

between macro-economic policies and employment. Particular areas for investigation include the limits of Keynesian fiscal management, external transaction regimes and planning mechanisms.

The group also discussed linkages between Government departments and researchers, focussing on the twin problems of ensuring that researchers were aware of research needs as perceived by departments and that departments were informed of research results. It was noted that confidence in research results usually depended upon acceptance of the underlying theoretical framework.

DISCUSSION

Shiplely referred to the mechanism of communication between research and policy makers and the government suspicion of research from "outside". The motivation of those who offer research to policy makers was questioned. Rose noted that it was hard for policy makers to appreciate the learning processes that went on in research and therefore many departments feel they learn more by doing it themselves.

Williams argued that there was not enough research so that policy makers could select among alternative models. Smith then asked Judith Johnston of the Social Science Research Fund Committee (S.S.R.F.C.) the extent to which studies funded by the Committee have been translated into policy. Johnston replied that there had been great interest from policy makers in research funded by the Committee but that the main problem had been the time it takes to complete research; this was the price of purchasing outside research. Johnston noted that she wrote reviews of the work completed which are then sent to the Minister. She did notice that people receiving information in this way were becoming more informed. There are however serious supply problems for there are too few researchers carrying out the kind of work that is needed. The infrastructure for much of the research is not there; the lack of workshops for example. Andrews pointed out that there were policy needs of those in the private sector too. Johnston indicated that the seminar series held by the S.S.R.F.C. was very successful and this forum allows information to go to a variety of different policy makers.

GROUP 7. WOMEN IN THE LABOUR MARKET

Members : Prue Hyman, Rosemary Novitz, Susan Shiplely, David Smith, Nichola Swainson.

Gender difference constitutes a major rigidity in labour market operation and dynamics - and this justifies and requires detailed study.

Major questions

- (1) Documentation of the levels and changes in vertical and horizontal occupational segregation and earnings differences by sex.
- (2) The nature and relative importance of the constraints on change, such as:

- (a) Early socialisation, the education system and their effects on career choice;
 - (b) sex stereotyped views of those with personnel responsibilities;
 - (c) insufficient affirmative action programmes;
 - (d) economic advantages for certain groups of segmented labour markets and a secondary labour force, particularly in times of low growth;
 - (e) the extra responsibilities outside the labour market carried in general by women and the lack of provisions to mitigate their effects.
- (3) The relationships between women's unpaid work and their work in the paid labour force.
- (4) Documentation and the assessment of the potential impact of change within households and the extension of provisions alluded to in (2)(a) such as parental leave, permanent part-time work, domestic leave, child care facilities and more equal sharing of household responsibilities.

Extent to which questions are adequately answered Labour force participants, occupational and industry distributions are available at a fine level but only 5-yearly. Quarterly/annual data and earnings data are inadequate in detailed coverage and in the scope they offer for investigating relationships with other factors. The constraints on change, information on women's (and men's) unpaid work, and detailed attitudinal and case study material all require a great deal of research.

Specific research priorities (1) The extent of horizontal and vertical occupational segregation by sex in the blue-collar workforce 1956/81. (2) Industrial structure, technological change and associated changes in the labour process - their impact on women's employment. (3) Longitudinal case studies of work in the paid and unpaid labour force - including attitudinal data and the impact of the home-based and work-based constraints outlined. (4) Wages and earnings - case studies and comparative studies by industry, firm and occupation, examining differences by sex. (5) Case studies of the reproduction of gender divisions in the workplace - such as the investigation of the extent of sex stereotyped views of women held by men (fellow workers, trade union officials and particularly those in senior positions and/or with hiring/personnel responsibilities); how these affect their behaviour and policies and how they can be broken down. (6) The relativity between ethnic and gender differences in the labour market. (7) The impact of voluntary unionism on conditions of work and earnings for women. (8) Non-sexist job evaluation and the concept of equal pay for work of comparable value. (9) Women generating their own employment via cooperatives and collectives - what factors affect their chances of success or failure? (10) Methods of promoting provisions for workers with family responsibilities, such as parental leave, permanent part-time work, domestic leave and child-care facilities. (11) Investigation, in the New Zealand context, of theories of

discrimination. (12) The relationships between and measurement of unemployment, underemployment and discouragement from labour force participation.

Obstacles to research Data (for example a labour force survey), personnel and time, money, commitment.

Other observations At present there is no forum for focussing on communication of research, policies and ideas on women's employment issues. It would be desirable to bring researchers, policy makers, unionists, etc., together. Conferences similar to the annual Women and Employment series in Australia would be an attractive option in this connection.

DISCUSSION

Cook asked what affect the greater number of household appliances had had on the amount of female labour expended in the household. The evidence, replied Hyman, suggested that the total time spent on housework had not gone down. Part-time women's time in the household had fallen however. There was, at the same time, a problem of measuring quality differences in work. This kind of work required time budget studies. Imray asked whether the work referred to included classification of time spent on housework by social class. Novitz replied that there was no New Zealand data on the relationship between social class and time spent on housework.

Brosnan noted some findings on the relationship between ethnic origin and sex. Almost half of the statistical variation in income in his study was attributable to sex differences. The Maori/non-Maori by sex interaction was not that important compared to Maoris vs non-Maori effect which was much greater for males. Unemployment was due to other factors. Then he asked to what extent is lack of research on this issue due to the fact that most research workers are male. Hyman suggested this *was* a factor and that there was a supply problem here. Dwyer concluded by referring to the underemployment of women in this kind of research work.