or a 'U'.

In addition to it being a long-standing parameter of kitchen planning, the work sequence was selected as a measure of comparison since a straightforward assessment could be made from each kitchen sketch plan.

From examination of the work sequences of the fifty-four kitchens, it was possible to divide them into three groups:

1. Kitchens with the recommended layout: work surface/cooker/work surface/sink/work surface

2. Kitchens with one fault in their work sequence. These kitchens satisfied the recommended work sequence provided the draining board beside the sink was counted as a work surface.

3. Kitchens with more than one fault in their work sequence.

Seventeen kitchen were assessed as having the recommended layout. Ten kitchens had one fault in the work sequence and twenty-seven kitchens had more than one fault. The most common fault amongst these kitchens was the absence of a work surface on one side of the cooker.
The relationship between the standard of the work sequence and the age and tenure of the dwelling is shown in Table 37. Kitchens in the more modern houses tended to follow the Parker Morris recommended work sequence, the adoption of which was advised to private builders in 1969 by the NHBC (4). It is no reflection of local authority provision that all the local authority kitchens did not conform to the recommended work sequence, since, as shown in 6, many tenants have altered the layout of their kitchens. The relationship between the standard of the kitchen work sequence and the degree of respondent's involvement in kitchen planning (Table 38), shows that, interestingly, those who had completely replanned their kitchens to their own specifications did not have kitchens which satisfied the recommended work sequence. This relationship is significant.

There is no relationship between amount of dissatisfaction with the kitchen for the performance of six functional tasks and how closely the kitchen conformed to the recommended work sequence (Table 39). In case this was due to the wide scope of the six tasks, whereas work sequence is only one aspect of kitchen planning, the data was re-examined using only two of the six tasks where quality of work sequence was considered to be of primary importance:

1. Food preparation and cooking
2. Washing up, drying up and putting dishes away.

However, as shown in Table 40, there was no relationship between the amount of dissatisfaction with the kitchen for the performance of these two tasks and how closely the kitchen conformed to the recommended work sequence. This was despite the fact that of the 39 dissatisfied comments about the kitchen for food preparation and cooking, 28
referred to layout (11) and work surface (17) (Table 30). With regard to washing up, drying up and putting dishes away, of the 20 complaints (Table 32), nine referred to dissatisfaction with poorly positioned sinks and draining boards. Therefore, there would seem to be inadequacies in the existing specifications for kitchen layout, as shown by further examination of the respondents' dissatisfaction with layout, work surface and sink position. Three of the eleven respondents who complained about poor kitchen layout in the context of task one, focused on the inconvenience of having to walk too far to the refrigerator. This factor of distance is included in American recommended layouts, but not in British recommendations. The other respondents complained that their layout was such that their work surface was too split up or cooker poorly positioned. 16 of the 17 complaints about work surface in the context of task one were about the lack of it. 9 respondents were dissatisfied with the position of their sink for task three, washing up, drying up and putting dishes away. All but one complained that the sink or draining board had been positioned in a corner, which make dishes difficult to get at, especially when a second person was involved in the task, helping to dry the dishes.

These comments highlight two inadequacies of the existing specifications for kitchen layout:

1. British work sequence recommendations do not take the refrigerator into account.

2. Architects can follow the work sequence recommendations and yet still produce a poor work surface, as demonstrated in Figure 7, where the recommended work sequence has been followed, but the draining board is in a awkward corner position.
Figure 7.

LAYOUT OF RESPONDENT 28'S KITCHEN TO SHOW INADEQUACIES OF EXISTING SPECIFICATIONS FOR KITCHEN DESIGN.

SKETCH PLAN. NOT TO SCALE.

KEY.

W/S. = Work surface.
**Kitchen Size**

There is a slightly higher rate of satisfaction with the convenience of the kitchen for the performance of six tasks amongst respondents with larger kitchens (Table 41), however, this is not significant.

**The Provision of Space for a Washing Machine**

Respondents' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the kitchen for use of the washing machine was examined in relation to the position of their appliance. Whether it was in its recommended position near the sink, in this case interpreted as next to, positioned away from the sink, or positioned elsewhere outside the kitchen (Table 42). Satisfaction appeared to be related more to ownership of an automatic 'plumbed-in' washing machine, than its position. This was due to the increased convenience of these machines, compared to those where the water supply is obtained by attachment to the sink taps. Only one of the 19 respondents with an automatic machine was dissatisfied. She considered it unhygienic to wash clothes in the kitchen. The main cause of dissatisfaction amongst those with non-automatic machines was that twin-tubs involved use of the sink whilst in operation and thus precluded the use of the kitchen for other tasks. Table 42 does show that of those with non-automatic machines there was a tendency for more of the respondents whose machines were next to the sink to be more satisfied.

**Provision of Storage. Provision of Work Surface**

In this investigation primarily focused on attitudes, there was not enough time, during the already lengthy interview to take detailed measurements of work surface and storage provisions in the kitchens. Sketch plans and careful observation by a trained investigator of these two facilities was sufficient to enable two groups to be distinguished: (1) kitchens with below average provision
of work surface (2) kitchens with below average provision of storage. However, there was again no positive relationship between dissatisfaction expressed by respondents during their assessment of the convenience of their kitchen for the performance of six tasks and interviewer assessment of their work surface and/or storage facilities as 'below average' (Table 43). In fact, mean dissatisfaction scores were lower for those respondents assessed as having inadequate provisions.

**Ownership of Domestic Appliances**

All respondents have a cooker, all but one a refrigerator and nearly all (47, 87%) a washing machine. Just under half have a freezer. A minority own tumble dryers and dishwashers. Patterns of ownership in this sample vary with socio-economic class, as has been shown in previous work [Fraser (5)]. Ownership of all appliances, apart from spin dryers, is higher amongst middle class respondents (Table 44).

All cookers and tumble dryers and the majority of refrigerators and washing machines are located in the kitchen. Half the tumble dryers and 14 (60%) of the freezers are kept elsewhere. Apart from appliances outside the kitchen located in a utility room, this was not the preferred arrangement. Only one respondent said she kept her freezer in a covered passage outside from choice, consideration of energy saving, and convenience. Other appliances were located outside the kitchen due to lack of space. In several cases, respondents mentioned they preferred to use what space there was for a table for eating. One third of these respondents were dissatisfied with this. The other two-thirds indicated that whilst not preferred, the arrangement was satisfactory (Table 45). Apart from
dishwashers, there would appear to be no relationship between ownership of domestic appliances and kitchen size (Table 46). Size of kitchen would be expected to affect purchase of a dishwasher, since it needs to be located in the kitchen and connected to the water supply.

There is a tendency for respondents owning five or six domestic appliances to be less dissatisfied with their kitchens for the performance of six tasks than respondents owning fewer appliances (Table 47). The 'high' ownership group contained the seven dishwasher owners and nearly all of the group owned a plumbed-in automatic washing machine. These two appliances have already been referred to as contributors to satisfaction with the kitchen for the performance of washing up, drying up and putting dishes away and using the washing machine.

6.5 Characteristics of Respondents and Their Assessment of the Convenience of Their Kitchen for the Performance of Six Functional Tasks

There is a significant tendency for respondents without any dissatisfaction or only one single complaint to have carried out major alterations or replanned their kitchens completely (Table 48). The majority of those with two or three complaints had done no or minor alterations and six of the seven with four or more complaints had done nothing to their kitchens.

Respondents with all of their children under five tended to be slightly more dissatisfied, although this was not significant. Two-thirds had two or more complaints compared to half those respondents with some or all of their children over five years old (Table 49).

Regarding tenure (Table 50), more owner occupiers had four or more complaints, this was not significant. There was slightly
more dissatisfaction noted amongst housewives and homeworkers (Table 51). Again, though, this was not significant. Respondents appeared significantly less dissatisfied if they had lived in the dwelling for five or more years.

Concerning age of dwelling there was significantly more dissatisfaction amongst those in more recently built dwellings (Table 53). This could be due to the fact that more of these dwellings had small kitchens and respondents with larger kitchens tended to show less dissatisfaction.

6.6 Summary

In order to examine the relationship between functional aspects of the kitchen environment and the respondent's attitude to her kitchen, her assessment of the convenience of her kitchen for the performance of six functional tasks was compared to kitchen facilities. Facilities were assessed in terms of criteria deemed important by functional research and covered: kitchen size; layout; space for washing machine; worksurface and storage provisions and the ownership of domestic equipment.

Examination of the evaluation of the kitchen for the six tasks showed slightly less dissatisfaction amongst those with larger kitchens and a high level of ownership of domestic equipment but no relationship between dissatisfaction and poor layout, poor positioning of the washing machine and below average work surface and storage provisions. There was a significant tendency for respondents making fewer complaints to have carried out alterations or re-planned their kitchens completely, or to have lived in their house for five or more years.
Owner occupiers, housewives and homeworkers and women with children over five seemed slightly more dissatisfied than local-authority tenants, working women and women with older children.

This chapter demonstrates the absence of any strong relationships between respondents' attitudes to the convenience of their kitchen for the performance of six functional tasks and the parameters of the physical environment and household characteristics. The following two case studies indicate this point.

Respondent 22 lives in a new 4 bed roomed inner terraced house on a housing estate just outside Guildford. Her husband works in insurance in London. She does about 10 hours work a week at home as a translator. She has two girls, one 7 and one 3 months at home. They have lived here for two years. Her kitchen measures $9 \text{m}^2$ and is arranged as shown.

Figure 8.
CASE STUDY NUMBER 4.
RESPONDENT 22'S KITCHEN.

Sketch plan. Not to scale.

It is over $8 \text{m}^2$, follows the recommended layout, is not obviously deficient in storage or worksurface, and the washing machine is situated close to the stove. However, Respondent 22 has 5 complaints to make about her kitchen from the point of view of its convenience for the performance of the 6 functional tasks.
Respondent 50 lives in a pre-1961 local authority 3 bedroomed semi-detached house. Her husband is a labourer and she is a part-time cleaner. They have twin boys aged 8 and have lived in the house for 6 years. Her kitchen measures $8 \text{ m}^2$ and is arranged as shown.

Figure 9. CASE STUDY NUMBER 5.
RESPONDENT 50'S KITCHEN.

Sketch plan. Not to scale.

The kitchen is under $8 \text{ m}^2$, has more than one fault as regards comparison with the recommended layout and was assessed as 'below average' in the provision of work surface and storage. Respondent 50 does not own a washing machine.

However, Respondent makes no complaints about her kitchen when assessing convenience for the performance of six functional tasks.

The observed lack of strong relationships raises the question that perhaps the attitudes expressed towards the six functional tasks are part of a larger complex of attitudes towards the kitchen in general. Chapter 7 investigates these global attitudes in depth.
Table 28.

RESPONDENTS INVOLVEMENT IN KITCHEN PLANNING BY TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Alteration</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Tenure Local Authority</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No alterations</td>
<td>11 (58)</td>
<td>8 (42)</td>
<td>19 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Alterations</td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Alterations</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
<td>12 (71)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Replan</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
<td>1 (12)</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29.

RESPONDENTS INVOLVEMENT IN KITCHEN PLANNING BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Alteration</th>
<th>Length of Residence</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No alterations/minor</td>
<td>Under 5 Years</td>
<td>21 (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 5 Years</td>
<td>8 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major alterations/complete</td>
<td>Under 5 Years</td>
<td>16 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 5 Years</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td></td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30.

RESPONDENTS ASSESSMENT OF THE CONVENIENCE OF THEIR KITCHEN

1. FOOD PREPARATION AND COOKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work surface</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally satisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally too small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too big</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor lighting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of comments</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*16 respondents made both satisfied and dissatisfied comments.
Table 31.

RESPONDENTS ASSESSMENT OF THE CONVENIENCE OF THEIR KITCHEN
2. USING ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of sockets</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of sockets</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally satisfied</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of comments</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32.

RESPONDENTS ASSESSMENT OF THE CONVENIENCE OF THEIR KITCHEN
3. WASHING, DRYING AND PUTTING DISHES AWAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of space at sink, need for double drainer</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly positioned sink and drainer</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor lighting, unable to see whilst washing up</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconveniently positioned storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen generally too small</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated by dishwasher (7 owners)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveniently positioned storage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveniently positioned worksurface</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Everything to hand'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Comments</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33.

RESPONDENTS ASSESSMENT OF THE CONVENIENCE OF THEIR KITCHENS

4. CLEANING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong> Floor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliances</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grease on walls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive:</strong> Easy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated by small kitchen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliances easy to move</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy now changed floor covering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy with reference to floor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Comments</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Respondents</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34.

RESPONDENTS ASSESSMENT OF THE CONVENIENCE OF THEIR KITCHENS

5. USING THE WASHING MACHINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>N/A*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong> Machine noisy in kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhygienic to wash in kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like a utility room in kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like machine located in bathroom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot use sink for food preparation whilst washing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive:</strong> Machine not in kitchen 'plumbed-in' elsewhere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine 'plumbed-in' in kitchen</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally satisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Comments</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Respondents</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondent does not have machine.
Table 35.

RESPONDENTS ASSESSMENT OF THE CONVENIENCE OF THEIR KITCHEN

6. LAUNDRY BY HAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Access (involves carrying wet washing through lounge)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like a utility room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like a double drainer sink unit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monopolises kitchen as machine used for spin drying laundry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive: Done in bathroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done in utility room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little laundry done by hand</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally satisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Comments</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36.

RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION WITH THEIR KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>Respondent Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No complaints</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen found unsatisfactory for one task</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two tasks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three tasks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four tasks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five tasks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six tasks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 37.

STANDARD OF KITCHEN WORK SEQUENCE, AND DWELLING AGE AND TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard of kitchen work sequence</th>
<th>Pre-1961</th>
<th>1961-69</th>
<th>Post-1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>owner</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>occupied</td>
<td>authority</td>
<td>occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One fault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one fault</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
<td>11 (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 38.

**STANDARD OF KITCHEN WORK SEQUENCE AND RESPONDENTS INVOLVEMENT IN KITCHEN PLANNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard of kitchen work sequence</th>
<th>No alterations</th>
<th>Level of Alteration</th>
<th>Complete replan</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>4 (24)</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>10 (59)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One fault</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one fault</td>
<td>10 (37)</td>
<td>4 (15)</td>
<td>6 (22)</td>
<td>27 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>19 (35)</td>
<td>10 (19)</td>
<td>17 (31)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 13.39; \ df = 6; \ p < 0.05 \]

---

### Table 39.

**STANDARD OF KITCHEN WORK SEQUENCE AND RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION WITH THE KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of complaints made</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>One fault</th>
<th>More than one fault</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.70 \; d.f. = 10 \; p = .56 \; n.s. \]
Table 40.

STANDARD OF KITCHEN WORK SEQUENCE AND RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION
WITH THEIR KITCHEN FOR THE TASKS FOOD PREPARATION AND COOKING AND
WASHING, DRYING AND PUTTING AWAY DISHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard of Kitchen Work Sequence</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>One Fault</th>
<th>More than One Fault</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation and Cooking¹:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Kitchen Layout</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Provision of Work Surface</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing, Drying, Putting Away Dishes²:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Positioning of Sink and Drainer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Data from Table 30.
²Data from Table 32.

Table 41.

KITCHEN SIZE AND RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION WITH THEIR
KITCHENS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>4-8 m²</th>
<th>8-16 m²</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t = 1.622; df. = 52; p > .05 N.S.

¹'Kitchen' area only of kitchen diners measured.
Table 42.
RESPONDENTS ASSESSMENT OF THE CONVENIENCE OF THEIR KITCHEN FOR
USE OF WASHING MACHINE AND POSITION OF WASHING MACHINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of Washing Machine</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>In Kitchen Next to Sink</th>
<th>In Kitchen Away From Sink</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auto(^2)</td>
<td>Non-Auto(^2)</td>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>Non-Auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Seven of the 54 respondents did not own a washing machine.

\(^2\)Auto - Automatic; Non-Auto - Non-Automatic.
Table 43.

STANDARD OF KITCHEN WORKSURFACE AND STORAGE PROVISIONS AND RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION WITH THEIR KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>Standard of Work Surface and Storage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate Worksurface and Storage</td>
<td>Below Average Work Surface Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dissatisfaction \( \bar{x} \pm S.E. \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{x} & \pm S.E. \\
2.13 \pm .28 & \quad 1.60 \pm .51 & \quad 1.45 \pm .34 & \quad 2.00 \pm .26
\end{align*}
\]
### Table 44.

**OWNERSHIP OF DOMESTIC EQUIPMENT BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appliances</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Households G.B. 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooker</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
<td>23 (96)</td>
<td>53 (98)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fridge Freezer</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>6 (25)</td>
<td>10 (19)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing Machine</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
<td>17 (71)</td>
<td>47 (87)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezer</td>
<td>18 (60)</td>
<td>5 (21)</td>
<td>23 (43)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumble Dryer</td>
<td>5 (17)</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>8 (15)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spin Dryer</td>
<td>2 (7)</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Figures include 'fridge-freezer sub-category.

<sup>2</sup>Source: AGB Home Audit (1973) Audits of Great Britain, Ltd. Sample 35,000 households.

### Table 45.

**LOCATION OF DOMESTIC EQUIPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appliance</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total No. (%) Sample Owning Appliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooker</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>47 (89)</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing Machine</td>
<td>41 (87)</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezer</td>
<td>9 (39)</td>
<td>14 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumble Dryer</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>7 (100)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spin Dryer</td>
<td>3 (60)</td>
<td>2 (40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Includes fridge-freezers.
### Table 46.

**KITCHEN SIZE AND OWNERSHIP OF DOMESTIC EQUIPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appliance</th>
<th>Kitchen Size</th>
<th>4-8 m²</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>8-16 m²</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total All Kitchens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freezer: In Kitchen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher: In Kitchen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumble Dryer: In Kitchen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 'Kitchen' area of kitchen/diners only measured.

### Table 47.

**OWNERSHIP OF DOMESTIC EQUIPMENT AND RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION WITH THE KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>Number of Appliances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>10   (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>13   (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 4</td>
<td>3    (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>26   (48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 48.

**INVOLVEMENT IN KITCHEN PLANNING AND RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION WITH THEIR KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>None/Minor Alterations</th>
<th>Major Alterations</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8 (33)</td>
<td>16 (67)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>15 (65)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>6 (86)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>7 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>29 (54)</td>
<td>25 (46)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.12; \text{ d.f.} = 2; p < .05 \]

### Table 49.

**AGE OF CHILDREN AND RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION WITH THEIR KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>All Under Five</th>
<th>Mixed Under And. Over Five</th>
<th>All Over Five</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>6 (25)</td>
<td>8 (33)</td>
<td>10 (42)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>10 (43)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>3 (43)</td>
<td>7 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
<td>16 (30)</td>
<td>20 (37)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.15; \text{ d.f.} = 2; p = .21, \text{ N.S.} \]
Table 50.
TENURE AND RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION WITH THEIR KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>13 (54)</td>
<td>11 (46)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>11 (48)</td>
<td>12 (52)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>6 (86)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>7 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.15; \text{ d.f.} = 2; \text{ p} = .21, \text{ N.S.} \]

Table 51.
ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF RESPONDENTS AND DISSATISFACTION WITH THEIR KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time and Part Time Worker</td>
<td>Homeworker</td>
<td>Full Time Housewife</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8 (33)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
<td>13 (54)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>5 (22)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>17 (74)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>3 (43)</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>7 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>15 (28)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
<td>32 (59)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.77; \text{ d.f.} = 4; \text{ p} = .067, \text{ N.S.} \]
Table 52.

RESPONDENTS LENGTH OF RESIDENCE AND DISSATISFACTION WITH THEIR KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX FUNCTIONAL TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints Made</th>
<th>Length of Residence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Five Years</td>
<td>Five Or More Years</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>11 (46)</td>
<td>13 (54)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>22 (96)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 4</td>
<td>4 (57)</td>
<td>3 (43)</td>
<td>77 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>37 (69)</td>
<td>17 (31)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 14.0; \text{ d.f.} = 2; p < .001.$

Table 53.

DWELLING AGE AND RESPONDENTS DISSATISFACTION WITH THEIR KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>Dwelling Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>7 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 4</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>13 (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 9.64; \text{ d.f.} = 4; p < .05.$
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7.1. Introduction

This chapter contains a description and discussion of attitudes towards the kitchen held by the women in the sample, which were investigated using a projective sentence completion test. The construction and administration of this test is described in detail in Chapter 4. Briefly, respondents were asked to complete as many as they could of ten sentences all beginning 'My kitchen ...' Their answers were then probed in full by the interviewer.

7.2. Analysis of the Response

The number of responses per respondent varied between five and ten, the modal value being 5, the mean number of responses 6.7 (Table 54). Inspection of the responses suggested that the women could be divided into three groups. The first group of women made responses predominantly related to the kitchen as a place for social interaction with the rest of the family. The second group considered the kitchen in terms of it being 'their own room,' more specifically 'their workroom.' The third group of women made responses that were concerned solely with functional statements about the kitchen, seeing it only as 'a room.' The complete responses of the following six respondents highlight the differences between each of the three groups.

For example, R20, of the first group, describes her kitchen as:
1. 'Where the family congregate, where the family is creative and together.'
2. 'Where the children chat to me while I'm baking.'
3. 'Where my husband and I get a closer relationship from a shared activity.'
4. 'So small that it gets cluttered very quickly which irritates me intensely.'

5. 'Where the floor gets dirty and scratched.'

6. 'The bypass between the garden and the toilet (You should see in on a Saturday and Sunday if the children are at the back it's a rush through all the time).'

7. 'At the front of the house so I can keep an eye on the neighbours. I'm not nosey, I just find it interesting.'

8. 'Where I can see the children playing, so they can play in the front.'

9. 'So small that the freezer, the washing machine and the tumble dryer are in the garage.'

R47, also group one, similarly describes her kitchen as:

1. 'The most used room in the house.'

2. 'Bright and easy to clean.'

3. 'Has a pleasant outlook.'

4. 'A room for living, cooking, children's crafts and having friends to sit for coffee.'

5. 'The most important room in our house.'

R46 of group two sees the kitchen as more her room than a family room. 'My kitchen ...'

1. 'Is My Room!' (her capitals)

2. 'Is compact and cosy, which I like.'

3. 'Is a little lacking in cupboard space, although I could fit more in.'

4. 'Is just a little too small to eat in. But a huge kitchen-breakfast room would lose its cosiness, which I should regret.'
5. 'Is a little dark at times, although it doesn't really
bother me.'
6. 'Is decorated to my personal taste with pictures and my
ceramic plaque.'
7. 'Not finished with regard to the decor,'
8. 'Is not particularly spotless. I loathe housework.'
9. 'Is my make-up room and hairdressing salon as well.'
R6, in group two, also thinks of the kitchen as her room.
'My kitchen is ...'
1. Spacious. You see, you are in the kitchen for a great deal
of the day and people who build houses don't realise that.'
(She explains: 'They don't. When you're home for the day,
it's the main room. I can go and sit in the kitchen quite
comfortably. I write letters out here. It's a lovely,
quiet room which is what I like about it. It's a nice,
spacious room and I like it like that because I don't like
to feel cramped, because I'm in there most of the day.')
2. 'Easy to work in!'
3. 'Easy to keep clean.'
4. 'Bright and sunny.'
5. 'Leads straight onto the back garden which is better with
the children (otherwise you get mucky feet traipsing into
the lounge. Here you can stop them before they get any
further, and also I can keep an eye on the children outside.)'
6. 'Has a dining area at one end which I prefer at the moment.'
7. 'Has a horrible grey floor, which needs daily cleaning.
That's the only thing I don't like about it.'
In contrast, R1's comments on the kitchen are all functional. 'My kitchen ...!

1. 'Is always kept clean. As when preparing food everything needs to be clean.'

2. 'Is tidy. As its rather small, everything needs to be put in its place after use.'

3. 'Is colourful.'

4. 'Is rather small as I said.'

5. 'Is lacking a lobby for boots and shoes to save the mess.'

R18, also of group three, is quite clear about her feelings for the kitchen as a functional area. 'My kitchen is ...'

1. 'A workroom as far as I am concerned.'

2. 'I am not over-fond of cooking or washing up.'

3. 'A place or room where I try to spend as little as time as possible.'

4. 'I don't think of it as a sociable place.'

5. 'That's all. It's just a room.'

7.2.1. The Kitchen as Family Interaction Space

Fifteen of the respondents stressed the social role of the kitchen. For example (R3) 'My kitchen is a meeting place for the family. It's one of the more positive things about it. Everyone sort of comes in and it's not shut off from the rest of the house, which I like because I like to be involved with the family and not have the kitchen as a cut-off sort of thing.'

R2 stresses 'room for children is important as they want to follow you around and bring the blackboard in and paint.'
R19 describes her kitchen as 'used most times of the day,' 'Used for coffee and chats with friends.' 'Used for snacks when the children come home from school.' R43's kitchen is 'large, which I like. There's room for other activities. It's big enough for a table for meals and homework.'

R44 describes her kitchen as 'the most beautifully decorated room in the house.' 'Planned just as I want it.' 'Where we spend most of our time.' R39 also sees her kitchen as 'a room where I spend a great deal of my time, especially with children of this age,' and complains that it is 'fairly small. I would like room for a table for meals and for the children's play.' R21 says her kitchen 'is used for everything. My husband uses my ladder for his tools and paints.' She also complains that it is 'awkward for trying to fit in the children's tables and chairs, so that they can paint and play in there and I can keep an eye on them.' The other respondents make similar comments about lack of space hindering the family's activities. For instance, R3 feels her kitchen is 'short of worktop space because the children have a rota to help lay the table and various things like that. So the cups and plates are kept out because otherwise they can't reach them in the cupboards.' 'It's too small for generally moving around. I've got 3 children and if they come in and want to help then we're on top of each other, and my husband and I often cook meals together.' R31 sums it up when she says 'I like my kitchen, I'm always in it so why shouldn't I have it nice and be able to have my dogs, children, husband and budgie in it.'
7.2.2. The Kitchen as the Woman's Workspace

The second group of respondents also made statements about activities, but instead of making references to family activities concentrated on the kitchen as their workroom. They were concerned with the environment of their workplace. Comments tended to be subjective, and although they did not strongly feel their kitchen was a place for family activities, many comments showed that they wanted to keep in touch with family activities elsewhere. For instance, R7 feels 'it's nice to have a nice kitchen because you are out there so much.' R52 thinks her kitchen is 'too small by far when you think of the amount of time spent in there.' R23 states that her kitchen is 'a place where I spend most of the day cleaning and cooking.' R35 thinks of her kitchen as 'my own territory.' R5 is generally pleased with her kitchen and thinks it should be 'a happy place. It shouldn't be designed for drudgery, it should be a place you enjoy going into - not a drudge hole.' R2's kitchen is 'sunny, which I am happy about as I am able to grow lots of plants. I think it's important for a woman when she's cleaning and washing in there to have the sun.' R14's kitchen 'has a back door going straight onto the garden, so I can see what the children are up to.' R24 comments that her kitchen 'has a window facing the front of the house which is nice as I work in there a lot and I like to have something to see.' R16 finds a major fault with her kitchen is that it is 'the wrong way round. It should have faced the garden so I can watch the children. In summer, we can't have the paddling pool, as I'm in the kitchen and I can't watch them. I either have to be in the garden or in the sitting room. Eighteen women tended to think of the kitchen as their 'own' room.
7.2.3. The Kitchen as a Functional Space

The responses of the remaining twenty-one respondents were solely functional, apart from eleven who mentioned that they liked to be able to look out of the kitchen and/or make contact with the family in other parts of the house.

7.3. Further Analysis of the Response to the Sentence Completion Test

In order to examine the responses further, particularly the comments of a functional nature, the first five statements from each respondent were analysed in depth. The range and relative importance of the respondents' concerns is shown in Table 55. The first five responses only were used here, since all respondents made at least five responses. In the test, respondents were given ten sentences to complete, in order to encourage them not to limit their response, although pre-pilot and pilot tests showed 5-7 sentences to be a realistic estimate of response.

Of the total (270) first five responses made by the women in the sentence completion test, 55% (150) were defined as functional statements, indicating the continuing importance of the kitchen as a functional area to respondents, irrespective of orientation (See also Table 56). Statements related to functional aspects of the kitchen were concerned with:

- Size
- Layout
- Storage
- Work surface
- Other: Miscellaneous functional comments
- Cleanliness: functional: ease/difficulty of cleaning floors, surfaces, appliances
Environment: objective: lighting, heating, ventilation, efficiency

Access: functional: number and position of doors

Those statements classed as non-functional were:

Size: family: amount of space for family activities
Cleanliness: non-functional: importance of cleanliness
Satisfaction/dissatisfaction: general overall feelings
Environment: subjective: 'cosy,' claustrophobic' feelings
Access: non-functional: amount of contact felt between the kitchen and the rest of the dwelling.

The proportion of all comments made by all respondents that were strictly functional in nature, as distinct from invoking other frames of reference is shown in Table 55. Environment, 'cleanliness,' 'size' and 'access' are notable as topics which may be viewed in more than one frame of reference. The individual response categories are now discussed in order of magnitude.

Kitchen size and activities were the two largest response categories (Table 55). When asked to describe their kitchens, the majority of the respondents (43, 80%) made one response in terms of its size. In twenty-one of the forty-seven responses, the respondents go on to explain their statement on the size of the kitchen in terms of activities. For example R43 says her kitchen is:

'Larg, which I like as there's room for other activities.'

The remaining half of the responses to kitchen size were related to functional aspects. R22 considers her kitchen:

'Too small to have all the modern equipment that I want.'

Twenty-five responses refer to the kitchen as too small, ten to its being of adequate size and twelve as spacious. The comments
which referred to the kitchen as an area for the respondents own or family activities have already been reviewed ('7.2'). The forty-six comments in this category were made by 30 (55%) respondents.

Thirty-seven comments on the environment were made by 31 (57%) of the respondents. Twenty of these comments which referred to the kitchen as 'bright and cheerful,' 'cosy,' 'claustrophobic' etc., were grouped together as subjective, non-functional comments about the environment. The remainder were classified as objective responses to the kitchen environment and the majority (13) of these seventeen comments on lighting and ventilation in the kitchen referred to its shortcomings.

Statements grouped under layout were those which referred to the positioning of cupboards, sink units and other items of kitchen equipment. Thirty-two comments were made by twenty-four (44%) respondents. Eighteen comments referred to problems with the layout of the kitchen and fourteen were favourable comments. Twenty-two of the responses about storage referred to the kitchen as lacking storage space, the remaining six responses were favourable.

In the cleanliness category, nine responses dealt with the ease of cleaning the kitchen and eight with difficulties in cleaning. The remaining six focused on the importance of cleanliness in the kitchen and as such formed a small group of responses which were not primarily functional. For example, R3 and R50 comment:

R3: 'My kitchen must be clean. I dislike a dirty kitchen.'
R50: 'I like it to look clean.'

Twenty-two statements were grouped under the heading access. These dealt with contact between the kitchen and the rest of the dwelling. Eleven were related to keeping in contact with other
members of the family, or the kitchen having a pleasant outlook. The remainder were functional, for example, R48 feels her kitchen:

'Could do with a back door. It's easier and cleaner than going through the dining room to the dustbin.'

Seventeen subjective comments on satisfaction and dissatisfaction were grouped together. Nine comments were made about work surface, six of which were unfavourable. Another nine comments formed a group of miscellaneous functional comments about the kitchen.

The first five statements made by respondents in the sentence completion test were examined according to their orientation towards the kitchen as a 'family' 'own' or 'a' room (Table 56). Of the responses made by 'family' oriented respondents 40 (53%) were non-functional and 35 (47%) functional. In contrast, the majority of the response from 'a' room oriented respondents was functional (69, 66%), with only 36 (34%) non-functional comments. The response of the 'own' room orientation was equally divided between functional and non-functional statements.

With regard to the individual categories, a much higher percentage of the responses made by 'family' oriented respondents referred to activities (21, 28%) compared to the 'own' (16, 17%) and 'a' room (9, 9%) groups. Those 'own' oriented concentrate on their activities rather than family activities. The emphasis on functional aspects of the kitchen of those 'own' and 'a' room oriented is demonstrated by the higher percentage of their comments devoted to the functional aspects of layout and storage, in contrast to those 'family' oriented.

The 'a' room orientation appeared slightly more concerned about access than either of the others. This might reflect the
speculation that the kitchen functions as a centre or base for women inclined towards the 'family' or 'own' orientations, therefore they are less concerned with getting out of it both objectively and subjectively. The percentage of the response concerned with the environment is about the same for all three groups. However, there is much more emphasis on subjective feelings about the environment from 'own' room oriented respondents. This could be due to their consideration of it as their room. No difference was noted between the three orientations in the percentage of their response devoted to size, satisfaction and dissatisfaction and work surface. Miscellaneous functional comments were slightly higher in the 'a' room orientation.

7.4. The Relationship Between Orientation and Other Variables

This initial analysis of the sentence completion test has revealed three groups of women with different attitudes towards the kitchen: those who see it as a 'family' room, those to whom it is their 'own' room and those to whom it is simply 'a' room.

Orientation to the kitchen was examined in terms of ground floor layout (lounge/diner and kitchen; kitchen/diner and lounge; separate lounge, dining room, kitchen); the communication possible between the kitchen and other ground floor rooms (in terms of the 'open, 'inter-open,' 'inter-closed,' closed classification). No relationship was found between any of these variables, nor between orientation and age of children in the household, employment status of the respondent, or socio-economic status. (Data not shown.) With reference to kitchen facilities, a significant relationship was, however, found between kitchen size and orientation (Table 57).
'Family' oriented respondents tended to have larger kitchens. This raises the possibility that kitchen size influences orientation towards the kitchen.

A significant relationship was found between orientation and how closely the kitchen conformed with the recommended layout, the assessment of which was discussed in Chapter Six (Table 5). However, it is not a positive relationship between favourable orientation towards the kitchen and quality of kitchen facilities. In fact, the majority of 'family' oriented women had kitchens with more than one fault in their layout, whilst almost half of those oriented towards the kitchen as 'a' room, a more negative orientation, had satisfactory kitchen layouts.

This absence of any positive relationship between favourable attitudes towards the kitchen and quality of kitchen facilities supports speculations raised in the previous chapter that attitudes towards the kitchen are perhaps part of a more global complex of attitudes.

The analysis of the other questions in the interview schedule directed towards outlining women's attitudes towards the kitchen is the next stage in the examination of these research results.
7.5. **Introduction**

In order to examine attitudes towards the kitchen in depth (after the sentence completion test, which was directed towards the initial identification and salience of the respondents' attitudes), a series of questions focusing on functional and social aspects of the kitchen were included in the interview, namely:

- Use of kitchen for relaxation (7.9)
- Attitudes towards being in the kitchen (7.10)
- Convenience of kitchen layout for the performance of six work tasks (7.11)
- Ideal kitchen (7.12)
- Attitudes towards other people being in the kitchen (7.13)

Two wider questions were also asked concerning:

- Respondent's own room (7.7)
- Respondent's favourite room (7.8)

Responses to the questions on rooms used for meals, satisfaction with eating arrangements, daily activities, frequency of use of the kitchen by other members of the family and satisfaction with dwelling layout were also examined with reference to attitudes towards the kitchen. In addition, relevant spontaneous comments made during the rest of the interview were included in the data on which the assessment of attitudes is based.

7.6. **The Extension of the Classification**

Examination of the responses to these questions refined and highlighted the differences in attitudes between the three groups initially identified, and enabled the attitudes of those respondents in the third group, to whom the kitchen appears at first to be just 'a' room to be further differentiated. The responses used in
this report to illustrate the differences between the women are only some of those on which the assessment of their attitudes was based.

R31 is a working class housewife in her early thirties with two small children under 5. The ground floor of her modern 3 bedroomed Local Authority terraced house is designed as a lounge/diner with separate kitchen. In the ten statements test she describes her kitchen as a family room. She likes being in her smartly decorated kitchen which is 10.9 m$^2$ with full length lined curtains, carpet, table and chairs, tv, birdcage and built-in dog basket.

'I'm a doer. I'm happy when I'm in here on the go. It's a pleasant room and I'm looking forward to doing it out again so I can get it as I really want it. You spend most of your day out here, so you might as well make it as comfortable as possible.' She uses the kitchen a lot for relaxing in 'Oh, yes, I always sit out here during the day and the boys play with their bricks on the floor or on the table, and the dogs in here. I had a friend in this morning and she sat down there (kitchen table) for coffee.' Other people are welcome in the kitchen, besides friends. 'My husband always comes and sits and chats to me and I like the children around then I know what they're doing.' She never feels isolated in the kitchen' because everyone comes out here. As our base.' Her ideal kitchen would be a more spacious version of the one she has at present with a larger dining area and a larger planned and fitted working area. The kitchen is her favourite room. 'I spend a lot of time here, as I say we virtually live in here so why shouldn't it be nice? That's why my husband bought me the portable television for our here.' She also thinks of the kitchen as her own room 'although everyone else is in here, it's my territory.'
R20 is a middle-class full-time health visitor with a family of four. One aged 7, 5-year-old twins and a two-year-old. Her 'house-husband,' as they both jokingly term him, is a professional working from home. The ground floor of the family's modern terraced house consists of a lounge/diner and separate $9 \, \text{m}^2$ kitchen in which they have replaced some of the fitted cupboards with a table and bench seats. She feels that her first three statements in the ten statements test about the family congregating, chatting and sharing activities in the kitchen sum up her ideas about it, and her family orientation is further substantiated by her answers to other questions.

On her ideal: 'I'd like the kitchen to be a living room, big enough to have the whole family sitting round for a meal and plenty of room for everyone to move around. Not exactly a typical farmhouse kitchen, but something like that.'

'I like being in the kitchen, especially if I feel like baking or cooking a special meal, trying out a new recipe.' Of her husband 'we're practically always in there (kitchen) together. We lead a very shared life. We have practically no separate interests.' Of the children 'I would say sometimes we try to hump them out of the kitchen, it's so cramped, especially if Michael's in there in his high chair and we're tired and rushing around, but we really enjoy the shared activities with them like baking, which is done mostly with Michael in bed so that the rest of us can enjoy it. The children chatter away so easily.' The kitchen is also seen as a relaxing area. 'If I'm on my own, I read the paper, listen to the radio and have my lunch in there. I enjoy that.' 'Sometimes when people come we chase the children into the lounge so we can talk without
interruptions.' She also thinks of the kitchen as her own room although it's a family room. 'I think it's my room more than anyone else's.'

R18 is a middle-class, full-time office worker with two teenage daughters. The ground floor of her modern four-bedroomed detached house was designed with a kitchen, lounge/dining room and study. Most other families on the estate use the study as a dining room. They use theirs as another living room, or father's 'sulking room.' as they call it. During the ten statements test in contrast to R31 and R20, R18 emphasised that she thought of her kitchen as 'a' room for functional tasks and as a place where she tries to spend as little time as possible. About being in the kitchen, she says: 'I find it a chore now. I never used to. I haven't always done a full-time job. I've stayed at home and thoroughly enjoyed being in the kitchen, but not now. I think that I've got so many other things to do that I spend as little time there as I can. It's just a matter of getting a meal ready, getting the washing up done and finishing quickly.' She dislikes other people in the kitchen, apart from the two girls: 'Because they're helping, getting it all out of the way.' Of her husband 'not particularly, again I think it's because I don't use my kitchen for anything other than cooking and he would get under my feet in there.' On relatives and friends in the kitchen. 'No, I wouldn't like this at all. I like to concentrate and they'd get in my way. I don't think of the kitchen as a sociable place at all.' Not surprisingly, she does not consider her kitchen to be a relaxing area, nor her own or favourite room. Her ideal kitchen would be a cooking area with a separate utility for the laundry.
R42 is a middle-class housewife with girls aged 10 and 14 and a boy aged 12. Her 3 bedroomed detached house built in 1974 has a lounge, dining room and 8.5 m² kitchen on the ground floor. In the ten statements test she concentrates on the functional aspects of her kitchen and is 'a' room oriented. She does not mind being in the kitchen, apart from when the rest of the family is home when she wants to be with them. She does not view the kitchen as a relaxing area. 'No. There's a chair in there, but I don't sit on it, funny enough. I always come out to look at the paper, and things like that. As soon as I've done what I'm doing, I come out.' She doesn't really mind her family, relatives and friends in the kitchen, but this never seems to happen. On friends, 'If I make a cup of coffee, they'll probably come and stand and natter to me while I'm doing it. Then we'll go off and sit in the lounge.' The lounge, not the kitchen, is her favourite room which she also thinks of as her own. Her ideal kitchen would be larger than her present one, light and pleasant. 'I wouldn't have a great big square kitchen, I would have it long with all my things up one end and then a table and chairs right down the other end away from the working part. And I'd have more domestic equipment.'

These four profiles highlight the difference in attitude between the members of the sample. R31 and R20 think of their kitchens as the centre of the house for the whole family and their ideal kitchens would be the 'living room' type. This is in contrast to R18, whose kitchen is a place for functional tasks, away from other living areas, and whose ideal would be to segregate functional areas even further by having a utility room. R42's kitchen is also a workroom, but she feels that perhaps it could be more integrated with other living areas, for example her ideal kitchen would still be a working area, but in contact with an area for dining and relaxing.
An outline of these differences in attitude, within the sample as a whole, is obtained by looking at the overall response to the individual questions previously mentioned.

7.7. Respondent's Own Room

Respondents were asked whether there was a room in the house that they thought of as being their own. As Table 59 shows, just under one-third (16) of the respondents did not feel one room was especially theirs. Another third (18) referred to the kitchen as their room, 15 (28%) to their bedroom, 3 (6%) to the lounge and dining areas and 1 (2%) to a room set aside as a workroom. Responses centred around the women's concerns for privacy, autonomy and territoriality. Sixteen (30%) of the women made comments about their own room in terms of feeling it was their own territory, and for all of these women their own territory was their kitchen. For example, R27 feels the kitchen is her own room. 'All the family use it, but I feel it's my territory.' Nine (16%) felt one room in the house was especially theirs because they had some degree of autonomous control over its decor and had 'got it how I want it.' R42 feels her own room is the lounge 'because I chose it all.' For the remaining 13 (24%), their own room was somewhere for privacy and for 12 of these women 'their' room was their bedroom. R7 comments about her bedroom, 'it's nice to make it pretty well off-limits. The children come in some mornings and jump on the bed, but otherwise they never go in there and I like to keep it like that.'

Four respondents indicated that their 'own' rooms were not meeting their needs either for privacy or for territoriality. One of these was the only respondent who chose the kitchen for reasons of privacy: R4, 'I like to think of it as my own little refuge,
but it's not really, as we're all on top of one another in this house.' She felt strongly that her house was too small and that her bedroom could not provide a refuge for her as it was poorly decorated and a junk room to the point that she was ashamed of it. R2, one of the respondents who did not feel that one room was their own, mentioned that she would like to be able to have this feeling about a room and felt very confined having no space to herself.

Territorial rights would then appear to be the reason for feeling that the kitchen is one's own room, as stated by 16 of the 18 respondents whose kitchen was 'especially theirs.' Within this group, R23 and R35 felt that the kitchen was their own room and their own territory 'out of necessity,' 'not in a nice way.' Four others comment that the kitchen is their own room because they are out there all the time; it's 'a woman's place.'

The need for privacy and territorial rights, the extent to which these are being fulfilled in the present dwelling, and the possibility of sex-role stereotyping underlying the kitchen as a woman's place will all continue to be examined in the light of responses to further questions. There is a significant relationship between attitudes to the kitchen revealed by the sentence completion test and kitchen as the respondents 'own' room (Table 60). It is seen that 14 out of the 18 of respondents for whom the kitchen is their 'own' room also described their feelings thus during the sentence completion test; the remaining 4 felt their kitchens were family rooms and now elaborated, saying they felt the family kitchen was also especially theirs, too, like R31 'because although everyone else is out here, it's my territory.'
7.8. The Woman's Favourite Room

Seventeen (31%) of the respondents felt they did not have a favourite room in their house. (Table 61). Three respondents in this group qualified their statements by saying that they had had favourite rooms in previous houses, and one commented that her house was not large enough for her to have a favourite room. Of the remaining 37 (69%), the majority (22, 41%) chose the lounge, primarily for reasons of relaxation. Like R36, 'We relax in here when we've put the children to bed,' and R33, 'When I feel a bit tired I quite like to sit in the sitting room with a cup of coffee and plonk down on the chair and have my bit of peace. It's nice and comfortable.'

Relaxation was also the reason for three respondents choosing the kitchen as their favourite room, like R47: 'The kitchen: it's cosy and relaxing doing what I like doing.' To these women, working was relaxing. The women's orientation significantly affected the choice of the kitchen as their favourite room (Table 62).

Respondents comments about relaxation and their perceptions of their lounges will be considered later in the analysis (Chapter 8). Of the nine respondents whose favourite room was the kitchen, seven regarded the kitchen as a 'family' place and two as their 'own' room in the sentence completion test.

7.9. The Kitchen as a Relaxation Area

Continuing to move away from the functional approach towards an examination of the kitchen as a social area, respondents were asked whether they used their kitchens for relaxing. Respondents gave their own definition of 'relaxation' in their answers. Thirteen (24%) of the women said they used their kitchens for relaxing in.
For example:

R10 'Yes, this is relaxing to me. More so than sitting in the lounge. I go in there and think, yes this is nice, but sometimes it's as though I'm sitting in someone else's house when I'm sitting in my sitting room because I'm not there very often.'

R11 'We play cards in here, and I do the crossword.'

R47 'Oh, yes. I have coffee with my friends, it's easy to sit in and the children can run in and out.'

Another 10 (19%) respondents were inclined to use the kitchen for odd moments of relaxation.

R26 'No, I like to go in the lounge, apart from my mid-morning coffee break.'

To the majority of the respondents (31, 57%), the kitchen was not an area for relaxation, although two mentioned that they would like it to be. Five respondents stressed their preference for getting away from the kitchen, as the equipment reminded them it was a work area. Again, of the twenty-three (43%) respondents who felt their kitchen was at least partly a relaxation area, seventeen had previously described it as a 'family,' (11) or their 'own' room (6). The relationship between orientation and use of the kitchen for relaxation is significant (Table 63).

7.10. Attitude Towards Being in the Kitchen

'Do you like being in your kitchen?' a question that could be pendentically described as leading, was chosen in preference to the neutral 'How do you feel about being in your kitchen?' Questions of the latter type have been found, both in other surveys of this nature and the pre-pilot of this survey, to obtain a poor response from working-class respondents who tend to be less articulate about
their feelings.

With regard to feelings about being in the kitchen, only six respondents directly admitted that they disliked being in their kitchen.

R18 "No. I find it a chore now. I used to enjoy being at home but now I find I've got so many other things to do I spend as little time in there as I can.' This low negative response seems surprising at first, considering how many of the respondents find fault with their kitchens - on both functional and social accounts. However, when the positive statements are examined more closely, it becomes a little clearer. 19 respondents explain that they are generally happy to be in their kitchens. They frequently mention that it is a pleasant room and atmosphere and that they like being 'on the go' and at the centre of things. 15 of these women think of their kitchen as the 'family' (8) or their 'own' (7) room. Another 13 link their liking being in the kitchen to the type of tasks they perform there, cooking being cited by nearly all as an enjoyable task. Again, the majority of these women (8) had already described during the sentence completion test their feelings about their kitchen as their 'own' or a 'family' room. The next group of 12 women differ from the preceding 32 making favourable comments. They, too, initially state that they like being in the kitchen, but go on to express this liking in terms of acceptance. They have to be there, they spend a lot of time there, so they have to like it. Thus, it would appear that these women are in a sense designating their acceptance of the kitchen as a woman's place. Six of the women go on to explain that at times they get 'fed up' and feel 'stuck in.'
Possibly they see their dislike of the kitchen as a reflection of themselves. This is a perception which because of a desire to be thought 'normal,' that is, accept that being in the kitchen is a normal role for women, tends to inhibit the spontaneous admission of a negative attitude. Four of the six women expressing this attitude think of the kitchen as their 'own' room in the ten statements test. Four respondents are completely ambivalent. R11 - 'I don't mind. It doesn't depress me.' The significant relationship between attitudes to being in the kitchen expressed in this question and orientation towards the kitchen expressed in the ten statements test is shown in Table 64.

7.11 Convenience of the Kitchen for the Performance of Six Functional Tasks

During the sentence completion test nearly all of the respondents made some comments on the functional aspects of their kitchen. Satisfaction with the kitchen as a work area was also assessed by asking the women how convenient their kitchen was for the performance of the following six tasks: food preparation and cooking; using electrical appliances; washing up, drying up and putting away dishes; cleaning the kitchen; washing using the washing machine and washing by hand. Their comments are discussed in detail in the previous chapter (6) on kitchen facilities. The amount of dissatisfaction shown by the respondents concerning the convenience of their kitchen for the performance of the aforementioned six work tasks was significantly related to their orientation towards the kitchen expressed in the sentence completion test. Respondents who described their kitchens as 'family' rooms tend to be less dissatisfied with their kitchen concerning the performance of the
six functional tasks specified above, than respondents of the other two orientations. A 't' test comparison between the 'family' group and the combined responses of the other two groups shows this difference to be significant. (Table 65).

When we look at the amount of dissatisfaction with the kitchen expressed by respondents during their first five responses to the sentence completion test and their orientation towards the kitchen expressed in the test the same relationship is again apparent. Those respondents with 'family' orientations tend to express less dissatisfaction. However, a 't' test on group mean scores shows no significance (Table 66).

Dissatisfaction expressed during the first five statements in the sentence completion test was examined further to find out in what areas respondents dissatisfaction lay and whether this varied with their orientation towards the kitchen as expressed in the sentence completion test (Table 67).

Overall, the majority of the respondents dissatisfaction centred on size (25 comments); layout (18 comments) and storage facilities (22 comments). Looking at dissatisfaction amongst respondents of different orientations, size and layout were the main sources in the 'family' room group. Size, layout and storage in the 'own' room group and size, layout, storage and environment of a functional nature (heating, lighting) for the 'a' room group. Looking across the three groups at each concern individually, a higher number of 'family' room oriented respondents express dissatisfaction with size and access. A higher percentage of comments of the 'own' room oriented respondents express dissatisfaction with activities. Each group devotes approximately the same percentage of dissatisfied
comments to layout and cleanliness. A higher percentage of the comments of the 'own' and 'a' room oriented respondents express dissatisfaction with storage and miscellaneous functional aspects. The 'a' room group focus more on objective features of the environment. The 'a' room oriented respondents make dissatisfied comments about kitchen work surface.

7.12. The Ideal Kitchen

The respondents were asked to describe their ideal kitchen to the interviewer. Eleven respondents described their ideal as a 'living room' kitchen, a space with room for activities other than functional ones. For example, R3 - 'I think ideally I'd like one of these farmhouse kitchens. I suppose it's connected with the fact that I've got this idea about kitchens being part of the family, not sort of cold and clinical. They should be warm and 'farmhousey.' Wood, I think, is a warm, friendly kind of material.' Ten of these respondents, including R3, were 'family' or 'own' room oriented during the sentence completion test. Similarly seven of the eight respondents who thought their ideal kitchen would be like their present kitchen belonged to the 'family' or 'own' room groups.

R43 - 'I'd have a slightly more modern version of this one. It wouldn't be all white and clinical. The kitchen is an activity room and should be seen to be so. I like having the children's art, pottery, games and hobbies around - and actual cooking. It's back to the farmhouse tradition really. I always take 'Homes and Gardens,' but I'm not swayed by the ultra-modern approach.'

These comments thus further distinguish the 'family' and 'own' room respondents from those to whom the kitchen is just 'a' room.
7.13. **Other People in the Kitchen**

In general, the majority of the women held a favourable attitude towards having company in the kitchen, for example, husbands, children, relatives and friends (Table 68). Slightly more women were not in favour of the company of their relatives; these negative comments centred on their dislike of being taken over or told what to do. A tendency is revealed for those in the 'family' or 'own' kitchen groups to be more enthusiastic about having company in the kitchen than those women in the 'a room' group, although this was not statistically significant.

7.14. **The Influence of Background Variables**

Sections 7.6-7.13 have demonstrated that significant relationships exist between orientation towards the kitchen and the following factors: use of the kitchen for relaxation; attitudes towards being in the kitchen; convenience of the kitchen layout for the performance of 6 functional tasks; the respondent's favourite room; and the respondent's 'own' room. The relationship between these same factors and the background variables of: kitchen size; ground floor layout; communication possible between the kitchen and other ground floor rooms; age of children in the household; employment status of the respondent and socio-economic status were also examined. No significant relationships were found in any of the above analyses. It was of particular interest that no relationship was noted between kitchen size and any of the above factors.

7.15 **Summary**

It is apparent from this brief resume of a series of attitudinal questions on the kitchen that those respondents whose responses in the sentence completion test lead to their being grouped together as women to whom the kitchen is a 'family' room are further characterised
as a group. They enjoy being in their kitchens and welcome the company of their husband, children, friends and relatives. They see the kitchen as a relaxing area and it is often selected as their favourite room. They envisage their ideal kitchen as a living room or farmhouse type kitchen, or one like their own. They also tend to be less dissatisfied with their kitchens from the point of view of performing a range of functional tasks.

This consensus of opinion does not exist between the respondents to whom the kitchen would appear to be just 'a' room in the sentence completion test. These 21 respondents form four distinct sub-groups. The first of these is a group of 4 respondents to whom the kitchen is solely a functional place, like R18, whose comments have been used to illustrate the whole group before. Her kitchen is a workroom, not a sociable place where he tried to spend as little time as possible and comments that her lounge is her 'living' room. These respondents are quite satisfied with the kitchen for functional purposes only, which they see as its role in the dwelling. For example, R1 is moving from her house with its dining-kitchen and lounge to a house specifically chosen by her for its three separate ground floor rooms. At present, she separates her dining area from the kitchen area as much as the dwelling design will allow, by carpeting the area which has a dining rather than kitchen-style table and chairs, but for entertaining she moves the dining table into the lounge rather than have guests see the kitchen.

For a second group of six women, the kitchen is not a functional area to be shut away, in fact from their comments it would appear to be integrated with the rest of the ground floor. R 49 and her husband have recently altered the ground floor of their three
bedroomed semi-detached house by knocking down a wall to make the lounge and dining room into one long room, putting a hatch through from the kitchen into the dining end of this room, taking the door down between the kitchen and hall, and putting a larger window and glazed backdoor into the modernised kitchen to give better views of the two children playing in the garden. R49 is very pleased with this arrangement, particularly because of the contact it affords her with the rest of the living area. 'It's so much easier to keep an eye on the children. Before I had to keep running through to get their things or see their paintings.' The kitchen is not seen as the centre of family activities but is frequently used for activities other than functional ones. R50's eight-year-old twins use the kitchen for their homework, and the family, friends and other visitors move freely between the kitchen and the one other living room to which the kitchen is directly connected. The kitchen then is not central to, but involved in the ground floor living area.

The third group consists of six respondents who want to keep their kitchen as a work area, but have this area in touch with the rest of the ground floor living area, an 'integrated workroom.' Four of the six feel they have this arrangement at present. The other two have kitchens that are integrated with other parts of the living areas in their homes and feel the need for more separation into the 'integrated workroom' style kitchen, where the actual kitchen area is purely functional, but in contact with other living areas, in contrast to the 'integrated' type where the kitchen is freely used for other activities.

The remaining five respondents are distinguished from the other three groups by their dissatisfaction. They want a kitchen that is not just 'a' room, which is how they all feel about their own at
the moment, but want a 'family' room. R 22 says her kitchen is a small kitchen which they don't live in at all. She would much prefer a larger room with table and chairs so the room could be used a lot more.

Thus, the kitchen is seen as 'a' room by these respondents in four different ways: (1) as a separated functional area; (2) an area completely integrated with the rest of the ground floor living area; (3) an 'integrated workroom' or separate working area in touch with the rest of the ground floor living area; and (4) as unsatisfactory functional areas that should be able to be used as family areas.

Whilst they form a homogeneous group, a difference in attitude also exists between those respondents identifying the kitchen as their 'own' room in the sentence completion test and direct questioning. R46 comments 'My kitchen's my room. It is. It's cosy. It lends a bit of security. As I said I find the living room big and cold, so on my own, which I am most of the time, I tend to sort of remain in the kitchen. I don't come in here much and watch t.v. or go upstairs. I stay in here and fiddle about and do my hair and whatever.' In contrast, R23 feels the kitchen is her 'own' room as she is there all the time through necessity rather than choice. About being in the kitchen she comments: 'I only have a couple of hours before picking David up from playschool and if I go in there and wash up, clean the cooker and clean the floor it takes all morning and I've done nothing else but been in the kitchen and it annoys me that I've been in there for so long. But I don't see any way I can get round that.' Of the 18 respondents in this group, four tend to resent the time spend in the kitchen, the remainder have a more favourable attitude in common with R23, like R27 who replies to the question 'Do you like being in the kitchen?':
'Yes, I do. I'd like it even more if it was the way I'd like it. But I do enjoy cooking a lot, that's why I like being in here most. Also my dream is to make it more of a living area than at present. To make it more comfortable. To get curtains and carpet. A bit more room and maybe you could get an easy chair in. I think it's a place to live in not just functional and I think it should be as nice as possible.'

In conclusion, examination of the responses to this series of attitudinal questions, in relation to attitudes towards the kitchen expressed in the sentence completion test, highlights those thinking of the kitchen as a 'family' room as a homogeneous group. Respondents who referred to the kitchen as their 'own' room are seen to be divided between those who like this and those who feel resentful about their time spent there. Those respondents to whom the kitchen is just 'a' room in the sentence completion test are differentiated by their responses to these questions into four subgroups.

The observed relationship between kitchen size and orientation in (7.4) raised the possibility that kitchen size may influence the women's orientation. However, no further relationships between kitchen size and any of the women's answers to the series of attitudinal questions discussed in Part Two of this chapter were noted. This would suggest that kitchen size is not an overriding influence on the women's orientations towards the kitchen. The significant relationships found between answers to these attitudinal questions and the women's orientations further substantiates the existence of these orientations. This data suggests that the women's attitudes towards the kitchen may be part of a wider complex of attitudes.
Analysis of preliminary group discussions (Chapter 3) suggested a link between attitudes to the kitchen and family activities. The discussions also showed that the kitchen could not be considered in isolation from other rooms in the house, especially those on the ground floor. Therefore, prior to the examination of family activity patterns in chapter nine, respondents orientations towards the lounge are explored in Chapter 8.
Table 54.
RESPONSE TO SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST ON THE KITCHEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses Made</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 55.
FRAME OF REFERENCE OF FIRST FIVE RESPONSES TO SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Frame of Reference</th>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction/ Dis-satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Surface</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Functional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number (%) of Responses</td>
<td>150 (55)</td>
<td>120 (45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 56.
ANALYSIS OF FIRST FIVE RESPONSES MADE IN SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST TO SHOW RANGE AND NUMBER OF RESPONSES
ACCORDING TO ORIENTATION OF RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Functional Orientation</th>
<th>Frame of Reference</th>
<th>Other Orientation</th>
<th>Total % Number Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>'Family'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction/Dis-satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Surface</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number (%)</td>
<td>35 (47)</td>
<td>46 (51)</td>
<td>69 (66)</td>
<td>40 (53)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 57.

**ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND KITCHEN SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Kitchen Size $^1$</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-8 m$^2$</td>
<td>8-16 m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>5 (33)</td>
<td>10 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>15 (83)</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>16 (76)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>36 (67)</td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^2\chi^2 = 10.6; \text{ d.f.} = 2; p < .01$.

$^1$'Kitchen' area only of kitchen/diners measured.

Table 58.

**ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND STANDARD OF KITCHEN WORK SEQUENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Standard of Kitchen Work Sequence</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>One Fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>10 (43)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
<td>10 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^2\chi^2 = 10.1; \text{ d.f.} = 4; p < .05$.
Table 59.
RESPONDENTS 'OWN' ROOM AND REASONS FOR CHOICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Chosen As 'Own' Room</th>
<th>Reason for Choice</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Territoriality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>13 (24)</td>
<td>9 (16)</td>
<td>16 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 60.
ORIENTATION TO KITCHEN AND CHOICE OF KITCHEN AS 'OWN' ROOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Room Chosen as 'Own' Room</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Other/None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>4 (27)</td>
<td>11 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>14 (78)</td>
<td>4 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>21 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
<td>36 (67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 26.8; d.f. = 2; p < .001.
### Table 61.

**RESPONDENTS FAVOURITE ROOM AND REASONS FOR CHOICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Chosen As Favourite Room</th>
<th>Relaxation</th>
<th>Sunny</th>
<th>Lot of Time Spent There</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>No Particular Reason</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
<td>17 (31)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 62.

**ORIENTATION TO KITCHEN AND CHOICE OF KITCHEN AS 'FAVOURITE' ROOM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Room Chosen as Favourite Room</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Other/None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>13 (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
<td>11 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>21 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (17)</td>
<td>45 (83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 10.72; \text{ d.f.} = 2; p < .01$

### Table 63.

**ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND USE OF THE KITCHEN FOR RELAXATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Use of the Kitchen for Relaxation</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>13 (24)</td>
<td>10 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 11.2; \text{ d.f.} = 4; p < .05.$

### Table 64.

**ORIENTATION TO KITCHEN AND ATTITUDE TO BEING IN THE KITCHEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Attitude to Being in the Kitchen</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Likes Related to Enjoyable Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>8 (53)</td>
<td>5 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>4 (19)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19 (35)</td>
<td>13 (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 25.7; \text{ d.f.} = 8; p < .01.$
Table 65.
ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND DISSATISFACTION WITH THE KITCHEN FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SIX TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>( \bar{x} \pm \text{S.E.} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.33 ± 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>4 6 2 2 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.28 ± 0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>1 5 4 5 2 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.05 ± 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>3 5 6 4 1 2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t = 2.00; \text{d.f.} = 52; p < .05 \) on group mean scores of 'family' vs. combined 'own' and 'A' (2.15 ± 2.2).

Table 66.
ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND AMOUNT OF DISSATISFACTION WITH KITCHEN EXPRESSED DURING FIRST FIVE RESPONSES IN SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>( \bar{x} \pm \text{S.E.} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.73 ± 0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>5 2 3 2 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.22 ± 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>3 2 4 6 3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.19 ± 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>2 4 8 3 3 1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t = 1.11; \text{d.f.} = 52; p < .10, \text{N.S.} \) on group mean scores of 'family' vs. combined 'own' and 'A' (2.21 ± 0.21).
Table 67.

ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND ANALYSIS OF DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED IN FIRST FIVE RESPONSES IN SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Total Number (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>'A'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>7 (27)</td>
<td>9 (22)</td>
<td>9 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>8 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>4 (15)</td>
<td>6 (15)</td>
<td>8 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>8 (20)</td>
<td>11 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Surface</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
<td>0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Functional</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number (%) of Dissatisfied Comments</td>
<td>26 (100) 40 (100) 46 (100) 112 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 68.

ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND ATTITUDE TO PRESENCE OF OTHERS IN KITCHEN

A. HUSBAND AND CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Presence of Others in Kitchen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>With Reservations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>11 (73)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>9 (50)</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>6 (29)</td>
<td>9 (43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.1; \text{ d.f.} = 4; p = .088, \text{ N.S.} \]

\[ \chi^2 = 5.44; \text{ d.f.} = 4; p > .10, \text{ N.S.} \]

1 Favourable With Reservations: for example, R35 speaking about her children: 'I like them to come and speak to me, otherwise I feel isolated, but I dislike them playing in the kitchen, because of the lack of space and safety.'

Attitudes towards the company of relatives and friends were more clear cut.
Table 68.

ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND ATTITUDE TO PRESENCE OF OTHERS IN "KITCHEN"

B. RELATIVES AND FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>Presence of Others in Kitchen</th>
<th>Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>11 (73)</td>
<td>4 (27)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>13 (72)</td>
<td>5 (28)</td>
<td>18 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>21 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 2.33; d.f. = 2; p < .10, N.S.

χ² = 2.35; d.f. = 2; p > .10, N.S.
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8.1. **Introduction**

This chapter explores in detail the respondents' orientations towards the lounge and the relationship between these and the background characteristics of the respondents. In order to assess attitudes towards the lounge respondents were given a second sentence completion test. The ten sentences began with: 'My lounge ...'

The term 'lounge' was chosen since pre-pilot and pilot work indicated of the range of other terms: 'sitting room,' 'front room,' 'other room,' in common use, it was the least ambiguous to all social classes. The procedure following during the administration of the test was the same as that for the sentence completion test on the kitchen (Chapter 7), the methodology for which is outlined in Chapter 4.

8.2. **Analysis of the Response**

As in the 'kitchen' sentence completion test, the number of responses per respondent varied between five and ten - the modal value being 5 and the mean 6.1 (Table 69). The mean response rate was slightly lower than that for 'My kitchen ...' (6.7), which might possibly have reflected the position of this test, in the middle of the interview. Despite the benefit of practice gained in the completion of the first test, respondents justifiably might have felt quite tired. In addition, during analysis of the response it was noted that respondents expressed less dissatisfaction with their lounges than with their kitchens. This would tend to suggest that their feelings about the lounge were not as strong as those concerning their kitchen, which might also have contributed to the slightly lower response rate. A class difference in the number of responses made in both tests was noted. This is probably due
to the middle class respondents greater articulation in a situation of this nature (Table 70).

Examination of the responses suggested that the fifty-four respondents could be divided into four groups, on the basis of their orientation towards the lounge.

The first group of 15 respondents emphasised the role of their lounges as 'activity' rooms. For example, R3 makes the following comments in her sentence completion test:

' My lounge is far too congested. Part of it is used as my husband's study.'
'My lounge is a centre for many family activities.'
'My lounge is lacking in electricity points. There's only one in the room which is ridiculous for the t.v., the stereo, the ironing.'
'My lounge has quite a nice atmosphere. I don't like the sort of lounge where you walk in and you can't put a cup down. I admire that sort in a magazine, but I don't think I'd like it to live in. I think I prefer my mess really, a place where people should be able to come and relax and not worry too much.'

The second group of 13 respondents tended to concentrate on the lounge as an area for relaxation. R29 comments:

'I like it to be cosy. It's a place you've got to be comfortable in really.'
'I like it to be a warm room.'
'... it's a place for you all to relax in.'

The third group of 20 respondents stressed the function of the lounge as an area for display rather than for doing things. For example, R9 comments:
'My lounge is a bit small. I would like the space for couple more pieces of furniture, like a china cabinet, for things I've got packed away.'

The fourth group of 6 respondents were termed sitting room oriented. Their comments demonstrated concern with the way their lounged looked, suggesting similarities with those women of a display orientation. However, specific references to the importance of the lounge for display were absent. Only a minority of their comments referred to activities and relaxation.

As all respondents made at least five responses, the first five responses were analysed in depth to examine the range of comments made and areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The 270 comments made were distributed across the following twelve topics, in order of magnitude: size (48); relaxation/comfort (31); arrangement (29); light/airy (28); activities (27); shape (25); access (25); miscellaneous functional (17); view (13); like (12); heating (10); tidy (5).

The response profiles for each of the four orientations are shown in Figure 10. In addition to talking about their lounge in terms of activities, activity oriented women tended to make comments about its size and subjective comments about the room being light and airy. Those oriented towards the lounge as an area for relaxation tended to concentrate on comments of this nature. The remainder of their comments were spread fairly equally between the other topics, apart from slightly more on activities. Shape, followed by size, the subjective category light and airy and access were the main categories of response of those women who appeared oriented towards their lounge as a sitting room. Those respondents to whom the
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Figure 10.
The display function of the lounge was of primary importance made most responses in terms of its size; arrangement; access and miscellaneous functional aspects. Respondents oriented towards the lounge as a sitting or display area tended to show more dissatisfaction in their responses to the sentence completion test as shown in Table 71. The individual response categories will now be examined in greater detail (Table 72).

8.3 Categories of Response

As in the sentence completion test on the kitchen, size was the largest response category, with 48 comments made by 39 respondents. Forty-seven percent of the comments on size were made by women oriented towards their lounge as a room for display. The majority of the women commented favourably on the spaciousness of their lounge. R31 (display oriented) has a lounge/diner which she uses as a lounge and considers:

'A nice size for a sitting room, but not if I had to have a dining table and chairs in it. It would be squashy and I don't want a squashy sitting room. Besides they would spoil the room.'

Of the eleven unfavourable comments on lounge size, three stressed that it was too small for activities. For example:

R22 (activity oriented) - 'My lounge is too small to have a work area where the family can work together.' (At the moment she has a desk upstairs.) 'I'd like a desk. Then there wouldn't be the feeling that "Mummy's up there," and I could be part of the family.' Another five respondents were dissatisfied with room size for arranging their furniture.

R9 (display oriented) - 'My lounge is too small. I'd like the space for a couple more pieces of furniture, like a china cabinet, as everything's packed away.' (Referring to ornaments, china stored
in her sideboard.) R10 (display oriented) - 'It's too small for the long furniture they make these days.'

Responses in the category relaxation and comfort were those which referred to the lounge as 'cosy,' 'homely,' 'comfortable,' and 'relaxing.' Nearly all of these comments were made by those respondents grouped together as relaxation oriented. For example:

R19 (relaxation oriented) - My lounge 'is a place to relax. That's most important.'

R28 (relaxation oriented) - My lounge 'is a room primarily for relaxation. All evidence of toys is put away by the evening so my husband and I can relax and be ourselves, not just parents.'

R41 (relaxation oriented) - My lounge 'is comfortable to relax in.'

R29 (relaxation oriented) - My lounge 'is cosy. I like it to be cosy. Well, it's a place you've got to be comfortable in really.'

The majority of responses concerned with the arrangement of the lounge were made by the display oriented women. These responses could be sub-divided into general comments (13) and comments on specific features which hindered arrangement (16). As an example of the former, R1, R31 and R14 (all display oriented) feel:

R1 'My lounge is good. I can do a lot with it.'

R31 - '... I can arrange it as I want.'

R14 - 'My lounge is easy to change round. It's just as well it's a big room as I usually have a swop around. I like doing that.'

Two women felt limited this way. For example:

R9 (display oriented) - '... I can't turn the room round really. It has to stay that way and I like a change.'
As an example of the second group, nine respondents commented on the use of electrical equipment in terms of its effect on the arrangement of the lounge. For example:

R36 (activity oriented) - 'My lounge is arranged round the stereo.'

R11 (display oriented) - The television aerial point is in a stupid place, so you open the door onto the t.v.

R14 (display oriented) - 'The t.v. point means you have to have everything centred on the t.v., so we got a portable.'

The other seven respondents who made specific comments remarked upon the unsuitability of the location of a built-in cupboard in the lounge. For example, R13, R15 and R45, all display oriented:

R13 - 'The cupboard is an eyesore and restricts furniture arrangement.'

R15 - 'There's no point having it in the sitting room.'

R45 - 'You shouldn't have a boiler cupboard in the lounge. Everyone comes in and says "What have you got a cupboard like that in there for?" It should be in the hall.'

The category light and airy refers to respondent's subjective feelings about the environment and featured notably in the response profiles of activity and sitting room oriented respondents. The majority of comments were favourable:

R25 (display oriented) - 'nice and light.'

R52 (activity oriented) - 'bright and cheerful'

The two unfavourable comments came from women who were conscious of their lounge being dark:

R6 (activity oriented) - 'My lounge is not as sunny as the kitchen. It only gets the sun on summer evenings. It's nice to come into a cool room in summer, but dull in winter, so its decorated in yellow to make it look more summery.'
R4 (sitting oriented) - 'My lounge is a bit dark. Having a
glass door through to the kitchen-diner brightens it up a bit.'

Only 3 of the 27 responses which referred to activities were
made by display or sitting oriented women. Most came from activity
oriented group. For example:

R40 (activity oriented) - 'My lounge is a "living room." Well,
we use it. Some people have their lounge sort of shut away, but
we use it a lot.'

R19 (relaxation oriented) - 'My lounge is used to watch t.v.;
to play family games; to have a snack lunchtimes; to eat our evening
meal as well.'

Only two women referred to the lounge as an activity centre unfavourably:

R6 (activity oriented) - 'It just gets overcrowded when the
children put their toys all over the place. But you can't help it.
You just have to put up with it.'

R38 (relaxation oriented) - 'My lounge is overcrowded. I would
love another room, however small, so the children could keep their
toys in it and the lounge could be our room. I'd just like to get
the kids and their toys out of the way.'

Consideration of all the responses which mentioned shape show
a fairly even distribution across the four orientations (Table 72).
Comments about shape formed a larger proportion of the response of
the sitting oriented women (Figure 10). Comments were evenly
divided into favourable (13) and unfavourable (12) aspects of room
shape. All but one of the problems stemmed from difficulties in
furniture arrangement. Three women found the minor arm of their
'L' shaped lounges too small for a table. Another four wanted wider,
squerer rooms as they had difficulty furnishing their narrow lounges,
Another four 'activity and 'relaxation' oriented women made more subjective comments about lack of a focal point in the context of furniture arrangement. The remaining respondent thought her ceiling was too low.

The majority of responses about access were made by the display-oriented women (Table 72). In addition, the majority of comments concerning access were unfavourable. Respondents disliked ground floor layouts which necessitated the use of the lounge as a throughfare. The comments were linked to two design features: staircases in the lounge and the only door to the back of the house in the lounge. For example, R2 is 'sitting' oriented and has a staircase in her lounge:

'My lounge has a staircase in it which I don't like. I'm not happy about everything being dragged through.'

R4 (sitting oriented; staircase in lounge) - '... You're in the sitting before you know where you are.'

R11 (display oriented; main exit to back garden in lounge) - 'My lounge has a door going to the back, which I don't like because of the children's mess. I don't mind a patio door, but not one you have to use.'

Ten respondents lived in houses where the main exit to the back garden was in the lounge. All but one of these found this unacceptable. Only those 'sitting' or 'display' oriented women found a staircase in the lounge unacceptable. Some display oriented women also disliked the French doors in their lounge. For example, R32:

'My lounge has French windows, which I don't use. When I did, the children used to run round and muck up the room.'
The remaining response categories were classed as minor (under 25 responses). The majority of miscellaneous functional comments were made by 'display' oriented respondents and consisted of odd comments such as:

R24 (display oriented) - 'My lounge has very nice parquet flooring.'

One unfavourable and twelve favourable comments were made on the view from the lounge. Most were made by activity or relaxation oriented respondents.

R3 (relaxation oriented) - 'My lounge has a pleasant outlook, although not too open to the outside world.'

R12 (activity oriented) - 'My lounge has a lovely view over fields.'

Twelve respondents specifically said they liked their lounges. Half of these comments were made by 'display' oriented respondents. A small number of functional comments were made by respondents of all four orientations on heating. Tidiness was commented on by five relaxation oriented respondents.

8.4. Arrangement of the Lounge

In order to examine differences in orientation towards the lounge in more depth the women were asked to comment on the way they had arranged their lounge.

Comments on room arrangement confirmed the distinctions between the four groups of women. The women classified as display oriented in the ten statements test again concentrated on arrangement of the room for display purposes, as shown by the following comments made by display oriented women:

R1 - 'I'd like more furniture to make it more attractive.'

R15 - On arrangement 'It's fairly good. I moved it round a lot
to get it like this. The three piece suite was awkward so now I have one chair and a settee. I'm going to buy another display unit when I can. I like to have things to show off.'

R9 - 'It's not big enough. I'd like the space for more furniture. Like a china cabinet. I don't like that door. You can't change the room around; it has to be that really, and I do like a change. I shouldn't really have this peacock blue (the colour predominating in suite, carpet, curtains), but I've had it for years and you just can't get rid of everything when you move. I go into the house 3 doors down and it looks much bigger, everything's light. It's just what you've got in there.'

In contrast, the activity oriented women concentrated on aspects of use of the lounge by the family.

R7 - 'It's arranged mainly for the children so they can't hurt themselves.'

R18 - 'The t.v. position is fixed, because that is where the aerial point is. It sounds terrible to say it's arranged around the t.v., but it is. The large settee arranged by the t.v. is purely to leave a bit more floor space, which is much better than how we had it previously at right angles to the window.'

R48 - 'Well, I've recently changed the furniture around to give the most possible floor space.'

R42 - 'I like the sofa round the fireplace and the t.v. in the corner, if you don't always want it on. The piano is down the other end so the kids don't disturb you with their playing. The record player is down there, too. That end is arranged more for the children so we can have the arrangement we want here.'
Relaxation oriented respondents commented on room arrangement in the context of relaxation.

R19 - 'Well, it's really done so that other than the t.v., we can talk easily to one another. We're not on top of one another, It's just comfortable, really.'

It was also noted that parts of their comments referred to how they used their rooms, which makes them closer to the activity oriented women, in terms of their frames of reference. For example:

R20 - 'It's arranged to leave as much space as possible between the t.v. and the chairs and the settee so there's lots of room in the middle. We were a bit puzzled as to where to put the t.v. at first, as it seemed to stick out and we had Michael (aged 2) in mind.'

The majority of comments on the arrangement of the lounge made by the sitting oriented respondents were in the context of the creation of a casual atmosphere.

R46 - 'It's arranged to give space. That wall jutting out takes your freedom away. The mirrors are there to do away with feeling cramped and hemmed in. I've tried to amke it so there's something interesting to look at whichever chair you're in. It's dark along that wall, so I chose one light chair to set the wall back. Everythink is at a low level deliberately. I've got blinds, not curtains which tend to take a lot out of the room as well. I took a while to work out but I'm happy with the arrangement now.'

R2 - 'I'm quite happy. I don't think a sitting room should have a lot of furniture in it, it's a place to sit and relax.'

R44 - 'It's done mostly so that when people are chatting, it's cosy round the fire. The coal fire is a very important focal point even when it's not alight. The t.v. is banished to the kitchen.'
These comments are in contrast to those made by display oriented women outlined above. This difference confirms the distinction between sitting and display orientations.

It was noticed from the more detailed content analysis that comments about television came from respondents in all groups. This was expected, as all respondents had one and all lounges were used, to some extent. Therefore, although watching television could be described as a reference to activity it was one common to all respondents. However, regarding stereo systems, although ownership was spread throughout the respondents, it was the 'activity' oriented ones who mentioned the arrangement of the room around the stereo. A lounge which allowed flexibility of arrangement was a feature appreciated by respondents in all groups. However, references to liking 'having a change round' and 'frequently having a change round' were much more common amongst display oriented women.

With regard to the general appearance and furnishings of the lounge, R9 is display oriented, her lounge is furnished with a three-piece suite, radiogram and television. Suite, carpet, curtains and wallpaper are carefully coordinated in shades of peacock blue. R7 is activity oriented. As she says, her lounge is furnished bearing her children in mind. Nearly all ornaments have been removed for safekeeping, a large fireguard protects the fireplace and a toy sack sits in the corner. However, 'activity' oriented respondents' lounges could be smart and those of display oriented respondents not necessarily furnished with brand new furniture. R48 is 'activity' oriented towards her lounge, which has superior furnishings to the rest of house, including a piano, new fitted carpet and velvet covered suite. R16 is 'display' oriented. Her shabby but well-cared-for lounge is furnished with heavy, old fashioned
second-hand furniture and a carpet square showing signs of wear.

Therefore, from the comments in the sentence completion test and the respondents amplification with regard to the arrangement of their lounges, it would seem that four groupings exist. The two groups display and activity appear to be situated at opposite ends of a scale, the 'display' oriented respondents stressing 'things' and the 'activity' oriented respondents stressing people in their descriptions of their lounge and comments on its arrangement. Positioned near to the 'activity' orientation on this scale is the relaxation oriented group who stress relaxation when describing their lounges and tend to mention activities rather than the display of objects when commenting on room arrangement. The 'sitting' oriented respondents initially appear only slightly different from the display oriented respondents, however, from their comments on the arrangement of the lounge it is seen that they are also concerned with the establishment of an atmosphere conducive to relaxation in the lounge. These comments establish the sitting orientation as a distinct orientation between 'relaxation' and 'display.' Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation focused on people</th>
<th>Orientation focused on objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Sitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation</td>
<td>Display</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5. The Relationship Between Houseplan, Life Style and Orientation To the Lounge

No relationship was found between the women's orientation to the lounge and the layout of the ground floor or the age of the children in the family (data not shown). A significant relationship was found between socio-economic status and orientation (Table 73). The majority of middle-class women were shown to be 'relaxation' or 'activity' oriented, whereas the majority of working class women
were 'sitting' or 'display' oriented. A significant relationship was also observed between the size of the lounge and orientation (Table 74). Women with large lounges (19 m$^2$ and over) tended to be 'activity' oriented, whilst those with small lounges (under 19 m$^2$) tended to be 'display' oriented. However, all of the large lounges were owned by middle class women. Thus, it is not clear whether a relationship exists between lounge size and orientation. When the orientations of only those respondents living in small lounges is considered, only three (38%) of the eight middle class women have a 'display' orientation compared to sixteen (67%) of the twenty-four working class women (Table 75). Therefore, it would appear that lounge size is not an over-riding influence on orientation towards the lounge. This is further substantiated by the comments of the three 'activity' oriented women with small lounges who felt it had 'adequate space' (R8); 'no limitations' (R40); 'is fairly spacious' (R48). In addition, of the six unfavourable comments made about lounge size by middle class respondents (out of a total eleven for the whole sample), half were made by women with large lounges.

8.6. Keeping a 'Best' Room

Respondents were asked: 'Some people like to keep one room as a 'best' room. Do you?' Whether or not the women were in favour of keeping a 'best' room is significantly correlated with their orientation (Table 76). The idea or actuality of a 'best' room was favoured by those whose primary orientation towards the lounge was as a 'display' or 'sitting' room. All of the 'display' oriented women and all but one (5, 83%) of the 'sitting' oriented women had a favourable orientation, that is they had or would like to keep a 'best' room. In contrast, just over half (7, 54%) of those 'relaxation' oriented and three-quarters (11, 73%) of those 'activity' oriented were opposed to the
idea or practice. Overall, thirty-five (64%) of respondents had or would like to have had a 'best' room. A significantly higher percentage (79%, 19) of working class women were in favour of a 'best' room whereas only half (16, 53%) of the middle class women were in favour of the idea or practice (Table 77). In addition, there would appear to be an interesting difference in the concept of a 'best' room between middle and working class respondents. For the working class women it appeared difficult to have a 'best' room unless it could be shut off, whereas the middle class respondents did not need to have this embargo on the use of their 'best' room for other things. For example, middle class R43 likes to keep a 'best room but its use for family activity is not precluded:

'The sitting room. We like to sit in a room that's reasonably tidy and would hate to invite friends into a cluttered room.' Similarly, R41, also middle class, has a best room: 'The lounge is a family room, but it doesn't look too lived in.'

In contrast, working class R9 comments on her 'best' room, her lounge:

'I like to shut it off and keep it nice.' Similarly, R11, who has a kitchen/diner plus lounge:

'I try to keep this room a best room. When I was a kid we had a best room and lived in the kitchen and dining room. But you need a big house. If I had room, I would probably keep the t.v in there (lounge), but have everything else done in the dining room.' R14 would like to have a 'best' room but feels she cannot at the moment with her kitchen/diner plus lounge house plan:

'Yes, that's what I'd like to do with this room. If I had a dining room then the kids could be in there more and then if people did come you'd know the room was clean and tidy and in the evening you could go in there.'
There is a significant relationship between lounge size and attitude towards keeping a 'best' room (Table 78). The majority of women with small lounges are in favour of keeping a 'best' room. However, when attitudes towards having a 'best' room and orientation towards the lounge are considered by lounge size (Table 79), it is apparent that independent of lounge size 'activity' oriented respondents are against keeping a best room, in contrast to display oriented respondents who are in favour of the idea or practice. Thus, the role of size in the women's attitudes towards keeping a best room is not clear.

Unlike orientation to the lounge, the effect of size would not appear to be linked to the fact that in this sample, only middle class respondents had large lounges, since the effect of size on keeping a 'best' room continues to be shown when respondents with small lounges only are considered (Table 80). Keeping a 'best' room is unrelated to the layout of the ground floor and the number and age of children in the family (data not shown).

8.7. Summary

Analysis of the sentence completion test 'My lounge ...' reveals four groups of women, distinguished by their orientation towards the lounge as an area primarily for 'activity,' 'relaxation,' 'sitting,' or 'display.' Analysis of comments on the arrangement of the lounge provided further confirmation of this distinction between the women in terms of their orientation. Orientation to the lounge was significantly related to attitudes towards keeping a 'best' room, more 'display' and 'sitting' oriented women were in favour of keeping a 'best' room than those 'relaxing' and activity' oriented.
No relationships were found between either orientation to the lounge or attitudes towards keeping a best room and the layout of the ground floor or the number and ages of children in the household. A significant relationship between orientation and socio-economic status was noted. Middle class women were more likely to have a 'relaxation' or 'activity' orientation towards the lounge, whilst the majority of working class women were 'display' oriented. Similarly, more working class women than middle class women were in favour of a 'best' room, although this did not approach the level of statistical significance.

Although statistically significant relationships were found between lounge size and orientation to the lounge and attitudes towards keeping a 'best' room, the role of size is not clear.

Examination of attitudes towards having a 'best' room highlights the difference between the four orientations towards the lounge in terms of the degree of separation of function desired by each. All but one of those 'sitting' or 'display' oriented have or would like to have a 'best' room and most demand separation between the space for this function and others like family activities. 'Relaxation' and 'activity' oriented respondents either do not regard keeping a 'best' room as incompatible with its use for other activities, their negative desire for separation of function stemming from a less formalised idea of a best room, or do not subscribe to the idea of keeping a 'best' room at all.

Chapter 9 examines the relationship between orientation to the lounge, orientation to the kitchen and family activities and discusses further the concept of separation of function in the context of this relationship.
Table 69.

RESPONSE TO SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST ON THE LOUNGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses Made</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 70.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONSE RATE TO BOTH SENTENCE COMPLETION TESTS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses Made</th>
<th>Kitchen Class</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Lounge Class</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 (41)</td>
<td>10 (59)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
<td>12 (44)</td>
<td>15 (56)</td>
<td>27 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>8 (40)</td>
<td>12 (60)</td>
<td>20 (100)</td>
<td>7 (54)</td>
<td>6 (46)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>15 (88)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
<td>11 (79)</td>
<td>3 (21)</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 71.

ORIENTATION TO THE LOUNGE AND DISSATISFACTION EXPRESSED IN FIRST FIVE RESPONSES TO SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>10 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing</td>
<td>11 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting</td>
<td>- (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>10 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>31 (57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 72.

ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST FIVE RESPONSES TO THE SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST TO SHOW RANGE AND NUMBER OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO ORIENTATION OF RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Orientation to Lounge</th>
<th>Total (%) Number of Comments</th>
<th>Total (%) Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major: Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation/Comfort</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Relaxing</td>
<td>Sitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
<td>26 (84)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light/Airey</td>
<td>10 (36)</td>
<td>8 (30)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>16 (59)</td>
<td>8 (30)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>7 (28)</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor: Miscellaneous Functional</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View</td>
<td>5 (38)</td>
<td>4 (31)</td>
<td>2 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>4 (33)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidy</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>5 (100)</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Comments</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 73. ORIENTATION TO LOUNGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Activity'</td>
<td>12 (80)</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Relaxing'</td>
<td>9 (69)</td>
<td>4 (31)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Sitting'</td>
<td>5 (87)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Display'</td>
<td>4 (20)</td>
<td>16 (80)</td>
<td>20 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 16.7 \text{ d.f.} = 3 \text{ p} = < .001 \)

### Table 74. ORIENTATION TO LOUNGE AND SIZE OF LOUNGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Lounge Size</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 19 m²</td>
<td>19 m² and Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Activity'</td>
<td>6 (40)</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Relaxing'</td>
<td>5 (38)</td>
<td>8 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Sitting'</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>4 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Display'</td>
<td>19 (95)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>32 (59)</td>
<td>22 (41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 10.2 \text{ d.f.} = 3 \text{ p} = < .001 \)

### Table 75. ORIENTATION TO LOUNGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF RESPONDENTS WITH SMALL LOUNGES (Under 19 m²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Activity'</td>
<td>30 (50)</td>
<td>3 (50)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Relaxing'</td>
<td>1 (20)</td>
<td>4 (80)</td>
<td>5 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Sitting'</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td>2 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Display'</td>
<td>3 (16)</td>
<td>16 (84)</td>
<td>19 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
<td>24 (75)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 76.

**ORIENTATION TO LOUNGE AND ATTITUDE TO 'BEST' ROOM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relaxing</th>
<th>Sitting</th>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Favour:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Would Like To</td>
<td>Against</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Activity'</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>11 (73)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Relaxing'</td>
<td>5 (38)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>7 (54)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Sitting'</td>
<td>4 (67)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Display'</td>
<td>14 (44)</td>
<td>11 (20)</td>
<td>- (1)</td>
<td>20 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>11 (20)</td>
<td>19 (36)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 25.6$ d.f. = 6 $p = < .001$

### Table 77.

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND ATTITUDE TO 'BEST' ROOM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude to Keeping a 'Best' Room</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Favour: Yes</td>
<td>12 (50)</td>
<td>12 (50)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Like To</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>7 (64)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>14 (74)</td>
<td>5 (26)</td>
<td>19 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 4.47$ d.f. = 2 $p = > .10$ n.s. (2 x 3 test) $\chi^2 = 3.90$ d.f. = 1 $p = < .05$ (2x2 test).

### Table 78.

**SIZE OF LOUNGE AND ATTITUDE TO KEEPING A 'BEST' ROOM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Lounge</th>
<th>Attitude to Keeping a 'Best' Room</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In Favour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>16 (50)</td>
<td>9 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>8 (36)</td>
<td>2 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>11 (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 6.82$ d.f. = 2 $p = < .05$. 
Table 79.

ORIENTATION TO THE LOUNGE, ATTITUDE TO 'BEST' ROOM AND LOUNGE SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lounge Size</th>
<th>Orientation to Lounge</th>
<th>Attitude To Keeping A 'Best' Room</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Would Like To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>'Activity'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Relaxing'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Sitting'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Display'</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>'Activity'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Relaxing'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Sitting'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Display'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 80.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND ATTITUDE TO KEEPING A 'BEST' ROOM OF RESPONDENTS WITH SMALL LOUNGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude to Keeping a 'Best' Room</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Favour: Yes</td>
<td>4 (25)</td>
<td>12 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Like To</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>7 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>5 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
<td>24 (75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CHAPTER NINE

Orientation and Behaviour

## Part One. Separation of Function.
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Part One - Separation of Function

9.1. Introduction. The Definition of Separation of Function

Chapter 8 describes four orientations towards the lounge. 'Relaxing' and 'activity' oriented women (13 and 15 respondents) regard their lounge as an area for interaction, whereas 'sitting' and 'display' oriented women (6 and 20 respectively) see their lounges as areas for quiet sitting and showing off furnishings.

In connection with their orientation towards the lounge, Chapter 8 looks at how the women felt about a 'best' room. The women's answers divided them three ways: those who kept one room for 'best' (19 respondents) (the lounge); those who would like to be able to keep a 'best' room (11); and those opposed to the idea or practice (24).

From their orientation towards the lounge and attitudes towards a 'best' room, respondents can be divided into two groups: (1) women who indicate a desire to reserve different areas of the home for specific functions in contrast to (2) women who do not indicate a desire to set aside certain spaces in the home for specific functions. This is referred to in this analysis as separation of function and is either positive or negative.

For example, 'relaxing' and 'activity' oriented women see their lounge as an area where a number of activities may take place as well as sitting and the display of furniture, pictures, ornaments etc. These two orientations are taken as indicative of negative separation of function. The women do not want to set aside certain spaces in the home for specific functions. Opposition to a 'best' room was also taken as indicative of negative separation of function.

'Sitting' and 'display' oriented women emphasise their idea of the lounge as an area primarily for sitting quietly and showing
off furnishings, functions they see as incompatible with some family activities, for example eating, children's games. These two orientations are taken as indicators of positive separation of function. The women want to reserve different areas of the home for specific functions. The keeping of or a desire to keep a 'best' room were also taken as indicative of positive separation of function.

Two additional indicators were used to assess separation of function. These were the women's attitudes towards meals and their attitudes towards visitors to the home. These are discussed in full in part two of Chapter 10 which documents family behaviour, however a brief description is given here in order to explain the construction of the scale measuring separation of function.

**Attitudes Towards Meals**

One dimension of family meal patterns distinguished in the analysis of women's attitudes towards meals (9.7) is an attitude to meals as formal occasions as opposed to meals as informal-relaxed situations. For two respondents, all meals are formal occasions. A more common pattern is for one meal, Sunday lunch, to be more formal. For example,

R3 - 'Sundays it's more elaborate.'
R26 - 'We're only together for Sunday lunch.'
R28 - 'We use the dining table for Sunday lunch.'

Meals where relaxation was mentioned were commonly midday snacks for just one or two members of the family, or evening meals.

R19 - 'We eat in the lounge in front of the t.v. as my husband likes comfort and relaxation.'
R41 - 'The men like to slump in comfort.'
R33 - 'Dad sometimes watches the sport in comfort.' (Saturday lunch)
As a sub-group of this dimension, meals could range from formal special to informal casual. For example R20 and her husband have a special meal together including a bottle of wine on Saturday nights without the children. R36 and her husband have a special meal on Sunday nights. R22 feeds her 7-year-old and baby first on weeknights, at the weekend she allows the eldest to join her and her husband for a special meal.

Breakfasts tended to be casual meals for the majority, families eating in relays or dribs and drabs. Many felt like R43;

'I'm not bothered about it as a meal.'

This brings in a third dimension. Meals as occasions invested with some values and meals as the intake of food, the latter referring to 'breakfast-on-the-move' and children being fed first in the evening to 'get them out of the way' for convenience.

These then are the components of the formal-informal relaxed dimension of family meals. Other dimensions of meal patterns and distribution of these patterns in terms of the frequency and combination with which they are found amongst the families is discussed in Part Two of Chapter 9 (section 9.8).

For the purposes of assessment of the separation of function, respondents' family meal patterns were assessed overall as formal, neutral, or informal. Eighteen families were assessed as 'formal' in their meal patterns, 14 as 'intermediate' and 22 as 'informal.' A formal family meal pattern was taken as an indication of positive separation of function and an informal family meal pattern as an indication of negative separation of function. Neutral meal patterns were not considered indicative of the direction of the respondents' separation of function.
Attitudes Towards Visitors

Inspection of the women's comments on aspects of the entertainment of visitors to the home (9.7) reveals another distinct orientation within the sample, namely those who have a ceremonial orientation towards entertainment as opposed to those who are informally oriented. As the following comments illustrate, respondents with a ceremonial orientation were distinguished by their references to specific areas of the house being designated suitable for visitors; setting aside different areas for eating and relaxing and keeping the 'work' aspects of meals out of sight.

R9 - 'This (her kitchen/diner) is better than a lounge/diner, as you can set the lounge aside for guests.'

R37 - 'It's nice, as having a separate dining room means guests don't have to go through the kitchen.'

R21 (who has a lounge/diner) - 'I don't like feeding guests in the same room as entertaining them.'

R31 - 'I like the lounge cut off. Obviously you want to go there after you've had your meals.'

R33 - 'We eat in the dining room and then go into the lounge and leave the dishes out of sight.'

R7 - 'It's o.k. as I can prepare meals without being seen.'

References to such concerns were not made by informally oriented women whose comments demonstrated their more casual, relaxed style of entertainment. For example, visiting personal friends and neighbours went wherever these respondents happened to be in the house. In contrast, amongst those ceremonially oriented, a small group entertained personal friends and neighbours, even when calling casually, in the lounge. Some of this group also emphasised that it was only
their 'best friend' who came into the kitchen and two made only pre-
arranged dates to entertain friends, for example for lunch or for an
organised coffee morning. Visiting relatives were entertained in-
formally by the majority of the women, apart from five of those cerem-
onially oriented who felt, like R41, that relatives 'counted as proper
visitors.' Entertainment of friends of the couple also highlighted
the difference orientations. Those informally oriented emphasised
their casual relaxed approach:

R3 - 'We're informal anyway.'

In contrast, those ceremonially oriented described themselves
as:

R39 'A little more formal.'

R5 - 'We use the kitchen/diner for meals and then go straight
back (to the lounge).'

R44 - 'We give special invitations to dinner parties.'

For many of the respondents, the 'ceremonial' aspect centred
around the provision of meals for guests. Another dimension of the
'ceremonial' orientation was where the ceremonial meal was absent,
but the ceremonial style was still present in the form of the formal
'sitting in the lounge.' For example, their comments about visitors
show no concern with cooking and eating arrangements:

R12 - 'You want to be in the lounge anyway.'

This is termed the 'ceremonial parlour.' The fourteen women in whose
comments this dimension was displayed were working class, which
suggests a class difference in the manifestation of ceremonial values
by the ceremonial meal and the ceremonial parlour.

A ceremonial attitude towards the entertainment of visitors
to the home was taken as an indication of positive separation
of function. Where an informal attitude was stressed it was taken as an indication of negative separation of function. Forty-three women indicated some degree of ceremony associated with the entertainment of some or all visitors, whilst eleven women stressed their informality concerning all visitors to the home.

**Construction of a Scale to Assess the Direction of Separation of Function**

In order to assess the direction of separation of function amongst the women in the sample, a scale was constructed.

Orientation towards the lounge as a 'display' or 'sitting' room, the practice or wish to keep a 'best' room, a 'ceremonial' orientation towards the entertainment of visitors to the home, and a predominantly formal attitude towards family meals were all used as indicators of positive separation of function.

Orientation towards the lounge as a 'relaxing' or 'activity' room, not keeping a 'best' room, an informal attitude towards visitors to the home and an informal attitude towards family meals were all taken as indicators of negative separation of function.

Respondents scored one point for the presence of each orientation on each scale, as shown in Figure 11.

In order that family behaviour patterns and background variables (houseplan, number and ages of children, socio-economic status) could be discussed in relation to the women's orientation towards the separation of function, the two measures positive and negative for each respondent were combined as shown in Figure 11 to provide one overall score denoting them as either positive or negative in separation of function.
**ASSESSMENT OF SEPARATION OF FUNCTION.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS USED IN ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lounge.</td>
<td>'Sitting'/'display' orientation.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>'Relaxing'/'activity' orientation.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Best' room.</td>
<td>Have/would like 'best' room.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Against 'best' room.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors.</td>
<td>Ceremonial.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Informal.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family meals.(1)</td>
<td>Formal.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Informal.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONDENTS' POSITIVE SCORE PLUS NEGATIVE SCORE EQUALS SEPARATION OF FUNCTION SCORE.

A POSITIVE NUMBER INDICATES POSITIVE SEPARATION OF FUNCTION.

A NEGATIVE NUMBER INDICATES NEGATIVE SEPARATION OF FUNCTION.

ZERO INDICATES NEUTRAL.

---

(1) For family meals some respondents were assessed as intermediate and given a score of zero.
Slightly more than half of the respondents (28, 52%) were assessed as having positive overall separation of function. Twenty-three (43%) were assessed as having negative overall separation of function and the remaining minority (3, 5%) were assessed as neutral.

When the relationship between the respondents positive or negative separation is examined in relation to background variables (number and age of children, the houseplan and socio-economic status), no relationships are found apart from a strong influence of socio-economic status (Table 81). The majority of middle-class women have negative separation of function as opposed to the majority of working-class women who have a positive separation of function score. This is not surprising since significant relationships were noted between socio-economic status and the individual areas used in the overall assessment (the lounge, best room, visitors, meals).

Summary

'Separation of function' is a measure constructed from respondents' attitudes towards some aspects of their lifestyles and surroundings: (1) their orientation towards their lounge; (2) keeping a best room; (3) family meals; and (4) the entertainment of visitors. This measure distinguishes between those women with formal attitudes, who wish to reserve different areas of the home for specific functions, termed here positive separation of function, and those with informal attitudes, who do not wish to set aside certain areas for certain functions, termed here negative separation of function.

It was felt that an overall indication of the respondents separation of function, in contrast to 4 separate assessments of
their orientations to the lounge, best room, family meals and visitors, would be useful when looking at family behaviour patterns in relation to the use of the kitchen, and in the explanation of variation in orientation towards the kitchen.

Part Two of Chapter 10 examines family behaviour patterns, looking at the relationship between behaviour and positive and negative separation of function and orientation towards the kitchen, in addition to background variables (houseplan, kitchen size, number and ages of children, employment status, socio-economic status) to investigate whether behaviour is influenced more by functional parameters (number location and size of rooms) or by the respondents separation of function and orientation to the kitchen.
9.2. Introduction

Data on family activities in the home was collected in order to examine the relationship between family activities, the amount and division of space in the home and women's attitudes towards the kitchen, suggested by a review of the literature and supported by the preliminary investigations (Chapter 3).

Six areas spanning work and leisure in the home were selected from preliminary investigations for the investigation of family behaviour patterns. These were:

- Ironing (9.3)
- Evening activities of the family (9.4)
- Use of the kitchen by husband and children (9.5)
- Use of the bedrooms (9.6)
- The entertainment of visitors (9.7)
- Meals (9.8)

The findings in each area are discussed in turn. Additional data on family behaviour is presented in Appendix V, in order to present the details not found in large scale surveys, which form a fuller picture of patterns of family life in the home. Throughout this chapter, where orientation to the lounge and separation of function are considered separately, it should be borne in mind that the respondents orientation to the lounge is one of the four components of separation of function.

9.3. Ironing

Ironing was chosen for the study of behaviour patterns in relation to housework tasks, from those tasks mentioned by the women during
the preliminary group discussions, since, as the equipment is moveable there is greater flexibility and therefore more opportunity for the manifestation of differences in behaviour patterns than with other tasks. All the women were responsible for doing the family ironing, although mention was made of older girls who ironed their own clothes.

Attitudinal rather than practical considerations appear to have a stronger influence on the respondents' habits associated with the housework task of ironing (Table 82). Concerning reasons for their choice of room when ironing, fifty-two (60%) of their comments were attitudinal in nature, compared to twenty-three (27%) related to functional aspects and eleven (13%) related to practicalities of the supervision of children (Table 83).

A group of eighteen women were distinguished from the others by their emphasis on their restriction of ironing to the kitchen, although their reasons for this differed. Nine of these women stressed that they ironed in the kitchen because they would not do it in the lounge:

- R4 - 'Well, you shouldn't do it in the sitting room.'
- R10 - 'I certainly don't fancy doing it in the lounge.'
- R14 - 'Well, I wouldn't do it in the sitting room.'
- R26 - 'I like to keep the lounge clean and tidy. I don't like to iron there.'

The other nine women ironed in the kitchen because just did:

- R12 - 'It's just natural.'
- R17 - 'I don't know. My mother used to do it there.'
- R25 - 'I just always have.'

Fifteen of these eighteen women said they always ironed during the day. In addition, members of this group spontaneously commented
about rules they had concerning the task:

R45 - 'I always do it on a Monday, so it's all finished and put away for the week.'

R42 - 'I do my ironing in the daytime, never in the evening.'

R30 - 'I always get all my work done before my husband comes home.'

Of these eighteen women, fourteen (77%) are 'display' or 'sitting' oriented towards their lounge. Two thirds (12, 66%) are working class and fifteen (83%) have positive separation of function (54% of the total number of respondents (26) assessed as positive in separation of function). These relationships are significant (Tables 84, 85 and 86). To these women ironing is clearly a work task and as such must be undertaken in the work area, the kitchen. To use the lounge for what they consider to be a work task would be incompatible with their ideas of the lounge as an area for 'display' or 'sitting.'

With respect to the other thirty-six respondents, thirty-four of their comments (40%) about choice of room for ironing were related to the priority of pleasant surroundings where they could watch television, listen to the radio and/or be with the rest of the family. As R45 explains: 'There's something to do at the same time.' Concerning the practical reasons for room choice for ironing comments focused on functional aspects (Table 83).dealt with: space; socket outlets; where the ironing board was kept; ironing boards marking certain floor coverings and lighting. The remaining practical comments (Table 83) referred to room choice being dictated by concern to either keep the children away from the safety risk of the hot iron or to supervise them.

R21 - 'It's easier in the kitchen, the kids don't keep falling over it and I can keep them in the lounge.'
All but one of the (11) women making such references had one or all of their children under five years old. There was much more flexibility in the location and time of day this task was done. Thirty used the lounge, eleven the kitchen and seven other places, with twelve women alternating between two places. Ten women ironed during the day, ten during the evening and the remaining sixteen were flexible concerning the time. Many of these women made spontaneous negative comments about the task. For example:

R1 (irons in the lounge, watches t.v.) - 'It's so boring.'
R51 (irons in kitchen in daytime) - 'I hate it. It's a slow job. I never seem to get it done. I have to keep going upstairs to put things away, the nappies have to be aired et cetera.'
R28 (irons in lounge, flexible about time of day) - 'I hate it. I do as little as I can. I try to dry everything flat on storage heaters.'
R32 (irons in lounge) - 'I watch t.v., it helps get it done.'

Thus, ironing in the lounge with the family relieved some of the monotony of the task. Dislike of the task also accounted for some of the flexibility about the time of day it was done. For example:

R31 - 'I do it when the fit takes me.'
R9 - 'I do it when I feel like it, otherwise I wouldn't make a good job of it.'
R37 - 'I do it when the mood takes me, as I hate ironing.'

The majority of these thirty-six respondents were 'relaxing' or 'activity' oriented towards the lounge middle class and negative in separation of function. These relationships were significant (Tables 84, 85, 86). No significance was found between other background variables and behaviour patterns concerning ironing, apart from employment status. Women who worked outside the home were significantly more likely to iron in the evening or have flexible ironing patterns.
However, the data shows that full-time housewives did not necessarily iron during the day, since 15 out of the 32 had flexible schedules or ironed in the evening.

9.4. Evenings at Home

The women were asked whether in general during the evenings the family tended to be together or spread out. The majority of women (45) felt that in general the family spent evenings together and most said that they liked this and tried to be together.

R31 - 'It's the only time we see each other really.'

R26 - 'Even if we had another room, it wouldn't be used for sitting in. My husband does his paperwork in the lounge.'

Others spent evenings together as they 'didn't do much' or 'just watched television.'

R40 - 'It's just how it happens really.'

Some of those spending evenings together as they 'didn't do much' or 'just watched television.'

R40 - 'It's just how it happens really.'

Some of those spending evenings together mentioned separate activities for individual family members which occurred earlier on in the evening.

R50 - 'Homework first then television.'

R11 - 'Homework first, then they play upstairs for an hour, then we watch television.'

Others mentioned occasional separation, prompted by the need to use facilities elsewhere.

R6 - 'My husband sometimes works on the dining room table.'

(in kitchen-diner)
Sometimes I work in my workroom and my husband works downstairs on the coffee table, that's the only time we're separate. I'd like a workspace in the lounge."

There is no indication of differences in evening togetherness between those families of women with positive separation of function and those with negative or neutral separation of function. There was no relationship between evening behaviour patterns and any other variables apart from the fact that of the minority of nine women who felt their family was spread out in the evenings, seven had older children and five had three or more children. This concurs with Hewit's observations (1) that in larger families children do their homework and entertain their guests in semi-private locations. In the other two cases, one woman worked outside the home for the entire evening. In the other family both husband and wife were academics. One worked in the lounge and the other in the dining room for reasons of space. The woman felt that this physical separation did not make a great deal of difference since they did not talk whilst working.

Of the majority spending evenings together six women would like more separation between the family in the evenings. All of these had positive separation of function. Two of their comments were linked again to the presence of older children in the household and having a larger family. The comments of the other four, 3 of whom also had older children, appeared to be related to their general feelings of a need to be alone, dissatisfaction, feelings of constraint and being 'tied down,' discussed further in Chapters 10 and 11.

With respect to conflict over the use of space between family members, a group of twenty-four mothers spontaneously enumerated one
or more rules about children's activities in the lounge, when asked whether there was any conflict between parents and children over the use of the lounge. For example:

R5 - 'No plasticine or painting. Drawing only with adult supervision.'

R31 - 'No drinks or play.'

R32 - 'My idea is you keep the front room tidy. You sit down in it. You don't take pencils in or jump around.'

Of these twenty-four women, fourteen (58%) were 'display' or 'sitting' oriented towards their lounge (Table 88). Half of all of the women thus oriented enumerated rules about protecting the lounge furnishings or 'look' from the children compared to one-third of those 'relaxing' or 'activity' oriented. Fourteen of the twenty-four were women with positive separation of function (Table 89). In addition, rules of those positive separation of function, for example, R5, R31, R32 above, were stricter than those of the other respondents whose comments below showed they were more tolerant:

R29 (negative separation of function) - 'No bikes.'

R48 (neutral separation of function) - 'I'm not keen on them using the blackboard in there, it's so messy.'

R27 (negative separation of function) - 'Nothing mucky. They know what they can and can't do in here.'

R40 (negative separation of function) - 'Everything apart from felt pens.'

Therefore, use of the lounge would seem to be more restricted for the children in families where the mother are assessed as having positive separation of function which indicates that they think of their lounges as 'sitting' or 'display' rooms. However, the relationships
between rules and orientation to the lounge and separation of function was not statistically significant. No relationship was found between any aspects of conflict between family members and other variables. Further information on conflict is appended (Appendix V).

9.5. Family Interaction in the Kitchen

The women were asked about the frequency with which their husbands and children used the kitchen for: (1) passing through; (2) chatting; (3) casual cups of tea and coffee; (4) helping; (5) doing things on their own and (6) using the area to be alone. Five of these six activity areas were chosen to provide information on behaviour patterns and use of the kitchen discussed in this chapter. The fourth was chosen to provide data on the amount of husband-wife interaction, the division of labour and the marital role relationship, discussed in Chapter 10.

9.5.1. Husbands' Use of the Kitchen

The respondents assessment of use of the kitchen by their husbands appears to be related in part to their orientation towards the kitchen. Apart from houses where the kitchens had no outside door, most husbands, whilst at home, frequently passed in and out via the kitchen. However, fewer husbands were described as frequently coming in to the kitchen to chat with their wives. There was a significant difference between 'own' oriented women and the rest of the sample (Table 90). Only three out of the eighteen of those oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room (17%) said their husbands frequently chatted there with them. In contrast, the majority of 'family' and 'want family' oriented women said their husbands frequently chatted to them in the kitchen, and 44% (7) of those who considered their kitchen as 'a' room concurred. It is interesting to speculate whether this difference is a cause or effect of this group of women coming
to regard the kitchen as their 'own' room. Frequency of chatting was also significantly related to kitchen size, with husbands chatting more frequently in large kitchens and kitchen-diners (Table 91).

Investigation of the husband's use of the kitchen for casual cups of tea and coffee (Table 92) revealed an established pattern. Husbands either had drinks in the kitchen frequently or not at all. There is an indication that husbands of those women oriented towards their kitchen as a 'family' room have casual drinks there more frequently than those of the rest of the sample (Table 92). 'Family' kitchens are centres of relaxation in contrast to the kitchens of respondents with other orientations. For example R12 and R13 regard their kitchen as 'a' room. Although all meals are taken there, it is not used for casual drinks:

R13 - 'No, he takes it into the sitting room.'
R12 - 'In the lounge. Only with meals in the kitchen.'

In contrast, 'family' oriented R43's meals are not taken in the kitchen, but her husband uses it for casual drinks:

R43 - 'Not during the week, but he will at weekends.'

There was no relationship between the houseplan, or kitchen size, and the frequency with which husbands used the kitchen for casual drinks.

Use of the kitchen for their own tasks amongst husbands appears to be equally divided between those women who said their husbands tended not to, those who described infrequent use and those who described their husbands using the kitchen frequently (Table 93). Examination of the nature of the tasks and frequency with which the kitchen is used suggests that (a) whether the husband has a hobby and (b) whether the task involves specific facilities like water,
could be factors influencing the husband's use of the kitchen.

(Table 93). This inventory of activities is neither exhaustive or
accurate in terms of the range of tasks and frequency of use, since
information was obtained from the women of their impressions rather
than directly questioning their husbands. Nevertheless, it illustrates
the increase and variation in men's kitchen activities that should
not be ignored by those concerned with kitchen design.

The housewife's orientation does not significantly influence
her perception of the frequency with which her husband uses the
kitchen for his own tasks (Table 94), however, it was noted that
more 'own' room oriented women (8, 44%) than those 'family' (4, 27%)
or 'a' (5, 24%) oriented replied that their husbands tended not to
use the kitchen for anything, whereas women of the other orienta-
tions were more likely to think of something that their husband
did there. Although this difference is not statistically signi-
ficant, it is further substantiated by their comments which showed
them to differ from the other orientations in the defensive nature
of their remarks about the kitchen as their own territory.

R45 - 'He likes it in the kitchen, he'd be in here all the time,
but I've made a point it's my kitchen and I don't want a man round
my kitchen,'

R2 - 'I hate him using my kitchen. He says he has nowhere to
go.'

This was in contrast to family oriented respondents like R47
who likes her husband in the kitchen, where he reads and mends
spare parts in the evenings.

The kitchen was used as a place to be alone by only a minority
of husbands. Their venue for being alone is discussed in Appendix V.
9.5.2. Children's Use of the Kitchen

All children used the kitchen heavily for all of the activities examined, with the exception of as a place to be alone (See Appendix V). Apart from children's use of the kitchen for their own tasks, its use for any of the activities studied was not significantly related to any of the variables under consideration, although some trends were noted concerning the number, age and sex of children.

The three women who said that their children chatted to them infrequently in the kitchen, all had older sons. Twenty women who emphasised that they encouraged their children to have snack drinks in the kitchen, all had younger children and of the seven of these who had specific rules that drinks were only to be consumed in the kitchen, five were 'display' or 'sitting' oriented towards the lounge. In twelve cases where the kitchen was used less frequently for casual drinks, eight mothers were 'relaxing' or 'activity' oriented towards the lounge and eight also had children over five. Significantly more respondents with kitchen diners and women who were 'family' oriented towards the kitchen tended to indicate the kitchen was used frequently by the children for their own activities than those with other houseplans or orientations (Tables 95, 96). The age of children affected the nature of the help they gave their mother in the kitchen. Rotas for helping were found in five families, all with three or four children. A more detailed description of children's use of the kitchen is appended (V).

9.6. Use of the Bedroom

Bedrooms were used for a wide range of activities by the majority (47, 87%) of families in the sample (see Appendix V). Attitudes towards this extension of their use were not significantly
dependent on any of the variables under consideration. However, it was observed that comments centred around use by the children and were frequently related to their number and age. The seven respondents who used bedrooms solely as bedrooms all had children under five and were concerned about their safety. Five of the eight women who stressed wider use of the bedrooms as a way of providing some degree of privacy for children had three or four children. Five of the seven women who encouraged children to play in the bedroom to preserve the appearance of the lounge had lounge-diners. Further details on use of the bedrooms are appended (V).

9.7. Visitors to the Home

To obtain information about family behaviour patterns and women's attitudes towards the rooms, the respondents were asked how frequently they entertained the following visitors and how they entertained them, including the rooms used. (1) Business callers; (2) Children's friends; (3) Relatives; (4) The couple's friends; (5) The respondents' friends and neighbours. A summary of the patterns found is presented here. A more detailed account is given in Appendix V.

Only eight women said their children had friends found less than once a week. Age of children significantly affects the frequency of visits and the rooms used (Appendix V, Table IX). Children under five have friends to the house less frequently. Of the minority where the lounge was the main room used for entertaining children's friends, they were either under fives accompanied by relatives or the respondents' friends, or older children's fiancé(e)s and friends. Other women who mentioned that they did let their children play in the lounge if they wished, were predominantly 'relaxing' or
'activity' oriented towards the lounge. The majority of children played in the bedrooms or garden. It was observed that a number of women with positive separation of function had rules about where the children were allowed to play.

Frequent visits from relatives were significantly more common amongst middle class respondents (Appendix V, Table X). A 'ceremonial-formal' dimension was observed from descriptions of their entertainment. (Chapter 9, Part 1). The majority informally entertained relatives. Middle class couples entertained mutual friends at home significantly more frequently than working class couples (Appendix V, Table XI). A class difference in the type of 'ceremony' this involved was noted: the middle class ceremonial meal and the working class ceremonial parlour. Only five of the women had visits from friends and neighbours less often than once a week. These visits were mostly informal, with casual callers coming by to see the woman wherever she happened to be in the house when they came.

9.8. Meal Patterns

A summary of the patterns found is presented here. A more detailed account is given in Appendix V. Three-quarters of the sample eat at least some meals in the kitchen and thirty-four (63%) use it for the majority or all of their meals. Frequency of use of the kitchen for meals is significantly influenced by kitchen size and the ground floor layout of the dwelling. However, these two physical parameters do not entirely account for the meal patterns observed. Two orientations towards meals were noted amongst the women: (1) family togetherness as opposed to individual eating and (2) formal as opposed to relaxed situations. These orientations also affect meal patterns and the effects are discussed in detail in Appendix V.
9.9. Summary

This investigation of behaviour patterns in the home was undertaken to study the influence of physical parameters (houseplan and kitchen size); family composition (socio-economic status; respondent's employment status; number and age of children) and the respondent's attitudes (orientation towards the kitchen; orientation towards the lounge and separation of function) on the use of space in the home. A number of relationships were found.

The results indicate that the attitudinal variables used in this study could be important in the interpretation of family behaviour in relation to the use of space in the home. The women's orientation to the lounge and separation of function were significantly related to their patterns of ironing. Concerning use of the kitchen, orientation to the kitchen is significantly related to the women's perception of the frequency with which their husbands come into the kitchen to chat with them and their descriptions of the frequency of its use by children for their own activities.

In addition, it was observed that the minority of women who made unfavourable comments about the family staying together in the same room in the evening all had positive separation of function. Concerning conflict between parents and children over the use of the lounge, the women who said they had rules about the children's activities in the lounge also tended to have positive separation of function and a 'sitting' or 'display' orientation.

There is an indication that husbands of 'family' oriented women used the kitchen more frequently for casual drinks. 'Own' room oriented women were more likely to state that their husbands did not use the kitchen for any of their own tasks, compared to
women of other orientations. This was substantiated further by the nature of the comments that they made.

With respect to the entertainment of visitors, mothers whose comments indicated they were liberal concerning allowing their children and their friends to play in the lounge, were 'relaxing' or 'activity' oriented towards the lounge. Those women who had rules about this had positive separation of function. It was noted that the women whose formal entertainment style was extended even to their own friends and neighbours had positive separation of function. (The ceremonial-informal orientation towards the entertainment of visitors was a component of separation of function.) The women's orientation towards meals as formal or informal occasions together with their orientation to the lounge and overall separation of function was observed to affect meal patterns.

With reference to family composition, socio-economic status was found to be significantly related to ironing patterns and to the frequency of the entertainment of couple’s friends and relatives at home. In addition, it was observed that the number and age of children in the family influence the women's comments on evening family togetherness and the use of the bedrooms. Age, sex and the number of children in the family influenced the nature of their use of the kitchen. The children's age significantly affected the frequency with which their friends visited them and also was observed to affect where they and their playmates went in the house.

Concerning physical parameters, use of the kitchen for meals was found to be significantly related to the ground floor layout of the house and kitchen size. The frequency with which husbands
chatted to their wives in the kitchen was also significantly related to kitchen size. In addition, it was observed that the houseplan also affected the women's comments about use of the bedrooms for other activities.

To conclude, the investigation of the determinants of family behaviour in the home is complex and the subject of a thesis in its own right. This limited study has attempted to show how attitudinal, in addition to physical houseplan and family composition variables influence family behaviour in the home.
Table 81.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SEPARATION OF FUNCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separation of Function</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10 (36)</td>
<td>18 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3 (100)</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>17 (74)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 10.0; \text{ d.f.} = 2; \text{ } p < .01 \]

Table 82.

ROOM CHOSEN FOR IRONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Lounge</th>
<th>Dining Room</th>
<th>Bed-Room</th>
<th>Garden</th>
<th>Utility Room</th>
<th>To(1) Total Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 12 respondents used more than one location regularly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Choice</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Lounge</th>
<th>Dining</th>
<th>Bedroom</th>
<th>Garden</th>
<th>Utility Room</th>
<th>Total Number of Comments (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudinal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Pleasant; t.v.;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Would not do</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in lounge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 'Just do;' tradition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Functional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Supervision of</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total Number of</td>
<td>37 (45)</td>
<td>38 (46)</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>86 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 84.

ORIENTATION TO THE LOUNGE AND REASONS FOR CHOICE OF ROOM FOR IRONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Chosen</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must Iron in Kitchen (Groups 2 and 3, Table 83)</td>
<td>Activity/Relaxing</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sitting/Display</td>
<td>18 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Groups 1, 4, 5 Table 83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (%)  54 (100)

\[ \chi^2 = 9.49; \text{ d.f.} = 1; p < .005 \]

Table 85.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND REASONS FOR CHOICE OF ROOM FOR IRONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Chosen</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must Iron in Kitchen (2, 3 Table 83)</td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>12 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>6 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (1, 4, 5 Table 83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.4; \text{ d.f.} = 1; p < .05 \]

Table 86.

SEPARATION OF FUNCTION AND REASONS FOR CHOICE OF ROOM FOR IRONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Chosen</th>
<th>Separation of Function</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must Iron in Kitchen (2, 3 Table 83)</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>15 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (1, 4, 5 Table 83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 9.08; \text{ d.f.} = 1; p < .005 \]
Table 87.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF RESPONDENT AND TIME OF DAY IRONING IS DONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day Ironing is Done</th>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full, Part-Time Worker</td>
<td>Home-Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>3 (12)</td>
<td>5 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>5 (45)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
<td>2 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>15 (28)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 7.33; d.f. = 4; p > .01; N.S.

Daytime vs. flexible and evening: χ² = 6.55; d.f. = 2; p < .05.

Table 88.

ORIENTATION TO LOUNGE AND Rules Concerning Children's Behaviour in THE LOUNGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Rules About Children's Behaviour in Lounge</th>
<th>No Rules</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing/Activity</td>
<td>10 (36)</td>
<td>18 (64)</td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting/Display</td>
<td>14 (54)</td>
<td>12 (46)</td>
<td>26 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 1.80; d.f. = 1; p < .10.
Table 89.
SEPARATION OF FUNCTION AND RULES CONCERNING CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOUR
IN THE LOUNGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separation of Function</th>
<th>Rules About Children's Behaviour in Lounge</th>
<th>No Rules</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>14 (50)</td>
<td>14 (50)</td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2 (67)</td>
<td>1 (33)</td>
<td>3 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>15 (65)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.82; d.f. = 2; p > .10.$

Table 90.
RESPONDENT'S ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND ESTIMATION OF FREQUENCY
OF HUSBAND’S USE FOR CHATTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation to Kitchen</th>
<th>Husband's Use of the Kitchen for Chatting</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Family</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>2 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Own</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (3) 'Want Family'</td>
<td>3 (60)</td>
<td>1 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Others</td>
<td>7 (44)</td>
<td>6 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>22 (41)</td>
<td>16 (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of significance:

2-way. Own (2)/All others (1, 3, 4): $\chi^2 = 6.62; d.f. = 2; p < .05.$
3-way. Family (1) + Want Family (3)/Own (2)/A (A):
$\chi^2 = 8.83; d.f. = 4; p = .065$, N.S.
3-way. Family (1)/Own (2)/A (3; 4): $\chi^2 = 8.30; d.f. = 4; p = .81$, N.S.
Table 91.
KITCHEN SIZE AND ITS USE BY HUSBANDS FOR CHATTING TO THEIR WIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen Size</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen-diner</td>
<td>7 (41)</td>
<td>4 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>3 (16)</td>
<td>9 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>12 (67)</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>22 (41)</td>
<td>16 (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 10.7$; d.f. = 4; $p < .05$.

Table 92.
RESPONDENTS ORIENTATION TOWARDS THE KITCHEN AND HUSBAND'S USE OF THE KITCHEN FOR CASUAL CUPS OF TEA AND COFFEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Husbands Use of Kitchen for Casual Beverages</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>6 (33)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>7 (33)</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>22 (41)</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 4.00$; d.f. = 4; $p > .10$ N.S.
Table 93.

**REASONS FOR HUSBANDS USE OF THE KITCHEN FOR THEIR OWN TASKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses Frequently</th>
<th>Uses Infrequently</th>
<th>Tends Not to Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reasons</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reasons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwork, odd jobs, mending: 8</td>
<td>Domestic Tasks (shoe cleaning, etc.): 8</td>
<td>Other base for hobbies: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewing beer, winemaking: 6</td>
<td>Washing, cleaning at sink: 4</td>
<td>Just doesn't use the kitchen: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies: 3</td>
<td>Reading: 4</td>
<td>No hobbies: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing and cleaning at sink: 3</td>
<td>Personal hygiene at sink: 3</td>
<td>Doesn't do (..., various, usually kitchen based, tasks, e.g. shoe cleaning): 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working (paperwork): 2</td>
<td>D.I.Y. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaving, cleaning teeth at sink: 2</td>
<td>Cooking, making beverage: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure (reading): 1</td>
<td>Use low as has other hobbies outdoors: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourmet cooking: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Comments</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 94.
RESPONDENTS ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND HUSBANDS USE OF THE KITCHEN FOR HIS OWN TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Husbands Use of the Kitchen for His Own Tasks</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses Frequently</td>
<td>Uses Infrequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>6 (40)</td>
<td>5 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>6 (33)</td>
<td>4 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>6 (29)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
<td>19 (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.60; \text{ d.f.} = 4; p > .10, \text{ N.S.} \]

Table 95.
HOUSEPLAN AND CHILDREN'S USE OF THE KITCHEN FOR THEIR OWN ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Houseplan</th>
<th>Frequency of Use of Kitchen by Children</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Sometimes/Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen-Diner</td>
<td>15 (88)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge-Diner + Separate Rooms</td>
<td>18 (49)</td>
<td>19 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>33 (61)</td>
<td>21 (39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 14.31; \text{ d.f.} = 2; p < .001 \]
Table 96.
RESPONDENTS ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND ITS USE BY THE CHILDREN
FOR THEIR OWN ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Frequency of Childrens Use of Kitchen</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Sometimes/Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>13 (87)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Own'</td>
<td>10 (56)</td>
<td>8 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 (61)</td>
<td>21 (39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Family' vs. 'Own' and 'A': $\chi^2 = 5.71; \text{ d.f.} = 1; p < .05.$
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10.1. Introduction

Three factors led to the initial assumption that women's roles might affect their attitudes towards the kitchen: the influence of roles on attitudes towards the environment observed in the review of the related literature (Chapter 2.4); the indication from Oakley's work (1) that women's identification with the housewife role was a critical factor in their approach to housework (2.4); and more specifically, the interrelationship noted between changes in women's roles and the development of the domestic kitchen over the past 150 years (Chapter 1.4). The interview schedule was therefore designed to allow an assessment of the relative aspects of women's situation to be made; that is: their identification with the housewife role, their marriage, and their satisfaction with their lifestyle.

The findings outlined in the four previous chapters indicate that aspects of the houseplan and family structure would not appear to be the overriding determinants of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the kitchen, or orientation towards the kitchen. In addition, respondents can be grouped as having positive, neutral or negative separation of function from their orientation towards the lounge, attitudes towards keeping a 'best' room and attitudes towards meals and the entertainment of visitors. Orientation to the kitchen and separation of function are shown to be related to aspects of family behaviour in the home.

A more direct indication that roles might play a larger part in shaping attitudes towards the kitchen than initially suspected was given by the women's response to the sentence completion test and questions on attitudes towards the kitchen. For example, twelve
women initially state that they like being in their kitchen, but then go on to explain their feelings in terms of acceptance. They have to be there for a lot of the time, therefore they have to like it. It was suggested in Chapter 7 that the women might consider their dislike of their kitchen as a reflection on themselves. This is a perception which, because of the desire to be thought 'normal,' that is accept that being in the kitchen as part of the normal traditional female domestic role, tends to inhibit the spontaneous admission of a negative attitude.

Therefore, before examining attitudes towards the kitchen in the context of women's roles, it is felt helpful, because of the suspected increased importance of roles, to review women and sex-roles from a socio-psychological perspective.

10.2 Sex Roles

The roles we choose have many consequences: They define the behaviour expected of us by others. They are major sources of our feelings about ourselves. They expose us to experiences which can affect our later attitudes, feelings and behaviour.

Thus, while roles may have been self-selected initially, once chosen, they play a major part in shaping our subsequent experiences and personality.

Two important issues in the study of sex roles are the effects of sexism and the origins of sex differences. The effects of sexism are manifold in our society. Few valid research studies exist (Fleck [2]) to support the widespread belief in existence of fundamental differences between the male and female personality. There is more variation between individuals regardless of sex than there is between men and women on average. In addition, variation in behaviour over time and from situation to situation makes it difficult to ascertain that any one group of people always behave
in a similar way [Bern and Allen (3)]. However, most people believe that women and men are different and that they should be different [Broverman et al. (4)]. Such beliefs affect the way people treat one another in many ways. For example, the way in which children are socialised for their later adult roles and in many instances within and outside the home.

As stated in Chapter 2.4, sex roles appear to be culturally, not biologically, determined. There are few sex differences that suggest a biological basis for the behavioural sex differences found in older children and adults. A review of the evidence (5) suggests two primary areas for which there may be substantial biological bases for the sex differences in behavioural patterns: aggressive and dominant behaviour in males and differential cognitive functioning. The exact mechanisms mediating these biological effects are unclear, but there does appear to be evidence for these effects. The evidence for biological mediators of other behavioural differences is weak at best. Thus, it appears that many apparent differences between men and women are not fundamental personality differences but are the result of the roles we assign to the sexes and our reinforcement of varying behaviours for each sex.

10.3. Changes in Women's Roles

Chapter 1.4 traced changes in the emphasis placed on the predominant roles for women of wife, housewife, mother and worker over the past 150 years. Changes in women's participation in these roles have been caused primarily by three interrelated factors: (1) changes in the economy affecting the labour situation; (2) changes in the age structure of society; (3) changes in values.
The combination of marriage (and thus of housewifery) with employment is the change most often commented on. There is increasing participation by women in the workforce, and more women are taking advantage of wider educational and training opportunities. In addition, a greater awareness of women's choices exists, promoted by the women's liberation movement and movement towards greater equality between the sexes through legislation.

The demographic changes of a lower birthrate and postponement of the children born in marriage have affected motherhood. So, too, has the rapid rise in the divorce rate, often resulting in a shifting of financial responsibility onto the woman, making her more likely to seek employment. In addition, attitudes toward motherhood have changed. In the 1950's, psychological studies on the adverse effects of 'maternal deprivation' through physical deprivation and lack of human contact, gave rise to the widespread belief that mothers who were not constantly with their children would do them irreparable harm. A study by Komarovsky (6) shows that although many women choose to stay at home with very young children, women who choose to work are not viewed as negatively by themselves or others as they once were. In 1943, 50 percent of college women surveyed said they would prefer not to work after the birth of their first child, especially if their husband had enough income. In a second study in 1971, only 18 percent were of this opinion. Sixty-two percent of the sample said they definitely planned to work after marriage but would stop for a short period after childbearing. In both studies, 20 percent of the women asked said they definitely planned full-time careers with minimal time out for childrearing. The same percentage of women continue to want careers which are uninterrupted
by their childrearing, while more women want to continue working outside the home after a break for childbearing.

Nevertheless, despite these changes, there is evidence that the domestic role remains the primary role for women in general. Oakley\(^7\) contends that:

A number of social developments this century have amplified the importance of gender in the family and thus the importance of domesticity in the family.

The increase in familism and increased identification of the family with the home has resulted in greater involvement with home life. Maintenance and decoration of the home has increased in popularity and the acquisition of sophisticated domestic equipment for technical and status reasons, which required 'more' and 'better' housework, for example, clothes and bedlinen changed and washed more often, carpets shampooed in addition to being vacuumed. Childhood has increased in length with a high value placed on the individual child. Now childhood is considered to be a critical period in life, 'successful' performance of the maternal role is crucial.

Concerning the situation outside the home, Oakley believes that:

A closing gap in the proportion of the labour force made up of males and females, together with an apparent rising similarity in the jobs they do, are adduced as evidence for the convergence in gender roles. In fact, the impression of convergence is 'illusory.'

From her examination of women's situation, she concludes that compared to men, women are: (1) concentrated in occupations which reflect the domesticity of the conventional role (nursing, teaching, unskilled or semi-skilled factory work, domestic and clerical work, as opposed to the masculine occupations of dentistry,
engineering, medicine and law); (2) less likely to be consistently involved in job or career due to the responsibility of childrearing. The dominance of domestic role for women is further demonstrated by the data on the inequality of the division of labour between husband and wife, discussed in Chapter 2. Therefore, we shall now examine the characteristics of the domestic role in more detail.

10.4. The Domestic Role

The vast majority of housewives are married women, and the allocation of the housewife role to the woman in marriage is socially structured. Marriage is not simply a personal relationship; rather it is 'an institution composed of a socially acceptable union of individuals in husband and wife roles' (8). Thus, the occupation of housewife is not freely selected. Marriage introduces women to sets of activities and duties which cluster into their customary roles in the home. The expectation that women would move into these roles in the normal course of their lives and would perform the associated tasks gladly and well is traditional in our society and persists to the present time. The promotion of the housewife-mother role as the only truly important and rewarding one for women has continued unabated into the 1970's. An American study of women's roles in women's magazine fiction (9) revealed that the only proper role portrayed from 1950 to 1970 was the role of housewife and mother, completely dependent on her husband and completely dedicated to her family.

There is increasing evidence, reviewed by Oakley (10) to suggest that progress towards sex equality is hampered by women's domestic responsibilities. In addition to its primacy over other roles for women, the other characteristic features of the housewife
role in modern industrial society are its associations with feminity economic dependence and low status work. The housewife role is allocated exclusively to women. It is associated with the dependent woman in modern marriage. Married women: 'engaged in unpaid home duties are not regarded as retired, but treated as "others economically inactive."'(11) By the modern concept of work, as the expenditure of energy for financial gain, housework is defined as the most marginal and inferior work of all.

There is no formalised training or instruction to prepare persons to do the tasks that the role requires. Women may become housewives overnight simply by getting married. There are no particular requirements for the job, and whether one comes to it with many skills or none is irrelevant. The specific tasks performed by women in the home are carried out under conditions which require diffusion of attention and effort. Many events - children, the cooking, tradesmen - may be competing simultaneously for her attention. The role requirements are highly repetitive and allow for very little respite or privacy. She is 'on-call' for whatever needs to be done 24 hours a day. Unlike other occupations, there are no standards or tests of performance, no objective externally imposed measure of how well the role is performed. The rewards bear no direct relationship to the quality of the performance. Because of this private, personal quality, it is basically invisible to the larger community. The role is highly ambiguous, no specific rights and responsibilities are attached to it. Housewives are not unionised and thus have no protection or interference with their highly individualised styles of performance. In addition, a woman only refers to herself, or is referred to by others as a housewife if she is not otherwise employed. It seems to be tacitly understood
that one is only designated housewife if one is not something else. All other work related roles have priority as descriptors of the person. Possibly related to this phenomenon is the often noted low status and devaluation of the role of housewife in the oft heard 'just a housewife.' The role of housewife also differs from other occupational roles in that the personal qualities of the woman are not related to her admission to the role category. One does not have to be suited to it either by training or temperament.

To summarise, therefore, work done in the housewife role is low in prestige, and it also isolates: since women doing housework are cut off from contact with other adults as they have no co-workers. This isolation tends to heighten the housewives' sense of powerlessness and to make these women more susceptible to psychological problems [Bernard (12)].

The traditional role operates differently at various points in the life cycle for women. The traditional female role for a woman in her twenties contrasts sharply with the role requirements for a woman in her forties. The traditional role of the young married woman is focused on total dedication to the needs of her children and her husband. Her 'free' time is extremely limited and should she attempt to work outside the home, she may well be emotionally and physically exhausted most of the time. Thus, at this stage in the life cycle, there are high costs associated with the traditional female role. These costs diminish as she and the children get older and the time available to develop new interests outside the home may result in increased self-confidence and satisfaction with life. However, the costs may remain high, should she attempt to cling to her mother role whilst her children mature and leave her an 'empty nest.'
10.5. The Domestic Role as a Source of Stress

The ubiquitous relegation of women to the housewife role and the special characteristics of that role give rise to some special problems for women. In addition, whilst the current changes in women's roles may lead to greater freedom, satisfaction and personal fulfillment for women, the process of change from the traditional role may produce conflict and uncertainty. For example, some women may feel guilty when their career role detracts from their marital role. The belief they may have absorbed that a mother should always be available to her growing children, may conflict with their aspirations through education towards a career. Other women may find culturally approved roles personally distasteful, yet perceive no other options. Social roles that are incompatible with an individual's aspirations and abilities, situations where two sets of values are irreconcilable or two desired goals are mutually exclusive, may produce stress.

The subjective significance of stressful occurrences is heavily influenced by the individual's sex role, especially in those situations where the culture lays down rigid guidelines for appropriate sex role behaviour. For example, in our culture, the meaning of marriage frequently differs between husband and wife, such that wives may be more conscious of and distressed by marital discord. The wife in an unhappy marriage may suffer from considerable anxiety, stemming from feelings of failure and lowered self-esteem, and realistic fears about starting an independent life. Her husband may be less concerned since his work may be his primary source of self-esteem and self-definition, rather than his emotional relationship to his wife and family.
That the marital situation is a source of psychological stress for women is demonstrated by the results from user surveys of psychiatric treatment facilities (13), which show that the incidence of psychological disorders is higher among married women than married men and lower among single women than single men. There is no evidence to support the theory that women who are less able to tolerate stress are more likely to marry, since the occurrence of psychological disorders among women who were once married (but subsequently divorced or widowed) is as low as it is among single women.

The source of psychological stress is not marriage per se, as intimated by some feminist literature, but would appear from research to be the specific requirements, expectations and obligations of women's traditional role. Since roles are implicated in the determination of the variation between women in their attitudes towards the kitchen, an examination of the sources of stress in women's lives connected with their roles is appropriate. Four aspects of women's traditional role in particular can lead to distress: loss of autonomy and independence; lack of differentiation and diversity in roles; the stresses of motherhood and loss of status and function. Whilst stress does not always result in such severe consequences as psychological disorder, it may well affect women's attitudes, feelings and behaviour.

10.5.1. Loss of Autonomy and Independence

Both partners sacrifice some of their autonomy and independence on entering marriage. However, it is primarily the wife whose sacrifice entails her psychological autonomy and her selfhood. Longitudinal studies of marriage show that wives make more concessions
and modifications of their values and personal qualities than do their husbands [Barry (14)]. Both husbands and wives agree that wives make the greater adjustment in marriage. Indeed, the cultural norm has been that, upon marriage the husband maintains his daily living routine with little if any modification [Burgess and Wallin (15)]. Unfortunately, this situation is not a psychologically healthy one. Although superficial inquiries may show that husband and wife usually view their marriage as equally happy, further probing frequently reveals dissatisfaction, frustration, bitterness or even desperation on the part of the wife [Bernard (16)]. In many marriages, the wife's task encompasses adjustment to her husband's personality and values, and adaptation to the life-style demanded by her husband's occupational, educational and socio-economic status. The toll of this sacrifice of individuality and self-determination seems high. There are some indications that non-working wives run the highest risk of psychological disorder: they may enter therapy more frequently [Bart (17)]; they are most likely to use prescribed tranquilizers and stimulants (New York Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, (18)); and they have an elevated rate of suicide [Schneiderman and Farberow (19)]. Wives who work maintain more autonomy and self-determination vis a vis their husbands and this may protect them from psychological stress.

10.5.2. Role Differentiation

The role of a housewife is ascribed to a woman when she marries rather than achieved by her. People in ascribed roles are expected to perform them competently. Because of this expectation, competence or success is not well rewarded and failures are dealt with harshly. In the case of achieved roles (e.g. occupational roles of men and women), there are lower expectations about role performance.
Thus, success is heavily rewarded, while punishment for failures may be moderate or light.

Married men in our culture usually have both an achieved role (job) and an ascribed role (in the family). This duality may protect them from anxiety about failing in the family role, and from other criticisms if in fact they do fail as fathers and husbands. Similarly, with married working women, success in work may reduce their anxiety over their competence as housewives, wives, mothers. Women who have only an ascribed role that is the traditional family role may be more anxious about failure in that role because they have no other responsibilities that would excuse a poor performance. Thus, playing multiple roles allows one's psychological outlook to be more balanced and stable. The psychological significance of the number of separate roles a person plays derives from the power of roles as sources of identity and self-esteem (Gergen and Marecek). Women who perceive their lives to be lived within a single role may suffer paralyzing blows to their self-esteem whenever they experience a failure or a disappointment in this role. Alternatively, if an individual perceives life to be composed of multiple roles, shortcomings can be compensated for by the successful aspects of other roles.

10.5.3 **Motherhood**

One of the major roles of traditional married women is the role of mother. In addition to being a major source of satisfaction for many women having children can be the focus of many problems. The cultural values and beliefs associated with childrearing are the source of strain rather than the children themselves. The primary responsibility for the child's development is placed on the mother and many women feel compelled to curtail their self-expression,
career development and self-actualization 'until the children are
grown.' The years with very young children probably encompass the
most psychologically stressful periods of motherhood. Birth of
the first child is accompanied by a radical personal change from
satisfying their own needs to satisfying those of the newborn.
Many mothers of young children mention 'overwork', being 'tied down'
to the infant and constant physical demands and fatigue as described
by Gavron (21). For the women with pre-school children, the
problems of isolation from adult company and lack of mobility are
reported as sources of stress [Lopata (22)].

10.5.4. Loss of Status

Another strain on married women is the reductions in the
requirements and status associated with the traditional mother and
housewife roles. The responsibilities, satisfactions and status
of the traditional feminine marital role have been gradually diminish­
ing over the last 25 years [Gore and Tudor (23)]. Increased
community support facilities, changing social patterns and smaller
family size decrease the time spent in child rearing. Organisations,
school and youth activities mean older children spend more time outside
the home. The number of years when there are children living in the
home has diminished as family size has decreased and children
gain their independence at an earlier age. In addition, to this
decline in the work allocated to the housewife role there has been
a decline in its perceived importance and prestige, documented by
Lopata in her survey of urban and suburban middle class housewives
(24). This devaluation of the traditional feminine role may result
in lowered self-esteem, feelings of worthlessness and bitterness
among women in this role.
This has been a simplified account of women's roles. It must be taken into consideration that membership of different socio-economic classes gives rise to differences in experiences, attitudes and values amongst women. Specifically, variations in the concept of marital roles exist between wives of different class backgrounds. Working class women are likely to emphasise those aspects of their marital roles that entail concrete responsibilities and obligations. They are more likely to evaluate their lives in terms of the jobs they perform (housework, childrearing) rather than the emotional satisfaction or their degree of self-actualisation in the marriage. Conversely, middle-class women are more likely to require that their marital roles are emotionally fulfilling and intellectually satisfying [Lopata (25)].
Part Two The Situation Of The Women In This Sample.

The second part of this chapter outlines the assessment of the women's identification with the domestic role and their marriage, in terms of (1) the division of labour; (2) the marital role relationship and (3) the women's satisfaction with their life style. Chapter 11 discusses the interrelationship between these factors.

10.6. Identification with the Domestic Role

Oakley (1) found that a high specification of standards and routines in housework correlated with high identification with the housewife role. Therefore, in this survey, identification with the housewife role was assessed from spontaneous comments about standards and routines made by the women during recall of their previous days activities.

From the detailed description of their daily activities the women were divided into three groups: (1) those spontaneously mentioning their 'housework routine;' (2) those giving a detailed description of their housework but not referring to their 'routine;' and (3) those with a more casual approach to housework.

Respondent 2 is an example of the first group who emphasise their 'housework routine' in their account of their daily activities.

R2: 'Yesterday was Tuesday. I got up, had breakfast, washed up, cleaned the kitchen floor and carpet-swept in the dining area. That was that finished and all cleared away. Then I showered and cleaned the bathroom - the bath and the floor etc. Then I made the beds, carpet swept and dusted the bedrooms. Then I carpet swept and dusted the living room. This is routine. This happens every day. Once a week, I pull everything out and do a good hoover. I don't do it every day as I don't think it's good to hoover. So once a week I turn out each room thoroughly.'
Likewise:

R26 - 'That's my little routine. I do that everyday then I know what time I've got and what I haven't got.'

R11 - 'I have a daily routine' (goes on to describe cleaning the kitchen, lounge, rest of the ground floor, upstairs).

R32 - 'I've got a routine. I know what I've got to do. I've got my days planned. I work to rules.'

The second group have a regimented housework pattern, although they do not refer to it as their 'routine' in the way that women in the first group do.

R29 - 'I get up about 7.30 to 8 (a.m.) and get breakfast ready. My husband's gone by 7.30. He gets his own breakfast - a cup of tea. Then the children get up. They have cereals and some breakfast, you know, and I dress them down here (in the lounge). Then I usually do the dishes and then I start in here (lounge) doing polishing and everything first, then hoover around and then do the hallways. I tidy my front room first. Then I start on the kitchen. Then I finish off in the kitchen and then I go to the shops and get whatever we're having for tea time and lunchtime. And then I come back and do the bedrooms and get what washing I've got together. Then I do my bit of washing and then it's lunch.'

R22 - 'Monday, I normally do a fair amount because after the weekend, the house gets dirty and I don't believe in running round with a duster at the weekend. And on Friday, I normally clean very well as well for the weekend. Cooking for the freezer I fit in. I might think 'today I'll do a cheesecake' and I might do three cheesecakes and that will do for the next month. Washing the baby's nappies I do every day. Even at the weekend.'
R9 - 'I do more or less the same thing. I sort of go right through. Well, if I don't do it my daughter does, but I like to get as much done as I can.

The third group are more relaxed:

R39: 'We had breakfast in the kitchen. Then I made some pastry and gave the children some lumps to play with. This led on to general vacuum cleaning of the ground floor and in fact, I washed the kitchen.

'Then several people came to call and I made coffee. They had children with them and they went up to the playroom. That was most of the morning gone. Then I was upstairs typing for a bit in the afternoon and the children were playing in the playroom and outside. Then, later on, various mums turned up to collect them and I had a short chat in the lounge. Then I was in the kitchen for a bit preparing things for the evening meal. Then I did some ironing in the lounge while the kids were watching tv.'

R17 - 'I don't have a routine. I do it (housework) in the afternoon, but I don't have a set pattern of jobs.'

R40 - 'I'm terrible really. I don't stick to a routine as far as housework's concerned. I'm really quite lazy. I don't like it at all. I do it when I'm in the mood.'

Women in the first group, spontaneously mentioning their housework routine were assessed as having a very high identification with the domestic role. The second group of women giving a detailed description of a housework pattern were assessed as having a high identification and the third group with no evidence of a routine assessed as having a low identification with the domestic role. Very high and high were considered as one group in the analysis.
Examination of the spread of levels of identification with the domestic role in relation to socio-economic status, (Table 97) shows stronger identification with the domestic role amongst working class women. Three-quarters of them have a very high or high identification with the domestic role compared to only one quarter of the middle class women.

There is a tendency for women working outside the home not to have a strong personal investment in a housework routine, taken as evidence of a low identification with the domestic role (Table 98). However, the inclusion of socio-economic status shows that the working class women who worked do not lose their stronger identification with the domestic role. This class difference could be explained by:

'Housewifery as a role for females is more positively evaluated in working class communities than in middle class social networks.' Komarovsky (2)

Oakley noted that prolonged education seemed to produce some degree of detachment from thinking about oneself as a housewife.

Oakley also found no class difference between her sample of 40 housewives concerning the specification of standards and routines. The difference between her results and those discussed here could be explained by the fact that Oakley's assessment was based on recall of days activities plus a series of direct questions: 'Do you have a routine?' 'Do you have standards you keep to?' Whereas this information is based solely on spontaneous unprompted mention of routines and standards.

Looking at identification with the domestic role and orientation to the kitchen, women oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room would appear to have a stronger domestic role identification (Table 99).
An examination of identification with the domestic role and separation of function (discussed in the previous chapter) reveals that women with a very high or high domestic role identification would appear to have a positive orientation towards separation of function. (Table 100).

10.7 Marriage

In order to make a relative assessment (that is between members of the sample) of their marriages, respondents were rated as having a tendency towards either a 'joint' or a 'segregated' role relationship from information gathered on organisation of their leisure activities, plus other relevant comments made by respondents about their marital relationship during the course of the interview.

In addition, the division of labour was assessed from the husband's level of participation in kitchen-work, as reported by their wives. An evaluation was also made of the women's satisfaction with their existing life styles.

The assessment of the marital role relationship is incomplete, since assessment in the area of decision-making (finance etc.) was omitted. This is an area used by Bott (3) who, with her three types of role organisation: 'joint,' 'complementary' and 'independent' first developed the concepts of 'segregation' and 'jointness' in marital roles. Decision-making is also examined by other researchers in the increasing amount of study in this area. The omission of the investigation of decision-making was due to the limitations of time and possible questioning of its relevance by respondents in research on the kitchen. Nevertheless, it is felt that, although limited, the evaluation of the marital role relationship used here is sufficient for distinction to be drawn between the women in the
sample in terms of a tendency towards a 'joint' or a 'segregated' marital role relationship.

The division of labour in the home between husband and wife is not assessed in general for all housework and childcare, but from specific information on the husband's participation in kitchen work. This is not seen as a drawback since answers could be expected to be more detailed and accurate since they focused on a specific point rather than being in terms of an 'in-general' assessment. As well as it's obvious relevance in this study, focusing on kitchen work was felt to be pertinent since previous research on the division of labour indicated that husbands helped less frequently with housework than with childcare (4). Also all the respondents elaborated after talking about what their husbands did in the kitchen to what they did and did not do in the rest of the house and with the children, and how they felt about his contribution. This, plus information on husbands participation in housework and childcare from the recall on the previous days activities plus usual weekday/weekend activities, gave sufficient information on the division of labour.

Oakley found that the organisation of the division of labour may vary from the organisation of roles in other areas of the marriage. Whilst incomplete assessment prevents these results from clarifying this point, this finding was borne in mind during the inspection of the respondents' comments. Therefore, since Oakley's findings contest Bott's theory that the concept of jointness/segregation is a general dimension of the marital role relationship, the assessment of the division of labour was not used in the assessment of the marital role relationship in terms of 'jointness' and segregation. Instead the two were used as independent factors in discussing the respondents' lifestyles in terms of their marriages.
10.7.1. The Division of Labour

The respondents were asked to assess their husbands' participation in domestic tasks in the kitchen. Seven patterns of involvement can be discerned on a scale ranging from a high level of involvement (1), where the wife describes her husband as 'sharing' kitchen work, to the lowest level (7) where he does not do any kitchen work at all. Table 101 shows the distribution of the sample across these categories.

Overall, the majority of the women said they received some help in the kitchen, supporting the general consensus that husbands participation in domestic work has increased over the last century. However, only a third of the women (categories 1 and 2) described patterns of involvement (sharing/high level of helping) implied by assertions of equality in modern marriage and the increasing prevalence of symmetrical family relationships described by Young and Willmott (8).

In category 1, the women described their husbands as sharing kitchen work. Husbands were thought capable of taking over responsibility for meal preparation and described as enjoying and being willing to help.

R20 - 'We're together every evening. We try to get all four of them (children) into bed together at 7. And then we go into the kitchen ourselves and prepare our own meal. And he does his share of the washing and ironing and the cleaning, too.'

It category 2, husbands helped frequently including cooking and getting meals. They were capable helpers who could assume responsibility for kitchen tasks, but there was less emphasis on sharing and enjoyment compared to category 1.
R36 - 'He very often prepares us a meal on a Saturday afternoon. Sundays, he helps carve the joint and cooks the vegetables and dishes it all up. He's a very good cook.'

The third category consists of husbands whose wives said that they helped regularly but do not cook.

R2 - 'He washes up evenings and weekends. He doesn't cook. In fact, I'm very fortunate that he does that, 'cos in Italy the men do nothing - they don't lift a cup - really! But I've got him trained. He doesn't ever do any washing or ironing.'

R6 - 'Usually at the weekends when he's home he does the dishes or tries to take the children off my hands and occupy them. He is as helpful as he can be. He doesn't do any cooking. He gets meals if he's taking care of them (the children) for the day while I'm out, but I've always prepared it the day before.'

In category 4 were husbands who helped but less frequently than categories 2 and 3. Their contribution tended to take the form of doing a token task at a set time.

R4 - 'Sunday lunchtimes, he rushes up from the table before we've finished our conversation and whizzes out and does a bit of greasy old washing up and leaves it all stranded - half the pots and pans undone anyway, as I haven't had time to clear them out - and then he whizzes back to his armchair and goes to sleep. He feels he's done it! So when he's finished his little activity, I go and run some clean hot water and go through the lot again. If I feel rotten or tired, or I'm rushing out somewhere, then he might do a little bit of washing up. He doesn't do wiping.'
R23 - 'Saturday morning he washes up. He likes to look in all
the saucepans and turn things down. He helps to prepare things some­
times like chopping up cabbage or chips. He says he likes cooking.'

Category 5 consists of husbands who did things in the kitchen
but whose participation was due to circumstances dictated by necessity
rather than from ideas of equitable division of labour between husband
and wife.

R31 - 'He doesn't help with anything like cooking and washing
up. He makes his own breakfast, tea and cereal, every day.'

Category 6 consists of husbands whose help extended to minor
tasks, a minimum amount of participation.

R24 - 'He doesn't ever really do any cooking or washing up.
He makes coffee sometimes, but he's not over helpful. He puts the
shopping away every Saturday and keeps the cupboards tidy.'

Eight wives in the last category (7) stated they had no help
from their husbands in the kitchen.

The relationship between the division of labour and socio­
economic status, orientation towards the kitchen, and level of identi­
fication with the housewife role was then examined (Tables 102,103,104).
For the purposes of assessment categories 1, 2 and 3 are classed
together as 'high', and categories 4 to 7 inclusive as 'low' division
of labour.

There is a tendency for less help with kitchen work amongst
working class husbands (Table 102). Table 103 shows that women orientated
towards the kitchen as their 'own' room report less help from their
husbands, as do women with a high/very high identification with
the domestic role (Table 104).
10.7.2. **The Marital Role Relationship**

The marital role relationship was assessed from respondents' accounts of the organisation of their leisure activities together with relevant spontaneous comments made during the interview. For instance, R20 indicates a 'joint' relationship with her husband, interests and activities being shared.

R20 - 'We lead a very, very shared life, we've practically no separate interests. The only time is at the weekends when I'm in the kitchen and Michael's outside in the garden or pottering about with the car. If we're not together in the kitchen, we're together in the lounge. We're mostly in. We occasionally go to the theatre and Michael goes out 2 nights a month to do with work. Friday evening we cook a proper meal together with a bottle of wine. We've stopped going out as it's too expensive. But this is very pleasant.'

In contrast, R31's description of her evening and weekend leisure time indicates a 'segregated' marital relationship. Husband and wife have precisely defined and differentiated roles and different interests and activities.

R31 - 'On father's day off, we carry on much the same. I don't drop my housework or cooking so the days are really the same unless we go out somewhere in the afternoon ... We rarely go out as a couple. He goes down the pub a couple of nights (Entertaining friends?) No. All the couples we know all have children, so my husband sees his mates down the pub at the weekend and I see the wives during the week. So we don't ever have anyone round for drinks or entertaining.'

Likewise:
R5 - 'Friday night my husband doesn't come home. He stays out for the business. He works Saturday and Sunday mornings. Saturday at 5 (p.m.) I get ready to go out with Mum and Dad to bingo every week and he babysits. Sunday nights about 7-ish, he gets changed and goes off down the pub.'

It was noted that some couples had a 'complementary' role relationship, sharing responsibilities but having separate interests.

R39 - 'Two nights a week he's quite often at work - not always. And two evenings, I go out and another evening he goes out. We believe we should follow separate interests.'

R21 - 'We're in most evenings. Once a week, I go to 'keep fit' and my husband goes to metal work evening classes. It's relaxation for both of us, it's important to get out separately.'

The women were assessed as having either a 'joint' or a 'segregated' marital role relationship relative to each other, 'complementary' organisation counting as 'joint.' A 'joint' relationship was found prevalent amongst the middle class women and a 'segregated' marital role relationship prevailed amongst the working class women (Table 105), in line with findings by Bott and other researchers.

From examination of the relationship between the marital role relationship and orientation towards the kitchen, it would seem that more working class women oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room have a 'segregated' relationship (Table 106). There would appear to be no relationship between the division of labour and the marital role relationship in agreement with Oakley and others (Table 107). Those with a 'joint' marital role are equally divided in terms of a high or low division of labour between husband and wife. There may be a slight tendency for women with a segregated role relationship to receive less help with housework from their husbands.
10.7.3. The Assessment of Satisfaction

The respondents were not asked directly about their satisfaction with their lifestyle in order to avoid the tendency of 'conventionalisation' [Edmonds (5)] - a concern to choose the socially desirable response. This is the essentially unconscious and unintended tendency for people to identify with the social relationships, arrangements and institutions in which they are involved [Blauner (6) explains further]. To openly express and admit to dissatisfaction is threatening to the self-concepts that most people hold of themselves when discussing areas where it is more desirable to appear contented rather than overtly dissatisfied.

Instead, respondents were asked a number of questions from which assessments of satisfaction and dissatisfaction could be made. Relevant spontaneous comments made during the whole interview were included in the responses on which the assessment of satisfaction were based. In the use of these it was borne in mind that spontaneous information tends to dwell on negative rather than positive feelings, therefore validity is greater in cases of dissatisfaction than of satisfaction, which is somewhat of a deduction based on the absence of evidence to the contrary.

'In the course of a lengthy interview, respondents quite commonly spontaneously express negative feeling which they have denied in response to a direct question, or fail to express positive feeling which may have been expected from their answers to direct questions' [Brown and Rutter (7)].

The women were asked: 'Do you ever feel isolated or cut off from the rest of the family when you are in the kitchen?' Since other studies have substantiated the relationship between feelings
of social isolation and work dissatisfaction (8). They were also asked: 'Do you ever feel the need to be alone?' since research by Gavron (9) indicates a feeling of 'captivity' to be a prime source of dissatisfaction amongst housewives.

In Chapter 11, satisfaction and dissatisfaction amongst the women will be discussed on an individual basis. The group response to the two questions above is, however, of interest in its own right.

10.7.3.1. The Need to be Alone, and Isolation in the Kitchen

The question on the need to be alone provoked comments of satisfaction, where the need was being met, or not felt, and those of dissatisfaction, a need to be alone or complaints of being alone too much. It is interesting to note from Table 108 differences in response according to orientation to the kitchen.

The majority of the 'family' kitchen oriented women feel their need to be alone satisfied. In contrast, half of the 'own' oriented women express dissatisfaction about having not enough or too much time alone. Slightly more of the 'a' room oriented women are also satisfied. It is interesting to note that of those dissatisfied in the 'a' room group, all but one say it is because they are too much alone.

Looking at isolation whilst in the kitchen (Table 109) again the majority of those of a 'family' orientation do not feel isolated and half of the own oriented women are dissatisfied feeling they are 'cut off' and 'missing out.' Most of those 'a' room oriented appear not to feel isolated there.

10.8. Past Housing Experience

As background information, considered to be of possible relevance in the consideration of the women's satisfaction or dissatisfaction
with their present life-style and their preferred life styles, questions on their past housing experience were included. Respondents were asked how many dwellings they had lived in since marriage, what type (including details of ground floor layout); where they had eaten most of their meals and how spacious they felt their past housing had been. They were also asked about their housing as a child, in terms of whether they had ever shared a bedroom and their feelings about this; where the family had usually eaten and how spacious they felt their accommodation had been.

Details of past housing experience were used in the explanation of the differences in orientation amongst the women, which forms the next chapter.

10.9 Summary

Analysis of the projective sentence completion test and direct questions to determine orientation towards the kitchen (Chapter 7), further substantiated the initial assumption from the related literature of the relevance of women's roles in the explanation of differences between women in their attitudes towards the kitchen.

Part One of this chapter therefore examined the situation of women in general in more detail than in the review of the literature (Chapters 1 and 2). Despite changes in women's situation associated with past and present social and economic developments, the domestic role remains the primary role for women. Its primacy, plus the special characteristics of the role and the conflict and uncertainty associated with the process of change are shown to be sources of stress for women.

The second part of this chapter considered the overall situation of the women in this sample, in terms of their identification with the domestic role and their marriage. The working class women have a
significantly higher identification with the domestic role than the middle class women. Women oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room appear to have a tendency towards a slightly higher identification with the domestic role. Women highly oriented towards the domestic role appear to have positive separation of function.

Examination of the division of labour in marriage showed a tendency for working class husbands to be described as giving less help in the kitchen by their wives. Women oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room and those with a high identification with the domestic role, also tended to report less help from their husbands.

An evaluation of the women as 'joint' or 'segregated' in their marital relationship relative to each other was made. A joint marital role relationship was found significantly prevalent amongst the middle class women and a 'segregated' relationship prevalent amongst working class women. There was an indication that more working class women oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room had a segregated marital role relationship. No relationship was found between the marital role relationship and the division of labour, although there may be a slight tendency for women with a 'segregated' role relationship to receive less help with the housework from their husbands.

An assessment of marital satisfaction was made for each women from indirect questions and relevant spontaneous comments made during the interview. These individual assessments are used in the following chapter. However, it was noted from the overall response to two associated questions, that the majority of women oriented towards the kitchen as a 'family' room felt their need to be alone satisfied, whilst half of those 'own' oriented were dissatisfied about not enough or too much time alone. Half of those 'a' room oriented were also
dissatisfied, almost all felt they were alone too much. The majority of those 'family' oriented did not feel isolated in the kitchen, whereas half of those 'own' oriented felt they were cut off or 'missing out.' The majority of those 'a' room oriented did not feel isolated. In addition, details of each woman's past housing experience were examined for use in Chapter 11.

The next chapter (11) examines the interrelationship between those aspects of the situation of the women in this sample described above. A case study approach is utilised in the explanation of the variations between the women in their attitudes towards the kitchen.
Table 97.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND IDENTIFICATION WITH DOMESTIC ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification with Domestic Role</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High/High (Disposed Toward Routine)</td>
<td>14 (44)</td>
<td>18 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (No Evidence of Routine)</td>
<td>16 (73)</td>
<td>6 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 4.4; \ d.f. = 1; \ p < .05$
Table 98.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPLOYMENT OUTSIDE THE HOME, SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND IDENTIFICATION WITH THE DOMESTIC ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification with the Domestic Role</th>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time/Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High/High (Dispensed Toward Routine)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (19)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26 (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (No Evidence of Routine)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9 (41)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>15 (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 (72)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.19; \text{d.f.} = 1; p > .10, \text{N.S.} \]
### Table 99.
IDENTIFICATION WITH THE DOMESTIC ROLE AND ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification with the Domestic Role</th>
<th>Orientation Towards the Kitchen</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Family'</td>
<td>'Own'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High/High (Disposed Toward Routine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (No Evidence of Routine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 1.88; \text{d.f.} = 2; p > .10, \text{N.S.}
\]

### Table 100.
IDENTIFICATION WITH THE DOMESTIC ROLE AND SEPARATION OF FUNCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification with the Domestic Role</th>
<th>Separation of Function</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High/High (Disposed Toward Routine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (No Evidence of Routine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 8.29; \text{d.f.} = 2; p < .05.
\]
Table 101.

HUSBANDS PARTICIPATION IN KITCHEN WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Participation</th>
<th>(1) Helping, Including Cooking</th>
<th>(2) Helping, Including Cooking</th>
<th>(3) Helping, No Cooking</th>
<th>(4) Lower Level of (2) and (3)</th>
<th>(5) For Self Only</th>
<th>(6) Very Little</th>
<th>(7) None</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (%)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
<td>11 (20)</td>
<td>8 (15)</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
<td>8 (15)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 102.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND THE DIVISION OF LABOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of Labour</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16 (62)</td>
<td>10 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14 (50)</td>
<td>14 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = .73; \text{ d.f. } = 1; p > .10, \text{ N.S.} \)

Table 103.

ORIENTATION TOWARDS THE KITCHEN AND THE DIVISION OF LABOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of Labour</th>
<th>Orientation Towards the Kitchen</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9 (35)</td>
<td>7 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6 (21)</td>
<td>11 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>15 (28)</td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 1.46; \text{ d.f. } = 2; p > .10, \text{ N.S.} \)

Table 104.

LEVEL OF IDENTIFICATION WITH THE DOMESTIC ROLE AND THE DIVISION OF LABOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of Labour</th>
<th>Identification with Domestic Role</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very High/High (Disposed Toward Routine)</td>
<td>Low (No Evidence of Routine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13 (50)</td>
<td>13 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19 (68)</td>
<td>9 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>32 (59)</td>
<td>22 (41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 1.78; \text{ d.f. } = 1; p > .10, \text{ N.S.} \)
### Table 105.

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND THE MARITAL ROLE RELATIONSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Role Relationship</th>
<th>Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>27 (73)</td>
<td>10 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>14 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>30 (56)</td>
<td>24 (44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 14.4; d.f. = 1; p < .001

### Table 106.

(see following page)

### Table 107.

**THE DIVISION OF LABOUR AND THE MARITAL ROLE RELATIONSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Role Relationship</th>
<th>Division of Labour</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>19 (51)</td>
<td>18 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated</td>
<td>7 (41)</td>
<td>10 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>26 (48)</td>
<td>28 (52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = .48; d.f. = 1; p > .10, N.S.
Table 106.
SOcio-economy status, the marital role relationship and orientation to the kitchen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Role Relationship</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th></th>
<th>Orientation to the Kitchen</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total (%):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 (27)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 (30)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 (41)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15 (28)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18 (33)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.05; \text{ d.f.} = 2; p > .10, \text{ N.S.} \]
### Table 108.

**ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND THE NEED TO BE ALONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need to Be Alone</th>
<th>Orientation to Kitchen</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need Satisfied</td>
<td>Family: 13 (38) Own: 9 (26) A: 12 (35)</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Unsatisfied: All</td>
<td>Family: 2 (10) Own: 9 (45) A: 9 (45)</td>
<td>20 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would like time alone</td>
<td>Family: 1 Own: 4 A: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Too much time alone</td>
<td>Family: 1 Own: 5 A: 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>15 (28) 18 (33) 21 (39)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) $\chi^2 = 5.22$; d.f. = 2; $p > .05$, N.S.

(2) Family orientation vs. other orientations: $\chi^2 = 5.00$; d.f. = 1; $p < .05$.

---

### Table 109.

**ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND FEELINGS OF ISOLATION IN THE KITCHEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings of Isolation in Kitchen</th>
<th>Orientation to the Kitchen</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Family: 13 (35) Own: 9 (24) A: 15 (41)</td>
<td>37 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Family: 2 (12) Own: 9 (53) A: 6 (35)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>15 (28) 18 (33) 21 (39)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 5.23$; d.f. = 2; $p > .05$, N.S.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONNECTIONS

11.1 Introduction ........................................... 290

11.2 Orientation to the Kitchen as the Woman's 'Own' Room. 290

11.3 Orientation to the Kitchen as a 'Family' Room. .... 293

11.4 Orientation to the Kitchen as 'A' Room. ....... 294

11.5 The Case Studies. ....... 297

11.6 Summary. ....... 324
11.1. Introduction

Using the information presented in Chapter 10, this chapter examines the relationship between the women's orientation towards the kitchen, their identification with the domestic role and their marriage in terms of the division of labour, the marital role relationship and marital satisfaction. In addition an attempt is made to explain the women's orientations, based upon the parameters listed above, the 'separation of function' (Chapter 9), plus socio-economic status, past housing experience and the other family and housing variables of number and age of children, the respondents' employment status, room size and layout of the ground floor.

As Table 110 shows, no single marital or lifestyle measure can explain the variation in orientation between the women in the sample. Furthermore, neither socio-economic status, age and number of children, employment status, room size, houseplan or other background data, such as past housing experiences can, alone, account for the various orientations. However, by taking a case study approach, whereby the unitary nature of the individual case is retained and the relationship between its various attributes emphasised, a working hypothesis (or rather, a series of working hypotheses) was developed to explain the differences in orientation between the women.

The hypothesis rests upon the identification of distinct sub-groups within each orientation. These sub-groups are illustrated in Figure 12.

11.2. Orientation Towards the Kitchen as the Woman's 'Own' Room

This could be considered the 'traditional' orientation: 'A woman's place is in the home and in the kitchen' being part of the
OUTLINE OF SUB-GROUPS WITHIN
THE THREE BASIC ORIENTATIONS
TOWARDS THE KITCHEN.

Figures in ( ) refer to number of respondents in sub-group.
norms and attitudes related to the traditional ascription of the
domestic role to women in society. One third of the women in the
sample were of this orientation. Looking at their characteristics
as a group (Table 110), the women tend to have a high domestic role
identity, report less help in the kitchen from their husbands and are
biased towards positive separation of function. Most of the working
class women in this group have a separated role relationship with their
husbands. Interestingly, when asked whether or not they like being
in the kitchen eight of the women 'own' room oriented say initially
that they like to be there, but then go on to say that they accept it
with some further admitting that they dislike being there. Only a
minority of women in the other two groups share this pattern of re­s­
ponse (discussed in detail in Chapter 7).

This finding suggests a difference between the women as to the
reasons for their orientations towards the kitchen as their 'own' room.
Further examination of this group of eighteen women reveals two dis­
tinct sub-groups termed 'traditional' and 'dissatisfied' for ease
of reference in Figure 12. Seven women belong to the former and
eleven to the latter.

11.2.1. Sub-Group One: 'Traditional "Own"

All seven women are highly committed to the domestic role.
Six are working class and one middle class. They are all satisfied
with their housing and their life-style. Their case studies show them
as conscientious housewives. Only two of the women indicate a
degree of awareness of their role and its constraints. To the others
it seems their natural role. R32 indicates her awareness in her
comments:

(on the kitchen) 'I suppose really that's the place we spend most
time in, don't we.'
(on her ideal kitchen): 'I think I'd have the one that I've got because if I had one with all things in it, automatic things that did everything, I think I'd get bored - if I had a fancy cooker and dishwasher I'd get more bored than I am now.'

R32 escapes to the bathroom to be alone, but feels it is impossible really to be alone. R29 is aware of feeling isolated and alone. Thus, whilst highly dedicated housewives, closely aligned with the other five, these women exhibit an undercurrent of awareness and acceptance of this role.

11.2.2. Sub-Group Two: 'Dissatisfied'

It is this awareness of the domestic role that unites the second sub-group of women oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room, in whom it is much more pronounced. Their circumstances vary, as their case studies show, but a unifying factor is a generally high identification with the domestic role, combined with an often acute awareness of their position and dissatisfaction with it, which they frequently do not admit to initially.

11.3. Orientation Towards the Kitchen as a 'Family' Room

Again, within their orientation two distinct sub-groups of women identify the kitchen as a 'family' room. A quarter of the women hold what can be described as a working class traditional approach (sub-group 3, Figure 12). The kitchen is a family room because the lounge must be kept for best. The remaining three-quarters hold a middle class shared approach (sub-group 4, Figure 12). The kitchen is the focus of family activities, stemming from the shared division of labour and joint marital role philosophy of these couples.

The 'traditionalists' have a very high identification with the domestic role, positive separation of function, segregated marital
role relationships and score very low on the division of labour. All four have only two rooms (kitchen-diner + lounge, or lounge-diner + kitchen). Possibly if they had three rooms, they would be the same as sub-group one, the traditional housewives oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room, with the dining room as the family room if desired and their priority of a 'best' room satisfied by reserving the lounge for 'best.'

The 'sharers' have low identification with the domestic role, negative separation of function, a high division of labour and a joint marital role relationship.

11.4. Orientation Towards the Kitchen as 'A' Room

In Chapter 7 the concept of three orientations was initiated from analysis of the sentence completion test. The orientation towards the kitchen as 'a' room was then sub-divided into four groups from the responses to further questioning (Chapter 7, part 2). Briefly, these were:

1. Women who wanted their kitchen to be a family room.
2. Women who considered their kitchen a purely functional room.
3. Women who thought of their kitchen as an integrated workroom.
4. Women who considered their kitchen as an area integrated with the rest of the ground floor.

These four sub-divisions are now allocated to sub-groups 5, 6, 7 and 8, respectively.

11.4.1. Sub-Group 5: 'Impeded Family Shared' Orientation

The women wanting their kitchen to be a family room appear to share the same lifestyle as those in sub-group four ('family shared') in terms of low identification with the domestic role, a joint marital role relationship, a high division of labour and a negative separation
of function. They appear satisfied with their lifestyles but not with their kitchen. It seems that the houseplan is causing dissatisfaction in particular the size of the kitchen.

From an examination of kitchen size (Chapter 6) and its relationship to orientation (Chapter 7), it is seen that kitchen size does not explain orientation. Although more of those women with a family orientation do have large kitchens, some have extremely small kitchens relative to women of the other orientations. The women in sub-group 5 seem aware of the limitations caused by the small size of their kitchen and can see how much better it would be if their present houseplan was altered. Indeed, one is seriously considering alterations to turn two separate rooms into one kitchen-diner, and another has actually installed a doorway between her kitchen and dining room. It seems that dissatisfaction with their surroundings predominates, stemming from their awareness of the feasibility of architectural improvements.

11.4.2. Sub-Group 6: 'Non-Kitchen' Orientation

The four respondents in this sub-group are united through varying circumstances which cause them to hold a non-kitchen orientation. Two seem predominantly work oriented and for one respondent the kitchen plays no part in her role model. All four consider their kitchen to be solely functional.

11.4.3. Sub-Group 7: 'Modern' Orientation

The women in the third subdivision of the 'a' room orientation towards the kitchen are a group of working class women with positive separation of function and positive orientation towards the domestic role. However, these characteristics are combined with a joint marital role relationship for half the women, although division of labour seems to be low on the whole. This differentiates them from the traditional
working class women of 'family' and 'own' orientations, who have segregated marital role relationships with their spouses and a low division of labour.

Half of these women are ambivalent towards or say they dislike being in the kitchen. However, despite their more shared relationship with their husbands, housework is still their responsibility and their husbands participation is low. There may be more sharing and equality in some areas of the relationship, but it does not automatically extend to the area of division of labour amongst these working class couples. It is possible that the women's own attitudes explain, in part, their husband's lack of participation in housework, for many women share the traditional male view that housework is women's responsibility. The traditional role model for these women is the kitchen as the woman's 'own' and/or 'family' room (sub-groups 1 and 3). These women of sub-group 7 seem to have a modern life-style but, since equality does not embrace the actual sharing of kitchen work, the kitchen is not the centre of the house, as it is in the modern middle class egalitarian approach (sub-group 4). Instead with this 'working-class modern' approach, the kitchen is 'a' room. The woman still has responsibility for the kitchen, but there is no identification with it. The women's old-fashioned mothers were 'in the kitchen all the time.' These women are showing they have more modern joint role relationships by rejecting this role model, hence the kitchen as an integrated workroom. Due to their 'joint' marital role relationships they do not feel the kitchen is their room, but it is still a workroom, where they go to perform the kitchen tasks which are still their responsibility and it is not regarded as a social family area.
11.4.4. Sub-Group 8: Integrated

Half middle and half working class, the majority of these women do not have positive separation of function. They have a low identification with the domestic role, a joint role relationship and a tendency towards a high division of labour. They are satisfied with their houses and their lifestyle. This profile identifies them with the women in sub-group 4, but their comments lack the emphasis placed by members of sub-group 4 on their shared relationships.

11.5. The Case Studies

11.4.1. Own Room Orientation Sub-Groups One and Two

The seven women in sub-group I appear to conform to the traditional housewife role and are content in this role. Overall, they have a high domestic role identity, segregated marital role relationship, low division of labour, like being in their kitchen and have positive separation of function. R33 is working class and a full-time housewife with three girls aged 13, 8 and 4, living in a local authority house with a ground floor layout of separate kitchen, dining room and lounge. To her, the kitchen is her own room, the dining room is the family room and the lounge is 'for best.' R33's description of her daily activities shows her traditional approach and high involvement in the domestic role.

R33 - 'I do have a routine. Usually I hoover through first, then today I've done the washing. Later on I shall do a bit of ironing and then start the dinner. So I'm either in the kitchen or the dining room. I don't go and sit in the living room till after dinner in the evening.'

On her husband's help in the kitchen:
R33 - 'He washes up and prepares the vegetables at the weekends. He'll help me wash up during the weeknight evenings if he hasn't got to go out anywhere. He does the washing; he doesn't do the wiping as he doesn't like that bit, so I do that.'

R33 likes being in her kitchen and does not feel isolated there. Her ideal kitchen would have a table and a part to sit in. On her ground floor layout, she comments:

R33 - 'I like the lounge separate from the kitchen and dining bit. When you're in the sitting room, you're shut off from the kitchen and you can forget about the hard work in the kitchen. You're in the kitchen all day slogging and you like to think: right I'll get out of it now and go in the sitting room and sit down.'

Of her kitchen:

R33 - 'I call the kitchen my kitchen. I'm always saying "come on now get out of my kitchen."'

Interviewer: 'Some people like to keep one room as a best room, do you?'

R33 - 'Well, I like to keep the sitting room tidy. I don't like the children messing it up too much. In case anyone pops in and it's looking a bit untidy.'

Working class R17 is a part-time worker with two children under 5. Her local authority house has a kitchen-diner and separate lounge.

R17 - 'We always seem to be out there.' (the kitchen)

Husband and wife eat in the lounge but the children do not. If R17's husband is late, she will feed the children first and have her meal with him later.

R17 - 'I think it's better to have a kitchen-diner. I don't want a separate dining room. I'm quite happy with what I've got.'
R17's kitchen is split into a 'kitchen' area and a very clean, tidy, attractive dining area demarcated by smart dark brown carpet.

R17 is influenced by her mother as a role model. On ironing:

R17 - 'In the kitchen.' (Why?) 'I don't know. I have to do it in the evening, as I'm at work. I do it in the kitchen as mother used to do it there.'

The following is an excerpt from R17's daily activities:

'I get up at 6:30, wash, dress. Then Darren and Tracy wake up. I bring them downstairs, I dress them in the kitchen and put the kettle on for a cup of tea. Meanwhile, my husband gets up and has a wash. I serve their breakfast, do my make-up in the kitchen while they're eating it, pour the tea out and my husband just has a cup of tea and goes out quick. They (children) play in the kitchen till I'm ready then we go (to school, child minder and part-time job).'

For R17, going to work is extra and has to be combined with her domestic role: 'If I have time I make the beds, if not I do them in the afternoons.' R17's afternoons are spent doing housework. At weekends: 'My husband and the children will be in the lounge. I'm mostly in the kitchen, with extra meals and housework.'

On her husband's help: 'He'll help with the washing up during the weekend - that is on Sunday. Not during the week. He doesn't help with or do any cooking.'

R17 likes being in the kitchen. 'I'm in there all the time. I like cooking.' and never feels isolated. She is happy with her house and generally satisfied. The lounge is her favourite room 'as we spent more time on this room, buying different things.' And the kitchen her own room 'because I'm in there all the time.'
On a best room: 'I think it's nice to have one room kept nice, I mean in case anybody comes.'

R17's comments demonstrate, as Oakley points out: 'The addition of paid work to the housewife's activities does not mean she is no longer a housewife.' (1) and the primacy of the housewife role in the value system of society.

R24 is the only middle class woman in this sub-group. She is a full-time housewife with children aged two and five. Highly committed to the domestic role, she is content, despite her comments which reveal her husband's dominance in their relationship. The following excerpts provide an example:

'Peter gets a bit grumpy if I'm not eating with him.' (Therefore, she feeds the children first when he is going to be late home and then waits for him.)

'Peter's stricter then I am.' (Referring to the children at mealtimes.)

Does your husband chat with you in the kitchen? 'Occasionally. Often he shouts to me and I walk around.' Does he help you? 'No really. He makes coffee, but he's not over helpful. He puts the shopping away every Saturday and keeps the cupboards tidy. If he wants to make something he'll cook that, that's occasionally.'

R24's husband: 'The garage, that's my province.'

On feeling isolated: 'I do. Myself I would like that serving hatch (from kitchen to lounge) open, but he won't have it open. I don't know why. I would like the company. I've always liked all doors open, even when I'm on my own.'

Of her 'own' room, the kitchen, she says: 'I like the way I've got it. I picked the colour for the walls and I've got my plants and that.'
She likes being in the kitchen: 'I don't relax in there, but I am happy in there doing things. I don't rush to get back in the lounge because the kitchen's nice. I like what I've done to it.'

It was observed that three of the working class women allowed the lounge to be used for wider purposes. For example, R27's comments show her working class traditional approach to the lounge as an area for sitting in or the display of possessions.

'Before (in last house) we ate in the kitchen, the same as here; convenience and I don't like eating and tables and things in the lounge. Quite apart from anything else, it spoils the look of the room if you've got a dining table and chairs in it. I like it to be a sitting room.' And on its arrangement: 'It's difficult to see the t.v., but the room looks best this way.' However:

'We eat on trays in the evening watching t.v.' And, about the lounge, 'There's plenty of room. The kids can get on the floor doing things.' 'We do just about everything in the lounge, it's a family room.' 'I don't believe in a best room. I'm afraid. Everybody uses everything freely.'

R27 is a traditional full-time housewife, working class with two children 11 and 13 although unlike most of the others, she does have negative separation of function. She could be described as 'relaxed rules traditional' (as distinct from sub-group 7 modern (traditional working class). R17 and R29 are also less traditional in feeling more free about how they use their lounges. For example R17 and R29 eat meals in the lounge although they also like to keep it as a best room:

R29 - 'There is only this lounge that you can keep nice. It's nice to sit down where everything is tidy.' 'It's somewhere
at night you relax and you think, well, that's that, you've done your job for the day.'

This 'relaxed traditional' approach could be influenced by the fact that all three of these working class women have a lounge-diner or kitchen-diner and thus more pressure on space, whereas the other working class women all have separate rooms.

The difference between this sub-group of 7 women and sub-group 2 composed of the remaining 11 'own' oriented women, is that although they have the same orientation and high identification with the domestic role the latter feel this is not from choice, but acceptance of this aspect of their lifestyle and express dissatisfaction. The following extracts illustrate this dissatisfaction.

R16 is a middle class nurse married to a working class ganger. The couple have two children under 5 and live in a local authority house with a kitchen-diner. R16 would like a separate dining room which she thinks would help her get out of the kitchen: 

'... and also I feel I'm in the kitchen all day whether I'm doing kitchen work or not.'

On her husband coming into the kitchen to chat with her: 'Not very often, no. In fact, I quite often moan. He goes off into the other room as he prefers to sit in there instead and every so often I have a moan that he's left me in here.' On liking being in the kitchen: 'Yes and no. Sometimes I do and sometimes I don't. Not very often I don't. You have the same routine day in, day out and on the odd occasion I get fed up. I don't really moan. I like housework really.' On ever feeling isolated in the kitchen: 'That I've got used to now again. When we first moved in and during the winter months when we had all the doors shut and I was here on
my own I did.' Her own room is 'the kitchen I suppose - because I'm always here.' R16 seems to like her situation, but her comments go on to reveal that she is dissatisfied and really accepts her situation. She frequently mentions wanting a dining room, in terms of it being a means of escape from the kitchen. For example, on having a best room: 'Mmm, the sitting room. That's why I'd like to have a dining room. We'd probably still have the t.v. in the sitting room and sit here (lounge) in the evenings. But other than doing cooking and washing and what-have-you, I'd be in the dining room during the day, say for sewing and with them (the children) playing.'

R2 is another dedicated housewife, her dedication stemming from her acceptance of her domestic role and making an investment in it in order to gain satisfaction. A homeworker, teaching Italian, she is English married to an Italian with two boys aged 10 and 13. She is middle-class and has a kitchen/diner plus lounge layout. 'My husband's Italian and the Italian man is the head of the family.' 'We wait and eat together at night even if he's late.' Snacks: if my husband's home then they have them in the kitchen/diner. If he's not home, then I let them have them here (lounge). He's very strict. We mustn't have anything in here.' (Family evening activities) 'I gave them a language lesson each for half an hour. They my husband said they had to go to bed. They both go at the same time.' 'If I had a separate dining room and a personal friend of mine came then we could go in there and have a chat, whereas it has to be the kitchen/diner all the time and I feel I'm never away from the kitchen.' 'I can't say my kitchen's my favourite room. I feel so confined.' 'I often feel tense because of the lack of space.'
Asked whether she likes being in the kitchen: 'I suppose so; it's not a case of liking it. I have to spend so much time in there. It's not unpleasant as it's sunny and nice and light in there. If it was bigger I'd be happier and probably enjoy being in there more. Being as it's so small I just accept it and do what I've got to do (no particular likes and dislikes re tasks done in there). I like cooking and there's a lot to my cooking 'cos I have to cook Italian food so there's a lot of preparing.'

On relaxing in the kitchen: 'No. I think I would if it was bigger. My cousin has got a kitchen twice the size of this kitchen/diner and it's wonderful. She's got a table and chairs (and she's got a dining room) but just to sit in it is wonderful. On her husband chatting to her in the kitchen: 'I think it's nice when the husband comes in to have a chat and I said to him the other day, "oh, you never come in to have a chat." He only comes in for a specific purpose.' On isolation in the kitchen: 'No, not really. Only sometimes when they all come in here and shut the door and I say please leave it open. It's just at times that I want to feel included. That's usually at the weekend. I don't know why, but they're all relaxing and I'm still at it and they shut me out. So I say leave the door open please. So my husband says "Oh, the smell of the cooking going about the house" and I say "Oh, well, it probably would anyway."'

Three women in the second sub-group differ from the first sub-group of 7 and the rest of the second group in that they have negative separation of function, low identification with the housewife role and a tendency towards a joint marital role relationship. For one of them, R52, the reason for the emphasis on the kitchen as her
'own' room is because she does her home hairdressing business there. Her 'own' room is 'The dining room and kitchen because I'm out here working and my husband isn't out here much.'

R6 and R7's profiles lead one to expect a 'family' rather than an 'own' room' orientation. However, although their profile differs from the other women, they share the same consciousness of their role. This would appear to be because although the division of labour is still high relative to many of the other women in the sample and the relationship is joint, both these women are conscious of circumstances having changed, now they have two small pre-school children to look after. Middle class R7's children are both under five. Her husband is a supervisor with British Rail. He commutes to London and usually works a late shift a couple of times a week, and frequently works weekends. R6, also middle class, has two children aged 4 years and 1 year. She is an ex-nurse; her husband is a doctor. They feel that their relationship is less shared than it was. They are conscious of this and give the impression they would like to feel more sharing and could be expected to gravitate towards the 'family' kitchen group.

R7 talks about her husband helping in the kitchen: 'Cooking? No. He used to when I was at work. But washing up he often does after the evening meal, when I'm getting the children ready. Or often we wash and dry up together.' On feeling isolated: 'No. I think it is good. I rather like the feeling of not being cut off. If one of you in the evening say gets up to have a cup of coffee, you leave the door open and the communication is still there.' Using the kitchen for relaxation: 'No. Not at the moment. I'd like it to be.'
To summarise, two groups of women make up those oriented towards the kitchen as their own room. 1. A group of traditional housewives highly oriented towards the domestic role from choice and happy with it; and another group of the majority of the women with an 'own' orientation, who are conscious of their domestic role and express dissatisfaction, although highly committed to this role.

11.4.2. 'Family' Room Orientation Sub-Groups 3 and 4

The following accounts help draw a comparison between the two sub-groups within this orientation and the differences between them and the other sub-groups.

Considering the four traditionalists (sub-group 3) first of all, three are working class, the fourth is a middle class owner occupier, but she and her husband emphasise their working class background in their description of how and why they feel about and use their house. Two case studies are used to illustrate this sub-group, R5 the middle class woman and R31 one of the three working class women.

R5 lives in a recently built three bedroomed terraced house with kitchen/diner and lounge, which the couple own. Her husband is an ice cream wholesaler and they have two girls 6 and 5 at school. R5 works at home keeping the books for her husband.

Her husband finishes at 3 p.m. each day and collects the girls from school. A qualified chef, he cooks the evening meal, does his wife's weekend breakfast in bed and regularly helps bathe the children.

R5's husband: 'If I'm in the house, we're usually in the same room. I've never thought about it before, but if I'm out in the kitchen doing something, then you won't come and sit in here, you'll be out there with me.'
At first their lifestyle appears shared, but in fact it is a separated relationship with the husband dominant.

R5 - 'We more or less live out there. You can put that down.'
(Do you like being in the kitchen?) 'Yes, both absolutely.' 'I spend most time out here.' 'We treat our kitchen just for the family. You can classify our kitchen more with the old living room. You know, where you had a scullery, a kitchen-come-living room and a front room which was classified as best. Well, I did anyway. The kitchen was always the untidiest room in the house. We had a kitchen range and gas lighting. No electricity until I was 14 - we were about 20 years behind everyone else. I liked that.' On isolation: 'No, I don't feel cut off. Mostly if I'm out there, then they're out there.' On being alone: 'No, I like company. I can get on with things with others around. Does your husband help in the kitchen? Her: 'Not in the evening. I stay out and clear up the dishes.' Him: 'While the children are little they are slow to finish their sweet, I don't eat a sweet, so I pick up the papers and wander in here and read the paper for a bit of peace leaving Carol in there alone with the kids.' On children's use of the lounge: 'Yes. Absolutely. For a start, I won't allow plasticine or painting. I only allow crayoning when we're in here. I wouldn't leave them. The simple reason is they'd get carried away.' On television:'as long as they're not rude, the kids get their way.' On visitors: 'Even if the in-laws pop down, I whip them in here (lounge).' 'The driver who picks my husband up for work every morning, he comes into the kitchen/diner; he never comes in here. He's classified as staff, you see, that's the difference. On keeping a best room: 'The lounge. It's our upbringing, I think. Basically, we have been brought up
in council property with the best room that we weren't allowed to use unless visitors came. We're not so strict we don't use ours. I think with the modern invention of t.v. that changes it. If it wasn't for that, then there wouldn't be any reason to come in here. Our front room was kept locked. The kids only come in here for t.v. or if we have company.'

R31 is a working class full-time housewife with two children under five and a lounge-diner.

R31 - 'I love my kitchen, I really do. I think if you were sensible enough and made it comfortable in the kitchen, there's no reason why you've got to mess every other room up.' 'I don't want an extra dining room - just one more to clean.' 'I like my sitting room to be a sitting room, where you all obviously want to retire to.' 'My father kept the sitting room special for him. It was his room. Only Mum and Granny were allowed in there, on his orders. I don't believe in that, 'cos a home's a home. But you shouldn't have to eat in the lounge.' 'I like to keep the lounge for best. I think it's important to have somewhere nice where people can go if you have visitors and I like to know there's somewhere clean at the end of the day.'

On her daily activities and her husband: 'Basically he clocks in. I feed him and he goes out again.' 'During the day, well, he has to come out here (kitchen), but in the evenings I think I must go in there (lounge).' 'My husband isn't a do-er. He likes his peace and quiet.' 'We rarely go out as a couple, he goes down the pub a couple of nights for a few drinks with his friends. Occasionally I go out with a friend and he looks after the children.' 'I used
to stay at home all day and go to work in the evening for "Datasolve" (computer programming) for 4 hours, but I found I was doing so many hours a day. And you find you don't sit down during the day.'

R20's case study illustrates the women and their lifestyles in sub-group 4. R20 sums it up by saying 'we lead a very, very shared life.' She is a full-time health visitor, he is in the structural engineering business and works at home. He calls himself a 'househusband.' The couple have four children, 7, 5-year-old twins and 2. They live in a 4-bedroomed end terrace house with a lounge diner and kitchen. Her comments emphasise their sharing of tasks and joint role relationship.

From the sentence completion test. 'My kitchen ...

'is where the family congregate. Where the family is creative and together.' 'is where my husband and I get a closer relationship from shared activity.' Her kitchen is 'so small that the freezer, the washing machine and the tumble dryer are in the garage.' Yet despite this, she feels it is a family place and it is used for meals and other activities such as her husband's wine making and the children's painting, jigsaws and other games. About her ideal kitchen: 'I'd like the kitchen to be a living room. Big enough to have the whole family sitting around for a meal and even with the table pulled out for there to be enough room for the family to walk around.' Talking about her use of the kitchen in general, she comments 'There is one other point that is relevant and that is my background. That is, in Ireland, they tend to have one kitchen that is huge and is a type of living room, like a farmhouse kitchen.'

This group of women oriented towards the kitchen as a 'family room are equally as constrained by the presence of children and
norms and attitudes relating to the domestic role for women in society as the rest of the 54 women in the sample. They are all satisfied with their lifestyle, compared to the majority of women calling the kitchen their 'own' room. This would seem to be because there is a generally high division of labour and joint marital roles amongst these women. As women with young children, it is inevitable that they are restricted and that the family workload in terms of housework and childcare is high and therefore the kitchen is going to be used heavily and there is pressure on women to become involved with housework.

Oakley\(^{(2)}\) found two major attitudes towards housework:

1. termed the traditional orientation, where housework is done for its own sake, found mainly amongst working class women.

2. The instrumental orientation which she describes as a self-conscious commitment to motherhood and belief in companionate marriage, this orientation being found mainly amongst middle class women.

Applying this to the sample here the two 'traditional' groups of women in the 'family' and 'own' orientation groups would seem to share Oakley's traditional orientation whilst the other two groups in each orientation have an 'instrumental' approach. The difference between the traditionalists, accounting for some to regard their kitchen as their 'own' room and other as a 'family' room appears to be whether they have 3 separate rooms, in which case the kitchen is their 'own' room, or two rooms combined (kitchen/diner + lounge or lounge/diner + kitchen) in which case the kitchen is a family room in order to preserve the lounge, unless they are 'relaxed traditional' about allowing wider use of the lounge (see page 301).
The difference between the two groups with the instrumentalist approach seems to be that the 'family' oriented groups commitment to a companionate marriage is borne out in everyday life, whereas for those of an 'own' room orientation, the women may hold an egalitarian philosophy of a joint marriage, but their marriages tend towards being segregated in practice, for example, no shared division of labour. This results in their high investment in the housewife role to try and make their position rewarding, and their dissatisfaction with their lifestyle.

Just as R6 and R7 are borderline in having gone from a more shared relationship to being conscious of their domestic role and hence are 'own' room oriented, there are two women in the 'family' room group who are borderline. Two respondents in sub-group four are slightly different as they have positive separation of function and a low level of help in the kitchen from their husbands and one has a segregated marital role relationship (only just). However, they are happy with their lifestyle and emphatic about the kitchen being a 'family' room.

Both have children who are becoming more independent in their early teens and the women seem to intimate a consciousness of the fact that mother in the kitchen would not be the centre of the family for much longer.

These women seem to fall between sub-groups 3 and 4 as they have the positive separation of function attitude of keeping a best room for sitting/display and more formal entertaining and family meals and their husbands do not help in the kitchen. However, they have the much more 'instrumental' approach of the housewives in sub-group 4. The emphasis on motherhood and the kitchen being a family centre, not from the main standpoint of keeping the lounge as a best room.
To summarise, those women with a 'family' room orientation towards the kitchen fall into two groups: (1) traditional and (2) shared. 4 women, 3 working class and one middle class but with strong attachments to her working class background belong to group (1). The remainder of those 'family' oriented women belong to group two, their orientation stemming from a shared, satisfying marital relationship. In addition to the two borderline women previously described, there is an exception to this in the form of R8, who feels her kitchen is the family room due to the close companionship of her mother who lives with the family and who shares all the tasks with her. Otherwise, R8 has a tendency towards a segregated role relationship with her husband. Of these women, the majority are middle class and only two are working class.

11.4.3. 'A' Room Orientation: Sub-Groups 5, 6, 7 and 8

Sub-Group 5: Impeded 'Family Shared'

This group of 5 women resemble the women in sub-group 4, 'family orientation shared,' but think of their kitchen as 'a' room. This would seem to be because they are acutely aware of its architectural shortcomings.

R40 has two daughters aged 6, at school, and 3 1/4, at playgroup. She is a full-time housewife, formerly a secretary, her husband is an accountant. The family have very informal meals and she is not bothered much about togetherness at meals. The freezer is kept in the garage in order to fit in a table and chairs in the kitchen. The overall impression of this modern house with 3 separate rooms is homely, shabby and relaxed, with plenty of children's paraphernalia scattered about. The marital role relationship is joint and her husband helps out when he's at home. R40 is low on identification with the domestic role. She admits to doing housework
when she feels like it. She goes to writing classes once a week and her interview is full of references to making time for the children. She describes her lounge as definitely not a 'best room, but a living room. The couple frequently entertain friends at home.

R40 is conscious of her kitchen being small, does not like being there much and says other people get in the way in there. She would like a proper kitchen-diner, 'Then the dining room would be wasted space apart from when more people come round.' They have improved the houseplan as best they can be knocking the hatch into a archway to 'open out the kitchen and provide more contact.' If she could change one thing about her house, it would be to make the kitchen and dining room into a kitchen-diner.

Otherwise, R40 seems satisfied in her relationship and her lifestyle and very much a 'family shared' person. It is her dissatisfaction with the kitchen which makes it 'a' room not a 'family' room. She is aware of it's architectural drawbacks.

Similarly, R37's 'family shared' feeling is overshadowed by her feeling that her 'a' kitchen will become a family kitchen once her planned alterations to knock down the wall of the dining room to make a kitchen-diner have been done. Her small kitchen has no room for a table, or the freezer, which she says she may decide to bring in from the garage after the alterations. Meals are casual and frequently taken in the lounge. R37 has two children, 3 1/2 and 2; her husband is in insurance at junior management level. She has a joint marital role relationship, and he helps her at home. She likes being in her kitchen as long as she has company. Her ideal
kitchen would be big enough to have as a kitchen-diner 'apart from that I'm quite happy. A fantastic kitchen would be wasted on me.'

R22 is Danish. Her husband works in insurance in London. She is a graduate who does translation work at home. She has two children aged 7 and 3 months. R22 is conscious of how her kitchen is deficient compared to Scandinavian kitchens in terms of provisions for its use as a family room as well as a workroom.

Whilst the comments of the other two respondents show they are acutely aware of the architectural deficiencies that prevent their kitchen being a family room, there is also an indication that they feel that integration of the kitchen with the living area would encourage a more shared relationship between themselves and their husbands in practice.

One of these women, R34, is working class with 3 boys, 3 1/2, 6 and 7. Her old local authority house has 3 separate rooms, the dining room is directly off the large but awkwardly designed kitchen. Because of the design of the kitchen, there is not room for even a small table and chairs to seat five, so the family eat in the dining room. R34's very close friend who used to live in the same style of house recently moved into a brand new house with a kitchen-diner on another local authority estate, for which R34 is full of admiration. She is acutely aware of her old kitchen and her friend's new kitchen-diner. (Although she has plenty of domestic equipment and her husband is altering her kitchen to improve the layout.)

'I don't particularly like a separate dining room. I like it how my friend's got it, a dining-kitchen.' Her ideal is naturally based on her friend's: 'In this kitchen, everything is such a tight fit, but in my friend's one, which is the only one I've seen and
liked, there is not a lot of cupboard space, but I like the design. I'd like a breakfast bar, too.' (Her friend's husband is constructing one.)

Thinking generally about her overall house layout,

'Well, I suppose it is quite good. I know someone up the road who has her dining room as a study and when she has visitors has them in the front room. She's the one that's got it all posh and then you can see how these places can look if you can spend a bit of money on them.'

If she could make one alteration to her house, she would knock the dining room wall down and make a kitchen-diner.

R34's husband is a fireman. She describes his help in the kitchen as high:

'He cooks his own meals at the fire station, so he can cook. He usually cooks here about once a week. If I'm in a hurry to get out to work in the week, he'll get the tea. He'll also wash up if the children don't. He's quite domesticated.'

The children also help, washing up and buttering bread. R34 doesn't do any work at weekends if she doesn't have to and the family spend time together at weekends and evenings when they are in.

However, her husband works nights frequently and R34 often works evenings from 7-9 or 9:30 p.m. as a Tupperware dealer and running through her interview there is an undercurrent of dissatisfaction. She seems lonely. She doesn't like being in her kitchen which she says is 'grotty.' Despite its use by all the family, she feels isolated in there. She also says she feels alone a lot and every afternoon when she is by herself she goes over to her friend's house on the other side of the town. About her housing
she mentions 'but I don't think you're ever satisfied.' (Her account of her past housing since marriage reveals she has lived in four houses, two old and then two new, the latter of the lounge-diner layout, which she did not favour).

R34 appears dissatisfied, although she has a joint relationship with her husband and he helps in the house. She seems unhappy. Her close friend who was there on one occasion confided that she felt sorry for her because she didn't have much money and her husband 'wasn't very good to her' and that she often didn't bother to leave her friend's house in time to arrive home before her children (six and seven) came home from school.

Sub-Group Six: Non-Kitchen

Turning to sub-group six, composed of the 4 women who consider the kitchen to be no more than a functional space, termed 'non-kitchen' orientation, two respondents seem to be 'work' oriented. R18 now works full-time after bringing up two daughters now teenagers of 19, at work, and 15, at school. On being in the kitchen:

'I find it a chore now. I never used to. It's extra now I've got a full-time job. I haven't always done a full-time job. I've stayed at home and thoroughly enjoyed being in the kitchen, but not now, I think I've got so many other things to do that I spend as little time in there as I can. It's just a matter of getting a meal ready, getting the washing up done and finishing quickly.'

On liking other people in the kitchen:

(Husband, who gives her no help) 'Not particularly, again, I think it's because I don't use my kitchen for anything other than cooking and he would get under my feel in there. I like to get it on and get it over and done with.'
(Children) 'Again, because they're helping, it's O.K. because it's getting it all out of the way. I don't think of it as a sociable place.'

Her younger daughter comes home from school and does the preparation for their evening meal every weekday except Tuesday, which is a half-day for R18 and as they joke, her daughter's 'day off.'

The other, R9, is working class, with four children 18, 15, 12 and 7. Her eldest daughter is at home all day looking after her year-old baby. R9 has a high orientation towards the domestic role and describes a housework routine. However, her daughter also helps in the running of the household doing the jobs in R9's routine and R9 has a part-time job. Thus, her outside employment plus shared housework responsibilities appear to combine to produce her feeling that the kitchen is just a functional space, whereas at one time she might have considered it as her 'own' room.

The third woman in this sub-group, R25, likewise does not feel her kitchen is a 'family' room or her 'own' room although she has a certain amount in common with respondents in sub-groups 1 and 3. This seems to be because all of the members of her family are becoming more independent as they grow up.

R25 is a full-time housewife living in a local authority house with a lounge-diner and kitchen. Like those women in sub-groups 1 (own orientation) and 3 (family orientation), she is working class, highly oriented towards the domestic role, get practically no help from her husband in household tasks in the kitchen and elsewhere and has a segregated marital role relationship and a positive separation of function rating. She has two boys, 19 and 12, at work and school, respectively. Her husband is a window cleaner.
From R29's description it seems that the four family members are independent. The family do not spend time together very often in the evenings.

'We're all here for about an hour in the evenings for a bite to eat and then the eldest goes out to discos and so on and the boy goes out to play, so there's just the two of us. Then my husband goes out to his club or the pub quite lot. Some Saturdays we go out together.'

'They're 12 and 19 at the moment. The eldest just comes in, has his dinner, washes, goes in his bedroom and goes out. The eldest never brings people home. Only now and again in passing a friend will come in the lounge while waiting for him to go out. When he was younger he used to have his stereo in his bedroom and have people in up there. That was before he left school. But now he's always out; it seems as though we never see him. The youngest is out a lot. He's a 'football boy.' He's got all his personal stuff up in his bedroom so he will take a lad up there now and again.' The family eat in the kitchen but 'we never really have meals together that much. I think in some ways it would be nice to eat together but it's just not possible with us because of the different times we come in.'

In the mornings, her husband leaves at 4 a.m., and her son also early, so breakfasts are taken individually.

'Last night (Tuesday) we had tea between 5 and 6 (p.m.) then the eldest came in about 7 and had his, which I saved for him (sometimes I cook something quickly). That was in the kitchen. Then I had company. I had the t.v. on but we were talking so I wasn't really listening to it. That was 'till 9.30 (p.m.), then
me and my youngest son went to bed. My eldest son went out. He came in very late. My husband went to the club after his meal. He came in 10.30ish.'

R25 gets the minimum of help from her husband and sons. About her sons, she says she 'spoils them.' Weekdays she makes a lunchtime cooked meal for her younger son, who eats it watching t.v. She also makes him a snack after school.

R25 has a morning housework routine that occupies her from 8.30 when the last of family leaves, until 11-1.30 a.m., when she starts to prepare the daily cooked lunch for her son. Then 'In the afternoons, I usually come in here and sit on the couch and fall asleep, or I might watch t.v. for a little while.'

R25 seems rather 'at a loose end.' Her family are all independent and she has no work or outside interests to fill her time. She is at present taking 'tablets for my nerves.'

The other women with this 'functional' orientation, R1 is ambivalent about being in the kitchen and thinks of it as a purely functional area. An only child she felt lost in the large houses she lived in as a child, and for most of her married life lived abroad in large houses with swimming pools, tennis courts and a domestic staff. An ex-teacher, now a full-time housewife with 3 girls 16, 11 and 8, all attending private school, she has lived for the last seven years in a three bedroom terraced house with kitchen/diner and lounge, which she thinks is fine for a couple with no children. She has formal living patterns and a positive separation of function. Her present kitchen-diner layout conflicts with her formal living patterns. She moves the table from the dining area into the lounge when entertaining and would like a
utility area for laundry and a separate study for her husband. In this case being in the kitchen does not seem to play a part in the role model for this woman's domestic role.

Sub-Group 7. Modern

The profiles of these six women identify them with women in sub-groups 1 and 3, the traditional 'own' and 'family' orientations, apart from the distinction that half of them have a joint marital role relationship with their husbands. This 'jointness,' however, does not extend to the sharing of household tasks, two-thirds having a low division of labour. For these women, the kitchen is not their 'own' province, or a 'family' room either in the 'traditional' or the 'shared' sense. Instead, it is integrated with the rest of the living area, although it clearly remains a workroom.

From the following profiles of women in this group, it can be seen that the kitchen is well used but not a centre. Rll is a full-time housewife, her husband works in a shop and the couple have four daughters aged 12, 10, 9 and 8, all at school. Their local authority house has a kitchen-diner. She is a typical member of this sub-group of working class women, with positive separation of function and high identification with the domestic role.

Rll - 'I try to keep this room the best. When we were children we had an absolutely huge kitchen and dining room and front room. The dining room we lived in with the t.v. and everything. We ate in the kitchen which was so big and the front was the best room. We used it when visitors came. I like a room like that. But you have to have a big house. If I had that, I would probably keep the t.v. in the front room, but if anything else was to be done, it would be done in the dining room.'
She has a housework routine. In describing her day's activities, she mentions:

'I do my work downstairs first, because I think, well, I must do: that in case anybody calls.' 'After lunch, I find odd things to do. I'm not the "on the go" type, but there's always something to do.'

Her husband gives her very little help: 'Only when he feels like it.'

However, she has a joint marital role relationship with her husband and weekends show her much more relaxed lifestyle:

'Saturdays, I don't do a lot, I spend time with the children, that's if they're in, or I just potter about. Sundays I definitely don't do anything, I don't have to do, only dinner. I usually hoover round because it looks so terrible if I don't. I either do that first off, or I leave it until around 10 (a.m.). We go out a lot on Sundays. Just for a walk or something.'

'If I'm late cooking the Sunday dinner, then we have that in here (lounge) on trays on our laps because the children like to watch the film, unless it's summer. They don't watch t.v. a lot then.'

Rll's husband is half-way through the construction of a dividing unit to separate the dining area from the kitchen part:

'Well, it is a big kitchen. It was built to have as a kitchen and dining room and we will separate it off somehow.'

'We thought it would be nicer if we divided it off. It won't be completely divided but it will make it separate and it will be a very small dining room then and a small kitchen. It will be a kitchen big enough to work in.'
The other respondents in this sub-group with kitchen-diners have also demarcated the two areas. For example, R13's husband also constructed a dividing unit to separate the dining end with its carpet, round table and stereo-system from the purely functional end.

With regard to being in the kitchen, R11 feels:
'I don't mind it. It doesn't depress me.'

On the use of the kitchen, she comments:
'It sounds awful. I didn't realise how much we used the kitchen.'

The other women are also ambivalent towards being in the kitchen:
R13 - 'Well, it's just another place, isn't it. I don't hate or like it.' 'I don't think I spend more time in here, it's just that eating and that brings you in here a lot.'

Or less:
R30 - 'No. I'm not awfully keen. It's more a case of having to. They've got to eat, so you've got to feed them.'

However, they are still noticeably defensive about the kitchen. Despite regarding it as 'a' room, it is their territory. Of other people in the kitchen, R30 comments"

'No. I like to be in the kitchen on my own. I don't like people telling me how to do my cooking.'

R14 - 'Not really, I like to do things myself.'

R13 - 'I'm not really worried, as long as they don't tell me what to do.'

And R15 of her relatives - 'I prefer them to stay out. You feel they're looking round to see what you've done and not done. Looking to see if you've missed a spot of grease.'
Ideal kitchens were functional in nature and separated from informal dining areas for more formal dinings rooms.

Rll - 'Oh, lots of cupboards so I could put everything in there and there wouldn't be anything lying about and it would be easy to keep clean. And lots of worktops, although that wouldn't worry me too much, it's the cupboards I'd want. I wouldn't necessarily want a space for eating. I would like a separate dining room.'

R30 is more informally inclined. She would have a table with benches on either side, but this would still be separated from the work end.

'I've seen it on the t.v., 'American ranch' style, where it's separated, but you can see through it all. So you've got your dining room.'

On contributing factor to the low division of labour may be the women's resistance to their husbands' help.

R15 on her husband's help, 'He does the dishes but he never does it right.' Her husband 'That's why I don't help more!'

Two of the five women work. Another, R14, has two children 3 and 5, one at playgroup and one at school and is actively looking for employment outside the home, as she explains:

R14 - 'Well, at the moment, I'm on my own enough through the day. I'm getting very bored, now the kids are off my hands. When they're small you've got so much to do, so I do miss it. I look forward to them coming home now.'

It has been observed that lower class wives gain more power when they are employed outside the home than middle class wives do [Bahr (3)]. Despite the more egalitarian philosophy
of middle class men relative to working class men [Gillespie (4),]. The former fact is probably due to the importance of the wife's income amongst less affluent people. With regard to the latter it may be that the working class male is ideologically more concerned about presenting a masculine image, but is more willing to concede material power when it is realistic to do so, whereas the educated male adopts the more sophisticated strategy of verbally supporting an egalitarian arrangement whilst tacitly expecting the traditional perquisites of his sex.

Increased power through employment may contribute to this 'modern' orientation resulting in a joint marital role relationship. However, as previously mentioned the jointness does not extend to a shared division of labour and the women still see themselves as responsible for housework.

Sub-Group 8. Integrated

These women resemble in profile the family-shared women of sub-group 4, but do not stress that their kitchen is a family room. Instead they feel that their kitchen is a room that is integrated with the rest of the house. They are satisfied with their lifestyles and marital relationships.

Nothing in particular binds them together as a group, apart from their similarity to the 'family shared' sub-group, without the emphasis on a 'shared' relationship. The kitchen is heavily used by all the family members for functional and social activities, but it is not described as a centre.

11.6 Summary

Differences in the women's orientation towards the kitchen are explained by breaking the sample down into eight sub-groups.
distinguished on the basis of different combinations of identification with the domestic role, marriage in terms of the division of labour, marital role relationship and marital satisfaction, and separation of function, plus socio-economic status and a range of background variables, such as past housing experience, age, number and age of children, employment status, and houseplan.

Table 111 summarises the profiles of each sub-group in terms of their chief characteristics.

The women oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room, sub-groups one and two, tend to have a high identity with the domestic role and low division of labour between husband and wife. Sub-group one, predominantly working class, with positive separation of function, like being in their kitchens and are happy with their situation. In contrast, the women in sub-group two, predominantly middle class and with a joint marital role relationship, express dissatisfaction with their lifestyle. Their orientation towards the kitchen and strong identification with the domestic role stems not from choice but through acceptance of their situation and an attempt to make an investment in order to make the best out of their circumstances.

The women oriented towards the kitchen as a 'family' room are also divided into two sub-groups (3 and 4). For one of these (3), traditional working class women with a high domestic role identity, low division of labour, segregated marital role relationships and positive separation of function, the kitchen is seen and used as a family room, in order to keep the lounge as a 'best' room. For the other sub-group (4), their orientation stems from a shared, satisfying marital role relationship which is stressed in
their comments and accompanied by a high division of labour. These women are predominantly middle class with a low domestic role identity and negative separation of function.

The remaining four sub-groups are composed of women oriented towards their kitchen as 'a' room. The women in sub-group five, 'impeded family shared,' resemble those in sub-group four in profile. However, it would seem that acute awareness of architectural shortcomings prevents these women seeing their kitchens as family rooms. In the 6th sub-group of women, to whom the kitchen is purely functional space, two women seem predominantly work-oriented and for one other the kitchen is not a part of her role model. Sub-group seven, 'modern' is composed of working class women who tend toward a joint marital role relationship, however, housework is still considered by them to be their responsibility. This seems to lead them to view the kitchen as integrated with the rest of the ground floor, but still a work room. Finally, sub-group 8 resembles sub-group four in profile. However, the women do not stress their shared marital relationships and view the kitchen as an area integrated with the rest of the ground floor, as opposed to stressing it as a centre of family life.
Table 110.

AN OVERVIEW OF SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE IN RELATION TO THEIR ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Domestic Role Identity</th>
<th>Division of Labour</th>
<th>Marital Role Relationship</th>
<th>Separation of Function</th>
<th>Attitude to Being in Kitchen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>13 (72)</td>
<td>5 (28)</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
<td>11 (61)</td>
<td>11 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
<td>16 (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>32 (59)</td>
<td>22 (61)</td>
<td>25 (46)</td>
<td>29 (54)</td>
<td>37 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
<td>54 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III.

A SUMMARY OF SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE IN RELATION TO THEIR ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN AND SUB-GROUP WITHIN THAT ORIENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation and Sub-Group Number</th>
<th>Own [No.(%)]</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>1(14) 9(82)</td>
<td>1(25) 9(82)</td>
<td>4(80) 2(50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>6(86) 2(18)</td>
<td>3(75) 2(18)</td>
<td>1(20) 2(50)</td>
<td>6(100)</td>
<td>3(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Role Identity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6(86) 7(64)</td>
<td>4(100) 4(36)</td>
<td>2(40) 3(75)</td>
<td>4(66)</td>
<td>2(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1(14) 4(36)</td>
<td>0 (0) 7(64)</td>
<td>3(60) 1(25)</td>
<td>2(33)</td>
<td>4(66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Labour:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2(29) 4(36)</td>
<td>1(25) 7(64)</td>
<td>3(60) 1(25)</td>
<td>2(33)</td>
<td>4(66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5(71) 7(64)</td>
<td>3(75) 4(36)</td>
<td>2(40) 3(75)</td>
<td>4(66)</td>
<td>2(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Role Relationship:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>2(29) 9(82)</td>
<td>0 (0) 10(91)</td>
<td>5(100) 3(75)</td>
<td>3(50)</td>
<td>5(83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated</td>
<td>5(71) 2(18)</td>
<td>4(100) 1(9)</td>
<td>0 (0) 1(25)</td>
<td>3(50)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of Function:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5(71) 6(54)</td>
<td>4(100) 2(18)</td>
<td>1(20) 3(75)</td>
<td>6(100)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0 (0) 1 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0) 0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0) 0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2(29) 4(36)</td>
<td>0 (0) 9(82)</td>
<td>4(80) 1(25)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude to Being in the Kitchen:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>5(71) 5(46)</td>
<td>3(75) 10(91)</td>
<td>2(40) 1(25)</td>
<td>3(50)</td>
<td>3(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts</td>
<td>2(29) 6(54)</td>
<td>1(25) 1 (9)</td>
<td>1(20) 0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2(25)</td>
<td>2(33)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislikes</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>2(40)</td>
<td>2(50)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseplan:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen-Diner</td>
<td>1(14) 5(45)</td>
<td>2(50) 2(18)</td>
<td>0 (0) 2(50)</td>
<td>4(67)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge-Diner</td>
<td>3(43) 1 (9)</td>
<td>2(50) 4(36)</td>
<td>1(20) 2(50)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
<td>2(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Rooms</td>
<td>3(43) 5(45)</td>
<td>0 (0) 5(45)</td>
<td>4(80) 0 (0)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
<td>3(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Size:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen-Diner</td>
<td>1(14) 5(45)</td>
<td>2(50) 2(18)</td>
<td>0 (0) 2(50)</td>
<td>4(67)</td>
<td>1(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>5(71) 4(36)</td>
<td>0 (0) 1 (9)</td>
<td>3(60) 1(25)</td>
<td>2(33)</td>
<td>3(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1(14) 2(18)</td>
<td>2(50) 8(73)</td>
<td>2(40) 1(25)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2(33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION FOUR. SUMMARY.

Chapter 12

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
The aims of this exploratory study were fourfold: firstly to explore the nature of the domestic kitchen and housewife's attitudes to the kitchen. Secondly, to examine these attitudes in relation to a range of physical and social variables. Thirdly, to investigate the relationships between such attitudes and family composition, the amount and division of space and family behaviour at home. Finally, to propose possible hypotheses to explain differences between housewives in attitudes towards the kitchen.

Each of these aims was addressed in the study and the principle findings in each area will now be considered.

As was expected, the kitchens of the respondents varied considerably. The assessment of the quality of the functional environment included an estimation of the variation in the following parameters: kitchen size; standard of layout; provision of storage and worksurface; space for a washing machine and the ownership of domestic appliances. When the respondents satisfaction with their kitchens was examined in relation to these parameters, it was found that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were generally unrelated to the quality of the functional environment. The only exceptions being less dissatisfaction amongst those women with larger kitchens and a high level of ownership of domestic equipment. The respondents varied in the level of their involvement in kitchen planning and it was observed that respondents who had carried out major alterations or replanned their kitchens completely made fewer complaints. Similarly, fewer complaints were made by respondents who had lived in their present dwelling for over five years.

From investigation of overall orientation to the kitchen using a projective sentence completion test, three distinct orientations
towards the kitchen were found to exist: the kitchen as a 'family' room; the kitchen as the women's 'own' room and the kitchen as 'a' room. The differences between these orientations were further substantiated by the women's responses to a series of questions focused on functional and social aspects of the kitchen: use of the kitchen for relaxation; attitudes towards being in the kitchen; convenience of the kitchen for the performance of six functional tasks; the respondent's own room and her favourite room. A relationship was found between the women's orientation to the kitchen and their response in each of these areas. More of these women assessed as 'having an orientation towards the kitchen as their 'own' room in the sentence completion test chose the kitchen as the room in the house they thought of as being their own. More 'family' oriented women chose the kitchen as their favourite room. More 'family' oriented women also considered the kitchen an area for relaxation. With regard to their attitudes towards being in the kitchen, more 'family' oriented women liked being there, whereas more of those 'own' oriented explained their initial statement that they liked being in the kitchen in terms of acceptance; they had to be in the kitchen for a lot of the time, therefore they had to like it there. This masked feelings of discontent and being 'stuck' there. Those who spontaneously expressed ambivalence or their dislike of being in the kitchen were all oriented towards it as 'a' room. Respondents oriented towards the kitchen as a 'family' room were less dissatisfied with their kitchens for the performance of six functional tasks than respondents of the other two orientations.

A second projective sentence completion test differentiated the women into four groups according to their orientation to the
lounge. These were as an area primarily for 'activity,' relaxation,' sitting' or display.' These distinctions were amplified by the women's comments on the arrangement of the furniture in their lounge. In addition, orientations towards the lounge was related to attitudes towards keeping a best room. More 'display' and 'sitting' oriented women were in favour of keeping a room for 'best,' than those who were 'relaxing' or 'activity' oriented.

With reference to the second aim, to examine attitudes to the kitchen in relation to a range of physical and social variables, the following observations were made. Orientation towards the kitchen was not related to the ground floor layout of the house; the communication possible between the kitchen and other ground floor rooms; the number and age of children in the family; the employment status of the respondent or their socio-economic status. A negative relationship was found to exist between orientation to the kitchen and whether the kitchen conformed with the recommended layout. Whilst this demonstrates the absence of a positive relationship between the quality of functional facilities and orientation to the kitchen, the meaning of this negative relationship is unclear. The majority of those positively oriented towards their kitchen as a 'family' room had kitchens with more than one fault in their layout, whilst almost half of the women oriented towards the kitchen as 'a' room, a more negative orientation, had satisfactory layouts. A relationship was noted between kitchen size and orientation; 'family' oriented women tended to have larger kitchens. However, there was no relationship between the women's answers to any of the series of direct questions on attitudes to the kitchen, which reinforced
the three orientations observed in the projective test, and kitchen size nor any any of the other physical and social variables investigated.

No relationships were found between the women's orientation to the lounge or attitudes towards keeping a 'best' room and the layout of the ground floor, or the number and ages of children in the family. A relationship was noted between orientation to the lounge and socio-economic status. Working class women were more likely to be 'display' oriented, whilst middle class women had a 'relaxing' or 'activity' orientation towards the lounge. More working class than middle class women were in favour of keeping a 'best' room. Relationships were observed between the size of the lounge and both orientation towards the lounge and attitudes towards keeping a best room.

In addition to the social variables already discussed, orientation to the kitchen was examined in relation to the changing levels of women's participation in various roles, through aspects of their marriage and their level of identification with the domestic role. The working class women were observed to have a higher identification with the domestic role than the middle class women. Women oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room appeared to have a slightly higher identification with the domestic role. Women with positive separation of function also had a high identification with the domestic role. Examination of the division of labour in marriage showed a tendency for working class husbands to be described by their wives as giving less help in the kitchen. Women oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room and those with a high identification with the domestic role also tended to
report less help from their husbands. The women were evaluated as 'joint' or 'segregated' in their marital role relationship. A 'joint' marital role relationship was found prevalent amongst the middle class women and a 'segregated' relationship prevalent amongst the working class women. More working class women who were oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room had a segregated marital role relationship. No relationship was found between the marital role relationship and the division of labour, although there may be a slight tendency for women with a 'segregated' role relationship to receive less help from their husbands with the housework.

Investigation of the relationship between orientation to the kitchen and lounge, the amount and division of space in the home, family composition and family behaviour at home was the third aim of this study. The measure 'separation of function' was constructed from the respondents attitudes towards four aspects of their lifestyles and surroundings: (1) orientation towards the lounge; (2) attitude towards keeping a 'best' room; (3) attitudes towards meals; (4) attitudes towards the entertainment of visitors. The measure distinguishes between women with formal attitudes who wish to reserve different areas of the home for specific functions, termed here positive separation of function, and those who do not wish to set aside certain areas for certain functions, termed negative separation of function. Analysis of six different areas of family activities showed that women's attitudes, in terms of orientation to the kitchen and separation of function, in addition to spatial and family composition variables, to be important determinants in the interpretation of family behaviour patterns in the home.
To recapitulate, the initial finding of the absence of a relationship between the quality of the kitchen facilities and the women's satisfaction and dissatisfaction expressed with their kitchen raised the possibility that attitudes towards the kitchen could be interrelated with a more global set of attitudes. This supposition was further strengthened on two accounts. Firstly, the women's responses in the projective sentence completion test and direct questions on their attitudes towards the kitchen indicated that the women's roles played an important part in shaping their attitudes towards the kitchen. Secondly, no relationship was found between orientation to the kitchen and either the amount of division of space in the dwelling or family composition, apart from kitchen size. Further analysis indicated tentative relationships between orientation to the kitchen and the individual parameters assessed in the evaluation of the women's situation: identification with the domestic role, the division of labour and the marital role relationship. There was a relationship between these variables and socio-economic status. In addition, socio-economic status was shown to be related to the direction of their desire for separation of function which in turn was related to aspects of the feminine role.

These findings suggest that women's attitudes towards the kitchen are the result of complex interplay between a number of variables, with women's roles as a critical factor. A case study approach was utilised to investigate the combinations of these variables which lead to different orientations towards the kitchen.

The explanation of women's attitudes towards the kitchen derived from this case study approach involved the division of the three original orientations into eight sub-groups. The group of women
oriented towards the kitchen as their 'own' room were further subdivided into a group of working class women with traditional views of women's roles, to whom the kitchen is, by tradition, the woman's room (own traditional) and a group of mainly middle class women who although outwardly conforming to the traditional housewife role, including thinking of the kitchen as their own room, are inwardly dissatisfied with their situation (own dissatisfied).

Likewise, two sub-groups were distinguished amongst those 'family' oriented. The 'family traditional' women are a group of working class women subscribing to women's traditional roles with a high domestic role identification, segregated marital role relationships and low division of labour, and thus similar to the 'own' traditional women. However, to these women the kitchen is a 'family' room, since lack of a dining room which could be used as a family living room meant that the kitchen has to serve this function, in order that the lounge may be reserved for 'best.' The other 'family' oriented women are middle class and egalitarian, with low identification with the domestic role, joint marital role relationships and high division of labour, to whom the kitchen is a room where the family congregates to share activities together (family shared).

The women who referred to their kitchen as 'a' room were differentiated into four sub-groups. The first group are a group of egalitarian women who wanted a 'family' kitchen, but who are prevented by the physical features of their housing or possibly by marital discord (impeded -family shared). The second sub-group consider their kitchen integrated with the rest of the ground floor living area. These women resemble the 'family shared' women in
profile with egalitarian marital relationships, however, they do not stress the 'shared' nature of this relationship, or describe the kitchen as the centre of family activities (integrated). The third group are also oriented towards the kitchen as an integrated area, however, they viewed it as an 'integrated workroom.' They are working class and tend towards a more shared marital role relationship than their counterparts in the 'own traditional' and 'family traditional' sub-groups. However, whilst they tend towards a joint marital role relationship the sharing does not extend to the division of labour, therefore, the kitchen is still regarded by them as a workroom (modern). The final subgroup is composed of women to whom the kitchen is 'a' room. Domesticity, with the kitchen as the symbol, was never part of their role model, for example, a respondent brought up in a wealthy family abroad with servants, or not part of their current role model, for example working women with grown-up children (non-kitchen).

The possible relationship between these subgroups is shown in Figure 13.

The eight sub-groups may broadly be regarded as stages in a progression from the traditional orientation towards the kitchen as the woman's 'own' room for domestic work, or 'family' room in a traditional way to preserve a 'best' room, through to the modern conception of the kitchen as a space for shared family activities. These activities cover not only those domestic tasks associated with the kitchen but also eating, entertainment and recreation, formerly confined to the lounge and dining room. This change in the symbolic nature of the kitchen is related to women's increased awareness of the choices open to them and changes in their participation in various roles leading to a decrease in the dominance
Figure 13.

ORIENTATION TO THE KITCHEN SHOWING
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUB-GROUPS.

Traditional. ______________________________ Modern.

1. OWN TRADITIONAL. 2. OWN DISSATISFIED. 3. FAMILY TRADITIONAL.

4. FAMILY SHARED. 5. IMPEDED FAMILY SHARED. 6. INTEGRATED. 7. MODERN.

8. NON-KITCHEN.
of the domestic role and 'joint' as opposed to 'segregated' marital role relationships. Alongside these changes, the study of family activities shows, through the measure 'separation of function,' the trend towards the adoption of a more informal lifestyle, with, for example, different activities carried out in the same space as opposed to the traditional desire for separation areas for different activities.

In addition to identification with the domestic role and marriage in terms of the marital role relationship, the division of labour and marital satisfaction, the case studies further implicated socio-economic status, separation of function and kitchen size in the explanation of women's attitudes to the kitchen. It is felt useful at this stage to put forward a causal model in which the connections between these variables are dealt with simultaneously. It must be remembered that this model is dependent upon assumptions and as Moser and Kalton (1) state:

'... there is always the danger that these assumptions are false, but the formal representation of causal connections in a model has the virtue of forcing the assumptions to be made explicit. Attention can then be focused on the assumptions to assess the reasonableness of the model.'

The causal model is shown in Figure 14. In order to understand and predict a woman's attitudes towards her kitchen, it is necessary to know the level of her participation in the female role (as evidenced by her level of identification with the domestic role; marital role relationship and division of labour); the direction of her separation of function; her houseplan and the size of her kitchen. Role participation is influenced by socio-economic status, which is in addition an influence on separation of function, as is the size of the lounge. The eight sub-groups previously described represent
Figure 14.

PROPOSED CAUSAL MODEL TO DETERMINE A WOMAN’S ATTITUDE TOWARDS HER KITCHEN.

LOUNGE SIZE. → SEPARATION OF FUNCTION. → HOUSEPLAN → KITCHEN SIZE.

Socio-economic status. → Level of participation in various roles. → ATTITUDE TOWARDS KITCHEN.

Figure 15.

PROPOSED CAUSAL MODEL TO DETERMINE A WOMAN’S SATISFACTION WITH HER KITCHEN.

PAST HOUSING EXPERIENCE. → ORIENTATION TO KITCHEN.

Ideal kitchen. → Length of residence. → Level of involvement in planning kitchen.

Houseplan. → Satisfaction with kitchen.

KITCHEN SIZE.
the range of attitudes towards the kitchen in the women studied. The differences between the women in these sub-groups represent the alternative values of each of the above variables in different combinations. For example, a middle-class woman (like Respondent 20 in this sample) who is low on traditional values, with a low identification with the domestic role, an egalitarian marriage involving a joint marital role relationship and shared division of labour, and negative separation of function, is oriented towards the kitchen as a 'family' room and is representative of the women in sub-group 3, 'family shared.' In contrast, a working class woman (for example, R32) who is high on traditional values, with a high identification with the domestic role, a traditional marriage encompassing a separated marital role relationship and low division of labour, and positive separation of function, holds the orientation of the kitchen as her 'own' room and is representative of the women in sub-group 1, 'own traditional.'

The models and examples above are intended to clarify the inferences made from the analysis of the data gathered in this survey. To ensure reliability and validity this model must be tested on a different population.

With the same reservations, Figure 15 presents another causal model to determine a woman's satisfaction with her kitchen. In the model, a woman's satisfaction with her kitchen is influenced by how closely it resembles her ideal kitchen, her concept of which is affected by her orientation towards the kitchen and by her past housing experience. The layout of her present house and the size of the kitchen influence both her orientations and her satisfaction with her present kitchen. In addition, the respondent's
length of residence and her level of involvement in planning her present kitchen also influence her satisfaction with her kitchen.

To conclude, the kitchen has long been the symbol of women's domesticity. This exploratory study indicates that women's orientation towards the kitchen is changing from one of it being their own separated territory to one of it being a general family area integrated and equal in status with the rest of the ground floor living area. This change is related to the movements towards equality in women's roles and informality in family lifestyles.

Architecture does indeed reflect domestic life. For example, the turn of the century movement of the kitchen from the basement to the ground floor in the middle and upper-middle class residence reflected the decline in domestic help which led to the kitchen becoming the domain of the middle class housewife. However, despite its 'elevation' to the ground floor living area, the kitchen retained its status as solely a workroom. The small cubicle-like kitchen of a large proportion of the subsequent housing stock stresses this separation of the housewife in her kitchen from the rest of the family in the remainder of the living area and the dominance of the domestic role for women. More recently, the trend towards the combination of spaces, for example, the lounge-diner and kitchen-diner has reflected trends in lifestyles and women's roles. However, such changes in design are usually through gradual evolution and subject to politico-economic influences, rather than immediate responses to needs defined by research. Therefore, research into the relationship between changing lifestyles and the residential environment, as in this study, is needed to establish current and anticipated future needs so that these may be more quickly and more accurately reflected in dwelling design.
This small, qualitative study has demonstrated the existence of groups of women with a range of orientations towards the kitchen, and identified the factors of importance in the explanation of their orientations. Further quantitative work is necessary to test the causal model put forward in order to confirm the existence and origins of these orientations. This study has also indicated that such orientations and 'separation of function' influence family behaviour and consequently the demands made on the space in the dwelling. If their existence is proven, their use in further studies would then lead to specific recommendations to maximise the satisfaction of women of different orientations with their kitchens and the rest of the living area. However, at this stage, it may be generally concluded that:

1. A women's attitudes towards satisfaction with her kitchen is not linked to its functional facilities, apart from the size of the room.

2. There is a trend towards the extension of the use of the kitchen beyond the housewife and domestic activities, to the family and social activities.

3. The level of a women's participation in various roles is a critical factor in the determination of her attitudes towards the kitchen.

Therefore:

1. Studies on the kitchen should not be confined to its provisions for domestic tasks, but take into account its wider social role.

2. The kitchen should be considered as a room equal in status to the lounge and dining room and incorporated into any studies which
cover the living rooms.

3. Studies of the interaction between attitudes and behaviour and the residential environment should consider women as individuals, as opposed to being subsumed within the family.
APPENDICES.
APPENDIX I

Group Interviews with Women to Explore Attitudes Towards the Kitchen

I.1. Procedure

To ensure that a wide range of attitudes was obtained, six discussions were held, from February to May, 1976. All the group members were married women living in the Guildford area, aged between 25 and 50, with at least two children over four years old living at home. Three groups were held with women living in either Local Authority or privately rented accommodation who were recruited from part-time cleaning staff employed in the University Halls of Residence. The other three groups were middle class, owner-occupiers. Two of these groups were recruited from members of a baby-sitting organisation operating in a middle-class suburb of Guildford, and the third from office staff at the University. Forty women took part in the discussions, 19 lower class and 21 middle class.

The discussions were conducted informally over light refreshments at lunch time or in the evening, in the Home Economics Centre, and lasted about one and one-half hours. Each group was asked to discuss the kitchen and living rooms in their homes. The discussions were tape recorded. During the discussion, group members were asked to draw a plan of the ground floor of their house.

I.2. Findings and Interpretations

I.2.1. Summary of Findings

Although nearly all the group members' comments may be interrelated on a logical or emotional level, they may, for the purposes of exposition, be grouped under six main headings. These are as follows:
The following is a brief outline of the main issues raised during the discussions:

**Kitchens.** The women felt they spent most of their time whilst at home in the kitchen and saw it as the centre of their activity.

A major concern was the avoidance of isolation whilst in the kitchen, from the point of view of being able to communicate easily with other parts of the home and the ability of the kitchen to accommodate more than one person at a time. However, it was desirable that 'messy' areas of the kitchen could be shut off, for example when entertaining visitors. In houses with only one living room, the kitchen was often used as an 'other room' for various activities. The presence of other people in the kitchen was only welcomed if the kitchen was large enough, or designed in such a manner as to prevent them getting in the housewife's way.

Many women complained that their kitchens were too small. There was no room for 'doing things properly,' eating and the increasing amount of domestic equipment that they owned. Inadequate storage space was another complaint, from those with large as well as small kitchens.

The importance of planned, ergonomically designed kitchens was recognised by the middle class groups who wanted working areas arranged compactly and at the correct height, in order to save
time and effort. Safety was a prime concern, increased safety stemming from a well-planned kitchen.

A door leading to the outside from the kitchen was considered essential. Although good communication with the rest of the house was desirable, many women complained that their kitchens had too many doors, taking up too much valuable space.

A utility room was seen as an ideal arrangement by many women. Its advantages were envisaged as extra space, somewhere for noisy equipment, a separate area for washing and a place to leave dirty articles and odd bits and pieces.

The women felt that their kitchens should be comfortable, attractive places and that not enough attention was being paid to kitchen design, in order to anticipate the demands being made on space by large items of equipment and the increasing and changing needs of a family growing up.

Eating. Amongst the middle class groups in particular, opinion was divided as to the optimum arrangements for eating meals. The controversy centred around whether meals should be eaten in the kitchen or the dining room. This was seen to depend on the number of people eating and the perceived level of formality of the meal. The importance of meals as family gathering times and 'occasions' was mentioned. Some middle class women thought it 'socially better' to eat in the dining room and that they had a responsibility to bring up their children with good manners, whilst others defended themselves by insisting that table settings and manners could still be of a high standard in the kitchen. The optimum arrangements for eating were seen as two dining spaces, one preferably associated with the kitchen.
Living Rooms  All groups agreed that a family needed two living rooms, firstly to provide more physical space and secondly to provide two separate areas for activities that would otherwise clash. Two rooms also provided privacy when required, for example, between parents and children. Two rooms enabled the women to keep somewhere clean and presentable for quiet activities and in case visitors called. The women also felt that two rooms enabled them to entertain visitors properly and 'make it nice' for their family.

The size and shape of living rooms was important, as it affected furniture arrangement. 'Cosyness' was frequently mentioned as a desirable attribute of living rooms.

Use of the dining room, where provided, varied. Its use for meals and other activities seemed to be influenced by its position and the amount of space in the kitchen and living room. Small, cold isolated rooms were disliked and rarely used. Some had been turned into bedrooms.

Design, Planning, Circulation, Space. The women disliked rooms being used as access routes, and rooms with too many doors. However, isolated rooms were also disliked. Sliding doors were criticised, since the loss of a wall prevented satisfactory furniture arrangement and poor soundproofing prevented the rooms being used for different activities.

Although highly critical of the doors and circulation patterns in their houses the women thought the advantages of open planning would be countered by the disadvantages, which they saw as the loss of privacy, increased cost of heating, increased effort needed to keep the area clean and tidy in case visitors called, and the problem of cooking odours drifting into the living rooms. The women thought
more attention could be paid to the provision of space, in relation to family needs.

**Children.** All the women agreed that the presence of children altered the demands made on the house. Pre-school children needed to be with mother all day, therefore downstairs play space was needed. Most used the bedrooms as play rooms. However, older children still needed space downstairs for messy play, which mothers felt they needed to supervise and, later on, space to entertain boy and girl friends. However, there was still a resistance amongst some women to bedrooms being used as playrooms, either because the rooms were too small or too cold, or because it was felt 'not right.' It was realised that children needed space of their own and privacy, but at the same time the women wanted to be able to keep a reasonable degree of control over them and keep the house clean and orderly.

The ideal arrangement was seen as a third living room, a 'family room' for the t.v., children's play, hobbies and general clutter. This room would be conveniently situated downstairs, but cut off from the clean and tidy living areas.

**Self.** The women regarded themselves as the central figure in the household. At times, they felt under a lot of pressure from the family, especially the children, and expressed a desire for privacy. However, they also wished to avoid isolation from the family whilst engaged in household chores. They also discussed their responsibility for caring for their family.

1.2.2. **Interpretations**

As explained in Chapter Three, the women's comments on family activities expressed concerns centring on four factors: autonomy, isolation, togetherness and conflict. These factors seemed to fit
a conceptual framework which would assist in the logical examination of family activities. The remainder of the appendix details the women's comments which were interpreted as expressing concern with these four factors. Looking first of all to the comments made by the housewives about their kitchens, we see that most of their comments about autonomy, isolation, togetherness and conflict relate to activities with a 'single person' focus, that is, where one person is involved in one or more activities.

Key to quotes: M = middle class: groups 4, 5 and 6
W = working class: groups 1, 2 and 3

The women regarded the kitchen as a self-contained or autonomous area:

(W1) 'Most goes on for us in the kitchen, the washing etc., you'd find all our dusters and utensils in the kitchen.'

The danger of isolation in the kitchen was strongly felt and the importance of windows, back doors and communication between the kitchen and the rest of the living area was emphasized:

(M4) 'I like the kitchen to be part of the house, not shut away, so you feel when you're cooking the dinner you're not just another piece of cooking equipment.'

Most comments about conflict involved the kitchen as a task area. The various tasks performed in the kitchen often overlapped. Small kitchens meant only one thing could be done at a time, leading to conflict between activities:

(W3) 'You put your washing machine out, and that's it.'

(W3) 'It's a waste of time having a kitchen the size of mine ... can cook just, I can't do a kiddies' party properly. I've nowhere to lay anything out properly.'
A large number of doors in the kitchen took up valuable working space. Bathrooms and w.c.'s leading off the kitchen were particularly disliked, their functions conflicting with the idea of the kitchen as a hygienic area for food preparation/consumption:

(W2) 'Upstairs is the right place to have them.' (Bath/w.c.)

(W1) 'My husband won't (eat in the kitchen) because our bathroom and toilet goes off the kitchen and he says that's taboo, that's it, he will not eat.'

A second source of conflict was between the kitchen as a pleasant working environment and noise from various items of domestic equipment. Conflict also arose between the kitchen as a clean and tidy working area and its use as a storage for dirty shoes, clothes and general family clutter:

(M4) 'In our house, it's just the kitchen. You've got no space, no outhouse for dirty wellingtons, roller skates, footballs and those kind of things.'

A utility room was frequently mentioned as a way of solving this conflict:

(M4) 'I'd like a utility room for my washing machine, tumble dryer and dishwasher, all the noisy machines so I don't have to live with them.'

(M5) 'We have converted the back door step and covered it in, and it's made a fantastic difference not having the washing stuff in the kitchen.'

(M5) On removing washing machine from kitchen, found it was 'much cleaner, less fluffy.'

In the kitchen, it is possible for several people to be involved in the same or different activities. Comments were made about 'togetherness' in the kitchen. Most women liked having people with them in the kitchen and wanted somewhere to sit down in the kitchen for meals, friends, etc.'
'But you find, like I do, if you have a friend in for coffee in the morning, we never get further than the kitchen 'cos you come out and chat when the coffee's being made and because there's a bar there with stools you just sit.'

'I love my breakfast bar, I can turn around and cook something and people can sit the other side and talk safely out of the way. Me and my cooking one side and the others and the doors on the other side - it's so simple.'

This was the case with larger, more spacious kitchens, and those designed so that the people/access area did not overlap with the working area enabling the housewife to carry out her work in her autonomous working area whilst enjoying the company of others. However, in smaller kitchens conflict arose as people passing through, or coming to see the housewife, or to use the kitchen, took up her working space and got in her way, thus increasing the possibility of an accident:

'I can't stand anyone near me when I'm in the kitchen 'cos it's so small.'

'I used to be ever so frightened when my children were young and I was in the kitchen.'

'We live and dine in the living and work in the kitchen one at a time. Two do get in there, but then you've had it.'

Nearly everyone wanted space in the kitchen for eating meals. Use of the kitchen for meals appeared to depend on the number of people eating and the perceived level of formality of the meal. Meals were seen as important times for family togetherness and families liked to sit down to eat together at least once during the day. In some cases there was not enough space for the whole family to eat in the kitchen, therefore the living or dining rooms were used for family meals and the kitchen for snacks, breakfasts (often taken at different times), lunches and teas for only two or three people.
'This is the reason we have our meal in the evening, so we're all together, we pull the table out, you know, and that's it.'

'It's important to sit down and talk.'

'We eat in the kitchen. We only use the dining room when we're entertaining. We all sit round the table. But as the kids get bigger there's less room and we're going to have to move into the dining room.'

'If we had a big enough kitchen we would eat in it. We'd put a table in it and use the dining room just for company.'

'... breakfast with the kids, we have in the kitchen at the breakfast bar. But when friends come we have to eat in the dining room, as we can only get three round the bar.'

'We have meals when my husband's not there and breakfast in the week in the kitchen. When the whole family is at home we go into the dining room, there's more room in there. There aren't enough seats in the kitchen.'

In some cases, there was conflict between the kitchen as a working area and the kitchen as an eating area:

'I don't like eating with pots and pans.'

'I am a very untidy cook. I love cooking, but it's just me, and after cooking it looks a mess.'

'It's nicer in the dining room.'

'I don't feel relaxed eating in the kitchen.'

'I like to be able to sit there and not look at the dishes.'

'... to take time to do it really makes something special.'

'We used to have a big enough kitchen to eat in, but we only ever did when we were decorating. We didn't like it. Well, the dining room was just off the kitchen and it did seem so much more refined to go into the "dining room" - with a table - so civilised and the children do turn it into a pigsty anyway if you're not careful, and I like them to learn how to eat in a respectable manner with tablecloths and serviettes.'

'Because there's not much working surface in the kitchen, I dish up in the dining room and three times a week I try and put food into serving dishes and not serve straight from the saucepans onto the table.'
'It's a great effort, but I think it's worth it.'

'It is, you just get lazy.'

'I think if you're eating in the kitchen you get a bit lazy. You find you're eating more and more in the kitchen, particularly with the kids, you find you're too lazy to use the dining room.'

'That's what I mean. If wonder if it is wise to eat too much in the kitchen, because it's so easy to lay it out there.'

'But you can just as well empty food from saucepans and put it in pretty bowls and serve it in the kitchen on the kitchen table.'

'But you can sit down in the kitchen and talk, too.'

'Oh, yes, it's not laziness that we don't eat in the dining room. You lay the table just the same.'

So far we have been talking about the kitchen as a self contained area of the house with its own function. The women were equally concerned about the location of the kitchen in relation to the living rooms (see also their comments on isolation).

Communication with the living rooms was desirable from the point of view of togetherness.

'Unless we have visitors that door from the kitchen to the living room is never shut.'

'I like our (house design) if only we could eliminate smells. I like to be able to see into the lounge and dining room - "Come and see this on t.v., Mum," etc.'

'That's where a hatch is useful, I use mine as a spyhole as much as anything.'

Although conflict of functions sometimes arose when the family was entertaining:

'I find when we have people to dinner and they're in the lounge and the shortest way through to the dining room is through the kitchen, and they see all the mess and pans on the way. They feel obliged to peer in.'

'We shut the door from the kitchen to the living room when we have visitors.'
When the framework is applied to the women's comments on the living rooms, it is noticeable that most of them relate to the amount and division of space in general, ranging from general feelings:

(M4) 'When the children grow up the place seems smaller.'

(M4) 'When you're concentrated in a smaller area, things start to niggle.'

(M4) 'I lived in a big Victorian house and there were rooms where you could go if you wanted to do certain things. Nowadays everything seems to be squashed into a smaller place. There's nowhere to go for privacy and you have to utilise the bedroom space.'

(M4) 'I prefer big houses, where the mess is spread around, not concentrated.'

(M5) 'I don't think you ever have enough space, I'd like a lot of room on the ground floor.'

(W1) 'But even these days, they don't seem to build the houses to go with the families.'

(M4) 'If you sat down, and had a lot of money, you could design a house to suit you, with lots of space, and doors where you wanted them.'

through to specific comments on the effect of the arrangement of rooms and the communication possible between them. The women agreed that two separate living rooms were desirable in family houses. The main disadvantage of 'open planning' (most commonly interpreted as a combined living and dining area) was seen as loss of autonomous space. Fittings such as sliding doors dividing the living rooms were considered unsatisfactory, the definition of a barrier appeared to be one that kept out noise and thus facilitated autonomous activities:

(M4) 'It's nice to be able to shut doors and soundproof a bit, especially with teenagers and music.'

Comments relevant to the dimension autonomy - conflict refer to both 'single' and multi-person activities. Most comments were made by women with only one living room. Comments were made about the
conflicting functions of the room as a living room and as a dining room. Housewives found it difficult to keep the room as a living room, neat and tidy enough for visitors to see, and found it equally unsatisfactory for eating meals:

(W1) 'I'd like a living room you could keep as a living room.'

(W1) 'One room for everything means there's a lot of wear and tear on the furnishings.'

(M5) 'I hate children watching t.v. whilst they're eating.'

(W3) 'If you do have company you have to crowd everything into one living room.'

(M6) 'Well, I've just got the one living room, which is a big bugbear. It's alright when there's just us, but when we have friends in for dinner, everything (the furniture) has to be scraped against the wall. We can just about get six to eight around our dropleaf table, but I'd love an extension.'

(M6) 'We only have one room so we have a dropleaf table, then it doesn't look like a dining room when it's not being used as such.'

(W1) 'I would like to set the table in one room, and when the meal's over say 'let's go into the sitting room.'

(W1) 'I would like a living room you could keep as a living room.'

(W1) 'Like Sunday evening, you think, 'Oh God, must I clear the table and wash the dishes now.' But you must, otherwise you room looks a mess, so you've got to wash up, really, otherwise you're looking at it.'

Conflict also arose between the living rooms as the housewife's autonomous clean space and their role as an area for family activities:

(M4) 'Our sort of house with the kitchen - living room dining room interconnecting, you can stand in one room really. But the children carry things from one room to another and smells get everywhere.'

(M5) 'I often wonder how people in these open plan houses manage. They obviously do, as they look lovely, but it must be jolly hard work.'
I feel that perhaps it's because we're Mums with young children, but I find that it's nice to have a room that's a bit cut off and one can keep sort of presentable and closed off really. I don't know if again I'm being a bit silly about that, but I do like to have a room which I feel is my own, which isn't going to be littered every time somebody comes into the house.'

'I think you must always, well, I've always tried to have one room tidy, so if anyone came you could take them in there. I mean if you're absolutely inundated with children's stuff absolutely everywhere - I mean I don't mind about the rest of the house, but if I've got one room I can just go and sit in!'

'I mean I don't make the children clear up every two minutes, but if they have something downstairs, when they go upstairs they have to take it with them. I mean I won't take it. I'll bring them back down and make them pick it up and take it.'

'My children are allowed in all the rooms. They have to tidy up after themselves. They're allowed to play in the dining room and allowed to sit in the lounge. They have to be sensible and not jump around on the furniture. They are allowed to sit all over the house as long as they're sensible.'

'I would say our children use every room in the house.'

(Expresses horror at people she knows who actually lock children out of rooms.) 'I think it's silly because you're locking yourself out as well, aren't you. You're having a room which is literally unused and I think it gets an air of being unused, as well.'

'We have to use every room in the house, we don't have any spare bits that we don't go in, posh parlours and that sort of thing.'

'It's silly to have space up there and not use it.' (On using bedrooms.)

A similar problem was encountered where the design of the house made it necessary to use the living room for access to other rooms, which meant the housewife's autonomous clean space was invaded during the day:

'I don't like my front door going straight into the living room.'
'We have to go through the sitting room to get to the kitchen, which is a nuisance.'

'We have to walk all the way through the living room from the front door to the kitchen. If you happen to be in the kitchen when the front door (bell) goes, you have to trek all through.'

'I've only got a front door, no back door. I'm worried about safety. If there's a fire in my kitchen or my dining room, I might not be able to get out. Doing the washing is a problem. All the refuse has to be taken out the front door. I have to keep walking through the lounge all the time, it's a very bad design.'

'A friend of mine has no door to the garden from her kitchen, only one to the hall. I would find that very difficult, I mean you pop out so often to go to the dustbin and with clothes. She has to use her lounge doors or her front door.'

'The only think I would like is the dividing door between the front room and the dining room taken away 'cos the kids are inclined to run in circles through the front door and round the rooms. I've put chairs in front of that door.'

Most comments centred on the clash of activities when several people wanted to do different things in the same living area, especially when visitors of only one member of the family had to be entertained and when parents wanted to be alone without their children. In houses with one living room the kitchen was used as an autonomous area by other family members in order to escape conflict over differing interests in the rest of the living area.

'Dad's always in the kitchen. He doesn't like t.v., only the news and sport on a Saturday afternoon.'

'This is the trouble, you have the children round you all day. You must have some free time. They're away at school, but they make up for it when they come home. But you can't put a 13-year-old to bed. When they're grown up unless they're out they're with you all the time.'

'I think parents need to be on their own, have a certain amount to themselves. When I've lost my temper I've actually said to them 'Don't you think Mummy and Daddy deserve a few hours alone without you?'
'There's nowhere for the older children to take their friends.'

'My son's got a girlfriend and it's difficult in one room. We all sit together and we all have to talk or listen to his conversation. This is why we wish we had another room.'

'You won't like having one room when the children get older and start bringing their girlfriends in.'

'We've only got one room, so we have to do everything in it.'

'Never have one room! We've had that, and it's very difficult when they (children) get to the homework stage, you've got to heat up another room anyway, and they may not have separate bedrooms.'

'You're lucky to have a dining room, we haven't got one, so we all have to do everything in one room, which is very awkward.'

'It's nice for you to have another room really, with children like, when the parents are discussing, the children can go in another room.'

In homes with two separate living rooms, dining rooms were often mentioned as being used for autonomous activities.

'Our dining room, well that's used quite a lot, for sewing and reading the paper.'

'My husband always reads the paper in there.'

'We have a piano in it.'

'My little girl practices her recorder in it.'

'In the week ours is just a playroom for drawing and painting.'

'My children paint in ours as we've got a Formica topped table.'

'Ours we use for meals and working, like housework.'

'The children have their friends in the dining room in the evening.'

Although there were still complaints about the clash of activities in the living rooms.
Especially when we have friends, or that sort of thing. The children are of an age now when they could watch something of an evening, and they can't.'

Our ten-year-old children like to watch t.v. till 9:30 p.m. and if there are people in the lounge they can't. We do move it upstairs for them occasionally, about once or twice a year.'

And another thing, when someone comes and you go into the living room and the children are watching t.v. and you are talking, and you tell them to turn the t.v. down, it's rude, and they go 'aah.' It's a bit of a shame, you do need another room, you could make it a t.v. room.'

'It's a nuisance, an awful waste of time.'

'I wish my t.v. wasn't in the lounge.'

If you have it in another room then you have to think about watching something, not just switch the t.v. on and relax. You'd have to say "I want to see that programme." and make an effort to watch t.v. If you have it in the lounge you just switch it on. There is so much rubbish on t.v.'

One thing I don't like is our t.v. in the living room, which I'm fighting to alter. I'd like it out of there very much. I'm fighting to put it in the study. But it's too big, the set we've got, to go in there really, but this is what I want, 'cos it's a comfortable room, our study, but it does annoy me very much to have it (the t.v.) in there (the living room). Perhaps that's purely selfish.'

'I just find in annoying to have it in my favourite room of the house.'

A family room/den for hobbies, t.v., children's friends, was mentioned as a solution to the problem of conflict between the lounge as a clean area and at the same time having a family home and solving the conflict between autonomous activities being carried out in the same area:

'I would like another room for the t.v. and children to take friends into instead of upstairs.'

'I think it would be nicer to have a spare room downstairs, because when the children get into their teens and have their friends in, you could perhaps be in the lounge, doing whatever and they could have their friends in, and they could go into the kitchen themselves and make themselves a cup of tea and coffee without any of the clatter of five or six of them trooping downstairs and back.'
(M5) 'It would be ideal to have a corridor between the kitchen and utility room leading to a room for the children.'

(M4) 'You really want a room that you don't have to walk through.'

(M4) 'I'd like a playroom for the children off the kitchen while they're growing up. Then Mum could still keep an eye on them.'

(M4) 'I'd love a room downstairs for the children that they could grow up with, and it could be used afterwards as a study or t.v. room.'

(M4) 'I'd love a room built on the side, separate from the rest of the house, with a sink, a large table and lots of room for storage.'

(M4) 'My friends have got what they call a family room. It's fantastic, it's full of old furniture, books, magazines, t.v., train sets. That's another thing with our houses, there's not enough room for train sets and motorway games.'

(M4) 'Where I went yesterday they've built a summerhouse with table tennis and its own sink. When younger the kids played down there and splashed paint all over the walls. When older, like they are now, they have parties down there and do their own brewing up of tea and get up their own pop groups.'

Central heating was mentioned as assisting the provision for autonomous activities as the bedrooms could be used as dens/playrooms. However, use of the bedrooms as playrooms conflicted with the idea of some women that upstairs was a private area not suitable for children to entertain their friends:

(W1) 'I don't let mine play upstairs.'

(M4) 'I allow all play upstairs, apart from painting, felt pens and plasticine. All toys are kept upstairs, apart from these which are kept in the dining room.'

(W3) 'My boy can sit up there, but he's not allowed to have other boys up there as they're too boisterous.'

(W3) 'I don't let them (boys) have girlfriends in the bedrooms. They have to come downstairs.'

(W1) 'It's not always convenient to take friends up to the bedrooms.'
'Not only that, but it's jolly cold.'

'Not only that but there's not enough room for boys to play, there's only just enough room for the necessary furniture.'

'Two of the girls are staying on at school, so they've got their studies. This is why I wanted them to have a room to themselves, so they can hide away up there.'

'We got our house because it's got more room upstairs than down, and we thought that with four children, at least they can escape to a fairly large amount of room upstairs.'

The women were obviously concerned that their children should have the privacy and space of their own that they needed:

'The trouble is that as children get older and get real hobbies, not like drawing and painting, but like playing the guitar, they've got to have a separate room really, they've got to have a private place.'

'As they get larger and bring friends in, then they need more space. They take up more space and make more noise.'

Other comments referred to the dimension isolation - togetherness. Although separate spaces were desirable for autonomous activities and the women complained about rooms used as access routes, isolated rooms were disliked and seen as a waste of space. Small, cold, isolated rooms were often just not used. Two dining rooms had been turned into bedrooms as they were isolated from the main living area:

'Our dining room we've made into a bedroom, it's not very big, really like a box room. You had to go out of the kitchen through the lounge and out into the hall to get to it, so even when ours was a dining room it was too small, cold and inconvenient.'

'You don't want a dining room that's cut off,'

It was important to the women not to be isolated whilst performing household chores:
'I used to do my ironing upstairs as I reckoned it was easier to fold the clothes and put them straight into the airing cupboard. But I didn't like it. I like being able to see out. That's why I like our kitchen at the front. You can see down the road, see everyone else.'

Whilst wanting their children to have privacy and autonomous space of their own, the women also liked to be able to keep an eye on them, and younger children wanted to be with mother. The women liked to feel they knew what was going on in the house:

'I want to stop Katy doing handstands indoors, but I can't see her when I'm in the kitchen.'

'I can't see what's going on from my kitchen. I can only hear, I'd like to see.'

'Let's face it, when children are young they don't want to go and play upstairs, they want to be within earshot/eyeshot.'

'I found when they were little they wouldn't go more than 10-15 yards into the garden.'

'Obviously babies have to play downstairs, as they have to be watched.'

'Children - wherever you are, they are, especially little ones, 1-5 years old.'

'Certainly when they're young there's colossal pressure on the areas of the kitchen and where you are, because young children like to be where you are, but I think once they begin to go to playgroups and to school ... and they get more independent ... the whole concept really changes, doesn't it.'

'When they're very small they want to be with you anyway, so they have to be downstairs anyway.'

'Really need somewhere downstairs, so that Mum can keep an eye on the children.'

'Painting and messy things are done in the dining room, as I like to keep an eye on the children.'

'We have rules on what sort of play is allowed downstairs,'

(Who doesn't think a portable t.v, for the children a good idea) ... 'No, I like to supervise my children's viewing as they're young. I wouldn't like them to be able to watch it all the time.
D-- has 6-8 mites of his round some nights, and they go in the dining room. I'd sooner have this as then I known where they are. When they're out you don't know what they're doing, and it's probably not constructive.

The importance of togetherness at mealtimes has already been mentioned in connection with the kitchen. Even though many families were happy to eat together in the kitchen, a separate dining space was still desirable to use for entertaining or ceremonial occasions.

The women also mentioned togetherness in connection with the family sitting down together and this was symbolised by their references to making the living rooms 'cosy':

We have to walk right the way round from the front door to the kitchen. This walk, all the way through the living room I don't like because it's never cosy, always a draught like a corridor and you can't really arrange the furniture cosily, if you known what I mean. It's all round the outside of the 'L' shape

Our room is long and narrow. I would prefer something square, so we could arrange the furniture better.

The unit housing our heating juts out into our room. If that wasn't there, it would make it bigger and more square. At the moment we have to have the furniture arranged around the edges of the room.

In conclusion, the quotations from the group discussions show that these dimensions (autonomy, isolation, togetherness, conflict) were important to the respondents, in relation to both the overall provision of space in the home and individual rooms. Their comments also show that although the kitchen can be treated as a self-contained space, the picture is incomplete unless related to the provision and use of space in the rest of the house.
APPENDIX II
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE.

THE USE OF KITCHEN AND LIVING ROOMS IN THE HOME.

Interviewer Name:_________________________________________
Interview Number:____

Respondents Address:______________________________________

Enter All Details of Dates Called and Date and Time of Interview.

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

1. Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOYS</th>
<th>GIRLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION ONE - MEALS

To begin with I'd like to ask you a few questions about meals.

2. Where does the family have (breakfast midday meal evening meal) during the week? 

   and how about Saturday? and Sunday? 

   Does all the family sit down together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KITCHEN</th>
<th>DINING ROOM</th>
<th>LOUNGE</th>
<th>ELSEWHERE (SPECIFY)</th>
<th>NOT EATEN</th>
<th>EATEN OUT</th>
<th>REASONS IF DON'T EAT TOGETHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B R K F S T W E E K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B R K F S T S A T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B R K F S T S U N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M I D D A Y W E E K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M I D D A Y S A T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M I D D A Y S U N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E V E N G W E E K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E V E N G S A T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E V E N G S U N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = All  H = Husband,  W = Wife.  C = Children (each child's initials if needed)

3. (a) If respondent uses only one room for meals.
   Why do you eat in the...............  

(b) If more than one room used for meals
   Why do you eat in the............... Why is this?
   And when you eat in the............... Why is this?
   And when you eat in the............... Why is this?

PROBE FOR ALL (Very important)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
4. Have you always eaten there? In these rooms? (in this house)
   If yes, PROBE: for the same reasons?
   If no, PROBE: what made you change?

5. Is it important to you for the family to be together at meal times?
   PROBE: Reasons

6. Are you able to have the eating arrangements that you want in this house?
   PROBE: reasons why/why not? If not satisfied ask "What would you prefer? Why?"
QUESTION 7

1. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

2. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

3. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

4. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

5. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

6. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

7. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

8. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

9. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

10. My kitchen is ______________________________________________________

Here are a couple of examples to help you:

1. My bathroom is .............. dirty at the moment.

2. My bathroom is .............. a private room, where I go to get a bit of peace and quiet.
SECTION TWO - KITCHEN

KITCHEN TEN STATEMENTS TEST

7. Could you please complete the sentences on this card, all starting with "my kitchen is..........." to show what your kitchen means to you. Try to give the answers as though you were answering the question to yourself, not to somebody else. Just write down what occurs to you, don't stop to think about it.

PROBE: "You have written....... How important do you think this is to you? Why did you put it in first place?.............. and so on for everything she has written...

KITCHEN PLAN

8. While you're doing that, can I just make a quick plan of how you've got your kitchen arranged?

Size of Kitchen ___________ x ___________ Ft.

Checklist

Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hatch (with or without doors?)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors (indicate back door)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumble Dryer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing Machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units (- Cupds. and Work surface)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall cupboard/other cupboards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs/stools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now go back to 7 and Probe on Ten Statements Test

9. Have you any items of domestic equipment that you keep elsewhere?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where kept? ________________________

Why? ________________________

Satisfaction with this: ________________________
10. Who planned the kitchen like this? (Builders/L.A./previous owners/the family)

11. Do you find that the layout of your kitchen is convenient for:

1) Preparing food and cooking? Is that difficult to do in your kitchen? Does anything else get in the way?

2) Using electrical appliances, e.g. kettles, food mixers, toasters etc. (position of electric sockets).

3) Washing up, drying up, putting away?

4) Cleaning the kitchen?

5) Washing clothes in the machine?

6) Washing clothes by hand?

12. Where do you do the ironing?

PROBE: reasons for choice
ACTIVITIES

13. We are very interested in how people use the various rooms in the house, especially the kitchen.

Could you tell me what you did in the house yesterday, starting with when you got up in the morning.

DAY OF WEEK _____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Interviewer: Stop when respondent sits down for evening meal).

Was this a usual day?

How about at the weekends? What's different then?

PROBE for differences in amount of time spent in the kitchen, increase or decrease? changes in type of activities she does, i.e. increase or decrease in cooking/cleaning/washing/relaxation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Thinking now about your husband, when he's at home, how often does he come into the kitchen for these reasons:

**READ LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When he's passing through, (i.e. going in and out back door, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To chat with you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a cup of tea or coffee with you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help you (i.e. when he's in there with you helping with the cooking, washing up, drying up, washing or ironing). Note What husband helps his wife with in the kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do something himself (i.e. own motivation, cooking etc. shoe cleaning, reading paper, mending car, hobbies, cleaning fishing tackle, clean teeth etc.) Note What sort of activities he uses the kitchen for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get away from the rest of the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROBE AND NOTE:**

- Week/weekend differences
- Reasons why/why not.
15. Now thinking about your children, how often do they come into the kitchen for these reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When they are going in and out of the house or passing through the kitchen on their way from one room to another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To chat with you, ask you something.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a cup of tea, coffee, orange, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help you (i.e. when they're in there with you cooking, washing up, clothes washing, etc.) Note what children help with in kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do something themselves (i.e. own motivation, cooking, washing up etc., hobbies, homework, cleaning shoes, clean teeth, playing). Note what sort of activities children use kitchen for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get away from the rest of the family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. If activity varies very much between boys/girls, younger/older children note by putting child’s initial into appropriate box.

Note comments and probe for reasons, i.e. R - "No they never do that" Int. - "Why not? Why is this?" and so on.
16. Do you like being in your kitchen?
   PROBE: reasons why/why not, what sort of things are you doing when you like/dislike being in the kitchen?

17. Do you use your kitchen for relaxing in?
   PROBE reasons why/why not? When/what sort of things done?

18. Do you like your husband/children/relatives/visitors and friends in the kitchen with you?
   PROBE: reasons why/why not? What sort of things are you doing when you like/dislike them coming in. What sort of things are they doing when you like/dislike them coming in, i.e. helping, chatting, doing something else?
   HUSBAND

   CHILDREN

   RELATIVES (WHICH ONES)

   VISITORS AND FRIENDS (SPECIFY)

19. Do you ever feel isolated or cut off from the rest of the family when you’re in the kitchen?
   N.B. PROBE for all
20. What would your ideal kitchen be like?

PROBE reasons why?

where she got ideas from?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My lounge is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL LAYOUT

20b Thinking about the position of your kitchen and living rooms, how well do you feel the layout of your ground floor works?

(PROMPT on the amount of communication possible between rooms and what she feels about this. Ease of access between rooms. What she thinks about hatches, windows, views from rooms).

SECTION THREE - LIVING ROOMS

LOUNGE TEN STATEMENTS TEST

21. Could you please complete the sentences on this card which all start with “My lounge is.......” to show what your living room means to you. Try to give the answers as though you were answering the questions to yourself, not to somebody else. Just write down what occurs to you, don’t stop to think about it.

PROBE: “You have written........... How important do you think this is to you?” Why did you put it in first place?.............. and so on for everything she has written (N.B. Casual chat, not formal interrogation, so vary your words!)

HOUSE PLAN - GROUND FLOOR

22. While you’re doing that, can I just make a plan of the ground floor of your house to show how the rooms are arranged?

Size of living room x ft.
Size of dining room x ft.

Check list

\ Doors
\ Windows
\ French doors
\ Hatches (large or small? doors? note)
\ Partitions (specify whether \ wall
\ or room divider)
\ Sliding doors (single? double? note)
\ Front and back of house
\ Label rooms

NOW GO BACK AND PROBE ON MY LOUNGE IS:...
23. What about the way you have arranged your lounge? Are there any particular reasons for arranging it this way?

PROBE for reasons why. (Int. may use "Do you like the way you've arranged your lounge? In what ways is it inconvenient?" if R. needs prompting to answer this question).

THE DINING ROOM (IF HOUSE HAS SEPARATE DINING ROOM)

☐ ✓ If no separate dining room

24. Can you tell more what are the best things about your dining room

PROBE FOR ALL

25. What are the worst things about your dining room?

PROBE FOR ALL

26. What about the way you have arranged your dining room?

PROBE for reasons why. (Int. may use "Do you like the way you've arranged your dining room? In what ways is it inconvenient?" if R. needs prompting to answer this question)
EVENING ACTIVITIES

27. How often is all the family at home during the week? ________________________________

At the weekends?

(PROBE: For family members who go out, do they go out to be alone, or do they go out with friends, to clubs, with rest of family, etc?)

28. Thinking about last night now, what were you doing? ................

............... . We left off your day's activities when you were having your evening meal, now after you had finished eating, what did you do next?

(PROBE for details of whole evening, i.e. and then what? what else? anything else? i.e. if watching t.v. was she doing something else at the same time?). If family out last night then choose night before.

DAY OF WEEK _____________________

How about the children, where were they, and what were they doing?

(PROBE for details as above)

How about your husband, where was he, and what was he doing?

(PROBE for details as above)
29. In the evening, do you tend to stay together in one room, or do you tend to spread out and use different rooms?

PROBE: (a) Which rooms used?
(b) Why is this
(c) Do you like this? Would you prefer to be together/separated more?

30. What sort of things does the family use the lounge for?

PROMPT: T.v., homework/study, hobbies, play, anything else?
During the day, evenings? weekends? To get as full an answer as possible about who uses the room and what for.

PROBE: for all activities taking place in lounge. How suitable is this?

31. What sort of things does the family use the dining room for?

PROMPT: As above

PROBE: As above
32. Is there ever any disagreement between the children over what to do in the lounge?
PROBE FOR DETAILS (What? When? What happens?)

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Is there ever any disagreement between Mum and Dad and the children over what to do in the lounge?
PROBE FOR DETAILS (What? When? What happens?)

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Is there ever any disagreement between you and your husband over what to do in the lounge?
PROBE FOR DETAILS (What? When? What happens?)

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

33. Are the Bedrooms used for any activities? (Besides sleeping etc.)
PROMPT: T.V., homework/study, hobbies, play, anything else?
During the day, evenings, weekends? To get as full an answer as possible about who uses the room and what for.

NO
PROBE: Any reasons why not?

__________________________________________________________________________

YES
NOTES: What activities, people involved, etc.

__________________________________________________________________________

PROBE: Do you like this arrangement?
34. Going on to visitors in more detail, how often do you have any of these visitors?

| People coming on business (insurance man or husband's job etc.) | Three/ four times daily | Once/twice week | About once month | Less than once month | Not at all really |
| Friends coming to see you: your friends, neighbours. |
| Friends of yours and your husband |
| Children's friends (playmates and boy/girl friends - note which). |
| Relatives (note which ones, i.e. parents, sisters and brothers, other more distant relations). |
| Anyone else who visits you regularly who doesn't fit in to any of these categories |

For each visitor who comes:

**PROBE**

- "Where do they go in the house?..." "Any particular rooms or do they go where you or the family happens to be?"
- "How do you entertain them?..." "Do you do something special (Drinks, coffee, meals) or do they join in with what the family is doing?"
- "Is this satisfactory?..." "How do you feel about your house from the point of view of entertaining these people?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Friends &amp; Neighbours</th>
<th>Couples</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Children's Friends</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Looking to see whether entertaining is formal (special routines, no visitors joined in - relaxed/guests join in with family activities).
35. Do you ever feel the need to be alone?
PROBE: When ____________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Why ____________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
What do you do about it? ____________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

36. Some people have a favourite room in their house. Have you got one?
(PROBE Which one, and why?) __________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

37. Some people have a room in the house which they feel is especially theirs, have you?
(PROBE which one, and why?) __________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

38. Some people like to keep one room as a "best room", do you?

| YES | PROBE Which one? __________________________________________
|     | Why? ____________________________________________________ |
|     | Why not? _______________________________________________ |
| NO  | ________________________________________________________ |

39. If you could change one thing about your house, what would it be?
PROBE Why _______________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
BACKGROUND DATA

THE HOUSE
40. House type: Detached ☐ Semi ☐ Terraced ☐


42. Tenure: Owner occupied ☐ Local authority ☐ Privately rented ☐

43. Bedrooms: Ring number 1 2 3 4 Are any shared? spare rooms? Give details______________________________

44. Heating: Full central ☐ Part central ☐ Upstairs ☐ Other ☐

Downstairs ☐

45. Have you made any large alterations to the house? (i.e. knocking down walls, rooms added, loft conversion, doors and hatches made or blocked up etc?)

NO ☐

1. What?______________________________________________________

YES ☐

2. Why were they carried out?____________________________________

______________________________

THE FAMILY
46. Age of housewife (<35 ☐ 35-45 ☐ 45-50 ☐ >50 ☐

47. Housewife's occupation_________

Full time ☐ Part time ☐ a.m., p.m., evenings ☐

Homeworker ☐

Full time housewife ☐

(If not working now, give details of previous employment)

48. Terminal education age of housewife <16 16 18 20 >21

49. Husband's occupation_____________________________________

(PROBE: on shift work, irregular hours, commuting very long distances. Anything that means he's in or out of the house for long periods).

50. How long has the family lived in this house?_______________________
PAST HOUSING

51. Since you've been married, what sort of houses have you lived in besides this one?
1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________
ASK
(a) Did the houses have a separate dining room/living room/kitchen?

(b) Where did you usually eat and reasons why?

(c) How spacious did you think the houses were, i.e. thinking of the kitchen and living rooms in these houses did you have enough room to do things, or did you ever feel cramped? When? Why?

52. Thinking back to when you were a child....

(1) How many brothers and sisters did you have? Brothers □  Sisters □

(2) Did you ever share a bedroom  NO □ YES □
Who with?
What age were you?
Did you mind?
Why?

(3) Did the houses your family lived in have separate lounges/dining rooms/kitchens?

(4) Where did the family usually eat?

(5) Was there always enough room at home to do things, or did you ever feel cramped? When? Why?
Interviewer Only

53. Interviewer's general impression of the kitchen:
(Ring box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old fashioned:</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old, no built-in units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine type:</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nearly all built-in units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rugs, plants, pictures</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare, utilitarian unadorned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clean</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well Decorated</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shabby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewer's general impression of the house, housewife and family.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Any comments about the interview (including room it took place in)

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX III

The Classification of Dwellings with Respect to Internal Layout of the Ground Floor

III.1. Introduction

As reviewed in Section One, a number of surveys have demonstrated the relationship between the provision of space in the rest of the dwelling and the use of the kitchen. For example, the General Household Survey (G.H.S.) (1973) (1), covering 12,000 households, showed that, irrespective of kitchen size, the more rooms in the dwelling, the less the kitchen was used for purposes other than cooking. Internal layout received consideration in the series of studies done by the Building Research Establishment (1966) (2). Random samples of local authority housing were drawn and comparisons made between respondents with two dayrooms (in addition to the kitchen) and those with one dayroom.

Ward et al. (3) used a four-part layout classification in their evaluation of the spatial environment of the kitchen:

1. House where there was a separate dining room, or distinct dining area apart from the kitchen.

2. Open-plan kitchen, i.e. dining area and kitchen area separated by a physical barrier such as cupboards and a work surface.

3. Kitchen which although separate from the dining room, had access to it through an open doorway (i.e. without a door).

4. House where there was no other dining area other than that allowed for in the kitchen, but which was not separated off in any way from the kitchen.

The division used in analysis by the B.R.E. is not sufficiently detailed to allow investigation of differences in communication
patterns between family members, as a result of variations in dwelling layout affecting the communication possible between rooms. In the division used by Ward et al., only the relationship between kitchen and dining functions is considered. The findings of the G.H.S. and B.R.E. strongly suggest that the number of other rooms in the dwelling is important. Therefore, classifications used in previous studies were considered too narrow for the purposes of this attitudinal survey, involving detailed examination of the relationship between planning and activities.

Consequently, in view of the need for detailed analysis of the size of the kitchen, the number of living rooms and the relationship between these rooms, it was necessary to examine a range of ground floor plans in the current housing stock, with a view to developing a classification of layout types, in relation to patterns of communication possible.

III.2. Method

Permission was obtained from Guildford Borough Council in 1976 to examine a range of plans of local authority and private housing built in the borough. This was with the understanding that all information obtained was confidential. The object of the exercise was that every significant variation should be represented. A random procedure would not necessarily have elicited this variation. Therefore, the following approach was adopted.

A total of seventy-one houseplans were examined in detail from those on file with the local authority. They were distributed as follows:

1. Land which became part of the borough as a result of the extension of the boundaries in 1904, 1922 and 1933 was
included. The most recent major extension, 1974, was ignored for continuity and administrative simplicity.

2. To take into account the variation in internal layout design over time and reflect the age of the current housing stock, ten plans per decade were examined, from 1900-1975. (Apart from 1940-1944, when building of new houses ceased in the borough for the duration of the Second World War.)

3. Again, to ensure the widest possible variation in internal designs, the plans were varied systematically by type. For example, if in one year, a majority of plans for semi-detached houses were submitted, plans of a contrasting type were selected for the following year.

4. As the classification scheme developed from this data was to be used in the design of a sampling frame for family housing, flats were excluded from this examination.

Unfortunately, due to the filing system used for local authority housing plans by the borough council, it was not possible to conduct the above approach on public housing. Therefore, the following results are those for private housing only. An informal examination of houseplans from 1900-1975 was also made to check that no outstanding differences existed between the two types and ensure that the classification scheme developed could be applied to public housing.

III.3.1. Variation in the Internal Layout of Dwellings, with Reference to Kitchen and Living Rooms in the Housing Stock of the Borough of Guildford

The plans were examined to obtain a general idea of the allocation of space on the ground floor. Of the seventy-one dwellings
Table I

SIZE OF KITCHEN AND AGE OF DWELLING IN SURVEY OF SEVENTY-ONE DWELLING PLANS 1900-75.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen size (m²)</th>
<th>Year (Housing standards in force.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900-18 (Tudor-Walters.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest.</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean.</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of plans examined. 19 21 16 15
examined; forty-four had three bedrooms; nineteen, four bedrooms; five, two bedrooms; and three, five bedrooms. The kitchens ranged in size from 3.4 m$^2$ to 15.1 m$^2$. The kitchens in the three-bedroomed houses ranged in size from 3.4 to 15.1 m$^2$, with a median of 8.4 m$^2$. In the four bedroomed houses, the smallest kitchen was 5.7 m$^2$ and the largest 14.3 m$^2$, with a median of 9.3 m$^2$. Therefore, quite a wide variation exists in kitchen size, with a significant overlap in the distribution of sizes between those in three and those in four bedroomed dwellings. Kitchens in the four-bedroomed dwellings examined tended to be slightly larger.

Table I shows no relationship between the size of the kitchen and the age of the dwelling. The age breakdown used reflects changes in recommended housing standards. Although, apart from Parker Morris, these were not directed at private housing, it was thought nevertheless that they might have influenced provisions in the private sector. The amount of space devoted to the living rooms, the kitchen and the hall was calculated as a percentage of the total area of the ground floor. It was found that the median percentage of space taken up for all three and four bedroomed houses examined remained constant from 1900-1975. Sitting rooms (including studies, sunrooms and hall-lounges) took up most space – ranging from 42-84%, with a median of 59%. Kitchens took up from 9-35%, with a median value of 19%. Halls (including staircases and cupboards under the stairs) took up from 0-27% of the ground floor with a median of 17%. (Remaining space was taken up by cloakrooms, w.c.'s, etc.)
III.3.2. The Development of a Classification of the Arrangements of Kitchens and Living Rooms

Examination of the plans of houses in Guildford showed that the layout of the ground floor varied not only over time between different styles of building, but also within a single type of house. In order to relate activity patterns to the characteristics of the houseplan, it was decided that some form of classification system was needed, in order to show the relevant characteristics of each type of layout.

As our interest lies in how the planning of the ground floor affects patterns of communication, it was decided to translate each plan into a topological map in order that communication patterns produced by different room arrangements could be compared easily.

Figure I.

GROUND FLOOR PLANS OF TWO THREE BEDROOMED SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES.

KEY.
H = Hall.
K = Kitchen.
L = Lounge.
D = Dining room.

A. B.

Figure I A and B are plans of the ground floor layout in two different houses. In A, access to each of the rooms is only possible by going through the hall. Each room is completely separate. Access to and from the house is through the front door in the hall and the back door in the kitchen. In B, the living rooms can be reached from the hall, but access to the kitchen from the hall.
necessitates crossing the living-dining area. Access to and from the house is again by doors in the hall and kitchen. Therefore, the planning of the ground floor in these houses has produced different communication patterns. However, with more than two of these plans, it becomes increasingly difficult to relate similarities and differences in communication patterns to differences in planning.

When the house plans are represented topologically, the exterior of the house becomes an oval of uniform size. Lines representing the boundaries of rooms are drawn within the oval; a common boundary means that communication/access is possible between the rooms. Access to and from the house is denoted by arrows. Topological maps of diagrams A and B are shown in C and D below, which clearly indicate the differences in communication patterns.

Figure II.

TOPOLOGICAL MAPS OF GROUND FLOOR PLANS OF HOUSES IN FIGURE I.

C.  

D.

MAP OF HOUSE IA.  MAP OF HOUSE IB.

In the topological map of house A the kitchen and living rooms do not have any common boundaries. However, each has a boundary with the hall, meaning that each has communication through the hall. In the topological map of house B, the living-dining room and kitchen have a common boundary as communication is directly possible between them. Whereas in house A communication between the living room and kitchen is only possible by first going into the hall.

Using the plans of housing in the Borough of Guildford, an exhaustive classification of the variation in communication patterns
due to the planning of the ground floor was developed, based on the topological mapping of each plan. This classification is appended (Appendix IV).

Of the seventy-one houses examined, twenty-two distinct variations in the planning of the ground floor, which would affect communication patterns, could be detected. From the classification (Appendix IV) it can be seen that in most of the houses examined that were built in Guildford before 1945, the rooms on the ground floor were separate and communication between rooms was only possible via the hall. Plan A in Figure 1 is an example of this type of house (number 2 in the topological classification). After 1945 in this sample communication between rooms in the form of hatches and doors became popular, although most houses still had a door from each room leading into the hall. Numbers 8 to 13 are all variants of this type. For example in Number 9 there is a hatch between the dining room and kitchen, the living room is separate and there are doors from each of these rooms into the hall. Number 11 in the topological classification is a variation of Number 10, with a door instead of a hatch linking the kitchen and dining room. A number of houses were then built with the dining room incorporated into the living room, or into the kitchen to make a dining kitchen. Finally, we see the importance of the hall in communication diminishing; numbers 19 to 22 in the classification show the hall functioning as a lobby and the kitchen being reached by crossing the living rooms. Plan B in Figure 2 is an example of the type of design.

Further classification divided the dwellings into four groups ranging from 'open' to 'closed' plan, depending upon the amount
of communication possible between areas with different functions.
This classification is explained in Chapter 5, part 5.2.
APPENDIX IV

Variation in the Planning of the Ground Floor of a Sample of Private Houses Built in the Borough of Guildford

Beside each plan number is the time span during which the dwelling plan was submitted. All house plans were of houses that were subsequently built. Seventy-one plans were examined.

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H - Hall</th>
<th>L - Living Room</th>
<th>Sc - Scullery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P - Parlour</td>
<td>D/K - Dining-Kitchen</td>
<td>← Entrance, Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - Kitchen</td>
<td>D/L - Dining-Living</td>
<td>St - Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Dining Room</td>
<td>L/H - Lounge-Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Fourteen houses have sculleries. Entrance to the scullery is always through the kitchen. The back door is also situated in the scullery. Eleven of these houses are planned as in (2) below, i.e.:

![Diagram of plan 1]

Three houses have only one living room, the parlour, and are arranged thus:

![Diagram of plan 2]

The kitchens in these houses were probably designed as kitchen-living rooms used for cooking. Later on, when cooking was transferred
to the scullery, the kitchen-living room became a living room.
Therefore, these three houses have been grouped under (7).

2. This is the most common design. All rooms on the ground floor of the house are separate. Access to each is obtained by going through the hall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Span</th>
<th>No. of Plans of This Type Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1900-1919</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1920-1944</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1945-1960</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1961-1975</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designs 3 to 6 are variants of the previous design. Rooms are separated by one or more halls.

3.

4.

5.

Two small halls
1. 1900-1919: 1

Entrance to main rooms via hall. Servants and kitchen quarters interconnecting.
2. 1920-1944: 1

Lounge/hall then small hall leading to separate rooms
1. 1900-1919: 1

It is noticeable that the majority of the houses planned in this way were built before 1945. Two other designs commonly seen in houses built before 1945 are 6 and 7.
Access to kitchen only through living room. Second living room separate. The living room in plans 21, 23, 24, 26, was most probably a kitchen-living room used for cooking and eating. Whilst the occupants of houses built to this design in later years installed a gas or electric stove and used the back room only as a living room. Some houses in this group have no kitchen door.

1. 1900-1919: 6
2. 1920-1944: 1
3. 1944-1960: 2

These topological maps show that after the Second World War, communication between the rooms on the ground floor without going through the hall became more widespread. In plans 8, 9 and 10, a hatch is used between the kitchen and dining room and the dining area is sometimes linked with the living area. Doors still lead from all rooms to the hall.

Access to living room only via kitchen. Other living room separate. Some houses of this design have no kitchen door.

2. 1920-1944: 3
3. 1944-1960: 1
8. Hatch between kitchen and living room. Doors to all rooms from the hall. One large living area.

9. Hatch between dining room and kitchen. 'Living room separate. Doors from all rooms to the hall.

10. Hatch between dining area of living room and kitchen. Door from all rooms to hall.

4. 1961-1975: 1  
3. 1945-1960: 1  
3. 1945-1960: 1  
4. 1961-1975: 1

Plans 11 to 13 show doors connecting the dining room and kitchen or dining room and living room. Again doors lead into the hall from all rooms.

11. Door between kitchen and dining room. Separate living room. Doors from all rooms to the hall.

12. Sliding doors between living and dining room. Separate kitchen. Doors from all rooms to hall.

13. Living-dining room. Separate kitchen. One door from living dining room and one door from kitchen to the hall.

2. 1920-1944: 1  
3. 1945-1960: 1  
4. 1961-1975: 2

3. 1945-1960: 3

In plans 14-16, the kitchen and living area have doors to the hall but the dining area does not. The dining area in these plans is linked by doors to and from the kitchen and living rooms.
No access from dining room to hall. Access through kitchen and living room. Doors from kitchen and living room to the hall.

3. 1945-1960: 1

No access from dining room to hall. Dining room separated from living room by sliding doors. Doors from kitchen and living room to hall.

3. 1945-1960: 2

4. 1961-1975: 1

Kitchen separate from dining-living room by glazed screen. Doors from kitchen and dining-living room to hall.

4. 1961-1975: 1

Plans 17 and 18 show dining-kitchens.

17.

Dining-kitchen.* Living room separated. Access only through hall.

4. 1961-1975: 1

Dining-kitchen,* with door to living as well as door to hall

3. 1944-1961: 1

*Actually planned for dining as opposed to being big enough for eating.

Plans 19-22 show that the function of the hall in communication has now diminished. The hall in these plans is more of a lobby and the kitchen is reached by crossing the living rooms.

4. 1961-1975: 1

20. 

21. Kitchen, reached by going through lounge and dining areas, lounge and dining area divided by partition or stairs, etc.

4. 1961-1975: 2

22. Kitchen reached by going through living room, which is not divided into a living or dining space.

3. 1944-1961: 1

4. 1961-1975: 1
APPENDIX V

Additional Data on Family Behaviour Patterns

I. Conflict Over the Use of Space

Disputes concerned with choice of television programme were excluded from this analysis.

The women were asked whether there was ever disagreement between:

i. the children

ii. themselves and their husband

iii. parents and the children

concerning the use of the lounge.

Ten women said there was frequently disagreement between their children; six of these had families of three or four children. (50% of the total of ten large families in the sample.) Seven comments concerned younger children's interference with the activities of older children, or being too noisy when older ones were watching television. Three were over conflict about the lounge being used for different activities, for example television versus piano versus records, and television versus board games. The women who did not mention these types of conflict between their children reasoned that their children were too young to have their own activities or there were other facilities: (extra rooms, télévisions, stereos) available for children to use.

The majority of the women said there was no conflict between themselves and their husband over the use of the lounge. Another eleven felt there was no conflict as suitable arrangements had been made to avoid this, in terms of another room being made available for the conflicting activity. For example R11 moves her electric organ into the kitchen-diner when her husband wants to watch television.
R40's husband moves the television into the dining room when she holds an amateur dramatics rehearsal in the lounge and, as R38 prefers records and her husband prefers television, they are making their bedroom into a 'comfy' room. Another eight women mentioned that there was sometimes conflict between themselves and their husbands over the use of space and that this was a problem.

As previously discussed (9.4), twenty-four mothers replied in terms of sets of rules when asked about the existence of conflict between parent and their children concerning the use of the lounge. Of the remaining thirty women, ten commented on the children being too noisy sometimes. Five mentioned conflict between entertaining visitors and the children wanting to watch television. Three mentioned activities like the playing of 'pop' music, or the recorder being particularly disliked by one parent. Another three cited disputes over television between fathers and children. One mentioned children disrupting her husband's hobby and two about lack of space in general leading to there always being a certain amount of friction. The remaining six women said there was no conflict as either the children were very young and in bed in the evenings, the family had two televisions or stereos, or the children joined in, or had their own space to go to.

II. Family Interaction in the Kitchen

Husband's Use of the Kitchen

Use of the Kitchen to be Alone

This topic was intended to uncover further information on family behaviour in relation to rooms in the home, since it was not expected that women would say their husbands would use the kitchen as a place to be alone. As anticipated, only five respondents said their husbands
used the kitchen to be alone, two to work and three when they disliked the television choice of the rest of the family. Three had kitchen-diners, one a lounge-diner and one three separate rooms. (Table II).

To be alone was variously interpreted as being alone to do something; to obtain peace and quiet; when angry. Room choice appeared frequently to depend on the children:

R17 - 'It depends, where the children aren't.'

Four respondents said their husbands could never really get away from the children's pestering and one said that this was why he went out.

R40 - 'If the house is full, he goes in the garage.'

Two said their husbands sent the children out of the lounge.

Ten women emphasised that their husband definitely would not consider the kitchen as a place to be alone, since; (R47) 'It's the centre of the house.'

R39 - 'That's where we are most of the time.'

Seven were 'family' oriented and one 'want family' oriented. Choice of location to be alone is shown in Table 1.

The six women that said they had not noticed a need to be alone in their husbands made comments like the following:

R10 - 'He likes being with the children.'

R51 - 'Nowhere, we're always together. Not like that.'

R2 - 'He's in the lounge. I don't think he goes anywhere.

He doesn't feel the need like that.'

Husbands liked the lounge, according to their wives, for comfort and snoozing. Outdoors was an equally popular choice, showing a class difference in the venue of those 19 men going outside to be alone. Middle class men stayed on 'home ground' (garage, garden), whilst working class men went to the pub (all respondents had gardens) (Table II).
R15's husband - 'I go to the pub. My living room down the road.'

R25 - 'If he doesn't watch t.v., he'll smoke and read the paper in the kitchen, or he'll go up the pub or club.'

The decision to find somewhere in the house or to go out did not appear to be influenced by the number or layout of rooms in the house.

A tendency was noted for slightly more men not to use the lounge to be alone, according to their wives, where their orientation to the lounge was 'relaxing' or 'activity,' although this was not significant. No other variables significantly influenced husbands' behaviour.

II. Children's Use of the Kitchen

The women were asked to estimate frequency of use of the kitchen by their children in terms of 'often,' 'sometimes,' 'rarely,' for the same range of activities used to assess husband's use of the kitchen. They were asked to comment on any difference in habits between children of different ages and sex, and, as before, encouraged to elaborate on the types of activities taking place in the kitchen.

The kitchen was used heavily by all of the children, for all reasons except the use of the kitchen to be alone (Table IV). The majority frequently passed through the kitchen, apart from the eleven kitchens without a back door. The majority also chatted there to mother (very young children an obvious exception). The three women who felt their children chatted to them less frequently all had older sons (aged 18 and 16; 19 and 12; 10 and 13). Toddlers wanted to follow mother around:

R7 (4,1, ) - 'They follow me out and hang round my leg.'

R36 (4 and 20 months) - 'They follow me around, so if I'm in there (kitchen) then they will be.'
R48 (4½ and 2) - 'The youngest is in there a lot with me when I'm working. The 4½ year old is much more interested in television, which is on when she comes home.'

Other children came in to play.

R22 (7 and baby) - 'If mum's busy, she doesn't like to be left, so she comes in.'

Older children, especially girls, came in to ask questions and confide in their mothers:

R10 (children aged 16½, 14, 8, 3½) - 'Yes, especially the fourteen year old, who comes to tell me things that won't wait till I'm sitting down.'

R35 (5 and 7) - 'Deborah (5) does. Andrew (7) doesn't.'

R42 (12, 14, 10) - 'If there's no-one to play with then they will.'

R45 (8, 6) - 'Yes, because when they arrive home I'm in the kitchen anyway.'

The majority of children also had snack drinks in the kitchen. Twenty women emphasised they encouraged this and seven of them had specific rules that children were to have casual drinks in the kitchen and not in the lounge. All twenty had younger children and five of the seven with rules were 'display' or 'sitting' oriented towards the lounge. Of the twelve mothers who indicated less frequent use of the kitchen by their children for casual drinks, eight were 'relaxing' or 'activity' oriented towards the lounge and eight also had children over five.

Size of the kitchen and layout of the ground floor had no effect, nor use of the kitchen for meals. Although it was noted that 4 of the 5 families where the children did not use the kitchen for casual beverages also did not use it for meals (data not shown).
The kitchen was not a place for children to use to be alone. In only three cases was it used 'sometimes' by families with 3 or 4 children; for a child to do homework, or for older children to get away from younger ones to do something like a jigsaw in peace.

In the majority of families the kitchen was used by the children for their own activities 'frequently' or 'sometimes.' These ranged from messy activities (felt tip pens, colouring, glueing, painting, pastry, plasticine), general play, puzzles and games, homework, through to several children making their own sandwiches and cleaning their own shoes, football boots and plimsoles. Kitchen-diners were especially heavily used, probably since many activities centred on the use of a table and in houses with kitchen-diners this was often where the only table in the house was located.

R16 - 'They do things which would probably be done in a dining room if we had one.'

Mothers of young children frequently mentioned their concern for the safety of young children playing in the kitchen. They did not allow unsupervised play there and some excluded their very young children from the room.

Children of all ages were considered by their mothers to help in the kitchen (Table IV), although the nature and value of such help varied from 'kitchen play' and trying to help, through to competent assistance, routines and rotas.

Pastry making and baking were popular activities for children to want to join in with:

R21 (boy 6, girl 4) - 'I don't know about help, but they enjoy it, rolling out the pastry and David likes making sponges.'

R20 (boy 2, girls 7, 5, 5) - 'We all love baking together, it's more recreation.'
R35 (boy 7, girl 5) - 'They both play when I'm doing pastry. They play making jam tarts.'

Help of all sorts was encouraged:

R29 (girls 4,2) - 'I let them try and help me as much as I can. Lots of things, like the vegetables, I give them a basket to help put the peelings in.'

But not forced:

R6 (boy 4, girl 1) - 'Katy is too young, but she will pass a cup to me for washing up. Mark is spasmodic setting the table or helping baking. He's lazy and prefers to get on with what he's doing.'

R4 (boys 6,8) - 'The eight year old isn't that way inclined, but the six year old clears and sets the table, washes up - not well! - and loves to help cook, especially cakes.'

R26 (girls 17 (at work), 12) - 'They don't do a lot as I don't make them, but they help now and again and will cook if they want to. Sundays my eldest always helps dish up lunch.'

Patterns of help varied with the age of the children:

R15 (boys 4,2) - 'They love helping to cook and following me round playing with the hoover.'

R37 (boys 3½, 2) - 'They do try in their own way - dry a spoon, stir things.'

R22 (girls 7, 3m) - 'She (7 year old) stands on a chair at the worksurface and stirs the pots. I encourage her to learn to cook as I learnt the hard way. She doesn't do the dishes, it's playing rather than actual help.'

The most usual help was regular washing and drying up. Children too young for this activity but who 'helped' tended to clear or set the table, wipe surfaces or wipe dishes. Cooking ranged from younger children buttering bread, older ones making tea and toast and teenagers
making meals. Older girls often made cakes on their own.

In five larger families, with 3 or 4 older children, there were organised rotas for helping with the washing up and similar tasks:

R3 - 'Washing up, sweeping the floor, laying the table, helping with the cooking.'

R10 - 'The boy helps too.'

R11 - 'They must learn to help.'

R12 - 'My husband believes they should learn to wash and wipe at an early age.'

R34 - 'The two older boys help wash up for pocket money. I think it's a good idea. I like to give them some practice.'

Learning is important. In keeping with her formal lifestyle, R1 gives her three daughters (16, 11, 8) cooking lessons on Sunday mornings, using a special 'learn to cook' book.

Only one woman with young children under five (boys 4½, 20 months) indicated there was no helping and no joining in. Three women all with older boys said their children did not help.

R25 (boys 19, 12) - 'I spoil them. The younger one may help now and again with the washing up.'

R41 (boys 18, 16) - 'They occasionally dry up, but my husband's attitude has spread to the boys. They're not unkind, just disinterested and I've got lots of equipment to help.'

Safety factors were a consideration of some of the women, concerning children helping in the kitchen, for example, dangers from the cooker and sharp knives. Size of kitchen did not effect whether or not children helped, but there were a few complaints from those with small kitchens (4-8 m²).
R46 (boys 6,5) - 'They help wash up. If I had a bit more room, I'd do more baking with them, but it really is impossible with two the same age. We always end up having arguments over not enough space.'

To summarize, the majority of children helped in the kitchen to a varying degree. 'Kitchen play' was regarded as fun and 'learning through helping' was considered important. It was encouraged, not forced in both sexes by mothers. Rotas were used as a way of ensuring fair shares of tasks in larger families.

The women's comments highlight differences in behaviour attributable to age and sex. In families with older children, more activity was noted amongst older girls, for example, baking cakes. Whereas older boys tended not to help. Helping in the kitchen is a very important area for mother-child interaction and the overall picture of the kitchen is of a heavily used area. Those associated with kitchen planning should bear in mind the need for extra space to accommodate young children playing; the safety aspects of toddlers who follow mother around; older children chatting; children helping.

III. Use of Bedrooms

The women were asked whether the bedrooms were used for any other activities besides normal bedroom use, and, if so, whether they minded this extension of their use. Use of the bedrooms is summarised in Table VI.

The seven respondents who used bedrooms solely as bedrooms all had children under five. Three of them expressed apprehension about the safety of small children playing upstairs, regarding windows and stairs.
The majority of respondents used bedrooms for a wider range of purposes. Only four were unenthusiastic about this use, two of them wanted rooms set aside as playrooms and a study, one disliked bedrooms overrun by neighbours' children and the other preferred it when her children played upstairs. Sixteen women were ambivalent about wider use of the bedrooms. The rooms were freely used for a range of activities, but four mentioned that their children preferred to be where mother was:

R12 - 'I don't mind, but the kids tend to like to be around adults.'

The remaining twenty-seven mothers expressed enthusiasm for the use of the bedrooms for a wider range of activities. Seven actively encouraged their children to use the bedrooms for play, the appearance of the lounge being their priority. Five of the seven had lounge-diners.

R22 - 'I prefer them to play there after my Friday clean up, but they like to be with me.'

R21 - 'The kids play all over the house, I'd like them to play more in the bedrooms as you can't move for toys down here.'

R2 - 'Yes, as they're not allowed to do things in the lounge.'

Another seven women had set aside rooms as playrooms for their children. Eight women stressed use of the bedrooms as a way of providing privacy for their children. Five of the eight had three or four children (half of those in the sample with large families).

R3 - 'Everybody should have a place of their own.'

R44 - 'It's their inner sanctum. I don't go on rampages and demand tidyness. They do their own thing.'

Eleven women mentioned themselves, or their husbands, using the bedroom
as offices, sewing rooms, or places to escape from the children, relax and read or do yoga. In Chapter Seven, four women mentioned bedrooms as their favourite room and fourteen women considered it their own room.

IV. Visitors to the Home

Callers on Business

Respondents interpreted business callers as those they invited inside on business. They intimated a trend towards inviting people inside rather than keep them on the doorstep.

R25 - 'They go in the kitchen or the lounge. I don't keep them at the door. It's far better that they come in.'

Fewer business callers were reported visiting the home, than those in the other 4 categories (Table VII). Callers on business weekly or more frequently were the result of, in two cases, the woman being a homeworker and in the other two cases, the husband running his own business.

Monthly business callers included the Avon lady for one respondent and sports club officials for one husband. Again, two women had callers connected with their being homeworkers (a home computer coder and part-time insurance agent). Less frequent visitors on business were club men and insurance men, mainly for working class respondents. For one middle class respondent the callers were again to do with her husbands work.

The majority of respondents seldom had visitors on business on a regular basis. (Business callers were interpreted by the respondents as callers that some invited transaction took place with, not door-to-door salesmen, charity collectors, gas meter readers. For instance, women counted Avon representatives if they regularly
dealt with them, not if they just said 'no, thank you' on the doorstep.

With regard to where business callers went in the house, the room used appeared to be influenced by the callers status. For example, R5's husband's driver comes into the dining area of her kitchen-diner:

R5 - 'Never the lounge. That's the difference; he's staff, you see.'

R19, 20, 23, and 21 all have callers connected with their own or their husband's employment, of managerial status. They all use the lounge.

Children's Friends

Table VIII shows a very frequent visiting pattern over the whole sample, only 8 women said that their children had friends round less than once a week.

There was no social class difference (data not shown). Table IX shows children under 5 having other children round to play less frequently than older children, possibly due to their being too young to form independent friendships, therefore their visiting playmates were children accompanied by relatives, mothers, friends and neighbours.

Looking at patterns of room use for visiting playmates, age of the children and the fact that most under fives were accompanied by adult friends of the respondent, makes a difference to room use.

The lounge was the main room used by visiting children in 9 cases. In five of these cases the mothers said it was because the children were young, needed supervision and wanted to be around mother, and adult relatives and friends were also visiting.
In the other 4 cases, the children were much older. For example, R26's 17 year old daughter's fiancé sits in the lounge with her and R32's 16½ year old boy, at work, has friends in the lounge some evenings.

Another 10 respondents mentioned visiting children playing in the lounge, although this was not mentioned as the main play area. They said the children could and did play there, as well as the bedrooms or garden. 8 of the 10 liberal women regarded the lounge as a 'relaxing' or 'activity' area, the other two had older children and specified that the lounge was for children to watch t.v. in only. 30% had positive and 70% negative separation of function. Thus, it would seem more liberal mothers and those with grown-up children or children under five visiting with their mothers allow the lounge to be used for play.

The majority (35) of mothers said visiting playmates used the garden, bedrooms, or dining room (where there was one) depending on the children's own preferences, for example:

R27 (boy 11, girl 13) - 'The boy's mostly out. The girls whisper in the bedroom. They know they can have friends round when they like.'

However, a number of women had rules:

R32 - 'They play in the dining room or the kitchen. They're not allowed upstairs.' (16½, 14½, 7, 4½, eldest allowed in lounge).

R2 - 'Outside or the bedrooms. My husband doesn't like to hear children all over the place.' (boys 13 and 10).

R4 - 'Bedrooms or outside. I'm discouraging use of the lounge now they're older. I'm clamping down now they're not toddlers.' (boys 6 and 8).
R9 - 'I don't like children running all over the house, but if they do want to take a friend up to the bedroom, then I don't mind.' (19, 15, 12, 7).

R12 - 'The 8 year old takes friends up to his room one at a time though.' (boy 8, boy 3).

All the women expressing rules had positive separation of function.

**Visits from Relatives**

Over half the sample saw relatives less than once a month. Looking at the patterns for each socio-economic group, frequent visits are significantly more common amongst working class respondents (Table X). Only 7 middle class women reported weekly or more often visits by relatives, compared to 23 reports from the working class women.

This difference in visiting patterns is probably accounted for by the fact that the middle class women live further away from their parents, as trends in mobility amongst the middle classes would lead us to expect (1). Therefore, visits from relatives tended to occur less often. However, when they did come, they stayed for a period ranging from a drive down for the day from Leicester; weekend visits; a week's stay from Ireland and Europe; to aged relatives staying for a month or so, or more, where the responsibility for their welfare was being shared out amongst family members. For example, R46's family have their Grandpa for one month in every three.

Very frequent visitors, daily, or 3 or 4 times a week, were mothers and sisters 'popping in' on their way to or from work, or from their homes close by, just staying long enough to 'pass the time of day' or have a cup of coffee. Only one woman entertained a relative for meals 3 or 4 times a week, that was R48, whose sister-in-law, a nurse, came for lunches on her way back from the hospital.
Relatives visiting once or twice a week, fortnightly or once a month, tended to come for meals. This could be lunch, tea, a more formal evening meal, or for the day. R26's mother comes for the whole day once or twice a week. R48's parents came to tea and stayed overnight babysitting about once a fortnight.

Comments on where and how visiting relatives were entertained and the women's attitudes to whether they liked or disliked relatives in the kitchen revealed a ceremonial-informal dimension of the entertainment of visitors to the home, already discussed in Chapter 9, part one. A ceremonial orientation towards the entertainment of relatives was used as an indicator of positive separation of function and an informal one as an indicator of negative separation of function.

It is true from the preceding account that frequent visitors dropped by for a chat or a coffee, whilst less frequent visitors came for meals. So ceremonial-informal orientations could be expected to be linked to frequency. However, attitude seemed to take precedence over frequency. For example, ceremonially-oriented R5's parents visit often, once or twice a week, but they stress the formality of their visits; they are always kept in the lounge. Whereas R7, who is informal, says her parents visit from Dorking, Surrey, once a month and they 'join in with family meals.'

Friends of the Couple

'Friends of yourself and your husband' was used to distinguish between these and 'friends and neighbours,' primarily the women's own acquaintances. The frequency with which they were entertained is shown in Table XI.
This type of entertaining in the home shows a significant class difference, middle class couples more frequently entertained friends at home (Table XI.). R38 (middle class) entertains fortnightly:

R38 - 'We use the dining room and the lounge after. We do quite a lot of meals.'

Whereas R26 (working class) says 'we don't do that sort of entertaining' and R33 (working class) 'We don't entertain like that, only the family.' and R31 (working class) 'All the couples we know have kids. My husband sees his mates up the pub and I see the wives during the day.'

Of those who entertained, many did meals and/or drinks; some did only drinks and snacks, the latter tending to be working class, like R14, who entertains monthly:

R14 - 'We have drinks in the lounge. We don't go in for food.'

In contrast to middle class R42 'We have people round for drinks; sometimes we do meals.'

As with relatives visiting, a ceremonial-informal dimension of the entertainment of other couples was noted, as previously discussed in Chapter 9, part one, where this dimension is used in the construction of the index of separation of function. Ceremonial orientations were noted amongst respondents serving meals and/or drinks by comments such as:

R44 - 'We give dinner parties by special invitation.'

R19 - 'It's much more formal; they (guests) don't go into the kitchen. It's like a separate room in all respects.' (lounge and dining room instead of her lounge/diner).
Whereas others describe their entertainment as informal:

R37 - 'We go all over the house.'

R52 - 'It's very informal: meals, drinks, records and that sort of thing in the lounge.'

R6 - 'It's not formal. I do meals and snacks, casseroles and that.'

R3 who has a kitchen-diner, entertains monthly in the way of drinks and dinner. 'I haven't got the set-up. If I had, then I'd probably do more, but then I'm really an informal person anyway.'

As regards satisfaction with their homes for entertaining other couples, there seems to be a class difference. Working class R12, who entertains monthly, does drinks and plays records, avoiding meals as she gets flustered.

R12 - 'You don't need a separate room as you want to be in the lounge anyway. We have had some meals in the kitchen/diner, but you're not going to sit round the table for long.'

This highlights the ceremonial parlour orientation.

Some of the middle class women find the lack of a separate dining room inconvenient when entertaining. They cannot have all the ceremony they want:

R22 - 'It's nice to be able to say "come into the dining room."'

Several with kitchen/diners and lounge/diners make special arrangements to satisfy their ceremonial needs.

R28 (lounge/diner, working class) - 'I do a buffet. It's all arranged beforehand.'

R1 (kitchen/diner, middle class) carries her table into the lounge and shuts off her kitchen/diner from the guests.
Friends and Neighbours.

The frequency with which the women received visits from friends and neighbours was high, only 5 women in the sample had visits less than once a week (Table XII). Working class women had friends and neighbours round more frequently, the majority having visitors daily, or three or four times a week, although this was not significant (Table XII). Frequency was not higher amongst full-time housewives than those who were working, possibly because many of the part-time workers did evening work and thus were still at home during the day, when most visiting by friends and neighbours took place.

Table XIII shows the predominantly relaxed informal nature of the entertainment of friends and neighbors. Eleven women said they went wherever they were:

R47 - 'Everywhere, whatever's going on.'
R49 - 'They follow me round.'

and 19 women said they always or predominantly used the kitchen:

R32 - 'Next door always sits with me in the kitchen, even when I'm doing my ironing.'
R26 - 'The kitchen's where they mostly come in the day as they're neighbours.'
R35 - 'My good friends say "carry on working" and we chat.'

The 3 women always using the dining room were working class where the dining room was the family living room.

However, not so well known friends were taken into the lounge and so were friends calling in the evenings. And of the 15 women always using the lounge, 5 were against use of the kitchen for visiting friends and neighbours. Amongst these were 2 women whose style of entertaining was very formal, 'ceremonial', even with friends.
and neighbours. For example, R23, who organises formal coffee mornings and R2, who always makes pre-arranged luncheon invitations with her friends. All 5 had positive separation of function.

V. Observations on Meal Patterns

Introduction

From the women's answers to questions on meal patterns and their attitudes to meals, two main dimensions of mealtimes were distinguished:

i. Family togetherness as opposed to individual eating.

ii. Formal as opposed to relaxed situations.

These dimensions were used in the construction of the index of separation of function outlined in part 1 of Chapter 9. In this appendix these dimensions of mealtimes are further elaborated. In addition, an overview of meal patterns looking first at the families and then at the rooms used is presented. Explanation of the use of the kitchen as opposed to other rooms at mealtimes is then sought in terms of facilities, family structure and attitudes.

Attitudes Towards Meals

1. Family togetherness and Individual Eating

Mealtimes were predominantly thought of as family times, in particular a time for the family to be together and talk. Meals were part of family life. One function of the family being to share food:

R37 - 'It's part of family life.'

R29 - 'Yes, it's more like a family if you can eat together.'

R22 - 'We're all involved.'

Mealtimes were seen as important times to talk and discuss things.

R4 - 'It's a family time and a conversation time. I've got a thing about it.'

R21 - 'It's the only time the family gets to talk and discuss things.'
R14 - 'Yes, we can talk over what's happened during the day. If we're in the lounge, then we don't talk as we have the t.v. on.'

Also an important opportunity for father (or mother) to see the children.

R10 - '...it's much nicer now we all wait, before the youngsters never saw their Dad.'

R34 - '... especially at tea time, so they can tell us what they've been doing and it's the only chance I get to talk to them if I work in the evenings.'

And for teaching/caring for the children. Encouraging social interaction.

R20 - 'It's important to be there to listen so that the children have a chance to talk about the day's experiences.'

R39 - 'We can all talk. The children can hear adults talking and get talking.'

16 mothers mentioned mealtimes in the context of teaching and caring for the children with more emphasis on a supervisory rather than interaction role. Teaching manners:

R49 - 'They learn from us so it's nice to sit down at the table. It teaches them manners.'

Making sure they eat:

R15 - 'Yes, the kids eat more and better. If fed alone they just pick.'

R18 - '... knowing what the children eat. One good meal a day especially.'

Two families emphasised ritual and formality regarding eating together.

R1 - 'It's an occasion. Meals are important. We make an effort to sit down together.'
The convenience of eating together was mentioned by 7 women, but for only two of these was it their sole reason.

R48 - 'The children are not good eaters and too tired, so meals are not enjoyable. They will be later.'

R36 - 'The children are fussy and it's too long for them to wait; it will be better when they are 7 or 8 and they can (wait).'

R38 - 'It's not important at this stage with young children. When they're older, we'll use the room more.'

These were all middle class women with young children, who obviously looked forward to meals taking on different functions, the present diminished enjoyment being seen as temporary, the children disrupting their usual enjoyment. One woman was slightly different in that, in addition to the drawbacks of eating with young children, she emphasised not wanting 'that sort of sitting down to a meal anyway' (R48).

Only one respondent was ambivalent about togetherness at meal-times. Ten women mentioned that they would like their family to be together for meals more often.

At the opposite end of this dimension is individual eating. In some families, this was occasioned by the husband's working hours. For example, in the case of the 30% of the families where the husbands rose early on working days and made their own breakfast. Children's age was another factor. In families with older children, individual activities could sometimes affect meal patterns in terms of togetherness.

R3 (negative separation of function, children 12%, 10, 6) - 'Breakfast at the weekend depends on what everyone is doing. So does lunch Saturday, and Saturday night. I eat with the children during the week as my husband has his work and social activities.'
R25 (positive separation of function; children 19 and 12) - 'Saturdays and evenings it depends who's going in and out. We have meals in shifts.'

In contrast to:

R9 (positive separation of function; children 18, 15, 12, 7) - 'We all eat together, otherwise we never meet.'

R10 (positive separation of function; children 16½, 14, 8, 3½) - 'We make a point of waiting to eat together in the evenings.'

Some of the women raise formal aspects of meals when talking about togetherness, emphasising the supervisory role of parents teaching children table manners when the family is together, and the ritual and formality aspects of togetherness:

R2 - 'My husband's the head of the family. We wait and eat together when he comes in.'

Some of the women raised informality in the context of togetherness like R46 - 'I don't want that sort of sitting down to a meal.'

2. Formal vs. Relaxed Situations

This dimension has already been discussed in part one of Chapter 9.

3. Summary

The preceding account demonstrates that the social functions of meals are many and varied, ranging from formal and/or special meals to relaxed casual ones for just sustenance.' For the family together through to individual family members. The nature of the meal varies according to whether it is breakfast, midday, or evening, week or weekend, the activities of the family and in some cases the age of the children, combined with the values and attitudes held by the individual women. These variations are discussed in the overview of meal patterns which follows.
Amongst the families in the sample a few showed meal patterns at the extremes of these types, for example: R1 and R2 have the most formal meal patterns. All meals are formal with all the family sitting down together at the dining table. R3's family have the most individual eating patterns, family members frequently getting their own meals to fit in with their activities. R18's family have the most relaxed meal patterns. All their meals are eaten in the lounge on trays sitting on the sofa. R46's family have the most casual meal patterns, of informal snacks and family togetherness is unimportant.

However, the majority of families showed a mixture of meal functions. Nearly all had a casual breakfast and a more formal family gathering for lunch on Sunday. For example, R11's family have a tendency towards formality at mealtimes. They make a consistent effort to eat together and R11 values family togetherness. However, the family has a casual, informal breakfasting pattern. R36's family have very informal meals all the time apart from Sunday lunch, where they eat together as a family with some semblance of formality. The next part of this section presents an overview of these meal patterns.

An Overview of Meal Patterns

A. The Families

1. Breakfast

Overall, the prevailing attitude towards breakfast is that of a casual meal. Husbands' work is an important influence during the week. In sixteen (30%) of the families the husband gets up and makes his own breakfast during the week and the wife and children have breakfast later. In the remainder of the sample where the husband did not leave very early for work, another ten families described
having breakfast in relays. In one family, the children got their own breakfast and took their parents tea in bed. Eleven families breakfasted more or less together, but in 'dribs and drabs' and 'on the move'; leaving only 16 (30%) of families in the sample of 54 who sat down to breakfast together. Only two of these families indicated that they tried to make a point of sitting down together. In eleven families either the husband, or wife, did not eat breakfast.

At the weekend the majority of the families (32, 60%) sit down to breakfast together. The remainder eat in 'dribs and drabs,' with a number of adults continuing not to eat. The increase in eating together is attributable to increased time available, rather than an increase in formality. Of the five families changing the rooms they use, two more from the kitchen to using the dining room at weekends and three to using the lounge or the bedroom instead of the kitchen or kitchen and dining room.

2. Midday Meal

In 23 (43%) families it is the housewife and children who eat at home midday during the week. In 13 (24%) families it is the housewife only. In 9 (17%) families the husband, wife and one or all of the children eat together and in another 3 (6%) families this happens sometimes. In 3 cases it is the husband and wife only and in another 3 families everyone is out at lunchtimes. On Saturday the majority of families eat together, apart from four where the children are fed separately and seven families whose members eat separately. One family is out. On Sunday all but three families always eat together (and one of these 3 sometimes).
3. **Evening Meal**

During the week, half of the families (27) eat together in the evening. In another 16 (30%) the children eat first and the husband and wife eat later and in 9 (17%) of the families the wife and children eat first and the husband eats later. Two families eat in relays.

On Saturdays the majority of families eat together, apart from seven families where the children eat first and husband and wife eat later and another 5 whose togetherness is dependent on the activities of family members. On Sundays all but five families eat together, those five feeding the children before the adults.

**E. The Rooms**

**Breakfast**

The kitchen is the single most frequently used room for breakfast for the whole sample, with a very small change on Saturday and Sunday. (Table XIV).

**Lunch**

During the week the kitchen is still the single most frequently used room for lunch for families with kitchen-diners and 3 separate rooms, but to a much lesser extent. More families with lounge-diners tend to use the lounge-diners, and, apart from families with kitchen-diners, in total other rooms are used more frequently, and in several cases, venues other than lounge, dining and lounge-dining rooms are mentioned.

On Saturdays, families with kitchen-diners lunch there, those with lounge-diners do not change their pattern and tend to use the lounge-diner. More of a change is noticed amongst those with 3 separate rooms, in that less now use the kitchen.
On Sundays, families with kitchen-diners lunch there, but there is a marked change amongst those with separate rooms to use of the dining room and again, a few more of the families with lounge-diners use them. Therefore, for the whole sample, use of the kitchen for meals is lowest at Sunday lunch time.

**Evening Meal**

Overall figures (Table XIV), show the kitchen is a less popular venue for evening meals. Although its use during the week is about the same as its use for lunch during the week. Again, nearly all those with kitchen/diners use the room for their evening meals in all days. However, amongst the others in the sample, there is a tendency towards the use of other rooms, this becoming more pronounced on Saturday and Sunday.

**Combinations**

Defined as two rooms used at the same time, except for cases where it can be one room or the other (midday meal during the week). This is much more common amongst those with a wider choice of rooms (i.e., 3 separate rooms) and more common for weekday lunch and weekday evening meals. Tables XIV and XV provide a summary of the meal patterns.

**Investigation of the Reasons for Use of the Kitchen for Meals**

Three-quarters of the sample (forty respondents) eat at least some meals in the kitchen. Of these thirty-four use it for the majority (fourteen) or all (twenty) of their meals and six only for a few meals (Table XVI). The majority of respondents (30) have a table and chairs or breakfast bar in the kitchen (Table XVII) and in all of these cases the kitchen was used for at least some meals. A group of eleven respondents have 'other', less satisfactory, provisions for eating
(Table XVIII) Nevertheless seven of them use the kitchen for most, or all meals. Most of these 'other' arrangements were in kitchens under $8\text{m}^2$ (Table XIX), which suggests that these provisions are makeshift rather than preferred.

Room choice for meals is significantly related to the overall ground floor layout of the home (Table XVI). The majority of families with kitchen-diners use the kitchen-diner for most (2) or all (14) meals. In homes where the dining area is combined with the lounge, half the families use the kitchen for the majority (3) or all (5) of their meals and the other half use it less frequently (3) or not at all (5). The kitchen is still a popular choice, even in houses with separate lounge, dining room and kitchen. However, in these cases only one family used the kitchen for meals all the time, the other nine used it for the majority of meals. Of the remaining eleven, two used it less frequently and nine not at all. These findings reflect those of the General Household Survey (2) that the majority of households use the kitchen for purposes other than cooking and that number of other rooms in the house is related to kitchen use.

Small kitchens, $4-8\text{m}^2$, were used significantly less frequently for meals than large kitchens, $8-16\text{m}^2$, or purpose-built kitchen-diners (Table XIX). This again concurs with the General Household Survey, where small kitchens, which they defined as those under 6 feet wide, were used less frequently for purposes other than cooking (Table XXI). However, the small size of their kitchen does not deter seven families for using it for most or all meals and four from occasional use.

From the combined effect of kitchen size and houseplan (Table XXII), it would appear that kitchen size affects use of the kitchen for
meals amongst families with lounge/diners. Of interest is that, despite
the wider choice offered by a houseplan with three separate rooms,
seven women of the fifteen with small kitchens use the kitchen for all
or most meals. Although kitchen size and houseplan are significantly
related to use of the kitchen for meals, they do not entirely explain
family meal patterns.

Examination of the women's comments concerning reasons for their
choice of rooms at mealtimes and satisfaction with the arrangements
possible in their homes for eating, indicates that their behaviour
is influenced by their attitudes towards meals and in addition, their
attitudes towards the lounge and the overall indicator separation
of function (which includes attitudes to meals and orientation to
the lounge).

As explained in 9.1, the women were assessed as predominantly
formal (18 respondents), intermediate (14) or informal (22), in their
orientation towards meals from their descriptions of mealtimes. A
formal orientation towards meals was observed to be associated with
positive separation of function and an informal orientation with
negative separation of function. More middle class women have an
informal orientation towards meals, whilst working class women are
inclined towards formality. The women's orientation towards meals
is not related to the age and number of children in the family.
Neither does their orientation to the kitchen bear a strong relation­
ship, apart from the indication that families of women oriented towards
the kitchen as a 'family' room are more likely to eat all or the
majority of their meals in the kitchen than those of other orienta­
tions. The effect of the women's attitudes on family meals is seen by
observing the differences in the rooms used and reasons for use, between
women living in the same houseplan type.
Of the seventeen women with kitchen/diners, nine were assessed as 'formal,' four as 'intermediate' and four as 'informal' in their orientation towards meals. Fourteen ate all meals in the kitchen/diner, two the majority and one a minority. The three families who ate elsewhere ate in the lounge in order to watch television; they were all informal in orientation. Concerning reasons for their choice of room for meals, three of the 'intermediate' oriented women ate in the kitchen as it was designed as the eating space and the other one because it 'suits us.' Four of the nine formally oriented women stressed that they ate in the kitchen/diner because they would not have food in the lounge, another four because the kitchen was the only room and the other one because it suited them.

With regard to whether or not the women felt they were able to have the eating arrangements they wanted in their house, all but two of the women indicated they were all or in part satisfied, but for different reasons. For instance, informally oriented R6:

'It's good with the kids for day to day running, and we can eat in the lounge as it's nicely connected.'

whereas formally oriented R2 appreciates the kitchen/diner in a different way:

'It's better than a lounge/diner as I don't want food in the lounge.'

The convenience of eating near to the food preparation centre was mentioned by women regardless of orientation.

Eight women found their kitchen/diner had drawbacks when entertaining. For instance the lack of space and the need to be tidier and more organised with food preparation, as the kitchen was on view. However, the three informally oriented women raising this point
said that this did not matter as their style of entertainment was informal, whereas one of those formally oriented found the kitchen/diner so unsuitable that she moved the dining table through into the lounge so she could shut off the kitchen. Overall, six of those 'formally' oriented and four of those 'intermediate' oriented said they would prefer a separate dining room.

R10 (formal) - 'so my husband doesn't have to sit with the pots and pans.'

R14 (intermediate) - 'You could set the dining room how you wanted it.'

Such a preference was not mentioned by the four informally oriented women, one of whom emphasised that she did not want a dining room as they were 'unfriendly.'

Thus, although almost all of the women with a kitchen/diner used it for meals, those informally oriented were more positively satisfied with this, that is they liked being able to eat in the kitchen for its own merits, as opposed to those formally oriented, who liked to eat there predominantly because it kept the lounge clean and free from food, or it saved the journey through to another room:

R16 - 'The only thing for it is that it's easier not carrying meals through to a separate room.'

R12 - 'You don't have to trail meals through.'

In contrast to those of an informal orientation who took food into the lounge. Although those informally oriented perceived drawbacks in the kitchen/diner arrangement concerning the entertainment of visitors, these did not worry them as their style of entertainment was suited to eating in the kitchen. Those formally oriented were more dissatisfied and many stressed their preference for a separate dining room for every day use as well as for entertaining.
Of the women living in houses with a separate kitchen, dining room and lounge, five were 'formal,' two intermediate and fourteen 'informal' in their orientation towards meals. Four of the five formal women served all meals in the dining room. The fifth used the kitchen and the dining room for Sunday lunch and the family's special Saturday night meal 'to teach the children there's more to eating than food.' She was sick of 'picnics in the lounge,' so no food was served there at all. One of the other four also mentioned dislike of food in the lounge as her reason for eating in the dining room. Two others ate in the dining as it was 'suitable' and 'for meals.' They indicated that they would not mind eating in the kitchen. All five women were satisfied with their facilities.

Ten of these twenty-one women with a choice of three rooms for meals, used the kitchen for all of the majority of their meals. Eight of the ten were of an informal orientation. Fifteen of the twenty-one used the lounge for meals, the five formal oriented women being amongst the exceptions. Comfort and television were the major reasons for eating in the lounge, meals were often of the tea or snack type. As R42 says of her use of her lounge for meals:

'Saturday and Sunday evenings, snack lunches and when we want to watch t.v. The venue depends on the food.'

Two women served all meals there:

R52 - 'It's pleasant, we relax round the fire.'
R18 - 'The kitchen is too small.'

In contrast to the frequent or exclusive use of the dining room for all meals by all five formal women, only one of the other respondents uses the dining room for all meals, her reason being lack of space in the kitchen. Three women (all informally oriented) did
not use the dining room at all for meals. Another one only used it for visitors when she needed more space. In another five families the dining room was used once a week for their one more formal occasion of Sunday lunch. Six used the dining room when the whole family was eating together, for more space.

It was observed that the five formally oriented women were satisfied with their eating arrangements, whereas ten of the other sixteen women wanted a bigger kitchen or a kitchen/diner. Therefore, even with a dining room available the kitchen was the preferred place to eat amongst those informally oriented, despite limitations of size (6-8 m² in seven cases), with the lounge often used in addition.

With respect to the 17 women in dwellings with lounge/diner layouts those informally oriented (4 respondents) ate both in the kitchen and in the lounge/diner, for relaxation and television. Of the four formally oriented women in this houseplan type, the one working class woman explained that all meals were eaten in the kitchen to keep the lounge for 'best.' Whereas the other three middle class women used the lounge, their concept of a best room not being so incompatible with its use for their meals which they indicated that they wanted to serve in a 'nice atmosphere.'

Of the eight women with 'intermediate' orientation, five had overall positive separation of function. Four of these five were working class and three of them ate in the kitchen in order to keep the lounge for best. The other one used the lounge only because her kitchen was too small. The one middle-class woman of the five used the kitchen for the majority of meals and the lounge/diner for more formal weekend meals. Of the remaining three of these eight women, who had overall negative separation of function, two were
'family' oriented towards the kitchen and took all meals there and one used the dining room, but indicated that although she did not mind this, she would like to be able to use her kitchen.
Table II

HUSBANDS CHOICE OF LOCATION TO BE ALONE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Respondent No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors 1. Away from house</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Garage, garden</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not choose to be alone</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining room</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.C.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where children are not</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of comments</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND VENUE FOR HUSBANDS GOING OUTDOORS TO BE ALONE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Socio-economic status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>Working class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Away from house</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( eg. Pub, club.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home territory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( eg. Garage, garden.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IV
RESPONDENTS ASSESSMENT OF FREQUENCY OF USE OF THE KITCHEN BY THEIR CHILDREN FOR FIVE ACTIVITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>N.A.</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing through</td>
<td></td>
<td>39(72)</td>
<td>4(7)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>11(20)</td>
<td>54(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatting to mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>51(94)</td>
<td>2(4)</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual drinks</td>
<td></td>
<td>42(78)</td>
<td>7(13)</td>
<td>5(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be alone</td>
<td></td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>3(6)</td>
<td>51(94)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do own tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td>33(61)</td>
<td>11(20)</td>
<td>10(19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help in household tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td>38(70)</td>
<td>12(22)</td>
<td>4(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V
CHILDREN'S AGE AND FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN HOUSEHOLD TASKS IN THE KITCHEN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Age of children</th>
<th>All under 5</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>All over 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VI

USE OF BEDROOMS FOR OTHER ACTIVITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments about use</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used solely as bedrooms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used for other activities</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude: Unenthusiastic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic (playrooms)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To protect lounge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy for children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult use</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND FREQUENCY OF BUSINESS CALLERS TO THE HOME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Socio-economic status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a week</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all really</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 5.15$  d.f. = 3  p > .1 n.s.
Table VIII

FREQUENCY OF VISITS TO THE HOME BY CHILDREN'S FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>3/4 times week</th>
<th>1/2 times week</th>
<th>once a fortnight</th>
<th>once a month</th>
<th>less often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IX

AGE OF CHILDREN AND FREQUENCY OF VISITS TO THE HOME BY FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>All under 5.</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>All over 5.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 times a week</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 times a week</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a fortnight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 19.5 \quad \text{d.f.}=10 \quad p < .05 \)
Table X

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND FREQUENCY OF VISITS TO THE HOME BY RELATIVES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Middle class</th>
<th>Working class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 times a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 times a week</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a fortnight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>80(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 18$  d.f. = 5  $p = < .005$

(1) Total respondents=54  26 had two distinct visiting patterns amongst relatives.

Table XI

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND FREQUENCY OF ENTERTAINMENT OF THE COUPLES FRIENDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Middle class</th>
<th>Working class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 19.96$  d.f. = 4  $p = < .001$
Table XII

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND FREQUENCY OF ENTERTAINMENT OF FRIENDS AND NEIGHBOURS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Socio-economic status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 times a week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 times a week</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less frequently</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 2.42$  d.f.=3  p=.49 n.s.

Table XIII

ROOMS USED BY VISITING FRIENDS AND NEIGHBOURS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Breakdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wherever she is</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining room</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comments</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table XIV

**ROOMS USED FOR MEALS: A SUMMARY OF MEAL PATTERNS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th></th>
<th>Evening meal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining room</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge-diner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^{(1)})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total(^{(2)})</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(1)}\) Bedrooms. Meals not eaten at home.

\(^{(2)}\) Exceeds respondent total of 54 as some families use a combination of rooms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Evening meal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen-diners</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Evening meal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge-diner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Evening meal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining room</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Bedrooms. Meals not eaten at home.
(2) Exceeds 54 as some families use a combination of rooms.
Table XVI

USE OF THE KITCHEN FOR MEALS AND HOUSEPLAN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen use</th>
<th>Houseplan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen-diner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All or majority</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of meals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no meals</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 10.3$  d.f. = 2  p = < .01

Table XVII

FREQUENCY OF USE OF KITCHEN FOR MEALS AND PROVISIONS FOR MEALS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tables and chairs or breakfast bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All meals</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XV111

OTHER (1) PROVISIONS FOR MEALS.

Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of meals</th>
<th>Provisions</th>
<th>Minority of meals</th>
<th>No meals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R21. Child's table + stools used with work surface.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R46. Folding table and stacked chairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) See Table XV11

Table X1X

PROVISIONS MADE FOR MEALS IN KITCHEN BY RESPONDENTS AND KITCHEN SIZE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisions</th>
<th>Kitchen size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-8 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table and chairs or breakfast bar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XX

USE OF THE KITCHEN FOR MEALS AND KITCHEN SIZE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Kitchen size.</th>
<th>4-8 m²</th>
<th>8-16 m²</th>
<th>Kitchen-diners (1)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or majority of meals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 21.7$  d.f.=2  p= < .01

(1) Kitchen-diners form separate group as purpose-built for kitchen work and dining. (Kitchen area of kitchen-diners only = 4-8 m². Total area of kitchen-diners 8-16 m². )

Table XXI


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Kitchen size.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking only</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and sitting.</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XXII

FREQUENCY OF USE OF KITCHEN FOR MEALS BY KITCHEN SIZE AND HOUSEPLAN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Houseplan and kitchen size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen-diner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-8 m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All or majority of meals.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or no meals.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 13.2$  d.f. = 4  $p = < .05$
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