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ABSTRACT

This thesis is an investigation of the gendered, classed and racialized identities associated with living a traditional family life in a suburb of Vancouver, British Columbia in the 1990s. It has two entry points. The first is a focus on gendered identities that are the result of "old" ideals in a "new" cultural and geographical context: what identities result when traditional ideals of motherhood, fatherhood and homeownership are played out in a context where the ideals are being questioned, the ability to live these ideals limited and the surrounding landscape does not seem to reflect these notions? I use the heuristics of "new traditionalism" and "declining fortunes" to understand this interpretation and reinscription of the "old" within the "new". The second entry point is a concern with place: how, in the 1990s, are white, middle-class familial identities gendered and experienced in and through place, and specifically suburban environments? Building upon Doreen Massey's rethinking of the notion of place, I define place as a constellation of social and cultural relations in a particular site and examine some of the ways that places and identities are articulated.

The thesis is based on archival work and in-depth interviews with residents in two neighbourhoods in the Municipality of Surrey, an outer suburb of Vancouver, British Columbia. Through an analysis of the planning of Surrey I show how the construction of Surrey as suburban set the limits of possibility and impossibility for identity there, deeming some identities "natural" and others peripheral. An examination of residential location decisions demonstrates that spatially demarcated neighbourhoods were desired and reconstructed and that the meanings of places within Surrey (what I term symbolic geographies) and distancing from a familial and racial
other were important in the process. By exploring the multiple linkages between gender, class and home I show how images of place, and especially the house and the neighbourhood, are part of situating the self. Through a focus on the tensions between new traditionalist ideals and practices, I suggest that cultural meanings circulating within specific places influence the experience of gendered subject positions and both exacerbate and smooth over tensions within new traditionalism. In an investigation of the links between religion, gender difference, new traditionalist convictions, and place, I highlight how religious networks involve a different relation to place compared to other residents.

I conclude that traditional models of family and gender (new traditionalism) remain pervasive signposts, and underlain by a relation to feminism, but are modified in response to the pressures of homeownership and different economic positionings (understood in terms of the discourse of declining fortunes). This modification is also class and place specific; the ability to live an idealized new traditionalist life is dependent upon the "possibility" of a male breadwinner wage and the meanings circulating within the residential neighbourhood.
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CHAPTER ONE
FAMILY LIVES, SUBURBAN PLACES: EXPLORING
ARTICULATIONS OF PLACE AND IDENTITY

I. Repositionings of the White, Middle-class, Nuclear Family in the 1990s

For much of the twentieth century in Canada and the United States, the white middle-class family has been assumed to be, and positioned as, the central and naturalized living arrangement and social category. Today this is no longer the case; the familial, racial and class aspects of the white middle-class family have been questioned and repositioned.

With respect to family, attempts to live and create nuclear families in the 1990s take place in a different context; familial experiences are now fractured. Unlike the singular "family" implied previously, the 1990s are characterized by multiple visions and realities of family living (what Judith Stacey calls postmodern families): blended families, single-parent families, lesbian and gay families. Family is a site of contestation: whether the nuclear family (generally narrowly defined as a heterosexual married couple with children, ideally with the woman not in the paid labour force) is the best or most appropriate environment for children; the consequences of the

proliferation of family arrangements, whether we are witnessing the "demise of the family"; and the implications of increasingly diverse forms of, and gender roles within, families. Gender relations are central throughout these debates. What men and women should and can do in families, and the gender of breadwinners, nurturers, caregivers and parents, are no longer fixed, but unstable and therefore contestable.

As the family has been repositioned, so too has the middle class. Homeownership and an idealized suburban way of life, long the pivots in middle-class living, are both questioned and seen to be under threat. Factors like declining living standards, omnipresent unemployment, rising house prices and the necessity of dual-earner families are seen to jeopardize the once idyllic lifestyle of the suburban, middle-class, nuclear family. Being middle class, according to some commentators, is now characterized by insecurity and anxiety, a constant fear of a downward economic and social slide.


Barbara Ehrenreich, 1989, Fear of Falling: The Inner Life of the Middle Class, New York: Pantheon.
Race has also been an element in the repositioning of the white, middle-class, nuclear family in the 1990s, for the racial underpinnings and exclusions associated with familial lives and understandings are increasingly recognized. Part of this is that the whiteness of readings of social life, how investigations and interpretations of middle-class families assume and construct whiteness, is being documented. More substantively, knowledge of racial diversity and opinions on programs like affirmative action are becoming part of white, middle-class, familial experience. Lillian Rubin has documented, for instance, how working class men and women in the United States attribute economic recessions and competition for jobs to a "racial other". Distancing from a racial "other" thus becomes part of their self positioning. Although Rubin is speaking of the working class in the United States, she has usefully identified the racialization of interpretations of everyday life, an identification that I build upon here.

Despite these repositionings, a particular image of family, and middle-class material goals, continue to guide many people's pursuits. According to Arlene Skolnick:

> For better or worse, family life, and an idealized image of what the family should be, remain the source of our greatest joys, our deepest worries, our most painful hurts.

It was this continuing salience of more conventional ideals that motivated the research upon which this thesis is based. Contact with people who had "chosen" a traditional family model, and a belief that academics tended to

---

disregard people living these models, made me curious and initiated the research.

My aim in this thesis is to engage with, and explore, the ideals and contours of contemporary white, middle-class, family lives, in the context of its repositioning in class, familial (especially in relation to gender) and racial terms. What interpretations, practices, identities and gendering are associated with being white, middle-class and living in a nuclear family in the 1990s? How do the "new" - contemporary repositionings - and the "old" - traditional ideals - intermingle? I investigate, in other words, how white, middle-class individuals in nuclear families are living, experiencing and reworking these gendered, classed and racialized tensions around the family. My substantive focus is identity: what interpretations and expressions of self are part of contemporary middle-class family life and how, if at all, do they draw upon and evoke the changed cultural context of this life. Through a series of interviews with residents in two subdivisions in a suburban municipality of Vancouver - Surrey - I suggest that understandings (necessarily gendered) of being homeowners and parents are situated with respect to other family types, the desirability of the nuclear family model, and a perception that a middle-class life is under threat.

My examination of these repositionings is filtered through place: how are the class, gender and racial identities lived in, and negotiated through, particular places. The places I examine are suburbs, for they are commonly seen as the "natural" homes of middle-class family life. A variety of motivations led me to this spatial focus. My experiences in a working-class suburb of Sydney (mainly as a child, but also five years as an adult) highlighted the continuing power of familial and homeownership ideals in the

13 Discussed in chapter two.
lives of many, and the salience of a "suburban", occasionally "anti-urban", way of life. I have thus long been intrigued as to why this was the case. On a more academic note, I felt that many academics had been dismissive of the familial and middle-class aspects of suburban places and lives. Identifying and focusing on changes in the built form of suburbs, like "urbanization" and increasing social diversity, seemed to leave behind a more conventional suburban space - the subdivision of detached houses - and living - the white middle-class family. I was and am interested, however, in what was happening in these places.

My thesis therefore is not only about white middle-class family life, nor is it solely about suburbs. It is about the intersection of suburbs (place), with white, middle-class family life (identity). It is about the interpretation, experience and reproduction of familial-related identities in and through suburban environments. Through archival work, statistics and planning reports, I tell a story of the way familial social relations are enunciated and spatialized in a certain site. The stories I was told in in-depth interviews allow me to tell other stories of the intrinsicality of place, placement, and a changing discursive and material context to the constitution of race, gender and class in middle-class nuclear families living in Surrey in the 1990s. In particular, I show how: spatial boundaries around middle-class, nuclear family identities were constructed in response to the perceived diversity of suburbs and the threat to families this encompassed; experiences of self drew upon "common sense" notions of the association between particular places and identities; and local cultures, consisting of rules of appropriate behaviour for a particular place, were a material influence on gender and class formation, especially in relation to interpretations of maternal employment.
In this chapter, my aim is to introduce the empirical themes and theoretical arguments that guide my analysis. In the next section I outline two heuristics that connect more conventional familial and class ideals with a contemporary context: new traditionalism and declining fortunes. These two categories usefully summarize the major ideals and struggles that were raised in the empirical work, and also allow me to bring the analysis to bear on broader academic debates. In the third section I outline the theoretical perspective of the thesis, situating it as a contribution to, and extension of, recent theorizations of place, identity and their intersection. Drawing on poststructuralist and culturally-oriented notions of identity and place, I develop articulations of place and identity that are investigated throughout the thesis. In the final section I introduce the rest of the thesis, situating each chapter as a consideration of some of the multiple articulations of places and identities within the context of new traditionalism, declining fortunes, and Surrey.

II. "New Traditionalism", "Declining Fortunes" and Suburbs

My understandings of familial-related identities in Surrey are framed by two discourses that link the continuation of "old" ideals with a "new" context: new traditionalism and declining fortunes. Although emerging from the interviews, they also have wider academic and popular resonance. As such, I have two goals when speaking of them. The first is to use them as heuristic devices to understand the interview material. My second aim is to contribute to academic discussions of the discourses, especially in relation to their intersection, spatiality and complexity, points I come back to in the concluding chapter. In this section I sketch the contours of the discourses, my use of them, and briefly explore their spatiality in order to contextualize
the empirical discussions in the rest of the thesis. I also introduce the suburban scholarship relevant to the thesis, setting out how I reformulate it.

a. New Traditionalism

New traditionalism is an umbrella term coined to describe the altered cultural context of families, class and gender in the 1990s, and a particular reaction to that context. Cultural and sociological accounts have identified new traditionalist ideals and practices as important in constituting familial gendered identities.\(^\text{14}\) The term gained currency as the result of a series of advertisements in the American magazines *Good Housekeeping* and *Family Circle*,\(^\text{15}\) but has also been used by academics and policy makers.\(^\text{16}\) It is most clearly evident in advertising, but has also been discussed in relation to politics,\(^\text{17}\) popular culture, television,\(^\text{18}\) and the narratives of everyday life.\(^\text{19}\) New traditionalism is a complex and contradictory set of ideas focused around gender relations within families and the problems women face around work and motherhood. In some respects it is "post-feminist", posing women's career and parenting decisions as choices rather than duties.\(^\text{20}\) In the Good Housekeeping campaign, for instance, professional women were depicted as choosing to remain at home.\(^\text{21}\) But new traditionalism is also a

\(^{14}\) See Elspeth Probyn, 1990, "New traditionalism and post-feminism: TV does the home", *Screen*, 31,2, pp.147-59.


\(^{16}\) See Judith Stacey, 1994, "Scents, scholars and stigmas: the revisionist campaign for family values", *Social Text*, 40, pp.51-75.

\(^{17}\) Witness, for example, the rise of the Reform Party and their platform of "family values" in Canada.


\(^{19}\) Katherine Newman, 1993, *op.cit.*

\(^{20}\) Probyn, 1993, *op.cit.*

\(^{21}\) Leslie, *op.cit.*
conservative, "anti-feminist" response to contestations of family, attempting "to resituate women in the home, with the home constituting the primary location of women's identities". In this respect, new traditionalism evokes and engenders the view that the conventional nuclear family is the best and only environment in which to raise children, and that women should remain at home with their children.

In many ways, the ideals espoused within new traditionalism - belief in the institution of marriage, necessity of raising children in a two-parent, heterosexual home, and a distrust of daycare and "working mothers" - are not new, but have been present throughout the twentieth century. The term "new" is appropriate, however, for it denotes the contemporary reworking of these long-held ideals, a process that necessarily recasts them. Specifically, regardless of the feminist ideals of individuals, feminism, as a set of popularly understood ideals, is present in most understandings of contemporary family life. "New" also refers to the different social landscape, which is characterized by a multiplicity of family arrangements. "New" thus designates the context of the ideals as much as the ideals themselves.

New traditionalism is a theme that emerged from my interviews, and one of my aims in discussing it is to understand the interview material. For both the men and women I spoke with, their nuclear model of family life was seen to be under threat by, among other elements, the tax system, the Surrey environment, and feminists. In articulating these fears they invoked

---

22 ibid. p.690.
23 For a description of these ideals see Judith Stacey, 1994, op.cit.
24 See, for instance, the contestations of maternal employment in the 1950s traced in Veronica Strong-Boag, 1994, "Canada's wage earning wives and the construction of the middle class, 1945-60", Journal of Canadian Studies, 29,3, pp.5-25.
what I have designated new traditionalism. As an investigation of the potency, negotiation and gendering of new traditionalist thinking in everyday life, this thesis is a useful counterpart and contribution to other academic discussions of the discourse, where representation has been the sole focus. Moreover, current understandings of new traditionalism are relatively unfractured, tending to depict it as monolithic and all-powerful. An example of this is the view that strong religious beliefs underlie new traditionalist ideals. In focusing on the working and negotiation of new traditionalism, I hope to convey some of the contestations and closures of the discourse. For instance, how class-specific is new traditionalism? What is the role of feminism? I also have a geographical aim, investigating how place-based constructions, local cultures and interpretations, impact upon and become part of, the reworking of new traditionalism. Does an acknowledgment of these place-based practices help convey the complexity of new traditionalism?

b. Declining Fortunes

I use Katherine Newman’s phrase "declining fortunes" to signal the cultural interpretations of the contemporary positioning of the middle class. Like new traditionalism, it has both academic and substantive origins. What initially alerted me to its existence was what I was hearing from interviews: the uncertain economic and employment context; the erosion of purchasing power amidst the incessant "ratcheting up" of consumption needs; and, especially acute in Vancouver, problems surrounding house prices and affordability, necessarily related, I was told, to immigration. Like new traditionalism, declining fortunes also has wider currency. Micaela di

26 Newman, op.cit.
Leonardo, for instance, has shown how deindustrialization operates as a "folk model", promulgated by the American media.27 Declining fortunes, as I use it in this thesis, is a discursive context that frames everyday understanding of being middle class.28

A recent series of articles in the Vancouver Sun on the "death of the middle class",29 highlights the salient characteristics of declining fortunes. A first element is that recent economic restructuring has been so deep as to affect middle-level managers and other middle class occupations. Thus the threat of unemployment has become more widespread.30 Second, rising taxes and stagnating wages have meant that remaining middle class is now a constant battle, one that is often lost.31 This is especially the case in families with only one wage earner. Third, house prices have meant that the dream of homeownership is unattainable for many:

Today Bruce and Kerry wonder if they will ever know the simple luxuries of living in a paid for home with a roof that doesn't leak. They worry about spiralling costs, particularly the cost of housing. They don't think they will ever be able to live in a new, modern home, something that was within reach of their parents.32

28 I use the term middle-class to loosely refer to a social category focused around professional and administrative occupations and homeownership, which I address in more depth in chapter five. See Mike Savage, James Barlow, Peter Dickens and Tony Fielding, 1992, Property, Bureaucracy and Culture: Middle-class Formation in Contemporary Britain, New York and London: Routledge.
On many fronts the discourse of declining fortunes is problematic and mythical. Most obviously, it is only relevant to a small portion of the population, hardly describing the lives of many contemporary urban dwellers. Lillian Rubin, for instance, contests the class specificity of Newman's claims, reminding us that working class women have always had to work, and that children of working class parents have often lived at home well into adulthood.\textsuperscript{33} Rubin also notes the racialization of the declining fortunes discourse, highlighting its immersion in a privileged, white consciousness.\textsuperscript{34} Newman herself falls into a "nostalgia trap", mythologizing and idealizing 1950s family living.\textsuperscript{35} The case studies that follow do not neatly fit the characterization of those with "declining fortunes". I spoke only with homeowners, most with relatively secure employment situations. Yet this mythical status of the declining fortunes discourse does not mitigate its strength as an interpretive tool, which is how I use it in the thesis. It is precisely as myth that the discourse is most powerful, capturing the imagination of many middle class families today.

I thus use declining fortunes as a scaffolding around which to build an understanding of the meaning of 1990s middle-class life. Like my invocation of new traditionalism, I also aim to contribute to understandings of declining fortunes. I am especially interested in its negotiation, gendering and spatialization. Specifically, what are the spatial practices associated with this discourse and how do symbolic geographies, especially in light of contemporary social geographies, form part of the discourse? How is gender implicated and what gender identities are part of the discourse? Additionally,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Rubin, \textit{op.cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{34} \textit{ibid.} ch.10.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Newman, \textit{op.cit.}
\end{itemize}
how is declining fortunes intersected by familial and racial concerns, especially new traditionalism?

Both these sets of understandings are racialized, underlain by, and expressions of, constructions of racial difference.36 In particular, they are embedded in a white consciousness and are sometimes dependent upon distancing from a racial other. In what follows, I am alert to the racialization of both new traditionalism and declining fortunes and explore it wherever possible.

c. Suburbs

My primary focus is the spatiality of new traditionalism and declining fortunes: what are their attendant spatial practices and how are they lived in and through place. A number of questions are relevant here. Are particular spatial practices (such as boundary making) necessary to the understandings of the repositioned family? Do experiences in place exacerbate contemporary gendered tensions around the family? I examine these questions in and through a particular site: suburban Vancouver. This focus is part of a long tradition, for suburbs, especially in North America, are seen the "natural" environment for nuclear families,37 constructed by, and emblematic of, familial ideology throughout the twentieth century.38 More recently, suburbs

36 Throughout the thesis, I am using the term race as a social construction.
as family places have been invoked in new traditionalist discourses around the family and gender. In the Good Housekeeping advertising campaign, it is a suburban home (detached house on large lot) to which women are re-situated.\(^{39}\) Assumed suburban ways of life are also central to discussions of declining fortunes. Homeownership, for instance, central to many suburban experiences, has motivated discussion of declining fortunes since it is seen to be under threat. Family and class are also issues that have occupied suburban scholars, although the diverse social characteristics of suburbs is also acknowledged.\(^{40}\) In this section, I outline more specifically how the gender, class and racial characteristics of suburbs have been understood and how they are reformulated in this thesis.

Since the late nineteenth century North American suburbs have been created by varying gendered ideologies and have therefore exhibited particular, gendered, characteristics. Heterosexuality is assumed, and gender is defined in the context of heterosexual, familial relations.\(^{41}\) Suburbs, and homes within them, were feminine spaces in contrast to the masculine worlds of city and work. Margaret Marsh's detailed analysis of late nineteenth century communities in the eastern United States shows that the architects, developers, planners and residents involved in building these communities ascribed to the notion that men should work and women should raise children. Suburban communities were seen to be most appropriate to

\(^{39}\) Leslie, op.cit.

\(^{40}\) For a summary see Carol A. O'Connor, 1985, "Sorting out the suburbs: patterns of land use, class, and culture", American Quarterly, 37,3, pp.382-394.

\(^{41}\) The heterosexism of suburban living and literature is not often commented upon. For exceptions see Gill Valentine, 1993, "(Hetero)sexing space: lesbians and experiences of everyday spaces", Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 11, pp.395-413; and Louise Johnson, 1994, "Occupying the suburban frontier: accommodating difference on Melbourne's urban fringe" in Alison Blunt and Gillian Rose, eds. Writing Women and Space: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies, London and New York: Guilford, pp. 141-68.
fulfilling these desires. This coincidence of constructions of gender difference and suburbs continued through the 1950s, in different places and times. Veronica Strong-Boag’s research in Canada confirms the importance of gender difference underlying the creation and image of suburban communities. Yet Strong-Boag paints a more complex portrait, acknowledging the presence of immigrant women in Canadian suburbs of this era. In the late 1980s, Isabel Dyck added another layer to these analyses of gender and suburbs, illustrating that suburbs were not only domestic spaces, but were also forums for negotiating the meaning of motherhood and thus identity. Both contemporary and historical scholarship, therefore, illustrates the braiding of gendered constructions of difference with suburbia in terms of principles underlying the constructions of suburbs, their subsequent demographic characteristics and as contexts for the interpretation of gender difference.

Suburbs in the United States, though to a lesser extent in Canada, have also been the product, and emblematic, of a particular class fraction, namely the middle class. Based on ideas of the importance of homeownership to economic security and raising children, communities for and of homeowners have long been created; from Jamaica Plain in New

---

England of the 1890s, to 1950s Don Mills in Ontario. As a result, the constitution of middle class identity and experience has been a major focus. Although working class suburbs have always existed and have became more prevalent since the postwar boom, they are not the focus here.

Gender and class are not separate but are mutually constitutive; a principle that is readily apparent in the suburban experience. Multiple variants of middle class femininity and masculinity are constructed and evident in suburban environments. For instance, Geraldine Pratt's analysis of the class-based meanings of homeownership suggests that homeownership is more central to definitions of middle-class masculinity than femininity. Similarly, parenting practices and underlying notions of gender are quite variable by class, as cursorily sketched by Barbara Ehrenreich. In the thesis I am explicitly attentive to the multiple overlaps of gender and class.

Race and ethnicity are also important characteristics of suburbs, though often noted more for their absence than presence. Early suburbs were invariably white, as were later 1950s Canadian suburbs, although it is important to point out that ethnically Canadian suburbs have been somewhat


48 Harris and Sendbuehler, op. cit.


50 Barbara Ehrenreich, 1989, op. cit.

51 See Marsh, op. cit.
more diverse.\textsuperscript{52} The place-specific constructions of gender and class I have outlined here are also racialized. They are often predicated on exclusions of people of colour, both overtly and covertly through house prices and exclusionary zoning.\textsuperscript{53}

These previous understandings of the links between suburbs, gender, class and race provide insights which I draw upon. I also reformulate these ideas in two important ways. First, I attempt to provide a more contemporary, Canadian, analysis of the intertwining of suburbs, gender class, race and family in a specific historical and geographical context. Mirroring the changed cultural context of the middle-class nuclear family in the 1990s is a different setting, for suburbs have changed, being much more heterogeneous. They now have downtowns and high density environments as well as low density housing.\textsuperscript{54} The social composition of suburbs is also more diverse, in terms of family types, race and income.\textsuperscript{55} Indeed, the traditional nuclear family is no longer the primary occupant and producer of suburban space.\textsuperscript{56} Whilst maintaining a focus on neighbourhoods made for

\textsuperscript{52} Richard Harris, 1992, "'Canada's all right'" the lives and loyalties of immigrant families in a Toronto suburb", \textit{Canadian Geographer}, 36,1, pp.13-30; and Strong-Boag, \textit{op.cit.}


and by nuclear families, I want also to foreground this altered spatial context. Since suburbs have changed, then it may follow that the interpretation of experience and practices within those places have also changed.

But my geographical aim and contribution to suburban scholarship is far more than representing place as a container. I also take the idea of suburbia as a place and the construction of identities within and through this place as issues to be examined rather than assumed. Despite Herbert Gans' careful ethnographic scholarship, nearly thirty years ago, that refuted the claim that suburbs automatically create certain types of people, the view persists that there is a direct relation between a place - suburb - and its people - suburbanites. I want to derive rather than assume the social and symbolic characteristics of the suburbs I examine. In other words, how do particular notions of class, gender and race (as circumscribed by declining fortunes and new traditionalism) become connected to specific sites that we call suburban. The conceptual shift offered here, therefore, facilitates a more fluid and nuanced understanding of suburbs as places and the identities associated with, and contested through, them. Achieving this reformulation requires a different theoretical vocabulary, which I introduce in the rest of this chapter.

III. Power, Culture and Identity

My concern in this thesis with experiences, practices and identities (especially in relation to gender) associated with living a white, middle-class, nuclear family life in Surrey, British Columbia, calls for an alertness to the importance of culture and representation in the constitution of social

relations, the materiality of discourse and the saturation of social life with power relations. I briefly outline the guideposts of my theoretical perspective in this section, drawn from contemporary feminist and cultural geography and poststructuralism.58

Important in what follows is a capillary rather than juridical notion of power, one that in geography has been clearly articulated in recent work using the landscape as text metaphor.59 A capillary notion of power recognizes that power does not emanate from a single source like capitalism or the rule of a sovereign but from many sources. The social field is saturated with power relations, flowing in many directions among many different actors. Following Michel Foucault, power is not an object, but a relation: the multiplicity of force relations (both domination and resistance) immanent to all spheres.60 All social relations are constituted by power relations and one's position and identity are reflections and products of relations of power. Similarly, power is often transmitted and established through signifying practices. James Duncan's work on Kandy or the discussions on "selling places",61 for instance, show how the built environment, as a signifier, reflects and reconstitutes power relations. Alongside this notion of power is an acknowledgment that discourses, like new traditionalism and declining fortunes, are not imposed by the "powerful"

61 Duncan, op.cit. See also Gerry Kearns and Chris Philo, eds. 1993, Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present, Oxford: Pergamon.
(like capital) and internalized by the "powerless" (consumers). Instead, they emanate from many sources, and are negotiated with, reproduced, and reconstituted in myriad ways.

Culture is also important, for it is a medium through which gender, class and other social relations are constructed, reproduced and understood. This sense of culture, as webs of meaning and significance through which people's experience is made sense of socially, is insightful because it locates culture as part of, rather than preceding or as an outcome of, social processes. I build upon this conception of culture here, with the relation of symbolic and experiential elements to lines of power, subordination, and domination the key point to be borne in mind.

In terms of identity, commensurate with the focus on multiple axes of power and difference in poststructuralism, conceptions of the subject and identity are fluid, multiple and overdetermined. I use the terms subject and identity interchangeably, following Paul Smith's distinction between the subject as the object of determinant forces and the individual as the perceived source and agent of conscious action. Identity is simultaneously a process and an outcome. As a process, I work loosely with Chantal Mouffe's conception of identity formation here, nicely summarized by Thomas Dunk as the:

---

64 Witness, for example, how the forest workers in Dunk's study produce themselves as loggers through a story they tell themselves about their own practices in comparison to those of environmentalists and city dwellers. Thomas Dunk, 1994, "Talking about trees: environment and society in forest workers' culture", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 31, 1, pp.14-34; p.16.
process of stitching together meaningful elements which
are already carriers of meaning and identity derived from
other contexts and uses.\textsuperscript{66}

This stitching together is not free in the sense that it is unencumbered by
relations of power. Instead, the individual is neither all-knowing nor
centered, but subject to a number of competing discourses.\textsuperscript{67} In other
words, the process of identity formation approximates limited choice:
choosing from available identities constructed by dominant discourses.

Just as there are many sources of oppression, identity is the result of
multiple, overlapping relations of power. It is overdetermined. As Mouffe
puts it:

\begin{quote}
We can therefore conceive the social agent as constituted
by an ensemble of "subject positions" that can never be
totally fixed in a closed system of differences, constructed
by a diversity of discourses among which there is no
necessary relation, but a constant movement of
overdetermined and displacement. The "identity" of such
a multiple and contradictory subject is therefore always
contingent and precarious, temporarily fixed at the
intersection of those subject positions and dependent on
specific forms of identification.\textsuperscript{68}
\end{quote}

The position of "wife", for instance, is constituted by heterosexual gender
discourses, personal biographies, state control and the education system, to
name just a few elements. In trying to understand the position of wife,
therefore, it is not possible to pinpoint one determinant, for there are many.

Identity, as the outcome of these processes, is composed of a number
of different subject positions. An individual's identity is never whole or
complete, but is multiple and fractured, being comprised of many different
subject positions that vary along lines such as gender, class and race. Not all

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{66} Thomas Dunk, \textit{op.cit}.
\item \textsuperscript{67} Paul Smith, \textit{op.cit}.
\item \textsuperscript{68} Chantal Mouffe, 1992, "Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics" in \textit{Feminists Theorize the Political}, eds. Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott, London and New York: Routledge, pp.369-84; p.372.
\end{itemize}
subject positions, either within or between individuals, are equal. There are always dominant and subordinate subject locations within discourses and one's identity. For instance, within "femininity", the identity of being female in western cultures, certain positions like mother, subservient and wife are dominant.

Many discussions of identity are abstract, rarely grounded in ethnographic material. Examinations of the multiplicity and complexity of identity are more often made on the basis of purely textual material. Keith and Pile, for instance, situate their account of the partiality of identity in Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* rather than the experience of immigrants. Part of the problem is conceptual, for moving from abstract understandings of identities to concrete situations is difficult. Linking experience, power and discourse is even more problematic, for how is it that dominant discourses are manifested in subjects and hence reproduced and recreated in everyday life? I use the term "doing gender" here to partially bridge this divide. The term is an amalgam of Candace West's and Don Zimmerman's sociology, and Judith Butler's notion of gender performativity. Gender identity can be thought of as the acting out of a script that prescribes certain forms of behaviour. The theatre analogy signals the constructed nature of the performance, but also recognizes the possibility of individual interpretation and refashioning of the script. In addition, doing gender emphasizes the embeddedness of these performances in everyday life: supposedly routine tasks like feeding the family and domestic chores draw
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69 Mouffe, op.cit.
70 For instance Paul Smith, op.cit. For exemplary exceptions, see Dunk, op.cit. and Frankenberg, op.cit.
71 Keith and Pile, op.cit.
72 Candace West and Don Zimmerman, 1987, "Doing gender" *Gender and Society*, 1,2, pp.125-51.
upon and reproduce gendered identities and experiences. Linking experience, ideology and practice is embedded in the thesis as a way of elaborating the relation between gendered practices and gendered discourses like the family. The notion is not only confined to gender, we can similarly think of doing or performing class, race and sexuality.

IV. Articulations of Place and Identity

As I suggested in the introduction to this chapter, this thesis is an investigation of the living of new traditionalism and declining fortunes and their attendant identities, in and through place. An understanding of the inter-relations of place with identity is therefore required, a task not without precedent in human geography. Humanistic geography, for instance, foregrounded both place in a cultural sense, and self-perception. According to Edward Relph, "to be human is to have and know your place", suggesting that identity is always spatially situated. Similarly, in environmental psychology, the importance of "place identity", or "an interpretation of self that uses environmental meaning to symbolize or situate identity", is acknowledged. Such perspectives are problematic, however, in terms of their conceptions of both place and identity. Humanism, for instance, has been critiqued for an essentialist sense of both place and

75 On sexuality see, for instance, David Bell, Jon Binnie, Julia Cream and Gill Valentine, 1994, "All hyped up and no place to go", Gender, Place and Culture, 1,1, pp.31-48.
identity, a critique similarly pertinent to environmental psychology. "Locality studies" also attempted an examination of the spatiality of social life, though with a poorly theorized conception of culture. My aim is not to comprehensively review such perspectives, for I feel they have been adequately dealt with elsewhere. I also do not wish to rehearse the traditional geographic arguments about whether space and place matter or the spatiality of social life; these are well worn and hopefully now self evident. Rather, I wish to situate the thesis as a response to, and extension of, contemporary discussions of place and identity, especially feminist claims about the geography of subjectivity and non-essentialist conceptions of place. In the first part of this section I outline how feminist theorists have thought about the linkages between identity and place, using their work as an important point of departure. In the second part I present and develop Doreen Massey's recent reconceptualization of place and space, and use it in the third part to present four articulations of place and identity that I examine in the thesis.

a. Departures: Placing the Feminist Subject

Location, situation, placement, home, travel, mobility, exile, margin, and center are just a few of the spatial concepts and metaphors permeating

79 Gillian Rose, 1993, Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, chapter three.
current feminist and postcolonial theory.\textsuperscript{84} Geography appears to be central to the search for a non-oppressive subjectivity.\textsuperscript{85} Feminist critiques of the masculinism and oppressiveness of traditional modes of thought and knowledge claims are often expressed through spatial metaphors. Recognizing that the "view from nowhere", or the Archimedean vantage point, is both masculinist and central to colonizing impulses,\textsuperscript{86} it is suggested that the place from which we know, mainly in the sense of position or relative location, is central to theory and politics.\textsuperscript{87} Donna Haraway's "situated knowledges" similarly acknowledges the partiality of all perspectives and the importance of embodied knowledge.\textsuperscript{88} The view from somewhere is seen as politically progressive because it entails a recognition of the knower's embeddedness in processes of domination and subordination.

These searches for a non-essentialist subject link place and identity in insightful but metaphorical ways. My aim in the thesis, however, is to examine the simultaneous metaphorical and material coupling of place and identity. Such a focus on the material is a useful adjunct to feminist theorizing. Many spatial metaphors are used,\textsuperscript{89} but to demonstrate my

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{85} It should be noted that these are theoretical formulations, referring to the position of the knower. However, they are useful and suggestive to my analysis, as I show in this section.
\item \textsuperscript{89} Pratt, 1992, \textit{op.cit}.
\end{itemize}
points about the benefits of a material linking of place and identity I will use two specific examples.

Movement and mobility have been important tropes in the rethinking of feminist subjectivity,\textsuperscript{90} based on the idea that a subject constantly on the move would be more aware of its instability and exclusions.\textsuperscript{91} Recognizing that movement is often neither possible nor desirable,\textsuperscript{92} recent work has seen living in a particular place - the city - as a substitute for movement. \textsc{lain} Chambers, for instance, agrees that there is a need "for a mode of thinking that is neither fixed nor stable",\textsuperscript{93} and he sees the contemporary city, especially one transformed by migration, as a precondition for seeing the limits and partiality of subjectivity. In the city, one is constantly confronted by strangers that test and stretch the limits of subjectivity, forcing us to recognize our complicities.\textsuperscript{94} More explicitly,

\begin{quote}
\textit{it is our dwelling in this mutable space inhabiting its languages, cultivating and building on them and thereby transforming them into particular places, that engenders our very sense of existence and discloses its possibilities.}\textsuperscript{95}
\end{quote}

And:

\begin{quote}
The city suggests an implosive disorder, sometimes liberating, often bewildering, that results in an interpolation in which the imagination carries you in every direction, even towards the previously unthought.\textsuperscript{96}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{90} Wolff, \textit{op.cit.}.
\textsuperscript{91} On exclusions, see Minnie Bruce Pratt "Identity: Skin Blood Heart" in Elly Burkin, Minnie Bruce Pratt and Barbara Smith, eds. 1984, \textit{Yours in Struggle}, Brooklyn, New York: Long Haul Press.
\textsuperscript{93} \textsc{lain} Chambers, 1994, \textit{Migrancy, Culture, Identity}, London and New York: Routledge; p.3.
\textsuperscript{94} \textit{ibid.} p.25.
\textsuperscript{95} \textit{ibid.} p.16.
\textsuperscript{96} \textit{ibid.} p.93.
In other words, the city pushes the limits of subjectivity and disrupts the certainty upon which oppressive knowledge and action is based.

Kathy Ferguson has recently made a similar point, though in relation to place more generally.\(^{97}\) Ferguson attempts to think of mobile subjectivities that "trouble fixed boundaries, antagonize true believers, create new possibilities for themselves";\(^{98}\) an endeavour that is necessarily spatial. This subject is necessarily mobile, not in the sense of being constantly on the go, but in having a constantly changing relation to places, different types of anchoring in and to place.\(^{99}\) It is the resources offered by, and experiences within, particular places (Ferguson calls them "temporal and spatial possibilities offered by specific locales")\(^{100}\) that facilitate a non-essentialist, non-hegemonic feminist subject. Location is something to be used by feminist subjects, enabling different knowledges and politics to emerge. Here, different types of anchoring to place are suggestive of different forms of identity.

Conceptualizations of space and place within these metaphors are problematic, ignoring the social construction of both space and place. As argued by Neil Smith and Cindi Katz:

> The spaces and spatial practices that serve current metaphors in social, cultural and political theory are neither so fixed nor so unproblematic as their employment as metaphor would suggest.\(^{101}\)

Since space and place are seen as pre-existing then it invariably follows, say Smith and Katz, that space can unproblematically ground identity: "the

---

98 ibid. p. 154.
99 ibid. p. 163.
100 ibid.
subject moves but space stands still, fixed, unproduced".  

Similarly, Caren Kaplan has argued for an historicizing of these references to place, on the basis that places (and therefore theory) are historically variable. In Chambers' narrative, for instance, the city grounds identity, but the city never changes. Similarly, Geraldine Pratt argues that Ferguson notes that "understanding how subjectivities get anchored and disrupted requires careful attention to the specifics of geography and particular locales", but fails to address the issue. I am not advocating that the material take precedence over the metaphorical; I recognize the intertwining of the material and the metaphorical. What I am suggesting is that attention to the specifics of the places in which identity gets anchored and produced is a necessary enhancement of searches for a non-essentialist subject. Not only can it curb attempts to literally translate these metaphorical references, but it can also help complicate the relations envisioned between place and identity.

More importantly, I would like to take issue with the relation between the subject and place evident in the narratives of Ferguson and Chambers, for both proceed as if relations to places were unfettered and unidirectional. The sense I get from Chambers' prose, for example, is of a subject that dips into and out of the city (and different cities, judging by Chambers' international wanderings documented in his acknowledgements) at will, a disembodied, non-specific, subject. Similarly, Ferguson's discussion of anchoring implies

---

102 ibid. p.79.
that the subject initiates the anchoring. Connections to place, it seems to follow, are constructed by the subject, rather than structured more broadly and part of relations of power. But this is a one-way understanding of the relations between place and identity. Relations to place are also socially constructed, as I attempt to show throughout the thesis. Places can also set limits on identity, and also reflexivity, and a recognition of these limits can hopefully lead to a more nuanced understanding of a feminist subjectivity.

In summary, what I wish to take from this discussion is the limitations "real" geographies place on feminist attempts to theorize a progressive political and theoretical subject. Unidirectional lines of causation are drawn between social process, subjectivity and place and the specific characteristics of sites are often ignored. But relations between places and identities are just as constructed as identity itself, a point I demonstrate throughout the following chapters. Moreover, because of this constructed relationship between place and identity, specific situations and sites often structure, enable and constrain specific identities. Thus I consider more explicitly the inter-relations of place and identity in an attempt to highlight the limitations location often places on identity. My purpose is not to refute the claims of feminist theory. Rather, by presenting a multiply constructed and spatialized picture of the social world, I hope to provide fodder for thinking about a more complex and situated theoretical subject.

b. Rethinking Space and Place

... while the notion of personal identity has been problematized and rendered increasingly complex by recent debates, the notion of place has remained relatively unexamined.106

In recognition of the problematic concepts of place and space in feminist theory, signalled in the above quotation from Massey, some geographers have been trying to formulate poststructuralist and non-essentialist ideas of place and space. Gillian Rose's concept of paradoxical space is one attempt to think explicitly about the spaces of the feminist theoretical subject formulated by Teresa de Lauretis.\(^{107}\) Rose explores the possibility of a space that avoids the exclusions of the masculine master subject: "paradoxical space", a space that is neither here nor there, centre or margin. Paradoxical space is multidimensional, consisting of overlapping social relations. However, I find Rose's concept a difficult one to work with empirically, partly because Rose's discussion of paradoxical space recreates the idealism of the other accounts I have just outlined. As Geraldine Pratt notes, Rose's more concrete descriptions only encompass one axis of difference at a time.\(^{108}\) It is also difficult to envision paradoxical space in a material and multi-dimensional sense. Because of these difficulties, I prefer to build upon Doreen Massey's reformulation of place, as I outline in this section.

In her more recent writings,\(^{109}\) Doreen Massey has suggested that in order to understand the "double articulation" of place and identity, the concepts of place and space need to be rethought. Rather than seeing space in terms of geometry, a simple pattern of heres and theres, "the spatial is social relations 'stretched out'".\(^{110}\) What this means is that space, in the sense of distance and geographical differentiation, is the pattern that social relations form since they operate within and constitute a geographically


\(^{108}\) Geraldine Pratt, 1993, \textit{op.cit.}

\(^{109}\) Collected in Massey, 1994, \textit{op.cit.}

\(^{110}\) ibid. p.3.
differentiated field. As Massey further points out, space is in constant flux; we only fix it in order to understand. But space is also fixed (or at least fixity is attempted) through social process, and it is here that the concept of place becomes relevant.

In reconceptualizing place, Massey is critical of views that characterize place as bounded, and as a site of authenticity and fixity.\footnote{ibid. p.5. Massey is especially critical of humanism here, although her critique is also relevant to the recent work of Sharon Zukin, who sees place as the grounding of identity. See Sharon Zukin, 1991, Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World, Berkeley: University of California Press.} Problematic in that they essentialize place, such views are also evident in contemporary movements, like reactionary nationalism.\footnote{Massey, 1994, op.cit. p.5.} Instead, Massey suggests we conceptualize places as "open and porous",\footnote{ibid.} taking her cues from feminism's anti-essentialist, political and multi-dimensional evocation of identity. Places are constituted by multiple social relations that come together in a particular pattern at a site: "a particular articulation of those [social] relations, a particular moment in those networks of social relations and understandings".\footnote{ibid.} As constellations of social relations change, so too do the places that they constitute; there is no essential or ahistorical character of a place or the people who live in and through it.

Massey's work is important to a number of strands within geography. She has been instrumental, for instance, in thinking about the interconnections of the local and the global. What I wish to focus on here are the consequences of conceiving of places as multiple, shifting and fluid, albeit socially constructed and interconnected with global networks of power, for thinking about the inter-relations of place and identity. In acknowledgement of the indebtedness of her formulation of place to
poststructuralist conceptions of identity, Massey briefly refers to the "double articulation" of place:

if places are conceptualized in this way [outlined above], and if their definition is amplified to take account of the construction of subjects within them, which are part and parcel of what it is to talk about place, then the identity of place is a double articulation.115

I "amplify" Massey's discussion of place in the next part. In short, I suggest that, contra feminist spatial metaphors, it is not just that subjects create places and draw meaning from them, but that identities are embedded within, and constructed through, places.

Before outlining these articulations of place and identity, I would like to signal where I depart from Massey's work. Her approach is no panacea; I think she also privileges the construction of places from the outside. In her concern to refute localized, unconnected conceptions of place (since these conceptions are more likely to see place as bounded and fixed), Massey emphasizes that the global is part of the local, but at the expense of the local being part of the global. In her example of her home place of Kilburn, Massay ably situates Kilburn within global circuits of capital, information and people.116 But she fails to evoke any sense of attachment to, or influence of, place in the sense of local networks or cultures, nor the impact of either of these on identity and social relations. I am not denying that places are internationally situated. But places (both relations within them and sense of place) are also the product of "internal" processes; of people's constructions and understandings of these sites and their actions within them. By foregrounding places as interrelations of social relations at all scales, Massey loses sight of the imbrication of place-specific and place-engendered social

115 ibid, p.8.
relations and the importance of the local.\(^{117}\) In what follows, my emphasis is on "internal" processes.

c. Articulations of Place and Identity

When place is understood as a site-specific constellation of social relations, then the necessary and myriad linkages between places and identities becomes clearer. For both identity and place are products and components of discursive practices, constructed simultaneously and in relation to each other. They are dialectically inter-related in the sense that actions and social processes are at once constitutive of, and constituted by, both place and identity. Recall that for Mouffe identity formation is the process of stitching together meaningful elements out of the available discourses.\(^{118}\) A geographer could add that discourses are spatially confined and specific; what is available in one place may be unavailable in another. To this extent, place has to be constitutive of identity because specific sites, as constellations of social relations and discourses, set the limits of possibility for identity formation. In other words, since processes of identity construction also create places and vice versa, then places contain within them particular notions of identity and, correspondingly, identity is most often associated with, and bound to, a particular site. My aim here is to add to this general understanding of why place and identity are related; offering an analysis of four specific articulations. They undoubtedly overlap; I separate them in an attempt to unpack the multiple inter-relations of place and

\(^{117}\) To be fair, Massey does accede this point in a footnote in Massey, 1994, \(\text{op.cit.}\) p.14. She acknowledges that she is pushing places as becoming, as processes as well as things, to the background, but thinks this is a necessary strategy to combat static conceptions of place. I am emphasizing here the other side of the articulation.

\(^{118}\) Mouffe, \(\text{op.cit.}\).
identity. I introduce the four articulations below, and also signal their relation to the theme of new traditionalism with which I began.

The first articulation is that discourses and places contain within them, by definition, the conditions of possibility for certain identities and not others. The making and design of a suburban landscape, for instance, privileges heterosexuality and a particular family form, with other identities deemed to be "unnatural" in such places. It is important to point out, however, that these possibilities are set by both the intersection of local social relations with global social relations, and the reconstruction of everyday life within places and the circulation of meaning. Further, they are neither unchanging nor pre-determined, but subject to constant redefinition.

Chapter three is an attempt to illustrate the intertwining and contestation of place, identity and family in the municipality of Surrey. Through an examination of planning documents, newspaper reports and residential development activity since 1960, I show how nuclear families came to be seen as the "natural" inhabitants of Surrey and allotted their own place. By using newspaper accounts I show how notions of families in their proper place were also invoked by residents. Finally, I suggest in chapter three that the place in which these social processes operated - Surrey - affected, like Massey's geological metaphor,119 those processes.

The second articulation is that the construction and experience of identity is spatialized: identity formation and resultant subject positions have spatial manifestations. In the context of relations of power, attempts are made to create and bound place in the image of a particular identity. Delimiting a place of one's own is part of the process of identity formation; boundary making is the spatialization of this process. In this respect place is

used to fix a fragile and fluid identity. The spatialization of identity, manifested in boundary making, is the focus of chapter four. There, I suggest that the use of place, and spatial metaphors, to fix fluid and fragile identities is part of the residential location decisions and daily activities of suburban residents. In the context of a general understanding that situated the traditional nuclear family as under threat both socially and spatially, and in a place - Surrey - that was socially heterogeneous, residents interviewed in the two communities sought to demarcate places for middle-class nuclear families, places they could feel at home. Chapter four also demonstrates one spatiality of new traditionalism, showing how attempts to live out a conventional family life involving the carving out of particular spaces.

Third, experiences within place form the basis for articulations of self, and may become mechanisms of change. Place can do more than set limits on identity, just like power it can be productive as well as repressive. It is here that culture and symbol become evident, for webs of meaning constituting and contained within sites represent available identities. Within this framework places provide a repertoire of meanings that can be drawn upon in the constitution of the self, and affiliation with specific places can generate ties among people and foster certain sorts of social relations.

Place-based repertoires of meaning were part of the process of delineating places for the nuclear family in chapter four, but they, and the associated "place identity", are most developed in chapters five and six. In chapter five, building upon the understanding that new traditionalist families should also be homeowners, I develop a notion of a local culture of property to capture the ways the intertwined symbolic and material resources within place are used to situate the self in class terms. Gender and perceptions of family disrupt these processes, but these too are place based. I also suggest
in chapter five that these local cultures of property are also underlain by the declining fortunes thesis. The salience of the repertoire of meanings developed within the two subdivisions for gender relations in the context of new traditionalism is examined in chapter six. New traditionalism was very much a guiding factor in both neighbourhoods, with residents striving to live a particular family life. But their material circumstances and location (especially the cultures of gender and mothering within these locations), meant that a number of different gender identities were experienced, and interpreted in different ways. The argument here, then, is that place, especially at a symbolic level, can produce (through processes of either support or disruption) identity and its fracturing.

The fourth articulation is that just as social processes are place specific, so too are the webs of meaning through which we make sense of our world. They are geographical in the sense that references to particular places are used as short hand for social relations. Spatial metaphors are therefore part of cultural understanding and the constitution of identity. David Hummon’s earlier work nicely illustrates this, where he shows how the built environment generally, and the meanings of places like suburban, rural, and city-dweller, are used to situate people in the social structure. Understanding of both oneself and others is predicated on their geographical placement. Returning to Mouffe, the construction of chains of equivalence and difference that occurs as part of identity formation is geographical: places are used to identify similarities and differences between people. This notion, which I term, symbolic geographies, cuts across the previous three articulations and appears throughout the thesis. In chapter three, symbolic geographies involving Surrey and Vancouver were important, whereas in

chapter four I document how knowledge and interpretation of the symbolic and social geography of Surrey was an integral component of the demarcation of new traditionalist families. The concept is deployed more subtly in chapters five and six, but appears through the understanding of appropriate and "natural" social relations in the two subdivisions.

Although these four articulations give insight into both the linkages between places and identities and the lives and identities of the people I interviewed, they do not exhaust the spatiality of middle-class familial identities in the two case studies. Places are not only constituted by one set of social relations (like familialism, for example), nor are inhabitants of a place positioned similarly in relation to these discourses and social relations. I approach this issue in chapter seven by considering the different spatiality and place-based practices associated with strong religious affiliation. Religious affiliation has been identified as underlying some new traditionalist thought, often being associated with a conservative attitude towards gender. In chapter seven I examine the imbrication of religious affiliation, gender, class and family with place. Through in-depth consideration of a handful of households I suggest that church-based networks simultaneously invoke a different relationship to the neighbourhood and articulate a different spatiality.

In the concluding chapter I return to the themes of new traditionalism, declining fortunes, suburbs and understandings of place and identity, drawing out the implications of the case studies for these issues. In relation to poststructuralist notions of place, identity and their articulation, I discuss the prevalence of boundary making practices and prospects for a progressive sense of place. I also critique my account of new traditionalism and declining fortunes in terms of two absent presences: feminism and race.
IV. CONCLUSION

In this chapter my main purpose has been to delineate the theoretical and empirical contours of the thesis. Rather than comprehensively reviewing all literature, geographic or otherwise, on place and identity, I have focused on the immediate context and contributions of the thesis, namely poststructuralist approaches to place and identity. Feminist concerns with "placing" a progressive subject are insightful for their explicit consideration of the imbrication of place with identity. Guiding the thesis is an attempt to inject these claims with a more material and spatial content. Beginning with Massey's reformulation of the concept of place, one objective of the thesis is to develop and work with a poststructuralist notion of place that does not deny at the outset its efficacy in identity formation. Second, and relatedly, one of the aims is to focus specifically upon and delineate how place and identity are inter-related; how it is that they are constitutive of each other. How is place constitutive of identity? How is identity spatialized and tied to specific places?

I have also introduced the major empirical focus of the thesis: new traditionalist understandings of family and gender, the contextualization of class within declining fortunes, and the increasing heterogeneity of suburbs. In the following chapter I extend the introduction and contextualization of the thesis, outlining my empirical work. There, I attempt to situate myself in the research process and in relation to the place (Surrey) and the people I interviewed.
CHAPTER TWO
SURREY AND ME: SITUATING THE RESEARCH

The claims I make in this thesis about place-related familial and class identities associated with new traditionalism and declining fortunes are based primarily on in-depth interviews with men and women living in two subdivisions in Surrey. Qualitative research like this is far from unproblematic, a point that has long been recognized. Most recently, feminists and poststructuralists have been critical of the ethics of conducting and reporting such empirical work, especially in relation to inequalities in power relations between the researcher and those he/she researches. Judith Stacey, for instance, questions the feminist embracing of ethnography as a method, suggesting that it may be more intrusive and exploitative than quantitative methods. Writing about, and "speaking for others" have also been problematized. The point made is that social "gaps" between academics and those they research lead not only to distorted understandings but also to appropriation and exploitation of "others". Responses to these more recent interventions have been both positive and insightful. Geraldine Pratt for instance, suggests that empirical work can counter some tendencies toward theoretical over-generalization and aid in recognizing the fluidity and

1 In chapter three I use archival, not interview, material.
multiple meanings of conventional categories like family. Similarly, Isabel Dyck sees ethnographic methods as "potentially powerful in allowing us to both describe women's action and reveal the meaning of these actions for them".

Critiques of qualitative work force a procedural and political accountability of such research and its knowledge claims. Good scholarship is "situated", acknowledging how and from where its knowledge was produced. In this light, my aim in this chapter is to contextualize my research and the knowledge derived from it. In particular, I want to outline how the research proceeded and attempt to situate myself in it and the chapters that follow. In the first section of the chapter I introduce the places where I did the research: Surrey, Berkshire and Glenwood. In the second section I sketch how the research was conducted and my position within it. Here, I attempt to contextualize my claims through talking about the interviewing process, my analysis of the interview material, and the principles guiding the presentation of my informants' words and worlds in the text. In so doing, I hope to show not only the constructed nature of my claims, but also their limitations and possibilities.

1. Surrey and the Case Studies

I chose the Municipality of Surrey as the focus of my research for a combination of academic and personal reasons. Surrey is a "well known"

---

7 Isabel Dyck, 1993, "Ethnography: a feminist method?", The Canadian Geographer, 37,1, pp.53-57; p.54.
Vancouver suburb, in the sense that it is often discussed in the media and comes up in conversation as the Vancouver suburb. As a newcomer to Vancouver, it was one of the few suburbs I knew much about, and I was interested in knowing more. In other ways the characteristics of Surrey were appropriate to, and guided, the analysis, as I illustrate below.

a. Surrey

In 1993, the Municipality of Surrey officially became a "City". Despite this designation, which is a legal one based on population size, Surrey remains a stereotypical suburb of Greater Vancouver. It is a fair distance from the 'centre' (downtown Vancouver), and is separated from it by a large body of water - the Fraser River (see Figure 2.1). Residential land uses predominate, a situation that for some immediately evokes images of sprawl and monotony. According to the 1991 Census, 254,000 people lived in Surrey, of whom 66 percent were part of the conventional nuclear family; and single-detached houses represented 52 percent of dwellings. As I outline in chapter three, young families in search of a home they could afford to own are largely responsible for Surrey's settlement pattern over the past thirty years. Such desires continue to propel discussions about short and long term planning, amidst an ever-decreasing amount of land and increasing house prices. The important issue of 1993, for instance, was the rezoning of previously rural land across the municipality to urban residential use in response to housing shortages.

---

9 The word 'Vancouver' is used to describe a number of geographical scales. To avoid confusion, I use Vancouver to describe the City of Vancouver. When referring to the entire Vancouver metropolitan area (see Figure 2.1), I use the phrases 'Greater Vancouver' or 'Lower Mainland'. 'Surrey' refers to the Surrey municipality, also shown on Figure 2.1.
Figure 2.1 Surrey's Location in the Lower Mainland
Figure 2.2 Surrey and the Location of Glenwood and Berkshire
Surrey also fits the characterization of late twentieth century suburbs. It is home to a significant Indo-Canadian community, and pockets of poverty have developed, mainly in Whalley, in line with contemporary economic restructuring. Townhouses and condominiums dot the residential landscape. Seniors living in the "retirement communities" of South Surrey and also throughout the municipality, are clearly present. Further, Surrey council is currently pursuing a mandate to create a "downtown", attempting to bring the designation "city" closer to reality. These characteristics, which I return to in the concluding chapter, formed an interpretive context for the people I interviewed. In this respect, much of what I have to say is derived from experiences in Surrey.

Surrey is also a powerful signifier: mention of the word invariably conjures up a social image. As such, Surrey is an especially fertile place in which to conduct research on symbolic geographies. Although the signifieds of Surrey have varied historically, they have been united by a focus on Surrey's "reputation" as a blue-collar, uncultured, crime-ridden and homogeneous place. Throughout the Lower Mainland, and among the Surrey residents I interviewed, "Surrey jokes" circulate widely and frequently, referring to, amongst other topics, the propensity of residents to be burglars, lack of "culture" and distance from everywhere. Recent newspaper articles have called into question this image of Surrey, commenting on its

11 The locations of communities within Surrey, like Newton, Whalley and South Surrey, are shown on Figure 2.2.
13 I do not attempt an analysis of these signifieds - by whom, from where and how they are produced - here. My aim is to introduce the general ways Surrey has been thought about.
multicultural and "urban" aspects. The terrain of discussion remains, however, that of image and symbol. The above reassessments of Surrey, for instance, start from the image of Surrey and proceed to either debunk or reinforce it. In recognition of this, a public affairs (or image management) coordinator for Surrey was appointed in 1993. In this respect, as a case study, Surrey may turn out to be a fruitful site for the examination of symbolic geographies. Indeed, as I demonstrate in subsequent chapters, the image of Surrey is an important component of the self-definition of some residents, and forms part of the discourse of declining fortunes. At the same time, my analysis shows that this image of Surrey is insufficient. Images of the many places within Surrey also have wide currency.

The preceding description of Surrey is a starting point intended to contextualize the research. In chapter three, I explicitly examine the creation of Surrey as a place constellation of power/social relations constituting and bounding it.

b. Glenwood, Berkshire and their Residents

The conclusions I reach in this thesis about the multiple articulations of place and identity rest upon two case studies of specific places, or neighbourhoods, within Surrey. My focus is the residential subdivision since, up to the present at least, it has been the most common site of housing for families. Subdivisions also have other advantages in terms of the ideas I am working with. Increasingly, subdivisions, loosely defined as groups of houses

---


generally built by one developer or builder according to a particular design, have a clear place identity or image. Made and marketed on the basis of their geographical and symbolic characteristics, their clear place identity may make it easier to speak of symbolic geographies. Residents also create subdivisions as meaningful and significant places in everyday life, investing them with meanings that extend and disrupt developer's intentions, as I show throughout the thesis.

To say that the two subdivisions were chosen carefully according to the application of strict criteria would be a misrepresentation. Serendipity coupled with some loose guiding principles is a more accurate description. Such flexibility is not necessarily a problem, for in this research at least, it allowed the themes and theories to emerge from, rather than be imposed on, the case studies. Given my interest in familial gendered relations, I wanted to focus on traditional suburban neighbourhoods, consisting of single-family detached houses. These principles allowed considerable leeway, since there were many subdivisions within Surrey from which to choose. I was most interested in families with young children, for whom the pressures of childraising (and hence gender roles) and homeownership would be most immediate. I felt that I was most likely to find a higher concentration of such families in a newer (less than 8 years old) subdivision, thus I began by perusing the real estate sections of the *Vancouver Sun* and the *Surrey Leader* of the past ten years.19

---


19 Newness also came to have other significances, as I show in chapter four.
I essentially proceeded by a process of elimination in combination with forays into many residential communities. Since I perceived I would have problems of access to the Indo-Canadian community, most of the Newton area of Surrey was ruled out. South Surrey was eliminated on the grounds of affluence, with average house prices there much higher than the rest of Surrey. This left the areas of Fleetwood, Guildford, Fraser Heights and Cloverdale, about two thirds of the residential development in Surrey. In this context, Glenwood (see Figure 2.2), the first subdivision, was chosen partly by chance; I stumbled across it in one of my excursions into Surrey. It appeared to be of manageable size, had visible signs of children’s presence, and the City Directory information indicated that it was typically middle class. Berkshire (see Figure 2.2), the other case study, was selected six months after Glenwood. As a result, I wanted it to differ on some grounds that emerged from the Glenwood interviews. Given the spatial and social coherence and relative affluence of Glenwood (themes that came to direct my analysis of white, middle-class family life there), I decided my next case study should be amorphous spatially and lower middle class.20 Wanderings around Guildford and Fleetwood led me to Berkshire, which I liked immediately because of its smaller houses and old cars that reminded me of "home". My reconstruction of the process may make it seem more definite than it was, but the general point is that the choice of case studies was the product of a recursiveness between guiding principles, intuition or sense about a place, and themes that emerged in the first case study.

---

20 A preliminary note on the way I speak of class is necessary here, although it is given fuller treatment in chapter five. For me, class is a hybrid category, consisting of occupation, upbringing, education, self-identification and experience. This amalgam of characteristics is bonded in the form of class identity - what one is perceived as by others and by oneself.
I discuss the characteristics of Glenwood and Berkshire, as places, in more depth in chapter four and provide more detail on the residents in chapters five and six. In Appendix 1 I present selected characteristics of Glenwood and Berkshire based on the 1991 Census, where the predominance of homeowners, white, middle-class nuclear families is apparent. More important, however, are the characteristics of the people with whom I spoke, for it is their words and concerns that guide the analysis. Most interviewees could be described as middle class in terms of both self-definition and occupational structure. Most residents described themselves as middle class, although often they would use the additional adjectives of upper or lower. The occupations listed in Table 2.1 also in the City Directory confirm this: manual occupations are rare. The traditional nuclear family is also predominant in both these neighbourhoods. Some retired people lived in Glenwood, whilst Berkshire had an increasing number of single-parent families renting their dwelling. In both places the majority of residents were white. The most noticeable differences between the two neighbourhoods are with respect to income, house prices, occupational structure and the labour force participation of women with children, themes I address in subsequent chapters.

It is also necessary to point out that the names of all respondents have been changed in the analysis to protect anonymity. Because of my desire to talk about these places specifically, and their small populations, I have also disguised other characteristics of interviewees. Occupation has been changed (whilst maintaining the social class category), as have previous residential locations (although the general location has been preserved), and the sex of children has been randomly changed. In sum, I have tried to reproduce an accurate profile of an individual, whilst altering the details.
Table 2.1: Summary Characteristics of Respondents, Glenwood and Berkshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic (families)</th>
<th>GLENWOOD</th>
<th></th>
<th>BERKSHIRE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time lived in Neighbourhood</td>
<td>5.1 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous house:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east of Surrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west of Surrey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Lower Mainland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned previous house</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented previous house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of Children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of children:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preschoolers only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school and elementary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary and high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Occupation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health care, teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-employed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional, managerial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skilled manual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Occupation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health care, teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at home</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Representing and Interpreting the Interviews

Chapters four, five, six and seven are based on interviews I did with 60 residents (from 30 households) in the two neighbourhoods. I focused on
Residents as a way of getting at "insider" constructions of place, although in both places I also did some archival research and interviewed builders and developers. Residents of the two neighbourhoods were identified from the City Directory. Using this information and eliminating those who had identified themselves as retired and those without phone numbers, letters were then sent to prospective interviewees. This letter (in Appendix 2) outlined my research, its concern with families with school-age children, and what I would require of them. It was followed a week later by a phone call, where a firm refusal or acceptance was most often given, although sometimes I was asked to call back. Some interviews were obtained through referrals. Interviews were hard to get, not surprising given the time demands I was placing on young families. However, those who participated were very forthcoming. It seemed that making the decision to talk to me was the most difficult part. Once they were committed, and I was in their living room, residents would actively engage my questions. Most interviews went way beyond the hour I had originally scheduled; the average was one and a half hours.

Because of my desire to speak about men's experiences and masculinity as well as women and femininity, I spoke to both men and women in the households I visited. Since it is recognized that in interviews women are often silenced, however subtly, by men, within each household I visited men and women were interviewed separately. Men and women

---

21 In both neighbourhoods, I obtained three interviews through referrals.
were also interviewed separately in the hope that both partners would feel more comfortable in talking with me about issues that may have been sources of conflict in their households. Generally, the strategy appeared to be successful in this respect, although most thought it strange that I wanted to speak to both of them separately. The method itself often became a topic of discussion: why did I want to do it, did I get different answers in general; and what did their partner say in response to this question? The gender dynamic introduced to each interview also made the differences between interviews more apparent. Where the couple preferred to be interviewed together I did so. This too had its advantages and drawbacks. Often a more flowing conversation would result, although invariably one of the partners would dominate the discussion, though not necessarily the man. I try to draw on the strengths of both these situations in what follows.

The interviews with both men and women were semi-structured, based loosely around the issues outlined in Appendix 3. Questions and the subsequent discussion fell into four major categories: housing history; descriptions of place; domestic practices and gender attitudes; and views of home. The first category captures background information and the housing careers of each respondent; the second images of the current neighbourhood as well symbolic as geographies; the third the negotiation and reproduction of gender ideologies; and the fourth the gender and class meanings of a specific place - the house. Discussions often veered from this path, and issues of place, gender and class were raised throughout the interviews. For instance, gender and family were invariably raised as issues in the context of housing moves, neighbourhood descriptions and divisions of labour in the home. Similarly, spatial constructions of difference in terms of the supposed
"natural" allocation of certain family types to particular places were ever present.

As I outlined in the introduction to this chapter, feminist and poststructuralist critiques of research problematize descriptions like the one above, on the basis that they ignore my position in constructing the "facts" collected from the interviews. Interviews are more than information gathering exercises. They involve a relationship between the researcher and the person interviewed, and the "data" collected are not simple presentations of facts. Instead, how the information was gathered, the power relations involved and the way stories are told affect what we know. A crucial component of contextualizing this research therefore, and acknowledging the partiality of its knowledge, is critical reflection on the interview process, my position in relation to the places and people I studied, and my interpretation and representation of their words and lives. I discuss these issues below, addressing, in turn, my relation to those I interviewed and how I re-present their words.

a. Me as an Outsider

My position in relation to those I spoke with is an issue because it bears on how I collected and represent their thoughts and experiences. In some respects I was both spatially and socially outside my "field site". I did not live in either of the neighbourhoods, I am not a homeowner and I do not have children. Being an outsider problematizes the research and impacts the knowledge I produce here. My "outsider" characteristics - young, educated (some interviewees thought I was "over"-educated), foreign, without

children, for instance - made it difficult for me to "hear" things. As examples, I was halfway through the interviews in Glenwood before I realized that the omnipresent discussion about architectural controls was also about social control and exclusion. Similarly, the discourses of declining fortunes and new traditionalism did not really become clear until after the first few interviews in Berkshire, when I was able to connect some of the things I had been hearing. I am still able to "read" the earlier interviews in these new lights, but obviously I also missed opportunities to explore the issues further. Through careful and multiple attempts to listen to what was being said to me (often more than once) I hope to represent the interviews adequately, whilst acknowledging that the words of the interviews are themselves representations of self. More directly, my position affected what I was told, for the stories I was told were certainly a response to people's perception of me, as much as my questions. For instance, and this is a point I come back to in the concluding chapter, my gender and assumed feminist inclinations seemed to provoke a certain defensiveness in relation to gender relations. It is therefore important to be aware of the impact of the interpretation of my position, which I try to do in the following chapters.

Although problematic, being an outsider is not entirely disadvantageous.25 According to Cindi Katz:

> One goes to the field as a kind of "stranger", and draws on that status to see difference and ask questions that under other circumstances might seem (even more) intrusive, ignorant, or inane to those who answer them.26

In other words, distance is both enabling and disabling. In my research, being an "outsider" was a point of discussion - especially as a foreigner - and helped establish rapport. It also made it easier for me to ask people to clarify things I didn't understand.

Framing myself purely as an outsider is incomplete. I feel I am in an ambivalent position in relation to the people I interviewed: I grew up in a place and family much like those that I describe in this thesis; it is a life course and residential location decision that was "naturally" taken by all those around me; and it forms the context in which my interactions with family and close friends from that place occurs. This partly explains my fascination with the topic: why are homeownership and family living in suburban environments such powerful forces? I am now at least partially outside the realms of meaning of which I speak, but I was produced from within and by it, both inside and outside.

Similarly, the position of the researcher varies through the research process. In her comparison of two research projects, one in which she was an "insider" and another an "outsider", Zavella notes that being inside is no homogeneous, utopian position for the researcher. 27 Power relations, points of connection between researcher and researched and levels of empathy and understanding vary within and between interviews. 28 Indeed, this should be self evident given the current understandings of identity and power as multiple and situated that I outlined in chapter one. As a result, there is no such position as inside or outside, but the researcher has multiple positionings during and whilst reflecting upon the research. For instance, I was not always in a more "powerful" position in relation to those I

28 Pamela Cotteril, op. cit.
interviewed. A number of times my interviews turned into occasions for the
interviewee to show their moral superiority to both me and others in Surrey
and Vancouver. Typically these tales were told by men, but also by some
women in Glenwood, though not Berkshire.

Given these points it is more useful to think of interviews as situated
accounts constituted by overlapping relations of domination and
subordination. They are not searches for "the truth", nor are they capable
of producing "the truth", as Kamala Visweswaran demonstrates. She relays
the story of two "betrayals" in her ethnography, where informants withheld
from her what she thought was significant information. The issue here is
not the researchers' ability to get at "the truth", she reminds us, but the
ability of informants, through their narratives in the interview/ethnography
context, to produce situated knowledges or partial accounts of themselves.

One of my interviews brought this home to me. I had visited Sid's home for
more than three hours, listening to what I thought were reflexive accounts of
his and his wife's lives. During the tour of the house immediately before my
departure, Sid started talking about the time he was unemployed - he had
been out of work for three of the past five years - which he had not told me
till then. I was startled and upset, and began to question the completeness
of what Sid had told me. Upon reflection, however, it was Sid's right to keep
this from me, and also reveals much about his identity as a worker and
provider. What is important, therefore, is to recognize this situatedness. In

29 For discussion of interviews as situated accounts, see Bill Jordan, Simon
James, Helen Kay and Marcus Redley, 1993, Trapped in Poverty? Labour
Market Decisions in Low-income Households, London and New York:
Routledge, chapter one, and on power see Bhavnani, op.cit.
30 Kamala Visweswaran, 1994, "Betrayal: an analysis in three acts" in
Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, eds., Scattered Hegemonies:
Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practice, Minneapolis:
my case, it appears that I was given the "public" story of people's lives, told mainly in the "public" space of the living room.

In this discussion I have not been trying to justify conventional research methods. Instead, I have been arguing that issues of power, access and distance in the research process are complex and contradictory. As such, they require an ambivalent, or "in-between" positioning of the researcher. I have portrayed these issues in the abstract here, signalling the importance of distance, partial knowledge and exploitation. I try to incorporate consideration of these issues into discussion of the interviews in subsequent chapters, using the principles presented in the next section.

b. Interpreting and Writing about Interviews as Stories

Recognizing the partiality and situatedness of the interviews and my position is insufficient. The problem of "textual appropriation" remains. According to Anne Opie, textual appropriation is the representation of interview/ethnographic material driven by academic concerns: questions in the literature frame the analysis; internally contradictory statements, hesitancy and sometimes counter examples are ignored. Academic concerns certainly framed my analysis of the interviews, since I focused on constructions of place in terms of intersecting relations of power, sense of place in relation to identity, and the spatial manifestations of identity in practices like boundary making. At the same time, however, I was open to themes emerging from the interviews. I detail the analytical process here in an attempt to further contextualize the research.

Immediately after each interview (either speaking into the tape recorder on the way home in the car, or when I got home), I recorded my reaction to

---

32 Anne Opie, 1992, "Qualitative research, appropriation of the "other" and empowerment", Feminist Review, 40, pp.52-69.
each interview (did it go well? were there many silences? was there anything noticeable about body language/mannerisms? what was the house like?), my recollection of what was said after the tape had been switched off (often a lot), and what I felt were the prevalent themes of the interview. Within the next week I transcribed the recording. I transcribed carefully, noting silences, pauses, and repetition of statements. I think taping and transcribing is necessary in scholarship that focuses on accounts of everyday life. As Marjorie Devault summarizes her experience:

I doubt that I could have reproduced the delightfully individual accounts built around the significance of particular brands of breakfast cereal or particular cuts of meat - these stories contained too much detail about items too ordinary to remember with confidence.33

My skills of recollection would also have missed many components of the "ordinary" people spoke about: the daily routine, the chance encounters with neighbours or the seemingly insignificant remarks that when heard again become quite telling comments. Taping and transcribing, then, are central to this thesis.34

It is almost impossible to completely reconstruct the analytical process, and I also want to resist the closure of such an account, for it belies the role of intuition in conducting research. However, I can sketch in broad strokes how I did the analysis. Once all interviews were transcribed, I sat down with

34 Transcribing creates its own problems, for it produces reams of paper and mountains of unsorted words. Transcripts have to be sifted into categories in order to make some analytic sense, but also have to be kept whole to be interpreted contextually. The computer software, "The Ethnograph" was an important aid, enabling me to shuffle and reshuffle (metaphorically since it was all on disk) interviews and themes as they developed, whilst maintaining the integrity of each interview. As a tool rather than driving force of the analysis, The Ethnograph was indispensable.
the transcripts and my notes and began to sort through the interviews. My first coding scheme was loose, delineating broad categories such as the different reasons people gave for moving to the neighbourhood, their housing histories, or their relationships with school and neighbours. I then developed finer categories based on what was being said in these broader areas, based on repetition of phrases, or themes I had identified as emerging from many interviews. Thus chapter four, initially intended to discuss residential location decisions and maybe the creation of "family places", became an analysis of boundary construction because of the repetition of "this isn't Surrey" and "north of the freeway" and "we wanted a new subdivision". Throughout the coding process, and the writing of the thesis, I kept returning to the interviews (both as a whole and as coded bits) in order to refine my analysis. In sum, I "read" the transcripts in light of three pre-determined categories - perceptions of neighbourhood, perception of identities associated with the home, and contemporary family life. What I write about in relation to these themes came from the interviews. The themes of declining fortunes and new traditionalism, around which I focus the thesis, emerged from an amalgamation of the detailed themes I had identified in relation to each of the broader categories I started with. They thus became umbrella categories that helped me understand the linkages between the specific elements.

In terms of the way I present the interview material, Anne Opie advocates close examination of interviews, especially their internal contradictions, as a way of addressing the problem of textual appropriation. A similarly close reading is conducted by Ruth Frankenberg,

35 Prompted by critical readings of chapter drafts by Geraldine Pratt, forcing me to think about the forest as well as the trees.
36 Opie, op.cit.
using psychoanalysis to inspire her interpretations of interviews.\textsuperscript{37} Both, in turn, suggest the use of lengthy quotations in the text. I use comparatively lengthy extracts from the interviews, in the hope of contextualizing them. I am alert to the importance of pauses, repetitions, and contradictions, and I hope to present accounts that are situated in both everyday life and academic concerns. As a way of legitimating my readings of the transcripts, and their surrounding social and spatial situations, I have tried to give more than one example of a point. I have also tried to present the conflicting interpretations and experiences within each place.

\textbf{III. Summary}

The length of this chapter indicates some of the complexity surrounding the conduct and representation of empirical work today and reflects my belief in the necessity of contextualizing knowledge claims. To this end, I outlined where and how the research was conducted and situated myself within it. In particular, I have attempted to draw attention to the ways my position may have affected the information I gathered, suggesting that we acknowledge the interviews to be public accounts of gender, class and family. By describing the way I analyzed and present the interview material, I also hope to have let the reader understand the position from which, and through which, the thesis is filtered. In the next chapter I continue the contextualization of the case studies whilst simultaneously beginning to develop the articulations of place and identity, via new traditionalism and declining fortunes, that I developed in chapter one.

CHAPTER THREE

PLANNING SUBURBAN SPACE, PLACING THE FAMILY:
SURREY, 1960-1993

The City of Surrey, encompassing 371 square kilometres of land, is a diverse place. A traverse of the municipality takes one through many different land uses and social formations. Coming in from Vancouver over the Port Mann bridge and heading south on 152nd Street, for instance, a Canadian flag flying high (off the tallest flagpole in British Columbia) guides you to the Guildford Mall, a retail magnet occupying more than two blocks. The mall is bounded by townhouses and apartments, and oozes into its surroundings as 152nd becomes a lengthy commercial strip. The new high rise towers of Guildford and Whalley begin to recede as one heads south, moving through endless single-family subdivisions, punctuated by the occasional mall, car dealer or "urban forest". If it is lunchtime, hordes of school children walk purposively from school to their favourite lunch spot; otherwise the street seems largely empty except for those in cars. After 76th Avenue it all seems to change. Heading downhill into the river valley, the houses become bigger and surrounded by more land, until large fields stretch out before you. According to another description:

The mostly empty area ... is protected agricultural land, a flat, lightly treed valley of market gardens and grazing land that accommodates the Serpentine, Nicomekl and Campbell rivers and accounts for about a third of Surrey's 371 square kilometres. Sikhs in turbans and Chinese in wide-brimmed hats can be seen tending the peaty fields of blueberries, potatoes and corn - as they have since the last of the fir, hemlock and cedar stumps were plowed under early in the century.

1 The location of roads, bridges and neighbourhoods is shown on Figure 2.2.
Continuing southward, the landscape gradually becomes residential again, dominated by even larger houses on even larger lots in Panorama Ridge (what some call Surrey's Shaughnessy)\(^3\) and the newer developments in Elgin and South Surrey. The journey along 152nd ends at Southmere Mall, where the presence of seniors marks a further shift in social composition and the City of White Rock lies just across the road.

This chapter is an investigation of the processes producing the landscape I have just partially described. Over the past thirty years, what have been the major changes in Surrey? Specifically, how did residential development proceed? What have been the primary forces governing this development? One of my aims is to provide a context for the case studies that follow, outlining in general terms the place - Surrey - in which the white, middle-class, nuclear families are situated. To this end, I provide a chronology of residential development in Surrey, sketching where, when and within what framework houses were built. I thus focus primarily on occurrences within Surrey, relying on planning documents, local newspapers and housing statistics.\(^4\) In focusing on Surrey, my assumption is not that processes "outside" Surrey were irrelevant; the City was and is situated in wider housing markets, political events and planning ideologies. The massive population growth of the Lower Mainland, for instance, propelled the growth of Surrey, which in turn was influenced by the Canadian economy and immigration policies. Similarly, the planning ideals I discuss here are not confined to Surrey. My strategy, rather, is to examine the imprint of these

\(^3\) Shaughnessy is an elite residential landscape in the City of Vancouver.

\(^4\) Specifically, I use research reports, discussion papers and official plans of the Surrey Planning Department, a comprehensive reading of the local newspaper - The Surrey Leader - for the period 1960-1993; representations of Surrey in The Vancouver Sun, The Province, and reports of the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) and its predecessor, the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board; housing statistics; and interviews with key residential developers.
processes in Surrey. My examination of the recent transformation of Surrey from an agricultural to residential space, built primarily for the homeownering nuclear family, is filtered through three lenses which I outline before beginning the analysis.

The first is a focus on the preponderance of what is called "single-family residential" in both the Surrey landscape and the discourses producing it. How and where does the homeownering nuclear family "fit" in Surrey? What visions of family lay behind the suburbanization of Surrey? Which ones were hegemonic? Was family a contested category? My purpose here is to situate the single-family subdivisions that are the focus of the rest of the thesis. In particular, I want to show how a space for and of the homeownering nuclear family has been imagined and positioned within Surrey.

Second, my narrative is filtered through the planning of Surrey. Imaginings of Surrey inscribed in planning documents and policies lay the groundwork for when, what type, where, and how houses could be built; they set the limits of possibility and impossibility for residential development in which builders, developers and residents worked. In other words, land use planning is:

an ideological discourse on the nature of the built environment and a system of negotiation which sets the rules of access and institutional purchase afforded to different agents.5

By focusing on the planning of Surrey, I am thus attempting to demonstrate the understandings governing residential development there.

Since planning discussions in Surrey were far from unique, this chapter also connects with, elaborates upon, and extends, understandings of

twentieth century planning discourses. In particular, I flesh out the ideals, goals and methods of what has been called "modernist planning" as they operated in Surrey. As summarized by Robert Beauregard, the modernist planning project seeks to bring reason to bear on capitalist urbanization and guide decision making with a technical, rather than political, rationality. Guided by a belief in emancipation and progress, planning is to:

triumph over both politics and nature with its basic principles and knowledges: the authority/knower/planner, possessed of immaculate objectivity, is to conquer, shape, and control environments, guiding society toward its "vision of the future", its "established targets".

The application of scientific principles reverberate throughout my discussion of Surrey. Abstract representations of space and a belief in spatial and social order are also important in my narrative. The spaces of both city and suburb are seen as uniform, coherent, devoid of difference, and disembodied. As I illustrate here, governing the development of Surrey was the view that the land of Surrey was an abstract plane to be controlled, ordered and dominated. I also pay particular attention to the spatial ordering implicit in modern planning. As Christine Boyer points out, the quest to order and discipline space was also cellular, a process of spatial demarcation. The

7 Barbara Hooper, 1992, "Split at the roots": a critique of the philosophical and political sources of modern planning doctrine", Frontiers, 13,1, pp.45-80; p.56. She is paraphrasing Harvey Perloff, 1957, Education for Planning: City, State and Regional, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
purpose is to be able to separate or break up confusing overlaps, to fix peripatetic land uses.\textsuperscript{11}

Urban and suburban space are to be spatially ordered, divided into separate land uses.\textsuperscript{12}  Zoning, for instance, originally introduced to control "nuisances", became crucial in controlling and spatially demarcating urban development.\textsuperscript{13}

It is important to point out that ordering urban space was also a cultural ideal.\textsuperscript{14}  The principle of "everything in its place" which underlay rationality and order was a moral issue, specifying:

not only how land uses should be arranged, but how land uses, as social categories, are to be related to one another.\textsuperscript{15}

In other words, the city was guided by, and subsequently expressed, the principle that there was a "natural" place for every activity and person. Ordering Surrey for both social and economic purposes was the dominant theme of the 1960s, as I illustrate below. This chapter, then, provides an illustration of twentieth century planning and its importance in framing residential development in Surrey.

I also wish to contribute to understandings of twentieth century planning by arguing that these planning ideologies are understood, and are contested through place-based motifs. My point is that these more general themes were understood and articulated in what were seen to be Surrey-

\textsuperscript{11}  Boyer, \textit{op.cit.} p.71.
\textsuperscript{13}  Boyer, \textit{op.cit.} p.156.
specific terms. Not only was the scientific ordering of Surrey emphasized for its ability to ensure a prosperous future, it was seen to be most appropriate to the specific concerns of Surrey. The meaning and history of Surrey subsequently modified the ideals somewhat. By focusing on the place-specific articulation of these ideals, I hope to demonstrate their modification and open up a space for their contestation.

The third filter of my suburbanization story is the notion of a suburb itself. It is now widely acknowledged that suburbanization broadly involves the transformation of agricultural space into residential space, influenced by factors such as transport networks, crises of accumulation, population growth, profit motives and anti-urban sentiment. It is further acknowledged that there are many different types of suburbs, with variation commonly being illustrated between places. Through the following narrative I explore the many meanings of suburb within Surrey. The question here is what notions of suburb and suburban living guided residential development within Surrey.

In the rest of the chapter I tell a story of the making and planning of Surrey as suburban in the period since 1960 through the lenses of family, planning and notions of suburb. The chapter is divided into sections that correspond to a different time period in the recent history of Surrey. These periods are: the 1960s where taming the landscape and rationality were the

18 For a Canadian analysis, see James Lorimer, 1978, The Developers, Toronto: James Lorimer.
governing motifs; the 1970s revolving around the issues of growth and cheap housing; the emergence of South Surrey as different in the 1970s and early 1980s; the Official Community Plan of the mid 1980s; and contemporary attempts to become a city. The concluding portion of the chapter draws out the import of the analysis to the case studies that follow; in terms of the ideological, economic and suburban context in which the neighbourhoods were developed, the hegemony of the nuclear family in the Surrey discourses of difference, and as an orientation map of the widely circulating symbolic and material geographies of Surrey.

I. Surrey before 1960 - A brief sketch

Incorporated as a municipality in 1879, white settlement began in Surrey in the 1860s.21 These settlers had been immediately preceded by the Royal Engineers, who surveyed the land and carved the municipality into a series of grid lines and half mile square parcels, shown in Figure 3.1. This perception and organization of space structured the original pattern of settlement, for when the pre-emption proclamation was issued in 1860, the flood of settlers, mainly farmers, were pushed into this grid. Within this pre-1890 agricultural space, settlers farmed and established small settlements, often with community halls. These settlements, such as Hall's Prairie, Surrey Centre, Hazelmere, Clover Valley and Elgin, remain in the contemporary Surrey geographic vocabulary. The physical landscape was also transformed, with parts of the upland logged. By 1890, these attempts to `tame' a perceived wild landscape had transformed the land, and brought it into the dominant concerns of agriculture, white settlement and rationalization.

During the first four decades of the twentieth century Surrey continued to be settled by waves of migrants, predominantly from the Prairies. It remained primarily agricultural, with an economic and cultural orientation toward New Westminster rather than Vancouver. With the opening of the Pattullo Bridge in 1937 and the growth of Vancouver, its orientation and character gradually changed. The first significant "suburban" or non-agricultural settlement occurred during the Depression of the 1930s, when people from Vancouver migrated to Surrey in order to live cheaply and be self-sufficient through gardening. Further groups of residential settlers followed, primarily for cheap housing, which meant that by the 1940s Surrey was being called Vancouver's bedroom, with residential development concentrated in the widely separated nodes of Whalley and Crescent Beach. The class composition of this settlement was mixed, with South Surrey peopled by affluent homeowners on large lots and North Surrey a mixture of blue collar and white collar workers. Zoning regulations were introduced by the Municipality in 1954, and new suburban residents also began petitioning for more facilities explicitly on the basis of being suburban dwellers, not farmers.

22 Treleaven, op.cit. p. 98.
24 Treleaven, op.cit. p.117.
Figure 3.1. Early Map of Surrey Municipality, circa 1890

Figure 3.2. Pattern of Residential Development, Surrey, 1960

From 5,800 in 1921 (less than three percent of the Greater Vancouver population), the population in Surrey had risen to 71,000 by 1961, representing nine percent of the Greater Vancouver population. The purely residential, as opposed to agricultural, character of this population growth can be seen in the ratio of number of parcels of land to number built on. In 1955, of the 55,000 lots in Surrey, less than half had dwellings on them. Just six years later, the number of lots had increased by a third, and more than two-thirds of the total had been built on. Spatial concentration was a hallmark of this process, as shown in Figure 3.2. Most residential development was to be found in Whalley, and to a lesser extent Guildford. South Surrey remained agricultural, as did most of Newton, Fleetwood and Cloverdale, although Cloverdale also housed the centre of government. White Rock and Crescent Beach were primarily residential, being both retirement and holiday communities. As a place with more affluent residents and no vacant land for urban expansion, White Rock formally seceded from Surrey in 1957, because of its perceived differences from Surrey.

In 1960, although Surrey had come a long way from being an agricultural settlement, it had no large shopping centres nor high rises, but consisted of a number of scattered settlements. Until then, residential development had been sporadic, scattered around the municipality and the result of numerous small holders subdividing and selling portions of their land. In this respect, Surrey appears to have been characterized by nineteenth century land development processes until well into the twentieth century.

26 Planning for Surrey, op.cit. p.10.
27 Treleaven, op.cit. p.116. On the different characteristics of White Rock at this time see Walter Hardwick, op.cit. p.139.
28 On early Canadian land development see Harris and Sendbuehler, op.cit., and Ross Paterson, 1989, "Creating the packaged suburb: the evolution
Many lived on lots in the north of the municipality that were not connected to services like sewage and water. Transport connections to Vancouver remained limited, with only the Pattullo Bridge and George Massey tunnel open. The seeds of change were present, however. The Port Mann bridge was about to open (1960), and since the opening of water crossings in Vancouver operated much like streetcars elsewhere, change was expected.  

Grosvenor-Laing, an international property developer, was about to develop the Guildford Town Centre, the first community plan was being discussed, and medium and high density housing were on the agenda. Although not a clear break with the past, the 1960s represent a turning point in the suburbanization of Surrey: from a rural past to a suburban future.

II. Rationalizing Surrey Space, 1960-1970

Ordering Surrey for both social and economic purposes was the dominant theme of the 1960s, although it was expressed and understood through what were seen to be Surrey-specific concerns. The early 1960s in Surrey were characterized by scrutiny of the haphazard process of development I described above. In an attempt to become "modern", Surrey council instigated a review of development, planning and the future of Surrey, culminating in a series of reports to council. The primary point of the reports was criticism of the uncoordinated subdivision and occupation of land which was seen to leave the until now bright future of Surrey to chance.  

---


30 Planning for Surrey, op.cit. p.3.
Growth, according to the reports, was ruining the Surrey landscape and the welfare and livelihood of its residents, for two reasons. First, the costs of urban developments were spiralling out of control. Land was being subdivided and built on at a great rate across the municipality, placing demands to provide sewers, water, schools and other facilities. Yet since the municipality was so large and population and housing so scattered, the costs of servicing were too great. Substandard and varying qualities of life resulted, which, according to planners, threatened to undermine one of the defining characteristics of Surrey - its livability. As stated in one of the reports:

Since it will not happen overnight the trying experiences of growth must be limited by careful control over development. Urban residential development must be directed into an orderly contiguous pattern to keep down costs of services.31

A second criticism of haphazard growth emanated from those who wanted Surrey to be a place for the investment in, and development of, residential land. The present pattern of land ownership, particularly the number of small holders and also the lack of a central hand guiding development, mitigated the potential for profit creation, for it was difficult for corporations to subdivide and develop larger parcels of land.32

The response to these pressures was to control, tame and order this rampaging Surrey: "a sense of order should pervade the whole"; orderly growth is the aim; and "the trying experiences of growth must be limited by careful control over development". Order was realized spatially: where development could occur would be directly controlled, which would therefore indirectly control the amount of development.

One expression of this spatially manifested rationality was that the planning reports further compartmentalized the land of Surrey within the parameters set by the original surveyor's grid lines: growth, residential development, commerce, industry and agriculture were all to have their own place in the municipality, and each piece of land, in turn, was to have its own meaning and appropriate social relations. In effect, the land of Surrey was imagined solely in terms of spatially separate land uses. Two specific policies were advocated with respect to developers and suburban growth: "urban residential development must be directed into an orderly contiguous pattern to keep down costs of services" and "what is needed . . . is the sort of framework within which a land assembler can comfortably and advantageously operate, serving the Municipality's purpose no less than his own". The result is depicted in Figure 3.3, showing the allocation of land to specific uses.

---

34 ibid, p.32.
35 Perspective '81, op.cit. p.79.
36 This rationalizing of the landscape had begun five years earlier with the changing of street names. Previously named after local people, places, and events, roads became numbered avenues and streets in 1957, on the grounds of efficiency - see Treleaven, op.cit. p.117.
37 Preface to a Community Plan, op.cit. p.30.
38 Perspective '81, op.cit. p.10.
Figure 3.3. Apportioning Surrey Space in the 1966 Official Community Plan

Yet the vision promulgated was far more complex than just rationality; it was modified according to the history and meaning of Surrey. Surrey's advantages as a place to live were seen to lie in its ability "to retain many of the advantages of the rural setting, [and] combine them with the advantages of urbanism".\textsuperscript{39} Surrey was therefore to be a mixture of urban and rural: certain areas were to be reserved for agricultural and rural living, shown in Figure 3.3, and residential development was to be concentrated and confined to designated urban areas in order to save on servicing costs.\textsuperscript{40} Instead of one urban area, five "nodal" points of growth, based on the original settlements, were designated. The rational ordering of space, although the dominant goal, was thus modified in accordance with the history and geography of Surrey.

The actual land use pattern envisaged and subsequently acted upon in the 1960s was also underlain by familial assumptions. Each of the five designated "urban" areas consisted of neighbourhoods, villages and towns, providing a gradation between urban and rural living that satisfied the spatial constraints on servicing whilst maintaining a proximity that facilitated the social mixing of rural and urban life. Moreover, this urban differentiation allowed the spatial separation of separate family types. Neighbourhoods, the smallest element of this "urban hierarchy", were to be:

\ldots the everyday world of the elementary school child, the focus of daily living for the homemaker, and the place where the father may relax in privacy with his family.\textsuperscript{41}

Villages, comprising two or three neighbourhoods, were to be more "urban", but small-scale, emphasizing local activities. Completing the hierarchy would be town centres, creating a feeling of urbanity, but still no more than three

\textsuperscript{39} Preface to a Community Plan, \textit{op.cit.} p.9.
\textsuperscript{40} Planning for Surrey, \textit{op.cit.} p.31.
\textsuperscript{41} Perspective '81, \textit{op.cit.} p.26.
miles from rural life. At the neighbourhood scale the nuclear family was predominant, whereas villages were more diverse:

Age group mix is to be achieved in the village by encouraging the forms of housing suited to each particular age group - apartments for single and married people without children, and for the elderly; town houses and garden apartments for young families in the pre-home purchasing stage; and single family homes with children of school age.

"Difference" was not only to be spatially ordered, but was conceptualized narrowly, in terms of family (and even then only with respect to singles and couples with and without children), age, life cycle and house type, with no reference made to class, sexuality or ethnicity. Moreover, the above quote almost exactly replicates the hierarchical "ladder of life" that Constance Perin identifies; a life cycle transition that had corresponding places and moves.

In the production and mapping of Surrey achieved in these documents, family is the pivotal point of all discussions of social differentiation. In some ways, the traditional nuclear family is the absent presence, the assumed given, that structures these reports. It is surprising how little discussion of families there is, but somehow it just seems to be there. At the most obvious level, none of the planning theories and demarcations of space would "work" in the context of other conceptions of difference. Consider, for instance, the neighbourhood and its focus around the elementary school. The assumed homogeneity and boundedness of this scale become nonsensical if it is recognized, for example, that women may not be at home.

42 ibid. p.15.
44 Perin, op.cit.
to make these places cohere. Definitions of families and lifestyles were rigidly drawn: underlying the series of planning reports was the assumption that "the family remain the basic social unit", "the single family dwelling will remain the prevalent model of housing" and "home ownership will remain a desired social and economic goal". As I will detail throughout this discussion, the traditionally defined nuclear family remained hegemonic throughout the process of making Surrey suburban.

Although an accommodation between the specifics of Surrey and the discourse of rationality can be identified in the 1960s planning reports, the extent of compromise was seen to favour modernist planning principles. In particular, the way space was apportioned between urban and agricultural in the original Surrey Official Community Plan (OCP) was seen to be anomalous in terms of local definitions and current patterns of suburban land use in Surrey. Generations of Surrey residents had been living at the interstices of urban and rural ways of life, living on areas of one to five acres, and defining themselves as neither urban nor rural. These land uses and ways of life were defined as "suburban" in Surrey, but had been overlooked, even obliterated, in the plans. The editor of The Leader for instance, alleged that "suburban" was seen as a residual category, a product of an urban and "highest and best use" ideology. Explicitly:

Unfortunately, we seem to follow the trend of negative thinking in regard to suburban communities. We call it suburban residential but it isn't really. In Surrey we have "urban residential" and various categories of zoning to prevent them from being urban residential just now. The thinking in regard to suburban zoning seems to be negative. The professional planners in their literature and their lectures are oriented towards apartments and row houses as the "highest and best use" of land. But suburban

47 Planning for Surrey, op.cit. p.33.
residential can be much more than non-urban... The people of North America have amply proven over the past thirty years that they want suburban living. Surrey is admirably located to supply that desire for suburban living. But we won’t get suburban communities unless Council and municipal officials widen their viewpoint, which at present concentrates on urban and non-urban. With a positive approach we can have communities which are self-supporting in total tax revenue and expenditure, and which can provide a better way of life than either rural or urban communities.49

An alternative vision of "suburban" was recognized only in principle by council:

Ideally, areas should be provided in which true suburban living can be experienced, if suburban living can be defined as the pursuit of activities such as hobby farming or the mere enjoyment of open space on one’s own property, which are not particularly appropriate for purely urban or farming areas.50

The placement of the "suburban" in Surrey was contested; not through challenges to modernist planning, but through discussions of secession. A number of secession movements dominated the political scene throughout the 1960s and 1970s,51 a product partially of dissatisfaction with current representations of suburban space in Surrey. To many, Surrey was a municipality too disparate to remain as one:

Surrey’s local government, try as it may, never can satisfy all the sprawling communities within its boundaries. . . Surrey’s got populated Whalley and Guildford, which have attracted many of the new suburbanites. The rural Port Kells area in the northeast, Newton towards the centre, Cloverdale, home of the "cowboys" out east towards Langley. The South Surrey peninsula with the expensive homes of Crescent Beach. Plus a dozen other places and miles of farmland - or sprawl.52

48 Editorial, Surrey Leader, April 2, 1964, p.2.
49 ibid.
50 Perspective '81, op.cit. p.54.
52 Vancouver Sun, December 8, 1971, p.17.
The vision promulgated by Surrey Council that I have just outlined was seen to be a spatially specific one, expressive of the "northern" bias of council and disregarding of the more rural lifestyles and concerns of those living in South Surrey. Part of the problem was money: too many resources, it was alleged, were being fed into the urbanized areas of Whalley and Guildford. Another issue was representation, for those on council's "Surrey horizon rarely strays east of Johnston Road nor south of 72nd Avenue." Even those living in urban areas in South Surrey were dissatisfied. According to one resident, his home area of Ocean Park was seen as "second cousins and poor cousins of the rest of Surrey ... with the representation we have on Surrey council today, everything is going north". The rationalizing impulse itself was not the subject of criticism. Instead, the landscape created in its image - in this case North Surrey - was identified as the cause of the problems.

Consequently, a spatial solution that distanced "suburban" Surreyites from the other meanings and influences of Surrey was advocated: secession. For instance, in 1966 an organization calling itself the Surrey Re-Alignment Association proposed a three way division of Surrey. The first area would be Whalley-Guildford-Newton, which would be a separate city; the second would be an expansion of White Rock to include Crescent Beach, Elgin and Sunnyside; and the rest - suburban and farm communities - would be Surrey Municipality. It was implied that a truly suburban community, and the

---

53 "Request plebiscite on secession scheme" Surrey Leader, April 21, 1966. Interestingly, financial motives were also central when White Rock seceded from Surrey in 1957. As a predominantly urban space, property taxes in White Rock would be lower if they didn't have to help finance the construction of services in the rest of Surrey.


55 Resident J.Kapalka in "Secession is urged for South Surrey area", Surrey Leader, February 17, 1966, p.1.

authentic Surrey, was to be found halfway between urban and rural, incorporating much of north and central Surrey and excluding the urbanized north and south sectors. These urban communities of Whalley and White Rock were to be separate entities, since they deviated from the "true" Surrey. The history of Surrey, and its already existing pattern of land use and its cultural meaning, thus led to the contestation not of the theme of rationality, but to the places created in its image, which were seen to deviate from the "true" Surrey.

These debates over Surrey and suburb, however, had limited purchase on the way residential development in Surrey proceeded. Not all representations of space are equal, their force depends on their interconnections with other lines of power. In Surrey in the 1960s the grid imposed by council and the desires of developers to maximize profits fused to produce a particular type of landscape. Following the formal delineation of urban growth areas, many new houses were built, concentrated in Whalley.

The urban landscape produced at this time continued to be one of predominantly single family dwellings. These houses were small by today's standards, averaging twelve hundred square feet and costing thirteen thousand dollars to build. Commensurate with the spatial channeling and encouragement of urban development, an increasing number of apartments were being built in Whalley and Guildford. In 1969, for instance, of the 1400 apartment units in Surrey, 1200 were in Whalley and along the Whalley-Guildford border. Again, however, we can see fissures in rational-scientific discourse, since it encompassed a number of possibly competing ideals. Apartments fulfilled the rational spatial plans of the municipality, but

57 Secession movements were not directly played out at local elections since Surrey's council members were elected "at-large" rather than according to where they lived - there was no ward system.
challenged its basis in familial ideology. In particular, it was becoming evident that apartments housed children as well as adults. This violated the principles outlined above, namely that families should live in detached dwellings. Some were angry at this, especially Mayor Ed McKitka, who argued that "we will never get development of homes, if all we encourage is this type [apartments] of development". He favoured limiting apartments to one or two bedrooms, on the assumption that then children wouldn’t live there.

Council and planners were not the only makers of suburban Surrey, for, true to the principles espoused in Perspective '81, development corporations became more active in developing Surrey's land. In terms of developers and development sites, Guildford Town Centre and its surrounding residential areas were the prime shapers of the Surrey landscape at this time. Proposed by Grosvenor Laing, who began assembling land after the Port Mann bridge opened in 1963, a city, Guildford Garden City, was planned, with a commercial heart anchored by the two major department stores of Eaton's and Woodward's. It was designed to halt the sprawling development of Surrey by providing the downtown magnet that Surrey never had. The Guildford development, it was hoped, would concentrate services and housing in a small area. To achieve this concentration the spatial division of Surrey marked by the Official Community Plan, and in particular

60 See also "Big builders scout Surrey", Surrey Leader, July 14, 1966, p.1.
the principle of one use to one piece of land, was to be violated. Instead, a new type of zoning was suggested by the planning department, a "comprehensive development permit" where a parcel of land would be treated as one and many types of zoning allowed within it.63 Despite objections from councillors who thought the new principle was a backward step - "we have been creating separate zones for commercial, industry, recreation etc. and now we are talking about lumping them all together" - it was soon approved.64 According to Grosvenor Laing, mixed uses, and especially the row housing disliked by councillors was necessary to create an "urban townscape".65

What later became known as the Guildford town centre disrupted the Surrey landscape and the planners' vision in many ways. Foremost among these was the arrival of big developers in Surrey who planned Surrey space in very different ways from small holder subdividers.66 Relatedly, Guildford also heralded different perceptions of space. In order to make both money and a new type of town for Surrey, perceptions of space and the material organization of space had to be altered by Grosvenor Laing. The land was "replotted":67 lot sizes and configurations were altered so that the land could be sold and developed in different parcels than the original survey.

To summarize, the early period of consolidated urban growth in Surrey was characterized by attempts to impose a rational, spatialized, order on the

66 In the British context, Michael Ball notes that different forms of building enterprise build very different landscapes because of access to finance, land, and level of risk aversion. See Michael Ball, 1983, Housing Policy and Economic Power: The Political Economy of Owner Occupation, London and New York: Methuen.
67 Replotting had long been an issue for larger corporations, for "these long, skinny lots create bottlenecks in area development". See "Editorial: replotting of property", Surrey Leader, July 28, 1966, p.2.
pattern of land use created by decades of haphazard subdivision and building. Council and planners presented a unitary vision of Surrey, consisting of discrete neighbourhoods and towns, populated by families and providing model communities in which to raise children. The resultant map (Figure 3.3) of Surrey reflected these socio-spatial visions, modified slightly in line with the historical geography of Surrey. Importantly, however, different notions of suburb were already evident in the landscape: truly suburban areas, the traditional single-family zone, and the nascent town centre of Guildford. The Surrey definition of suburban as a rural-urban interface, however, was obliterated by these plans. Although contested by those who had more "rural" visions, this remained the framework that guided much of the urban growth between 1965 and 1972. Residents, in search of space and cheap housing, continued to move to Surrey. If residents were concerned about the pace of growth in the late 1960s, a crescendo of concern was to be heard throughout the 1970s, as the legislative, economic, ideological and spatial climate of suburban Surrey changed dramatically.

**III. 1970s - Rampant Growth and Cheap Housing**

During the 1970s the pattern established by the 1966 Official Community Plan was firmly entrenched. Residential development was concentrated in the designated urban centres, with denser development nodally distributed in the centres of Whalley, Guildford, Cloverdale and the district created by Southmere. The production and meaning of suburban space in Surrey, was gradually changing, however. Two important motifs can be identified: growth pressure and the varied responses to it that changed the character of Surrey; and the changing legislative and planning framework. Together, they redefined Surrey as a place of cheap and,
arguably, substandard and homogeneous housing. It is in the 1970s that Surrey most closely resembles the tract development seen to characterize post second world war suburbanization.\(^6^8\) Indeed, Surrey as the epitome of suburban monotony was popularized by a discussion in a widely cited Canadian urban textbook.\(^6^9\) Again, however, these processes operated in place-specific terms.

The institution of a new legislative framework governing the development of land in British Columbia in 1972 dramatically changed the shape of Surrey. Previously, development occurred in the context of rigid zoning laws that did not allow a mixture of uses side-by-side.\(^7^0\) More to the point, the municipality alone governed property and land development. Both these practices were changed under 1972 provincial legislation. All development had to occur under the auspices of a land use contract (LUC) between a developer and council that stipulated the agreed upon uses of a piece of land, and the amount of money the developer was to pay the municipality. With LUCs the burden of paying for subdivision servicing shifted from council to the developer/subdivider. Surrey Municipality freely used LUCs, to the extent that some alleged that council extracted unreasonable amounts from developers.\(^7^1\)

The advent of LUCs meant that the pace of growth quickened, from 500 dwellings in 1970 to over 2000 in 1975 (see Figure 3.4), with single family dwellings remaining most common. The effects of this boom were felt

---


\(^7^0\) Guildford Town Centre was the exception.

long after the demise of LUCs in 1978, as previously approved projects were built. In the month before LUCs were repealed in 1978, council met often and approved an unprecedented number of development proposals. Examples are a small-lot subdivision of 121 single-family lots in Fleetwood, approval for 576 housing units built by Marathon Realty in Ocean Park, and a 113 lot subdivision by Wolstencroft in Newton. As such, LUCs spawned a number of different types (mixed versus single use) and sizes (from ten lots to 600 lots) of residential development. Residential growth continued to be spatially differentiated, as seen in Figure 3.4. The dominance of Whalley as a site of new construction peaked in 1971, and by the end of the decade Newton was attracting increasing development. South Surrey was also rising in prominence, a trend I consider explicitly in the next section.

---

Figure 3.4. Residential Construction in Surrey, 1971-1979
Source: Surrey Planning Department Files.
Despite diversity, the dominant spatial formation envisioned and produced within LUCs was Surrey as a place of cheap housing. Within the regional planning discourses promulgated in the Greater Vancouver Regional District's (GVRD) 1975 Livable Region Plan, Surrey was envisaged as an urban growth area.\textsuperscript{74} As expressed by then Mayor, Ed McKitka, the Livable Region Plan was a tool for Vancouver and Burnaby to secure industry and commercial development, "with the outer ring of the municipality providing the low cost housing, the parks and green space".\textsuperscript{75} In effect, it was the GVRD's intention that Surrey was to provide housing for those who couldn't afford to live elsewhere in the Lower Mainland. Within public discourse, those governing Surrey attempted to contest this view. They wanted Surrey to become more than a repository of urban growth, to no longer be Vancouver's bedroom.\textsuperscript{76} To them, Surrey should also have industry, commerce and a diversity of lifestyles: "Surrey is a community looking for a heart of its own as it tries to change its image of being just another bedroom suburb of Vancouver".\textsuperscript{77} As put by Deputy Planner Lee Tan:

\begin{quote}
We are trying to establish a self-sufficient community, with not only homes but jobs, commercial centres, recreational facilities and the other facilities that are essential to create a total community.\textsuperscript{78}
\end{quote}

The confluence of regional (GVRD), provincial (LUCs), and Federal (Assisted Home Ownership Plan - AHOP) government policies produced Surrey as a place for cheap housing by facilitating large-scale development.

\textsuperscript{74} Greater Vancouver Regional District, 1975, \textit{The Livable Region: From the 70s to the 80s}, Vancouver: GVRD Planning Department.
\textsuperscript{75} "$60,000 houses Surrey minimum", \textit{Surrey Leader}, July 29, 1976, p.1.
\textsuperscript{76} Letter to editor by Ald. J. O'Brien-Bell, "Surrey doesn't wish to be dormitory", \textit{Province}, March 22, 1976, p.4.
\textsuperscript{77} "Strong heart vital to quicken suburbs pulse", \textit{Vancouver Sun}, 13/10/79, p.A7.
\textsuperscript{78} \textit{ibid.}
AHOP was instituted in 1973 and ran until 1978. Its aim was to help low income families purchase their own home, but contained strict limits on the size and cost of the home bought. Over a third of AHOP housing built in the Lower Mainland was built in Surrey, primarily because land prices were so low, keeping the total cost of the house well within the limits set by the CMHC.

Defining Surrey as a repository of urban growth worried both planners and council: they were concerned that the cost of the houses would not be sufficient to provide services such as schools and recreational facilities. In response to this, in 1976 Surrey council passed a by-law stating that all new homes must be at least twelve hundred square feet, and therefore cost about sixty thousand dollars. Two justifications were made for this move. The first was to ensure that property taxes on homes were enough to cover the costs of services, and the second was to give more "breathing space to Surrey, where residential construction has been climbing fantastically this year". This ban sparked debate that can be understood in terms of competing definitions of Surrey and suburban.

The Vancouver media, labelling the ban "the Surrey problem" was quick to denounce it: "the route Surrey council is taking alone is politically and socially unacceptable. The impression is one of unacceptable, shabby discrimination". The Sun seems to be implying here that it was Surrey's job to maintain growth and provide cheap housing. It is also indicative of a naturalization of real estate processes: a market imposed ban that made AHOP housing impossible in the middle-class West Side of Vancouver was


"$60,000 houses Surrey minimum", Surrey Leader, July 29, 1976, p.1.

not commented upon. The CMHC also disagreed with the ban, although addressed the debate on Surrey’s terms. They thought that the ban would compound, not fix, Surrey’s tax problems.82

In a climate of concern for property values, local property owners saw AHOP housing as problematic in terms of homogeneity and lifestyle. All these sentiments were expressed in one discussion of a subdivision planned for 128th Street and 104th Avenue. Residents thought that smaller lots (a corollary of AHOP housing) would devalue their property and threaten their single family lifestyle. "We came here to get away from that kind of housing",83 they argued, and "the single family atmosphere here is being eroded".84 AHOP housing seemed to threaten the natural relation between house type and familial social relations, conflicting with residents' constructions of Surrey as a family and "quiet" place.85 At the same time, however, opposition to the minimum house size regulation alleged that increasing the minimum house size put home ownership beyond the reach of "young couples" who wanted to "start out in Surrey".86 The ban therefore threatened Surrey’s identity as a place for young families. Developers responded to these claims on similar terms, saying that AHOP purchasers were different, but only in that they were younger and had fewer children.87

It was also thought that small lots and small houses necessarily spelt sameness. In addition to the size restriction council also passed a by-law

---

82 "Small home ban to boomerang, Surrey told", Province, July 30, 1976, p.29.
85 "Green Timbers folk battle development", Surrey Leader, April 21, 1977, p.1.
86 "Surrey homes non-conforming", Surrey Leader, August 26, 1976, p.1. The quotes are from the president of Qualico Developments.
requiring that a house exterior not be repeated within 200 feet,\textsuperscript{88} emblematic of a view that "a mixed community is more natural, more livable".\textsuperscript{89} A photo essay in the \textit{Surrey Leader} clearly articulated these concerns, viewing AHOP housing as a "threat to individuality":

\begin{quote}
rows and rows of the darn things squeezed out as if from some giant toothpaste tube gone mad. Like so many cabbages growing on a field squeezed together, irrigated, fertilized, distributed, advertised, graded and consumed.\textsuperscript{90}
\end{quote}

Design critiques were also combatted on the basis of cost and historical evolution:

\begin{quote}
There are several "look-alike" subdivisions in Surrey that we were all upset about ten, fifteen years ago. Now this family has added a carport, that one redesigned the windows. The shrubs and trees have softened the overall impression and added individuality.\textsuperscript{91}
\end{quote}

The AHOP debate in Surrey, stimulated by the convergence of a number of elements producing Surrey as a repository of urban growth, also demonstrates the copresence and contestation of different conceptions of Surrey and suburb. Where, for instance, the definition of Surrey as a repository of urban growth conflicted with its identity as a family place, contestation, invariably through spatial motifs, ensued. Simultaneously, homogeneous, tract-like development was seen to be inappropriate for Surrey.

\textsuperscript{88} "Council passes housing controls", \textit{Surrey Leader}, March 8, 1976, p.3.
\textsuperscript{89} "Editorial: changes need in Surrey planning", \textit{Surrey Leader}, July 28, 1977, p.4.
\textsuperscript{90} Dan Propp, "Housing a threat to individuality" \textit{Surrey Leader}, July 22, 1976, p.5.
\textsuperscript{91} "Editorial: new housing policies needed", \textit{Surrey Leader}, June 3, 1976, p.2.
IV. Surrey goes "up-market": Developing South Surrey 1972 - 1985

Changes in South Surrey during the 1970s are also indicative of the spatial differentiation of Surrey and different visions of it. Although AHOP housing and industry were earmarked for north, not south, Surrey, the towns within South Surrey were also the destination of substantial residential development during this period, seen in Figure 3.4 above. The South Surrey story of the 1970s consists of an accommodation between place-specific and more general visions.

South Surrey is and has been positioned as "different" within Surrey along a number of axes. One of these is class, and its related lifestyle traits. As summarized by one recent description:

> South Surrey is arts and crafts heaven. Residents there say they have such different lifestyles from those in north Surrey that they identify more with the separate, bordering city of White Rock, which models itself after the cliff-hugging artist town of Sausalito, California. "There are more self-published poets and craft types per square inch in South Surrey than any other place I know", says Sam Roddan, a retired Crescent Beach teacher.

As home to many of the founding agricultural families, and as site of an elite acreage and equestrian-based residential lifestyle, the residents of South Surrey and Panorama Ridge have often laid claim to being the "original" and "authentic" Surreyites. More importantly, the mixture of rural and urban living seen to prevail in South Surrey was represented as ideal for raising children:

---

92 Although this was primarily because land values in South Surrey were too high, it was also partially cultural to the extent that land values were high because of its cultural meaning, as I explain in this section.
93 Douglas Todd, 1984, "Surrey may yet have the last laugh", *Vancouver Sun*, December 4, p. B1.
Here was a pastoral, uncluttered community in which the children could grow up surrounded with the last remains of nature and yet near the city. Such pastoral living was threatened, however, in a series of studies and recommendations on South Surrey presented to council in the early 1970s. Ostensibly advocating residential development of the South Surrey peninsula to its "maximum capacity", these reports exhibit the rationalizing and modern, abstracting approach to suburbanization that I discussed above. Little regard was paid to the existing uses of the land, its topography, land ownership or the role of developers. Instead, South Surrey was mapped solely in terms of its potential for residential development and therefore population growth.

The lack of local content and specificity in the South Surrey plans were quickly pointed out by politically active and articulate South Surrey residents. They vehemently opposed the plan on the basis that the type of residential development and density of population proposed was inappropriate to the history, geography, and identity of South Surrey. As a unique place, South Surrey did not accord with the traditional meaning of either urban or suburban: "most of the residents are "refugees" from cities and urbanized suburbs and they are not happy to find that the city is following them out to South Surrey". These understandings were both spatialized and framed within definitions of Surrey and suburb. Growth pressures were seen to originate in north Surrey:

95 The Corporation of the District of Surrey, Planning Department, 1974, The South Surrey Plan, October.
96 "Grassroots suggestions on Surrey plan wanted" Province, February 29, 1972, p.21; and "South Surrey residents fight plan" Province March 23, 1972, p.21.
97 "Elgin seeks local input" Surrey Leader, February 17, 1972, p.1; and "Vote on secession refused by council", Surrey Leader, February 17, 1972, p.1.
We're constantly wondering down here what council is going to dream up next to satisfy the appetite of the north. People in the north aren't attuned to the south.99

It was as though South Surrey was under attack from the north, which represented growth. Attempts were hence made to ideologically and socially distance South Surrey from the rest of Surrey. In particular, the designation "Surrey" became problematic. Instead of the secession earlier advocated, the early 1980s witnessed calls for changing the name of South Surrey to Semiahmoo.100 In this way, South Surrey could retain the tax and amenity advantages of being part of Surrey, but could also distance itself from the Surrey image. The class differences between north and south Surrey were also magnified. South Surrey, and especially isolated developments within it, were compared to the rest of Surrey in a particular way:

Montreal has its Westmount; Toronto has its Rosedale; Vancouver its Shaughnessy, Dunbar and West Vancouver. . . On a much smaller scale here in Surrey, Panorama Ridge has developed in that pattern.101

This debate could not ignore, however, pressure for residential development emanating from development corporations. As an accommodation, these images were harnessed to attract a certain sort of residential development to Surrey. The different class character of South Surrey was highlighted and promoted in a number of developments like Elgin, Ocean Park and Southmere. These were explicitly designed as affluent, non-Surrey, residential communities. I detail the development of Southmere below as a way of showing the embeddedness of images in the suburbanization process.

"Southmere Village", a 155 acre development of the Genstar Development Company completed between 1978 and 1981 is indicative of this process of appropriation and the creation of place in the making of residential environments. The dissatisfaction with the Surrey image, particularly in South Surrey, was re-created. According to the marketing brochure's description of the location of Southmere:

Southmere Village is a 155 acre site in South Surrey adjacent to the City of White Rock. White Rock is a seaside town which has its origins as a small summer resort and retirement community. Transportation improvements in the Vancouver area over the years have resulted in increasing urbanization of the Semiahmoo Peninsula, which comprises White Rock and South Surrey. The area is becoming more of a residential suburb of Greater Vancouver.102

The association with Surrey and what is thought of as suburban development is actively downplayed here. "Surrey" is only mentioned twice, and only when coupled with "South", suggesting that even the location of Southmere is different, since it is part of Semiahmoo, a designation that transcends municipal boundaries. Socially, Southmere is more related to the "seaside town" of White Rock than suburban Surrey. Both techniques serve to distance and distinguish the Southmere development, as well as consolidate the self-representations of generations of South Surrey residents.

At the same time, however, Southmere was the product of the type of thinking that had dominated Surrey council throughout the 1970s that I outlined above. Built under the auspices of a land use contract that "provides more flexibility for innovation than a typical zoning bylaw",103 the development is notable for its demarcation of space and concordant social

102 The following discussion is based on an interview with the developers of Southmere, Genstar Corporation, as well as advertising material for the development.
103 Marketing pamphlet: Southmere Village
A prime objective of the project was to "create a viable town centre for White Rock/South Surrey" by mixing commercial, residential and recreational facilities. This mix was explicitly spatial, consisting of:

... a commercial hub comprising some 30 acres, at the southeast corner of the site. The residential land uses are arranged in rings of decreasing density as one moves away from the town centre. Two major park sites form focal points in the plan, one of which contains the two stormwater lakes.104

Social mix and heterogeneity were built into the plan, not because of any desire to create a more equal society, but because different uses would spread the risk of the investment, and the commercial areas were needed in the area. However, different spaces were not to have a variety of uses, but only one, conforming to the dominant vision promulgated by council.

Finally, a sense of place was crucial in the development, a policy evident in the Genstar slogan of "Bringing land to life!". Using the entire parcel of land with its "natural boundaries", Genstar were trying to create a "distinctive community" with a coherent identity. Each residential "enclave" was to have its own image and sense of place, as was the commercial development, forming a focus for White Rock and South Surrey. Design, and particularly the lakes and entrances were part of this, communicating the feeling that Southmere was independent and different. Design guidelines, selection of a few builders and covenants restricting use of stucco and other "lower class" building materials were used to "ensure quality" and maintain a particular, class-based sense of place.

A familiarity with developments like Southmere helps demonstrate the importance of imbuing a space with meaning as part of the process of residential development, meaning that often builds upon and re-creates

---
104 Marketing pamphlet: Southmere Village
indigenous images. In the Southmere case, discontent within South Surrey and its ideological distance from North Surrey were drawn upon to produce a landscape whose general form and the process of development had been an anathema to residents, but whose particulars were accepted, even embraced. This brings me to my final point in relation to Southmere, how the coalescence of a number of factors in South Surrey in the 1970s and 1980s produced a particular type of landscape. Both Surrey and suburb were defined in narrow and local ways that distanced them from the perceived homogeneity and working class basis of the rest of Surrey. As a result, a new form of suburban development, peculiar to South Surrey, was created.

V. House Price Inflation and a New Community Plan: Redefining the Suburban Landscape, 1980 - 1990

The early 1980s were a period of instability in the history of Surrey and a time of flux in terms of defining the suburban landscape. The vision articulated by the 1966 OCP was being challenged on many fronts, the Land Use Contract legislation had been repealed in 1978, and development was occurring in an uncoordinated way and at a great pace in many localities, particularly Fleetwood and Newton. Growth continued to be a concern of both council and residents, so much so that council wanted to impose a two month freeze on all rezoning applications. Residents felt growth was impeding improvements in their quality of life and was not attuned to their needs. Further, the municipality remained under pressure from both the regional and provincial governments to shape development along distinctive

lines and come up with a new community plan. A further impetus for rethinking Surrey's spaces and development path was provided by the volatility of the Lower Mainland housing market. The building boom propelled by the end of the LUC era dissipated, to be replaced by a shortage of building lots and new houses. Figure 3.5, for instance, shows the minute number of houses built in the early 1980s.\textsuperscript{107} A massive increase in house prices followed: a two storey, four bedroom house that cost $94,000 in 1980 would cost $170,000 in 1981.\textsuperscript{108} Yet the spectre and materiality of high interest rates (with some homeowners forced to renegotiate their mortgages at twenty two percent) and the opening up of land for development in other municipalities led to prices plummeting in July of 1982: average house prices fell from a high of $120,000 in 1981 to $80,000 in 1982. It was in this context that council attempted to articulate a new community plan and new visions of space and Surrey.

Promised since 1978, a new community plan was finally unveiled in 1983 and revised again in 1986. The modernist tenet that any planning is better than no planning remained: "Without a plan, Surrey could be like an unorchestrated symphony - with a plan, many individual actions can contribute to overall harmony".\textsuperscript{109} The means by which this harmony was achieved were different from the 1966 OCP. Aesthetic and social concerns assumed greater significance. In determining residential land use, for instance, the major factor was "the desired pattern for a community and the type of lifestyle the community prefers".\textsuperscript{110} In effect, rational planning guidelines remained, but as a template. They were (more obviously than in

\textsuperscript{107} Data for housing other than single family is not available.
\textsuperscript{109}\textit{Surrey Official Community Plan} tabloid.
the 1960s) expressed through and modified by a concern with the specific social and physical context of Surrey. This can be seen in the "overall concept" and the plans for individual towns.

The hallmark of the 1983 Official Community Plan was its "overall concept" that called for nodal development in the form of "identifiable and concentrated urban communities separated by suburban communities", shown in Figure 3.6. Unlike 1966 the impetus for these nodes was not servicing costs, but the perceived aesthetic problems of sprawl:

It has been a long-standing policy in Surrey to develop distinct towns. This is a policy which distinguishes Surrey from many other municipalities in the GVRD which have opted for an even spread of suburban subdivision instead. In those communities the suburban pattern stretches without much relief from one end to the other. This results in urban developments abutting the ALR [Agricultural Land Reserve] without transition, and yet the overall density is so low that the conveniences of urban life can only be reached by automobiles.

However, the urban, and by implication agricultural areas were seen to have their basis not in rational planning but in nature:

distinct urban communities have developed on the highlands of Surrey, most of them have clearly defined natural boundaries in the form of ridges, creeks and ravines which provide a natural transition between the urban communities and the rural land around the rivers.

---

111 Official Community Plan, op.cit. p.129.
112 Official Community Plan, op.cit. p.129.
113 Official Community Plan, op.cit. p.32.
Figure 3.5. Residential Construction in Surrey, 1980-1992

Source: Surrey Planning Department Files.
Figure 3.6. "Overall Concept", 1983 Official Community Plan

Although the view of land as a resource and as potential profit remained, these views melded with others that were seen to emanate specifically from Surrey. Given that "each area in Surrey has grown and developed in an individual fashion",¹¹⁴ and that this individuality was valued, then it followed, according to the plan, that this individuality should be a component of subsequent development. In particular, community identity and image were to be actively fostered:

The plan for Surrey intends to create communities. Communities should be identifiable and each should have a focus.¹¹⁶

Consequently, each town was to have its own theme or image, within which residential development would occur. The space the plan envisioned and subsequently produced was a patchwork, where:

a great variety of environments is accessible to many people, where different landscapes are close at hand and can be enjoyed even without living within them.¹¹⁶

Urban, suburban and agricultural land uses were to be spatially contiguous, within a nodal pattern created around the five major centres. In this way, a variety of opportunities for suburban living in Surrey were offered. Not only were social relations stretched across the municipality, but so too were the concepts of Surrey and suburb. They embodied a number of different meanings, and signified diversity, encapsulating a set of possible lifestyles, identities, social relations and spatial formations. Five town plans thence became part of the Surrey plan. Each town had its own character drawing on this heritage: Cloverdale as agricultural, South Surrey "suburban", Fraser Height's separation from Surrey, Whalley as a downtown.

¹¹⁴ Official Community Plan, op.cit. p.75.
¹¹⁵ Official Community Plan, op.cit. p.131.
¹¹⁶ Official Community Plan, op.cit. p.129.
It is important to point out that this concept of diversity was narrowly conceived. The primacy of family and the assumed relation between house type and family form persisted. The stated desire for social heterogeneity was not enforced through zoning. Instead:

Surrey will continue to consider the indicators of a free housing market as a suitable expression of the social preferences of its present and future residents.117

Diversity, by both council and developers, however, was considered narrowly:

ground-oriented townhouses with minimal property should be incorporated in neighbourhoods to allow older people to stay. Younger singles could stay if apartments were provided. In a strictly single family neighbourhood, however, apartment buildings are, at this stage in Surrey’s development, a disruptive element.118

Note that first, the single family neighbourhood is the baseline, the assumed given, and that second, diversity is conceived only in terms of stage in the life course. Race, class and sexuality were absent, as was the possibility that families would live in townhouses or the elderly in detached dwellings. Although broader than the 1966 OCP, a limited conception of difference prevailed.

This Official Community Plan also drew set boundaries within Surrey, unlike the 1966 OCP whose boundaries were subject to continual negotiation. The categories were hardened and fixed, setting strict boundaries for development in that land designated urban etc. was to formally remain that way unless an official amendment to the OCP was made. It also made development within these boundaries easier, for as long as the proposed use accorded with the zoning, it would be approved. The impact of

the plan was substantial. It was immediately followed by a building boom, as the uncertainty surrounding its contents dissipated. In 1989 the greatest number of dwellings in Surrey's history were built, seen in Figure 3.5. Compared to the 1960s, Whalley was no longer dominant, but the majority of housing was built in Guildford, Fleetwood and Newton.

The Boundary Park development, officially part of Newton and begun in 1985, was part of this post OCP boom. It demonstrates some of these themes of place identity, social mix and visions of space/Surrey/suburb. The fate of the parcel of land upon which it was to be built was subject to much discussion, a result partly of the more formal public approval process established by the OCP. West Newton residents were vocal in their opposition, since they wanted the land to remain suburban.119 However, the OCP designated the land urban, facilitating the development. The proposal was finally approved in 1985 "after years of battling for council approval" and consultation with West Newton residents.120 Consisting of 110 acres and 500 dwellings by the time it was completed in 1989, the creation of a sense of place was central. However, this sense was drawn from its surroundings. Consequently, existing community identity was integral to the project in complex ways. Genstar tried to negate the image of West Newton, which at that time was known as a place of wet t-shirt competitions, by building an "upscale" residential community. They also tried to create a coherent community, with a lake as a focal point. The spatial form of this community had to conform to the surrounding land uses. The project therefore had a gradation of density, high in the north to mirror the commercial boundary there, and low in the south near Panorama Ridge (see

Figure 3.7). This "density gradient" also illustrates the vision of difference expressed. The varying lot sizes provided were interpreted in terms of different family types and different demands for open space by families. A comparison of Southmere and Boundary Park, both designed by the same person with similar goals but under different planning visions and in different parts of Surrey, is instructive for showing the different spatial visions and formations resulting from the 1983 OCP. Although Southmere certainly drew on the specific image of South Surrey, the local, micro-geography was more explicitly part of the building of Boundary Park.
Figure 3.7. Boundary Park Plan
Source: Boundary Park Advertising Brochure.
The 1980s, then, were a period of changing meaning in Surrey. A new OCP continued the rational planning of the previous decades, albeit couched in somewhat more aesthetic terms. As a result, the uniqueness of Surrey was supposed to be drawn upon in residential development, exemplified in developments like Boundary Park. Cemented during this period were the multiple meanings of the signifiers Surrey and suburb. Surrey came to represent diversity (albeit limited socially), in terms of both the Community Plan and the residential environments constructed. In effect, the meaning of space in Surrey changed to take account of indigenous or local meanings. The resultant land use was therefore a compromise between the two representations of space. Relatedly, enshrined by the late 1980s was the spatial differentiation of different conceptions of suburbs within Surrey. Northern Surrey was, in Surrey parlance, urban, consisting of single-family residential communities with some high density concentrations. Fraser Heights, in which the first case study is located, was to be solely single family and South Surrey the more "up-market" variants of both of these. The Surrey definition of suburban as in-between urban and rural was maintained through its spatial allocation to particular parcels of land. The original white settlers' meaning of Surrey as agricultural land was also preserved in the Agricultural Land Reserve. These trends, nascent in the late 1980s, were to form the basis of the production of space in Surrey up to the present.

VI. Remaking and Re-imaging Surrey 1985 - 1993

A re-evaluation of the Surrey image, along the lines envisaged in the OCP, characterizes the period from the late 1980s to the present. Imaginings and material constructions of space were re-thought along at least three axes: media representations; residential constructions and images of place
and space; and the attempt to "citify" Surrey by making Whalley a high
density, downtown core. All three motifs exhibit the modification of
suburban ideals in Surrey and form an immediate context for the case studies
that follow.

In contrast to earlier, derogatory representations of Surrey, this was a
time of flux in terms of images, with the diversity of Surrey being
acknowledged, even celebrated. In the Surrey Leader, for instance, Surrey
was described as "colorful and unpredictable", and its representation in
crime statistics criticized. Surrey voices were increasingly heard in the
Vancouver-centred media, both officially - "Surrey is one big, beautiful
municipality and we’re going to be acknowledged as such" - and by
residents:

You will find the daisies and buttercups growing in wild,
tangled masses on vacant lots reminiscent of a pre-housing
Vancouver landscape. You will find frogponds and other
earthly captivations mesmerizing your six year old longer
than any concrete amusements ever did.

These pioneering efforts shifted the terrain upon which Surrey was
represented. The diversity of Surrey, as a place, is now recognized and is
becoming part of Vancouver geographical imaginations. As it was put in The
Province:

There are residential areas in South Surrey that are just like
high-class areas of West Vancouver, and we have real
working-class neighbourhoods in the north end. We’ve got
a cowtown out in Cloverdale, which is very much a farming

124 "You can leave your heart in San Francisco, abandon fresh cheese
community with the second largest rodeo in western Canada.\textsuperscript{125}

The process is not complete, however, for Surrey is still a negative signifier, evidenced in the still circulating Surrey jokes.\textsuperscript{126} Concomitantly, the images of places within Surrey are becoming more widely known and used, as I show throughout this thesis. Newton, for instance, has a particular meaning, as do smaller places like Sunshine Hills, a large suburban residential subdivision near Cloverdale. Ironically, then, just as "suburb" as a referent has declined in importance, the signifier "Surrey" is also changing. In the 1990s Surrey signifies diversity - ethnically, age wise, job opportunities and house types. As a result, communities within Surrey take on meaning of their own in the geographic vocabulary of residents, as I show in subsequent chapters.

The type of residential development that now dominates Surrey, and the encouragement of diversity and uniqueness within the OCP, are partly responsible for this changing image. Unlike the 1970s where AHOP and compact lot housing in places like Newton were the norm and seemed to affirm the reputation of Surrey, and also in contrast to the early 1980s where most affluent residential development was destined for South Surrey, most developments from the late 1980s on consisted of larger houses in what were termed controlled developments. A perusal of the Real Estate sections of both the \textit{Vancouver Sun} and the \textit{Surrey Leader}, for instance, substantiates this claim, with the selling of controlled subdivisions predominant. Throughout the summer of 1986 the \textit{Surrey Leader}, for instance, carried an advertisement for Somerset Grove, "one of Guildford's finest controlled residential subdivisions". Average house size is increasing, a result, some

\textsuperscript{126} On Surrey jokes see the column by Denny Boyd, "Surrey's idea of a good joke in Vancouvers", \textit{Vancouver Sun}, October 25, 1984, p.A3.
developers and builders allege, of it being uneconomical to build small, isolated houses anymore, since land prices are so high. As summarized in the *Surrey Leader*:

Builders claim that the system creates disincentives to build smaller, more affordable homes. Social agencies complain that land is being gobbled up by speculators and developers who then build enormous homes on lots to match. The affordable housing crunch has devoured the lower class and is now moving up to rip at the heels of the middle class, dimming the dream of many to purchase a single-family house on a spacious urban lot.127

Within the increasingly prevalent controlled subdivisions, micro-geographies of power, place and distancing from the term "Surrey" are prevalent. Morningside Estates, for instance, was a controlled subdivision in Fleetwood, marketed on the basis of architectural and social homogeneity. Many developments in Fraser Heights were also planned and developed along similar lines, where there was active disassociation from the traditional image of Surrey. The first case study, Glenwood, is a good example of a controlled subdivision, as I document in chapter four. Simultaneously, however, the image of cheap housing is also being reworked by developers such as ParkLane Homes. They are building a compact lot subdivision in Cloverdale, with the intention of bringing "a touch of Kitsilano to Surrey" and making the small houses desirable.128 The second case study, Berkshire Park, is also a compact lot subdivision that is distanced from the AHOP image.

As of the beginning of 1994, the 1983 OCP was being officially reviewed, reflecting the diversifying process. Part of this diversification trend were the plans for "Surrey City Centre". Seizing an opportunity opened up by the extension of Skytrain into Surrey, the municipality is trying to create a

---

downtown core. The current language - naming it Surrey City Centre in particular - indicates that the signifier Surrey is a long way from encompassing urban high-rise: "city" aspects of Surrey have to be directly signalled. This suggests, nevertheless, that more, rather than less, instability in the meanings of Surrey and suburb are likely in the future.

It would be misleading to end the "Surrey story" here. Rational scientific representations of space are far from absent. They continue to underlie the planning, spatial allocation and building of houses and residential neighbourhoods, principally through the concept of "everything in its place". Indeed, the sway of local, Surrey-specific representations of space has waned over the past two years. The designation "suburban", long the centre of a Surrey identity, has been threatened by increasing housing demand. As a result of the subsequent "suburban lands review" in West Newton and Cloverdale, a significant portion of suburban land has now been designated urban. Not only does suburbanization need to be contextualized, but so too do representations of space - their purchase is historically and geographically specific. In these respects, the history of Surrey since 1960 is not a linear passage from rational, outsider, to more place-specific representations of space, Surrey and suburb. All three terms remain unstable and multifarious, intersecting in different ways in different places at different times.

VII. Conclusions

In this chapter I have tried to show how space and place are produced through, and drawn upon in, suburbanization, which in turn are underlain by the privileging of a specific vision of family. Since 1960, a rational scientific representation of space guided residential development in Surrey, but this process was expressed, worked through, and sometimes contested, in local,
Surrey terms. Rational visions were modified by the perceived specificity and history of Surrey. In the 1960s the rational representation of space espoused by planners contained within it the meaning of suburb within Surrey and its geographical differentiation. Diversity within Surrey was explicitly recognized in the planning discourses of the 1980s. Historical and geographical processes have meant that Surrey is many types of places rolled into one. In some parts, Surrey is a city, in others, it assumes a more traditional suburban form. Stretching across the landscape, however, is the primacy of family as a differentiating factor. There are two implications of the preceding analysis that I would like to draw out in depth.

The first is the position of this narrative within more conventional suburbanization stories. I have attempted to add another layer to other suburbanization stories by emphasizing the planning framework in which residential development occurs. Notions of what a piece of land is and should be, and what a suburb should be, become intertwined with social and economic processes (e.g. real estate development, construction industry, planning discourses, resident activism), and in turn make their mark on the landscape. Through this, I have demonstrated that the broader context of suburbanization affects the outcome. I have also suggested that the place in which these processes occur also matters. Place - Surrey - was neither empty nor meaningless. Its existing, and dynamic, meanings impacted suburbanization.

The second implication is the position of the two case studies in this narrative. The rest of this thesis focuses on two "single-family" subdivisions,

---

built for the nuclear family and privileged within Surrey planning discourses. The first neighbourhood, Glenwood, is an affluent, controlled subdivision in Fraser Heights. It is indicative of Surrey's newer middle-class subdivisions that I mentioned in the last section, and is notable because it is located in North, not South Surrey, with the latter historically being the home of the affluent in Surrey. Berkshire Park, the second neighbourhood, is a compact lot subdivision in Fleetwood. It therefore has different reference points in my suburbanization narrative. Its general location - Fleetwood - is positioned as a site of urban growth, envisaged in the 1983 and current planning discussions as a source of land to fulfill the demand by young families for houses they can afford to buy. Berkshire therefore fits the characterization of Surrey as a site of cheap housing. As a compact lot subdivision, Berkshire is also partially reminiscent of the debates over Assisted Home Ownership Plan houses I discussed in section three. In the following chapters I investigate further the different positioning and meaning of the two neighbourhoods, and explore their commonalities as contexts for the negotiation and constitution of gender, class and race.

---

130 Which I explain in more detail in chapter four.
CHAPTER FOUR
BOUNDING THE MIDDLE-CLASS NUCLEAR FAMILY

I. Suburbs and Boundaries in the 1990s

Basically I think everybody finds this area is a very very compact area, there's sort of no outside influences on this subdivision, it's just a subdivision, it has definite boundaries, you know, 108th, 160th, 164th, 104th. And there's no outside influences other than just the single family dwellings, that appear, you know, nicer houses, the people all really like it, everybody wants to protect this little area from the big world outside.

Reinforcing this pattern of income differentiation has been the widespread desire of urban dwellers to separate themselves from lower income and minority groups. In the past as in the present, most of those moving outward have been seeking social separation from the lower classes as well as better housing and more spacious surroundings. Middle-class families commonly equate personal security, good schools, maintenance of property values, and the general desirability of a residential area with the absence of lower-income groups.

These two quotes capture the two major contexts and starting points of this chapter: the spatialization of middle class, familial identities through erecting boundaries around neighbourhoods; and academic understandings of the urban geographies produced by such processes. The first quote, from a resident of Glenwood, suggests that a homology between place and identity exists there, and is actively defended by residents. In their everyday lives, the inhabitants of Glenwood carved out a place of their own, a "home" in which to feel comfortable and to which they felt they naturally belonged. Moreover, this "home" was spatially demarcated and expressed. My first aim

1 Anne, Glenwood.
in this chapter is to explore this homology between place and identity in terms of the themes introduced in chapters one and two. Specifically, how are middle class family places made and remade, especially in the context of the discourses of declining fortunes and new traditionalism? How, if at all, are the associated identities spatialized? Finally, using the comparison provided by the two case studies, are there different types of middle class family places and identities?

The second quote signals the nesting of the chapter in attempts to comprehend the spatial, exclusionary, and familial practices associated with suburban living. In particular, I want to bring together two different strands of analysis. The first is the North American historical literature on suburbs, which has emphasized the importance of boundaries in suburban places and living. Most often, as Danielson suggests, suburban living has been sought and defined against urban living: a retreat from the perceived chaos, crime, poverty and anti-family characteristics of the city. In Richard Sennett’s late nineteenth-century Chicago, for instance, the economic world was rapidly changing, the population diversifying, and chaos and fear dominant emotions. Then, lack of control was identified with the city, and suburban living and retreat into the nuclear family adopted as attempts to shield individuals from the disorder and diversity of the city. As well as the symbolic boundaries identified by Sennett, other defence mechanisms have been used: restrictive covenants that maintain land values and often explicitly


4 ibid. pp.88-96.

5 ibid. p.141.
deny minority groups access to particular places; more explicit exclusionary zoning, common in the United States; land use planning to allocate "families" to their "proper place"; and reliance on the housing market as a "natural" filter.

The second strand of analysis is more recent, purportedly "postmodern", adding another defense mechanism to this list: the building of physical walls around suburban neighbourhoods in an attempt to keep others out. A monopolistic land development industry, in combination with an all-pervasive fear, have created residential landscapes where space is blatantly used as part of processes of exclusion. Communities of the (often white) wealthy are explicitly isolated and protected from the perceived chaos and crime of the rest of the city through walls and gates, creating what Mike Davis astutely terms "fortress LA". "Master-planned communities"

7 Danielson, op.cit.
9 I say purportedly because there is a confusion between postmodernism as an era and as a mode of analysis. For a sample of the two uses of "postmodern" in urban literature, see Michael Dear, 1988, "Postmodernism and planning" Environment and Planning D: Society and Space; Michael Peter Smith, 1992, "Postmodernism, urban ethnography and the new social space of ethnic identity", Theory and Society, 21, pp.493-531; Elizabeth Wilson, 1991, The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women, London: Virago, ch.9; and Janet Wolff, 1992, "The real city, the discursive city, the disappearing city: postmodernism and urban sociology", Theory and Society, 21, pp.553-60.
surrounded by high walls that enclose social homogeneity are becoming increasingly prevalent.\textsuperscript{12}

My aim in this chapter is to bring together these different approaches to suburban boundaries; demonstrating the benefits of thinking about boundaries symbolically (clearly evident in the historical literature), in tandem with a recognition of the changed context of the 1990s (highlighted by analyses of "postmodern" urban form).

Postmodern analyses of suburban exclusion assume that borders between neighbourhoods have to be physical to be efficacious, thereby overlooking the long history of symbolic boundaries in suburban life. A more explicitly cultural analysis would therefore extend the claims currently being made. In the two place-making stories that follow I show that symbolic boundaries are crucial in the formation and reproduction of both these neighbourhoods and identities within them. Moreover, the negotiation and re-constitution of meaning, power and identity are absent in postmodern accounts. In Edward Soja's study of Orange County, California, for example, there is no suggestion that the meanings implanted into the landscape by the Irvine Company are negotiated or resisted in any way.\textsuperscript{13} Similarly, although Karen Till ends her examination of one "master planned community" with the claim that "the Madronaville story reminds [us] that consumers are not passive receivers of information but are real people with ideas", the contention is foreshadowed rather than explored.\textsuperscript{14} Middle-class, familial,
residential communities are not only made by capital. They are given meaning and re-created by their inhabitants. Analysis should therefore take account of the (re)creation of meaning by residents.

As I outlined in the introductory chapter, the urban and suburban situations of a place like Surrey in the 1990s are far removed from those that formed a backdrop to the historical literature. It is therefore fruitful to examine the patterns of congregation and separation in Surrey. In the rest of this chapter I document two patterns that connect Sennett’s concerns with those of contemporary urban analysts. First, it was not the city that was feared, but the suburbs. Surrey’s diversity meant that crime, poverty, family arrangements other than the nuclear family, and unemployment were all close, spatially and socially, to the residents of Berkshire and Glenwood. It was thus certain suburban lifestyles they were avoiding, not the city, but in a symbolic sense. Second, and related to the first, unlike Sennett’s retreat into the family, the protection of, and retreat into, the residential neighbourhood was clear. A spatial strategy, bounding the neighbourhood and home, was adopted.

I demonstrate these points through an investigation of the multifaceted creation of two suburban subdivisions in Surrey. The aim is not to comprehensively document the histories of the two pieces of land, nor is it to present an exhaustive inventory of residents’ reasons for locating there and descriptions of their neighbourhood. Instead, I draw out the major themes of the interviews, and I pay particular attention to the establishment of an affinity between the places and identities, as well as the role of symbolic geographies in the creation of bounded, middle-class, familial places.
II. A Gated Community without Gates: Delimiting the Boundaries of the Affluent Middle-class Family in Glenwood

Located on the periphery of Surrey's single-family residential zone in Fraser Heights, the Glenwood subdivision (whose location is shown on Figure 2.2 in chapter two) is a bounded and coherent white, middle-class, nuclear family neighbourhood. Its physical separation from the rest of Surrey, established by the Trans Canada Highway, became a symbolic, relatively impermeable, boundary protecting Glenwood residents from the chaotic world "outside". Two inter-related powers and practices produced this spatial formation. First, as part of a profit-maximizing strategy, Glenwood was positioned as different and isolated by the residential development industry. Second, residents cemented this symbolic divide through practices and ideas which were a spatialization of their interpretations of, and identities within, the declining fortunes discourse.

a. Making Boundaries (1) Planners and Developers

The planning and development history of Glenwood and its surroundings evinces its physical and social isolation from the rest of Surrey. Glenwood's general location is known as Fraser Heights, land north of the Trans Canada Highway and on bluffs overlooking the Fraser River. Farming land for most of the time since white occupancy of Surrey began, Fraser Heights had for a long time been forgotten in the Surrey planning discourses. It was not until 1983, for instance, that it was recognized as a community within Surrey, being previously known as a village of Guildford. In anticipation of a growth spurt in the 1970s, the land was "replotted" so that consistently sized and located urban lots could be created.15 While the

building boom did not materialize, disagreement over the future meaning of the land continued, even among residents. Those who owned large parcels of land, like the Dominion Construction Company, sought an industrial zoning for all Fraser Heights in order to extract maximum value from the land. Residents preferred housing to maintain their "hillside overlooking the river" as a "special" area.\(^{16}\) An innovative solution to this impasse was adopted, melding the visions of residents, council and Dominion Construction. Following its designation, amidst opposition, as an area of urban housing in the 1983 OCP,\(^{17}\) Dominion Construction and other land owners engaged the services of a professional planner to decide the future of Fraser Heights.\(^{18}\) Together, they planned a mutually satisfactory urban community, which they then presented to council.\(^{19}\)

This proposal and resultant neighbourhood were important since they set the stage for Glenwood in a number of ways. First, they ensured the marking of Fraser Heights as residential space, both in practice (Fraser Glen was built) and in planning policy. Second, the community and subdivision - Fraser Glen - envisioned in this proposal was a "self-contained community" that set it apart from the rest of Surrey.\(^{20}\) Moreover, Fraser Glen was a controlled subdivision, with strict architectural guidelines.\(^{21}\) As the only large scale residential development north of the highway, it set the tone for the land that was drawn upon and reproduced in the design of Glenwood.

---

When you build your home at Glenwood Estates, you're not free to do as you please.

At Glenwood Estates, we don't leave the future to chance. Glenwood is planned to be a community of quality and lasting property value because we've built the guarantees right in!

Innovative design and architectural guidelines ensure that privacy and a superior lifestyle will be shared by everyone building an executive home at Glenwood Estates. That's why people aren't free to do completely as they please. They must share with their neighbours a respect for the spirit of Glenwood and a commitment to build with the best.

If you're searching for an exceptional building lot in a landmark planned community, visit us today. These final phase properties promise to be spoken for quickly. Lots from $59,900.

When Glenwood was being planned in the mid 1980s, a sharp symbolic and physical boundary around it was part of its design and development. The image of Surrey as a place of cheap housing that prevailed into the mid 1980s and the inactive and deteriorating housing market (see chapter three) propelled the developer, Grosvenor International, to position Glenwood differently. The aim was to cater to the "move-up" rather than starter market to ensure a better financial return;\textsuperscript{22} an aim that had spatial consequences. The first was the establishment of a symbolic difference between Glenwood and Surrey. Figure 4.1 is indicative of this boundary. There, the erasure of Surrey is obvious; it is only mentioned in the directions on how to get to Glenwood and is not even named on the map. According to the advertisement, Glenwood is close to all other Vancouver centres except, ironically, Surrey. A clear boundary between Glenwood and the rest of Surrey is being drawn. Glenwood was also designed so as to enhance its physical distinctiveness and isolation, evident in Figure 4.2. It is clearly separated from its surroundings, and especially other residential developments; enveloped by farmland and the highway and with an elementary school within walking distance. There is only one way of entering Glenwood, and this entrance, with its wide brick-paved drive and trees, immediately announces that this place is different (Figure 4.3a). The park and pond in the centre of the subdivision substantiate this distinction (Figure 4.3b). This design and isolation sustain the claim implicit in Figure 4.1: if Fraser Heights is unique, then Glenwood is very special.

\textsuperscript{22} Michael Ball, 1983, \textit{Housing Policy and Economic Power: The Political Economy of Owner Occupation}, London and New York: Methuen, p.116 notes that the increasing importance and profitability of the "move-up" market is a result of the increased market power of long term owner occupiers.
The social distinction of Glenwood was also partially established by planning and design, emphasized by the architect's drawing underneath "any plans this weekend?" in Figure 4.4. Advertised as an "inspired" neighbourhood, planning created order in the general chaos of Surrey. As such, it made Glenwood unique. Design and architectural guidelines were central to this planning framework, primarily because they would ensure that Glenwood appeared different from the rest of Surrey. All roofs, for instance, had to be of cedar shake, houses were to have a minimum amount of brick, they were not to be basement entry, no clotheslines, and the same house and/or colour was not to repeated within six houses.

Part of this strategy was that originally only four specially selected builders were allowed to build in Glenwood. The selection of these builders was essential to creating the distinctiveness of Glenwood. They were known as "quality" builders, having histories of building houses that appealed to the affluent middle class. Cedar West, for instance, had previously developed and built Hazelwood Grove in Guildford, and Norway and Chrisdale were involved in Fraser Glen. Both Hazelwood and Fraser Glen were controlled neighbourhoods. The selection process was also racialized to the extent that none of the builders were Indo-Canadian. It may have been the case that white builders would be more likely to build houses to fit the desired aesthetic.

23 I interviewed two, with the other two no longer being in business. Neither of the firms is currently involved in housebuilding in Surrey. One builds only custom homes and condominiums; the other has come full circle and builds small pre-fabricated homes for compact lot subdivisions on Vancouver Island. Chrisdale Homes had been involved in Fraser Glen, and had a lot of input into the design of Glenwood. Cedar West Homes were a small family-run operation (now part of a steel company) noted for the quality of its construction. It had developed and built in Hazelwood Grove, another controlled subdivision in Surrey.

24 Indo-Canadian builders are common in the Surrey and Lower Mainland housing markets.
Figure 4.2. Glenwood and Surroundings
Figure 4.3a. Glenwood Entrance

Figure 4.3b. Park and Pond, Glenwood
Combined, these strategies were making Glenwood a place for the affluent middle-class. In the words of the advertising in Figure 4.4, it was to be "one of the Lower Mainland's most desirable residential addresses". The market was explicitly those who wished to express their identity, and especially their relative affluence, through their home and neighbourhood. This is most evident in the following text from a feature article in the Surrey Leader:

Located on a plateau high above the Fraser River between Douglas and Barnston Islands, Glenwood Estates offers the best of town and country living in the heart of Surrey. Nestled among the tall trees of Fraser Heights, this desirable community of executive homes is ideally situated next to major transportation routes, regional shopping centres and most city amenities and has been planned to provide 280 building sites for quality single family residences. Full height cedar hedges combine with low stone walls and solid granite planters to mark the perimeter and main entrance of this prestigious community. In the centre is an extensively landscaped garden park with duck pond, gazebo, a pedestrian bridge spanning man-made waterfalls and walkways which will tie into a series of nature trails throughout Fraser Heights. With typically only four lots to each acre, all lots are generous in size, fronting on quiet through streets or private cul-de-sacs.

In this extract, class references dominate. Glenwood is described as "executive", "quality", "prestigious" and on a "plateau high above". The text also links class with the spatial form of Glenwood. The built environment is seen to mark out exclusivity through the main entrance, tall trees and quiet cul-de-sacs.
In the entire Lower Mainland, there is only one community like Fraser Heights. And in Fraser Heights, there is just one Glenwood Estates...we planned it that way!

The Luxury of Choice
Inspired and controlled planning is key to the success of Glenwood; a private setting of spacious estate lots for executive homes situated on a plateau high above the Fraser River between scenic Douglas and Barnston Islands.

With only four lots to each acre, homesites are of generous and gracious proportion, fronting on quiet streets and private cul-de-sacs which encircle a beautifully landscaped garden park and reflecting pond. With roads and services just completed and display homes still under construction, now is the time to get the “pick of the properties,” ensuring that your home is perfectly situated.

Custom Fit
The very best way to buy a home on such spectacular lots is to have it built the way you want. It’s called “custom building” and at Glenwood Estates, we’ve made it an easy and exciting process and surprisingly affordable.

A number of selected quality builders are now working on site. When you arrive at Glenwood, drive around and look at their work. Ask questions and let them know the kind of home that would be perfect for your lifestyle. They’ll help you see that moving into your dream home is as simple as choosing a builder you feel comfortable with. You set the criteria; they’ll look after the details.

Developed by
Grosvenor International Canada Limited.

For further information on building sites call: 683-1114
For further information on custom homes call our featured builders:

Cedar West Homes Ltd.  Chrisdale Homes Ltd.  Elite Homes  Norway Homes Ltd.
536-6783  584-4488  596-9974  590-6444

Just 30 minutes from downtown Vancouver and within 10 minutes of Burnaby, Coquitlam, Delta, New Westminster and Langley. Turn off Highway 1 at Surrey at 104th Street, head north to 104th Avenue, and look for the granite entry gates.

Figure 4.4. Glenwood Advertised as a “Planned” Neighbourhood
Source: Surrey Leader Real Estate Section, Wednesday November 26, 1986, p.3.
Glenwood - as the product of overlapping discourses and practices of planners, property owners, developers and builders - was thus created as a place for the affluent, the homeowner who wanted to live in a place expressive of that identity. Advertising was selling the place and its image, the houses were secondary. Further, although family references were absent in Glenwood advertising, a certain family form was assumed. Both builders and the developer presumed it would be families moving in, with some houses - ranchers - set aside for retirees.\textsuperscript{25}

\textit{b. Making Boundaries (2) Residents}

Glenwood was also a place of the middle-class nuclear family. For many who live there, it represents a spatial solution to the perceived social problems of crime and the feared death of the family. The social and spatial perimeter of Glenwood was therefore unmistakable; underlain by the motivations of those who moved there and their subsequent spatial practices. Reasons for moving to Glenwood and descriptions of the subdivision were multi-layered, and often came out at different points in the interviews. In what follows I talk about the common elements in these motivations and descriptions: Glenwood as not Surrey, isolated from Surrey and controlled and ordered.

For most Glenwood residents the home was more than a place to live and raise children, it was an investment. There are many examples of this, including:

So when we were going to make the move to Surrey that was our objective, we weren’t looking for a house, we were looking for a piece of property to build and move into.

\textit{[Glen]}

\textsuperscript{25} Moreover, builders, in designing the houses, assumed that the occupants would be families and that house layout would only be an issue in terms of location of kitchen, number of bathrooms and choice of colours.
It's an investment, that's the main thing. If we moved up the main thing would be for investment for the future. Because your money's probably working better in a house than it is in the bank [Debby]

It's a growing investment, to me it's our investment for the future, we financially made some arrangements, we don't have a lot of insurance anymore, but what we have is in our house [Anne]

But they did not want a house just anywhere. It had to be in a particular type of neighbourhood in an appropriate location. An uncontrolled, or chaotic neighbourhood was seen to be problematic since it represented all the traits they feared: crime, renters, welfare, different ethnicities, and non-nuclear families, evident in the following extracts.

I wouldn't live in Whalley, not because I'm a snob, it's terrible to say, but I would rather be in an area where there's a solid family unit and most of the homes in that area are broken homes, a lot of condominiums, I have nothing against condominiums, I rented one too, but I know myself that there's not enough time to go around when my husband's out of town to look after the kids and everything. [Debby]

Single parents have a greater chance of raising troubled kids than so-called normal families. Because every kid needs a father and a mother and a mother can't be both or has a much harder time being both. ... Like that subdivision [Ruby] meant, it was all homes rammed together, a central playground where all the kids congregate, and the parents can't really see them and they can do what they want, and the teenage kids have nothing to do but roam and look for trouble. [Edward]

Two points are important here. First, the intersection of new traditionalism and declining fortunes discourse is clear: it is not only poverty that is feared, but the poverty and family arrangements of, invariably female, single parents. They were seen as problematic (and to be avoided) because they were taken to imply a lack of care for children. Second, Edward's thoughts, in the middle of a discussion about the relative influence of
economy and family values in his description of contemporary family decline, highlight how social problems are spatialized. Single parents and poverty were identified with particular neighbourhoods in Surrey. For some residents, the move to Glenwood was therefore an explicit attempt to extricate themselves from what they saw as undesirable neighbourhoods:

The little area where we were didn't seem to be getting any better. It was kind of going downhill. A few of the people that moved in moved in to very nice houses and we saw them getting run down, becoming overgrown. So that kind of influenced us too, the writing was on the wall that this area wasn't going to get much better. [David]

But in Somerset [another subdivision in Surrey] we realized we'd built too grand for the area, and we knew enough about the market, knew that if we didn't do our move quickly our value would go down. So we decided to move down here. [Julie]

Our concern when we moved was that the house was too small and also the neighbourhood was becoming very bad, of the seventeen homes in our area I don't think there was one that hadn't been "visited" [burgled] at one time or another. ... I think there was a feeling in that old neighbourhood whereby people were moving out, and the people that stayed were the ones where the wife didn't work and they didn't have any money. ... We felt like we'd outgrown the neighbourhood. [Anne]

Basically we wanted to move somewhere that had more square feet in the actual house. But it was also there was a change in the neighbourhood - there were more renters. [Veronica]

Here, neighbourhood change, and especially an influx of renters, were perceived as threatening their lifestyle and values. As respectable, comfortably middle-class, family people, wishing to maximize the investment value of their house, a planned, homogeneous and controlled space was seen as most appropriate, what Debby termed a "neighbourhood":

We had been looking for a couple of years, we don't do anything on a whim, and we purposefully looked for a
neighbourhood this time because our other house, it was in a very unorganized neighbourhood and we were told that if it was two blocks either way we probably would have got twenty percent more when we sold because our next door neighbour never mowed their lawn, and it was very unorganized. So we purposefully bought in a neighbourhood for resale value and also for the fact that we wanted something for the kids.

Ernie, whose children were older and who had lived in East Vancouver for twenty years, also wanted a controlled space:

We were looking for a particular type of neighbourhood I think. A quiet place to live, where there's a park, just a quieter neighbourhood.

Jennifer, moving from Kamloops because of her husband's job, noted:

With the real estate being as up and down as it was at that point [we thought] that it would be safer to build, buy a house in a controlled area, where it's all laid out what you can do.

These desires for a "neighbourhood" at once confirm the intentions of the developer and underline the importance of boundaries in the residential location decision. It appears that, a priori, a spatially bounded and socially homogeneous location was desired, which led to locating in Glenwood.

Glenwood, as the developers and builders hoped, fitted the bill in a number of ways. First, the architectural guidelines did more than ensure a consistent aesthetic; they were seen to ensure social homogeneity. In Glenwood, they meant that renters did not move in. When I asked Steve, the husband of Debby who wanted to live in a "neighbourhood", whether he wanted to live in a particular type of subdivision, he replied:

No, probably just a newer area was our concern. Like I said, with controls on the houses. We were in a neighbourhood before that, we were the nicer house on the block with a whole bunch of older houses that were deteriorating quickly. In that kind of environment that we were in before, we found that more people when they sold, they were going to turn around and rent it.
Second, the location and characteristics of Glenwood mitigated somewhat a general concern about the reputation of Surrey. Louise, from Burnaby, had originally vowed "no way, we're not going to move to Surrey". However, after visiting Glenwood many times she was convinced it was different. Kathy, from Langley, had similar reservations:

Surrey had always had, to both of us, a bad reputation, and some friends of ours moved out to Surrey and said you should come and look at some of the nicer areas out here it's beautiful. One of the areas that we looked at was down near Fleetwood, Hazelwood Grove, which was a very nice area, and they had bought there, lots were just being snapped up so fast, we couldn't get one in that area. And we just happened to see an advertisement in the paper for lots in the Glenwood subdivision, so I phoned up.

Anne and Pete originally only searched in South Surrey at similar controlled neighbourhoods since they perceived North Surrey to be too chaotic and undesirable. But as Anne recalls:

For what we wanted to pay we couldn't afford this type of house in that area [South Surrey] and the real estate agent said he knew of an area in Surrey, the north part of Surrey, that would probably be very similar on the other side of the freeway. In which case I said I wasn't even gonna look. I just thought it wasn't where we wanted to live and the other side of the freeway sounded awfully far away to me.

In all three cases, the original dislike of Surrey was retained by redefining Surrey to mean everywhere but north of the Trans Canada. Others already knew that it was different from the rest of Surrey:

We knew the area really well, we knew about Fraser Glen, and we just happened to be around here and a house came up for sale.

The important point here is that the differentiation in the respective reputations or place identities of Glenwood and Surrey was even part of the residential location decision. In residents' reconstructions of why they moved to Glenwood, its cultural, social and spatial difference was paramount.
Third, the aesthetic and image created by the architectural guidelines appealed in class terms. The aesthetics were definitely desirable from an investment standpoint, as Edward points out:

Like that entranceway, I think that adds dollars to our home. Maybe it's a little glitzy, but it's part of what makes this subdivision nice, like the little lake in the park, not that functional, but it adds ambience.

The "look" of Glenwood also meshed with particular class visions. It was attractive in the sense that the large houses, layout, and consistency were valued. In some cases, Glenwood acted as a magnet in some couples' house searches. For instance, Louise and Doug kept coming back to Glenwood at the end of each day they were househunting, as did Ernie and Monica, Karen, Greg and others. Veronica summarizes these experiences when she recalls that "when all was said and done, we kept on coming back to this area, and we grew to like it more and more". Controls were also welcomed in class terms, symbolizing a particular taste and class position. The following story told by David is evocative in this regard:

My wife's brother built a house between here and Fleetwood, ... and he wanted to be able to do what he wanted to do, and not have to have any guidelines. While he could certainly afford to, he wanted to keep his prices right down, so he wanted to have an asphalt roof, all vinyl siding, he wanted a more modern house, so I guess this area would be a little too pretentious to him.

Like the advertising of Glenwood where not being free to do as you pleased was cast in a positive light, controls were seen as a sign of affluence and status, marking residents as different from their socio-spatial

---

26 Given what I say later in this chapter about the racialization of particular architectural styles, controls may also have had a racial element. However, I am unable to substantiate this point, which I discuss further in the conclusion.

27 The occupations of those I interviewed are listed in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 in chapter five, where I consider more explicitly the links between housing and class identity.
surroundings. In effect, the appeal of Glenwood sought by the developers and builders was recreated in the stories residents told about why they moved to Glenwood. Individual, middle-class oriented interpretations of the discourse of declining fortunes were spatialized through a desire to live in a controlled subdivision that, like Glenwood, was part of, but separate from, Surrey. As Debby remarks:

> We like this side of the freeway because it's so away from everything and it seems to be a little bit more sheltered from crime and stuff, there's a lot of problems on the other side of the freeway.

Locating in Glenwood was also emblematic of middle-class housing values of investment and self-expression via housing, a point I deal with in depth in chapter five. For the moment, however, I would like to substantiate these points through reference to cultural practices and ideals within Glenwood.

**c. Boundary Maintenance**

Residents' activities and opinions fleshed out and gave meaning to the uniqueness and isolation of Glenwood and solidified the walls that had been built. Primarily in an attempt to keep the perceived danger at bay, a distinction between inside and outside Glenwood permeated the understandings of residents. High, symbolic boundaries around Glenwood resulted, maintaining it as a middle class family community. I focus in this section on first how the coherence of the inside, or a particular sense of community, was created in Glenwood, and second on how this was differentiated from the rest of Surrey, or how the inside-outside distinction was maintained.

Architectural, landscaping and building controls were more than a motivating factor in the move to Glenwood. They were also the foundation
for an aesthetic and spatial coherence within the social life of the subdivision. According to some, it made Glenwood a "community", gave it a uniqueness and identity that other (Surrey) neighbourhoods did not possess. David generally had liberal political values, and "the fact that you had to do certain things rubbed me the wrong way a little bit". But

In retrospect, though, I see that as a very positive thing, because there’s, I think it provides some continuity to the area and I think that helps provide that sense of community, that neighbourhood feeling. ... I don’t think there’s a lot of repetition, there’s certainly not a great variety, but in retrospect it’s a positive thing. I think it helps give it an identity.

Indeed, as I show in chapter six, controls were the basis of a community solidarity that necessitated certain gender identities.

More importantly from the perspective of boundaries of class and family, the original building covenants were valued and enforced through the opinions of residents. For instance, Glen thinks that to live in Glenwood necessarily and naturally means compliance:

I just chuckle at it because I couldn’t care less, up to a certain point, they don’t allow gable end houses, and the odd one has been put in. And I think it looks so out of place, I don’t know why anybody would want to build here when it sticks out like a sore thumb.

Ernie identifies a more overt pressure:

I think if you look at the way that houses are built here, I think if you don’t build a house to conform here, I really feel that you might get a little bit of pressure from the neighbours. Or you might even feel pressure to build a house to conform here because of what you see. Somebody might come and say well I want to build a walk-in basement home with another level, they might not do it after they look around, especially if they’re going to live here because they’ll be under a little bit of pressure from their own mind.
Even though the controls were no longer in force, pressure to keep landscaping immaculate remained:

You know, keeping up with the Joneses type thing, but not really, you don't want to let your neighbours down in a sense by having a really uncut lawn, unpainted house, you just feel bad in a way for your neighbours. Everybody does around here. [Veronica]

What Ernie, Glen and Veronica are identifying, I think, is a discourse linking Glenwood to a particular orientation towards house maintenance and, implicitly, a specific class location and identity. Regardless of occupation, and, to a lesser extent, income, living in Glenwood involved an attitude about housing that differentiated its inhabitants from those living in other areas. All were proud of the covenants and respected them, living in a controlled neighbourhood was like a badge that only a select few could wear.

The existence of controls was also a symbol of deeper socio-spatial constructions of difference, for restrictions on house style were symptomatic of a broader concern with social homogeneity along the lines of class and family. They guaranteed that residents would live in a place populated by people similar to themselves. When speaking about Glenwood, most residents worked with definitions of who did and did not fit into the neighbourhood. Noise, different family arrangements and not looking after the yard were definitely out. This is Michael's opinion of some of his neighbours:

They're crazy! They actually don't fit in this subdivision. [laughter] They're a bit loud, they're a bit obnoxious. Most people in here have a bit of a brain in their head. They actually lived over near where we would have been before and then they built in here.

In contrast, retired people did fit in. They were valued for the care they took with their gardens, and sometimes as surrogate grandparents. Debby
described her son's relationship with the retired couple who were her neighbours in glowing terms. She especially valued the interaction between generations that she felt was absent in many children's lives.

Controls, however, and valuing of housing meant that residing in Glenwood was the spatial expression of a desire to live with other like-minded heterosexual couples with children. This was explained in familial terms by Edward:

It's not just money, it's family. There's family in this neighbourhood. When there's a marriage break up the money goes two ways and you can't afford to buy, it takes a family what ever number of years, it's taken us ten years to live in this home, being together and working together for ten years, because our family has been together that long, and good fortune financially, that we were able to move here and other people we see are in a similar position, they've worked and are in their second or third home, and the family is still hanging together and because of that they can afford it. If they split up the money is half, they're renting or buying townhomes. I don't know of many broken families here. ... You think this is a nice family neighbourhood, it's because we're nice families and we can afford to live here and broken families can't afford to live here because their finances are broken up.

To Edward, and others, he surmised, being in Glenwood was the consequence of families staying together. It is also the result of families living in and maintaining large houses. According to Ernie:

The thing is that these people have families. The houses are huge, right, and they don't have the basement suite so they're not renting bottom and up. This [house opposite] is a family of four children and this [house down street] is a family of, I think, three children. So it's families, it's not adults, or young adults who have to get together to pay the rent. And I guess the rents are not as high as they are in Vancouver. [Ernie]

Whatever the reasons, Glenwood was universally defined as a family place. Veronica, active in the neighbourhood, summarizes these views:

If you're in this type of situation, and you value this type of life, then I think this is the place to live for it. Because like
I said before, you hardly meet any other types of families, even though I’ve met lots of people who might not have the same values or whatever, but the way it looks from the outside is mom, dad and kids, and all that kind of stuff. And all parents turning up to all the games.

As I show in chapter five, this perception of Glenwood as a family place had practical and emotional benefits, in addition to providing a base for a local culture of gender. The point I wish to focus on here is the way these conceptions of Glenwood were sustained and exclusionary. It was made clear to me that Glenwood was for residents only:

Anne: The neighbours here are very particular about what kind of neighbourhood they want to live in, so they want to maintain it, there were people coming in and dropping car loads of kids off and having them running around the neighbourhood like races and stuff and the people in this neighbourhood wanted to keep it for people that live here, they do not really wish to have a lot of outside people coming in, parking, using the neighbourhood. ... So the people here think this is for us, we pay the taxes, we want our nice little neighbourhood, to like it here you have to live here, you can’t start capitalizing on this here little area.

Although the defence of the boundaries of Glenwood was not an explicit or coordinated strategy of residents, a number of activities, largely based on word of mouth, served to bolster its borders. One social custom is worth noting in this regard. It was common among residents to say hello when passing each other on the street, even if they did not know each other. Strangers could immediately be identified by this practice, including me since I did not say hello, increasing the likelihood of surveillance of outsiders.

Similarly, there was general opposition to uses and meanings of the land (Fraser Heights) other than single-family residential. According to Ernie:

I hate for this to get commercial. That mall is okay, but anything bigger than that would just bring in too much traffic.

And Steve:
The only thing that I was a little nervous of, they were talking about putting apartment blocks in this area, that's another area, type of housing, that I would like to see that we would be away from. ... so far, everything that's going up here is all single family, so I think we're away from that sort of.

The Fraser Heights Residents' Association had, in fact, previously coordinated a campaign to keep townhouses out of the area.

A second example of boundary maintenance is a proposal by BC Transit for a bus route to run from Guildford along the main road of Glenwood. As Anne recalls:

They were gonna put the bus route right through the neighbourhood area, not past our house but through the neighbourhood, past Veronica's house actually. I can remember the neighbours petitioning, threatening to block the road, so I spoke to my buddy at BC Transit and told her what would happen and she wasn't terribly accommodating but the result of it was that they ended up getting the bus where they wanted it on the outskirts. It's probably not terribly safe for it to come through the neighbourhood when you're raising children.

The problem seemed to be noise, traffic and that the bus could potentially transport "undesirables" to Surrey. The principle of exclusion over-rode those of convenience, accessibility and women's safety, although as Veronica notes, most Glenwood residents owned two cars anyway. Veronica also explained opposition to the bus in planning terms:

talk about something that was not planned, the way they planned that bus route. When we got it stopped that was the main thing. It now goes along the main arteries outside the subdivision, it was just totally opposite to what everyone wanted. The people that lived on the main street weren't keen.

The issue of a baseball diamond was similarly contested. The land next to the elementary school had always been designated park land, but until 1990 had remained "bush". Council proposed that a baseball diamond be built, in light of the shortage of such fields in Surrey. Again, residents
protested, though for two different reasons. The retired person who organized a petition preferred the land to remain bush since it would then be more attuned with the trails of the area. Opposition also emanated from parents concerned about the isolation of Glenwood. The field was seen to bring "outsiders" and traffic into Glenwood; most parents were willing to drive their children elsewhere to play sport. Being articulate and vocal, these residents prevailed over the minority who wanted play space for their children. Libby, who thought residents were being short-sighted and anti-family, noted that ironically baseball was played in the park, though informally by neighbourhood children and not formally by outsiders. The moat around Glenwood remained without a bridge.

The accessibility of Glenwood to outsiders was limited, partly for geographical reasons. According to Ruby:

This is still sort of isolated, cause it's out of the way, you have to have a reason to come over here because there's nothing, it's not a place to cruise or to shop, or go out to dinner or anything, it's just a place to live and not to go.

These activities described above, however, point out that the walls constructed around Glenwood were also symbolic. The Trans Canada Highway symbolized this separation. According to Veronica:

It's like having a moat around you. Psychologically especially, people always talk about going out to the other side of the freeway. It reminds me of when I lived in the Yukon, and people would say they're going to the outside, and that's, it's just like what it's like here, people say they're going out, meaning the other side of the freeway.

And Doug:

You always say the north side of the freeway, you don't say you live in Surrey, you don't say you live in Guildford, because you're away from everything, everything that happens seems to happen on the other side.
The gulf between Glenwood, its residents and the rest of Surrey was thus understood spatially, signified by which side of the Trans Canada Highway you lived on. To this extent, residential differentiation was quite sharp, both physically and symbolically. Further, residents' decisions to live in Glenwood were the spatial expression of a class and familial identity. In particular, they were seeking a middle-class, socially homogeneous neighbourhood where they, and their children, could be isolated from the dangers perceived to be elsewhere in Surrey. Attempts were also made to defend these borders, both overtly and subtly.

III. Berkshire Park. Fluid and Multiple Constructions of Difference

Whether Berkshire Park is a clearly bounded neighbourhood depends on how you look at it. In conventional terms, it is an amorphous community with blurred boundaries. It is an ordinary or average Surrey subdivision:28 house prices in early 1994 ranged from $180,000 to $220,000; it is nondescript in terms of house style, just one of many subdivisions springing up all over Fleetwood; and is populated by middle-income, generally dual earner, nuclear families. Upon further investigation, subtle walls were constructed around Berkshire through the spatialization of declining fortunes and middle-class identities. Within the context of financial constraints, moving to Berkshire was the spatial expression of an intent to be surrounded by middle-class, white families. I explore these fluid and multiple boundaries in this section.

28 Technically, Berkshire Park is the name of the subdivision in the centre of the block I am dealing with, as I show below. Most residents, however, would say that they lived in Berkshire Park, so I use this term for the whole area.
a. The Making of an Ordinary Subdivision

Berkshire's position in Surrey and its planning discourses establishes it as unexceptional, resembling the many small-scale subdivisions built over Surrey in the 1980s. A prime component of this is its geographical location in the Fleetwood area of Surrey. Historically, Fleetwood was a small community within Surrey oriented toward New Westminster, not Vancouver. Until 1965 Fleetwood consisted of small farms and "rural-urban fringe dwellers" and was a service centre for the Trans Canada Highway. As such, it consisted of a few small stores clustered around the highway. With the building of the Guildford Town Centre and the re-routing of the Trans Canada Highway its service function was eclipsed. Planners then attempted to create a new centre for Fleetwood by moving commercial businesses from the junction of 160th and the Fraser Highway to the corner of 152nd and the Fraser Highway.

Fleetwood's present social and symbolic attributes are an extension of this history. Evenden provides a useful summary:

On making enquiries one soon realizes that Fleetwood is hardly known outside the District Municipality of Surrey. Even within the District its identity is problematical. Local government officials know it of course, and it appears in public documents as a spatial focus for community planning, albeit not of the first rank. It is known to those in commercial life who have conducted business in the area, especially if their dealings have occurred over a period of time. But some know it only to denigrate it as a place of any societal or social geographic consequence, preferring to think of it only as a resource, whose commercial areas are ripe for redevelopment, and whose legacy of small firms and urban sprawl makes land available for new development.30

29 ibid.
30 ibid. p.225.
Evenden's comments can be substantiated in a number of ways, of which the planning context is most important. Current planning discourse sees Fleetwood as exhibiting a "lack of identifiable entry" and "an indistinct identity from Newton and Guildford".\(^{31}\) In the 1983 Official Community Plan and its subsequent amendments, Fleetwood is defined as one of the growth areas of Surrey. Fleetwood's meaning, therefore, is primarily as a place for new housing developments, a representation repeated by developers and builders. For instance, an advertisement for houses in Fleetwood in 1987 (the time Berkshire was being occupied), sold them solely on the basis of price and convenience.\(^{32}\)

The fluidity of Berkshire is most evident in the composition of its built environment. Although focused around an elementary school, I interviewed households in three distinct but contiguous subdivisions, shown in Figure 4.5. The first, called Westpark by the builder, is a compact lot subdivision consisting of ninety-one lots. A compact lot subdivision is where the lots are smaller than usual, in this case the average lot size was 12 metres wide by 24 metres deep. The developer is only allowed to build compact lots if the small lot size is compensated by park space, in this case walkways and a park in the centre of the subdivision. The aim of such developments is to try and satisfy the demand for low cost housing while still providing a detached house. The actual Berkshire Park subdivision was built by Father and Son homes and consists of 102 houses, with no fancy entrance. There were some controls on the type of house one could build, but the only noticeable ones were shake roofs and no identical houses side by side. They were not important to residents. Advertising was not widespread and local knowledge

\(^{31}\) Planning Department, Surrey, 1989 Annual Review of the Urban Residential Lands of the Official Community Plan, Surrey, p.36.

\(^{32}\) "Your choice: 53 new homes", Surrey Leader, January 7, 1987, real estate section.
and show homes were deemed more important. Figure 4.6, from the Surrey Leader, demonstrates these points, advertising the house rather than the neighbourhood. Wedged between these two developments were lots on which builders would build speculatively and attempt to sell (a "spec" home) or residents would buy and build their own home. Pat and Ken, whom I interviewed, are representative of the first pattern. Although they weren't looking for a newer house, they ended up buying a spec house because it was one of the few available in the area. Sherri and Lee adopted the other model: they bought a lot and then contracted a builder to construct the house that they had designed.

Together, these three factors - location in Surrey, place identity of Fleetwood and the amorphous character of residential development and house styles in Berkshire - suggest the permeability of its social and spatial boundaries. Berkshire was neither spatially nor socially different; its houses and residents seemed to gradually merge into their surroundings. This is also evident in Figure 4.5, depicting the variety of house styles and types that characterize the immediate vicinity of Berkshire. Along the southern and eastern edges of Berkshire are older, ranch style homes built at least thirty years ago. Examples can be found in Figure 4.7. The western edges are solidly townhouses, designed primarily for seniors but also occupied by some families. The northern edge, on the other side of the Hydro right-of-way, is early 1980s AHOP housing. Locationally, then, the boundaries around Berkshire are to some extent nonexistent, for it is located in the middle of a heterogeneous area. Indeed, the neighbourhood was often nameless. It was given many names - Berkshire, Fleetwood, Guildford, "I don't know". The designations Berkshire or Berkshire Park stuck because of the name of the elementary school. Further, the boundaries of the community were hard to
discern. In the end it appeared that the major roads - Fraser Highway, 152nd and 156th streets, and the Hydro right-of-way defined the boundary.

The fluidity of Berkshire’s boundaries was confirmed in conversations with residents. As a place or neighbourhood with distinctive attributes, it was not a factor motivating residents' decisions to move there. When I asked why people had moved to Berkshire, the house rather than the neighbourhood was mentioned. Since most had not previously owned a house, townhouse or apartment, the attainment of ownership was paramount. This desire for a house was expressed in a number of ways.

For many, the stories they told about their house searching process cast Berkshire and their current house in a negative light. For them, Berkshire wasn’t their first choice, but was what they could afford. Tim and Traci just wanted to buy a house, stay near their family and get out of their Guildford town house. Marie looked around North Delta where her family lived, but because of affordability she was "forced" to move to Berkshire. Those from out of the Lower Mainland spoke at length of the geographical limitations on housing choice posed by the expensive Lower Mainland housing market. Interestingly, however, they usually had some specific local reason for choosing Surrey, like church contacts (Sherri, Bruce, Linda) or relatives (Andrew, Fran).
Figure 4.5. Berkshire Park and Surroundings
Designer Homes for the Discriminating Buyer
In BERKSHIRE PARK...

— 2 HOMES TO CHOOSE FROM. —
CASTLE PINES .... 1692 Sq. Ft. .... $119,900
TWO STOREY .... 2000 Sq. Ft. .... $129,900

- Vaulted ceilings
- Cedar shakes
- Wood railings
- Energy-efficient packages
- Full sized lot with front lawn
- Decorative brass hardware
- Oak cabinets
- Forced air heating
- Dishwasher
- Double garage
- Soaker tubs
- 5-year limited home warranty

CALL NOW AND CHOOSE THE COLOURS IN YOUR NEW DESIGNER HOME ........ AUGUST 1st POSSESSION

pepperridge homes ltd. 588-5080
Ron Heaver 594-3324 Martin Van Heusen 588-5485

Figure 4.6. Advertising Berkshire Park Houses
Source: Surrey Leader Real Estate Section, Wednesday July 2, 1986, p.2.
Figure 4.7. Older Housing in Berkshire Park
Relatedly, house searches were not neighbourhood specific. For instance, according to Mark:

It was more financial oriented as opposed to, I think we were pretty much like all first time buyers, you tend to look at finances and find affordability first and deal with what’s available in that price range in terms of what you want for your own personal type of house.

Important here is that Mark ends with "your own personal type of house", not neighbourhood, even after affordability was taken into account. This substantial irrelevancy of the neighbourhood is also more starkly evident in the following quote from Ingrid:

We had initially intended to build a home, which is why we wanted to move away from Langley, why we put our house up for sale. And we were wondering what to do in the interim, and then Henry's uncle was selling this house, he had bought it for his daughter who decided to move up north so one day Henry's mother phoned us and said there was this house out in Surrey, do you want to go look at it. So I think it was the same day that we headed out we came out here to have a look at it, it just seemed suitable for the time being, and it was about a week and it was all signed and we've been here ever since because we haven't been able to afford to build a home.

Ingrid appears to want to move to anywhere but Langley, and moving on a whim is indicative of a lack of planning or strict criteria.
Unlike the spatialization of the discourse of declining fortunes manifest in Glenwood, isolation and being away from Surrey were not valued. When I asked residents what they liked most about the area, in contrast to Glenwood residents who pointed to the merits of isolation, Berkshire households referred to the convenience and accessibility of the location. Convenience was a factor at three spatial scales: neighbourhood, Surrey and the Lower Mainland. At the neighbourhood level, the location of the elementary and high schools were cited as positive factors; as were the short distances to work and amenities. Mary has a five minute walk to work from her house and did not move until she first found a job in Surrey and second could live within walking distance of it. Marie likes it that her children can walk to school and her husband to the bus stop to take him downtown (via the Skytrain); whilst Traci, at home during the day without a car when Tim is working (he works shiftwork so is not always away during the day), says:

I like the fact that I can walk to the store whenever I need anything, put the kids in the stroller and go for a walk. I like the fact that they’re putting a park in now, we didn’t have one before and it should be ready in the spring.

At the Surrey scale, Bruce remarked that Berkshire was "centrally located and conveniently located in terms of shopping, transport and schools". Similarly, Berkshire has "easy access to everything" [Ken]. What was most accessible were "the malls are up the street, the border is twenty minutes away" [Kurt], "there’s the theatres and the mall not too far" [Liz] and "Safeway’s only two minutes away, I go there almost every day to get fresh things" [Marie]. Essentially, the characteristics of Fleetwood deemed negative by Evenden and planners - commercial, retail facilities and proximity to major transport routes - were given a positive twist by residents and became attributes of their neighbourhood.
Centrality in terms of the Lower Mainland was also a factor. Both Henry and Hal said it was central for their commutes to work and Henry adds:

and also for Ingrid, because whenever she does something, or visits with her friends, its halfway for her to almost anything in the Lower Mainland.

The following conversation between Joanne and Mark also illustrates the theme of centrality in Greater Vancouver:

Mark: From a location standpoint this is excellent, as far as centralization in terms of the Fraser Valley. You can’t beat it, you have close access to Richmond, relatively close access to Burnaby and that area of Vancouver, and the Fraser Valley which speaks for itself.
Joanne: Which was also a consideration for us because we’re both salespeople so we have to travel all over the Lower Mainland and we have to have easy access to wherever.

Along with an amorphous character, Berkshire seemed to lack a distinguishable place identity in residents’ accounts of their move and lives there. Where it did have boundaries and identifiable characteristics was with respect to the elementary school. The elementary school served to define the subdivision as a particular type of place, both before and after residents moved in. For instance, Barb and Sid had very strict criteria for where they could live when they moved to Surrey from Calgary:

We have three children, one in elementary, one going to junior secondary and another to senior secondary. So we needed school access, within walking distance, we didn’t want our children being bused and all the rest of it. And close enough for me to get to work [in New Westminster].

The specific characteristics of the school were also important. Some had heard about its good reputation through the grapevine. Part of Kurt and Sharon’s motivation for moving was their dissatisfaction with the school in the previous area. They had heard that in Berkshire the school was right in
the neighbourhood, an important factor for them since in their previous location their children had to cross a busy road to go to school. Further, the school "had such a good reputation".

Others felt an attachment to the neighbourhood via the school. Linda and Bruce were about to move after searching for a bigger house for more than two years. It had taken them so long because Linda insisted that they stay in the same school catchment area. She is adamant: "I wouldn't feel the same commitment to the neighbourhood or to hang around if it wasn't for the school". About half the couples I interviewed (those who had previously owned a house) had not moved very far. Ken and Pat lived a short three blocks away before their present home, which they had moved into solely because it was the only one available in the area when they were looking. They wanted to stay close because:

But we wanted to stay in the area because we wanted to stay with the same friends and the same school, and didn't want the disruption of carting them to miles away so that's how we ended up here. We didn't move too far.

Similarly, Sherri and Dan moved a couple of blocks to their Berkshire house, partly for the school and partly for the amenities. Those contemplating moving, like Tim, would not move far:

If we did move to a bigger house it would only be a couple of streets over, like this general neighbourhood.

Indeed, Liz and Jess were living in Westpark when I interviewed them, and moved to Berkshire one week later. When I saw Liz while interviewing one of her friends, she told me they wanted a bigger house but in the same elementary school catchment area.
b. Making a (Bounded) Community of Families and Homeowners

The stories I was told about reasons for moving to Berkshire and experiences there were ambiguous. On one hand, as I showed above, socially exclusionary motives underlying Berkshire residents' housing decisions are obviously absent. Convenience, affordability and the aspirations for homeownership, traditional factors in understanding residential location, appear to be primary. At other levels, however, some elements of declining fortunes and middle class spatialities are evident. Negative descriptions of Berkshire, for instance, were also ways that residents signalled to me that Berkshire was "beneath them". As an example, Tim was careful to point out that this was not the last house they were going to live in, but that Berkshire was a spatial and temporal accommodation. In this sense moving to Berkshire was expressive of a particular phase in the life course, one that he hoped to also move beyond financially. Further, the designation of Berkshire as "ordinary" was implicitly social and spatial; living there was also a spatial manifestation of a young, middle-class, interpretation of Surrey and declining fortunes.

As an ordinary neighbourhood, Berkshire was valued because of what it symbolized: a white (predominantly at least), family-oriented, non-welfare, "working person", neighbourhood. Although a virtual non-entity in terms of place identity and recognition in popular geographies, location in Fleetwood was important because of what it was not. It is here that the racial backdrop to these residential location decisions sometimes surfaced, most often, for instance, through reference to symbolic geographies. The Newton area of Surrey is significantly populated by Indo-Canadians,\textsuperscript{33} and the landscape is

\textsuperscript{33} In 1991, according to 1991 Census data compiled by the Surrey Planning Department, Punjabi was the "mother tongue" of 11.9 percent of Newton residents, compared to 4 percent in Guildford/Fleetwood.
dotted with Sikh temples, markets, and different architectural styles. These characteristics were well known amongst those I spoke with. In comparison to Glenwood where families defined themselves as apart from Whalley, the Berkshire residents I spoke with did not want to live in Newton. According to Mary:

We looked at Newton but it didn't have a very good reputation. Guildford had a pretty good reputation.

Most often, the racial characteristics of Newton weren't mentioned specifically. However, other parts of conversation seemed to imply that the descriptions were racially motivated. At this level, then, Berkshire's position in Surrey - socially, spatially and symbolically - was an indicator of difference that was used in the residential location decision, albeit in a negative way.

A desire for social homogeneity was also manifest in the decision to move to, and life within, Berkshire Park. Primary here was that there be other children, and more specifically families, around. A particular position in the life cycle was actively sought. Part of the reason was practical:

Marie: We asked a few neighbours before we moved in what it was like, the location, whether there were kids and stuff, so that they had somebody to play with.

Sharon: We wanted to find an area with kids. In the old neighbourhood, actually the main reason we moved was there was no kids.

Hal: everybody here has kids and they're all roughly the same age, so you have something in common, a common bond

---

However, not any type of family would be acceptable. The neighbourhood also had to have homeowners, not renters. According to Jess:

> Everyone that moved in here, they were all younger and I guess our age sort of, but they were all buying their house too.

A "community" of homeowners, especially in the starter homes of Berkshire, signified a particular family form:

Andrew: It seems to be mostly younger families, or older people that don't have kids anymore, they just want a nice or smaller home. This area is nice and they don't want a big house.

Darlene: These are good homes for like a starter home, so people move in then have children. And if you have little kids it's great, but now that mine are getting older we're lacking space.

Most importantly, Berkshire was not a place for "welfare families". Sharon, for instance, was looking for a neighbourhood with a particular type of child. She describes her old neighbourhood as:

> there was a house that was rented that kept shifting from different kids that were transient families. They weren't my kind of kids. They didn't have the same values as we did.

and later:

> a lot of the townhomes were government subsidized and we just heard a lot of rumours that the kids weren't being taken care of and we just didn't want our kids to have that upbringing. And then we learned about this area through real estate agents, that in Berkshire Park the school is right in the subdivision it's so easy, and the area was good.

Berkshire, however, had people with similar values to her. As described by her husband Kurt:

> the people are a little bit more, not that Sharon and I are university scholars, but they're [neighbours] are just
different, they teach their kids, a lot of kids are in piano lessons, and hockey, you know, more involvement in community. That’s what was lacking, no community. Nobody had a block watch. We have barbecues and block parties in summer, Christmas parties.

Class was therefore central to good families, and Berkshire represented the right mix for them.

It is important to note, as residents were quick to remind me, "you can't pick your neighbours. You have to take a chance and live with the consequences" [Ron]. However, indirect strategies, based on the cultural encoding of the built environment, were used to attain social homogeneity. Residents wanted to live in a new subdivision, one with houses roughly the same age. Not only did newness imply a greater probability of social homogeneity, new houses and subdivisions also symbolized a particular class fraction and nuclear families. For Tim, it meant working people rather than those on welfare:

Robyn: Thought that a new area would be different?  
Tim: Yeah, more families, or once that in you’re in an area of more expensive houses you’re going to get people that are more, how do you say it, they’re working, and you don’t have to worry about them being on welfare, kids running around and causing problems.

Bruce emphasized the sameness of the built environment:

I thought it was great that the houses were all of a similar ilk, in this one area, because Surrey, characteristically not so much these days, was very mixed, very inconsistent, style and quality of houses you could find. You could find new houses in the middle of modern houses, little old ramshackle huts next door, and the fact that this was all similar style ...

Consistency in the built environment meant consistency of social relations, since, in Sharon’s words, "all these homes would appeal to specific people". These people were young families.
Robyn: What makes it friendly?
Ingrid: I guess because a lot of the families are in the same circumstances. Some very young families with children, and similar knowledge is passed down.

Hal: To me I like this neighbourhood because I find the people here are all basically working class people and they seem to enjoy their lifestyles at home.
Robyn: What do you mean by working class?
Hal: Everybody's working, they're not high income wage earners, they're not low income, it's all middle of the road.

Ingrid: What I like is that things are all on a par. This is a typical, middle income subdivision.

George: In the cul-de-sac we sort of do feel that we are part of a community because the people that we do know are very similar to us with younger families.

A new neighbourhood was crucial here, for as Sam puts it:

Robyn: Wanted to live with similar people?
Sam: I think it causes less problems in the sense that if you go into a more mature area where there's older people and young kids, you would expect there to be a conflict, and through no fault of any particular party if I was an elderly person and I had kids running across my front lawn while I was out gardening every day, that would probably be a bit annoying to me. Or throwing balls around or whatever.

And Mark:

[The neighbourhood matters], from an aesthetic standpoint, driving around looking at the area, seeing a lot of people that basically fit the same mould as what we are, you'll find in this area that almost every house that you come to is pretty much in the same situation. As well as from an economic standpoint it pretty much fit into right where we were. Everybody was pretty much of the same sort of middle class, not to cast any prejudices towards them, but it was all middle class families that were all in the beginning stages of their family and it seemed to fit very nicely with what our thinking was.
These examples are indicative of more than a desire for homogeneity. Class in Berkshire, especially by the men, is experienced in terms of typicality. As long as everyone is in the same boat, they feel comfortable living there.  

New neighbourhoods and Fleetwood also had racial subtexts. Andrew and Fran, for instance, wanted to move into a neighbourhood where all the houses were completed, specifically because they didn’t want to live near a "monster house":

Fran: And driving in it was all complete and everything and that appealed to us, we saw what was here.
Andrew: We looked in some places where half the cul-de-sac was finished but you never know what's on the other half. Especially nowadays when there could be a monster home going up next door.

My impression from this, and other, interviews was that monster houses necessarily meant Indo-Canadian residents. Also part of the Surrey socio-spatial vocabulary is that the Indo-Canadian community build and live in different types of houses. In particular, the houses are seen to be two storeys plus a basement, being capable of housing more than one family. Berkshire residents used this knowledge when choosing where to live. Marie explicitly used house style in her house hunting process.

I don't want them [Indo-Canadians] as my neighbours. There was one new area we were looking at, there were two lots there and we just sat there one day and watched, and all these houses, they don't look like East Indian houses, but they all had ten cars and in and out were all these East Indians. I was surprised because the house didn't look, it was a three level house with a basement which you couldn't even see unless you were at the back. I don't think it's fair that they pay taxes when they've got three families in one house... They stuff our schools when they all live in one house.

Non-Caucasians also made a socioeconomic difference:

35 Lyn Richards, 1990, Nobody's Home: Dreams and Realities in a New Suburb, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, finds the "all in the same boat" sentiment a source of social cohesion in her Australian studies.
Robyn: Most people here Caucasian?
Hal: Not necessarily, no, that's, I think the problem with the high school, this area like I said, it doesn't matter what your ethnic background is, everybody in here is middle class and so we can go out and play volleyball together, it doesn't matter about your ethnic background, but when you get a place like the high school where it's drawing from all different economic levels, and my personal belief is that a lot of your ethnic battling comes from poverty or lack of money or lack of education. And I think that's what happens here.

To summarize, a subtle form of internal coherence was constructed, or at least desired, in Berkshire. The discourse of declining fortunes was invoked and spatialized, albeit in a different way than in Glenwood. Fear of families on welfare and non-white residents led to knowledge of the social and symbolic geographies of Surrey being used to choose to live in a new, complete subdivision in Fleetwood rather than Newton. In this respect, middle-class, white identity was spatialized. Further, the boundaries between residential neighbourhoods, apparently blurry in conventional terms, were quite distinct in symbolic terms.

c. Boundary Maintenance

For a variety of reasons - location, resources etc. - efforts at what I term "boundary maintenance" were not as successful in Berkshire as they were in Glenwood. Attempts were certainly made to maintain the neighbourhood as a place of and for the working, homeowning, family. Nevertheless, its position as a starter neighbourhood for young, homeowning families was being redefined during my interviews. This was the product of two inter-related processes: movement out of the neighbourhood and the resultant change in its social composition.

Of the fifteen families I interviewed, five were either moving or contemplating moving in the next six months. Liz and Jess, for instance,
moved within the subdivision to a bigger house the week after I spoke with them. With the children getting older, Liz felt they needed a bigger house, with, most importantly, two bathrooms. Marie was also looking for a bigger house, and this time they wanted to build their own. Others were moving because of what they perceived as a deterioration in the neighbourhood. Hal’s children were nearly of high school age and he was concerned about sending them to Johnston Heights High School:

If we stayed in this, I would be going into hearsay, because I don’t know the high school, I’ve never set foot into it, from what I understand the high school has an ethnic problem.

The resultant changing social character of the area was startling and worrying to residents:

One thing that is happening right now is because it’s a starter neighbourhood the houses are cheaper and investors are starting to buy up and have rented out a couple of them. [Andrew]

A number of houses have been sold and been bought by investors and put renters in them.

It was universally acknowledged that the houses and yards of renters were different:

George: Yeah, usually more rundown. People don’t take as good care of them. Not necessarily noisier, maybe a little more inconsiderate because they don’t feel as part of the neighbourhood as the rest of them.

Sid: We can tell a renter’s house because of the change in the maintenance of the property. The previous owners were meticulous.

Social relations were also different, particular social norms weren’t generally adhered to.
Traci: I think that people that rent their houses don't seem to care as much, at least people that I've noticed around here they don't care as much what happens to their house. We had renters across the street that had starlings inside the attic of their house and the siding was starting to peel off and they didn't care. ... They just seem to think that it's not their property so they don't take as much care with it.

Tim: You don't know who's gonna move in, or what type of people you're gonna get, you might get three guys who party all night. I worry about that. Are you going to get a crack house? You see that on TV all the time. But you wouldn't get that around here. But you never know when it's renters.

Given the perceived social locations and attitudes of renters, "problems" with renters invariably surfaced. Then a number of solutions were available and tried. The first was ignoring them, which was often taken. Complaints to more official bodies could be made, as Tim recalled:

Here, we've had a lot of people, some of the renters really let their yards go really bad to the point I even, I would generally never do this, but I had to complain to city hall. Just because their grass was too high, and it was distracting for cars coming round the corner, you couldn't see them.

More common was for the surrounding neighbours (usually the men) to get together and approach the offenders. The story of one instance is told by Bruce:

We've had a lot of trouble with renters, especially with the house next door to us. The house right adjacent to us was sold I guess about twelve months after we moved in, and the first four lots of tenants that we had were just awful and we had real trouble with them, with dogs, not cleaning up the mess, music, loud, late at night, and now fortunately they do have fairly good tenants.

Strategies like suggesting the tenants hire Darlene's sons to mow the lawns and phoning the real estate agent and/or owner in the middle of the night

36 It wasn't by design that I didn't interview any renters, thus my discussion is of the views of homeowners.
when they had been wakened by the tenants, were employed, often successfully. Another, and far more preferable, solution was to wait till the current tenants moved and pressure the landlord to rent to a family. A traditional family was far more acceptable:

Mark: We were saying maybe what you should do is look for families and put families in there and things will probably go a lot smoother.
Joanne: Which has now happened.
Mark: Yeah, they're a couple from England. Their kids have heavy accents, it was funny to watch the intermingling of the kids.

These attempts to maintain homogeneity in Berkshire had, until now, mixed success. It is important to note, however, that the actual Berkshire Park subdivision was partially immune to the influx of renters. It was the destination of people moving out of Westpark, and the turnover of population was low.

*d. Bounding Home*

If the boundaries around Berkshire were blurred and ambiguous, then the walls around house and home were well-defined. When a more openly cultural perspective on the spatialization of middle-class life is adopted, different forms of boundaries become apparent. A trend throughout the neighbourhood was the building of walls around home and family, especially in Westpark, where the distance between neighbours was small physically. There, privacy or more specifically lack of privacy was a universal concern. Henry was most disturbed:

we thought of all the close homes and small spaces around the homes, sort of a lack of privacy, and we’re exactly in that situation. Our neighbours when they’re barbecuing their patio is on the second level so they can look down onto our yard.
According to Mary:

Actually that's one of my big gripes, because you can always hear what's going on next door and you don't really want everybody to know all the time, all families argue.

Responses to the sense that personal space was being invaded were varied. Most saw one positive aspect, summarized by Mary:

It's funny, we have a block watch programme but we don't really need it because in this particular cul-de-sac you can see everything that goes on anyway.

Another reaction was to set up intangible barriers to combat the lack of physical space between neighbours. Henry, for instance, had put a sign on his door saying "do not disturb" so that his children could spend time with their parents. As he puts it:

We don't want to over involve our kids and that it's not necessary for them to have their friends around all the time.

Notably, however, these feelings were unusual.

More widespread were definitions of "good neighbour" that maintained social distance, as expressed by Ingrid:

I didn't make a point of going out to get to know them and neither did they; it was more a sense of regarding each other's privacy because we were so close here.

Friends and neighbours were different, according to Liz:

we're not great friends with a lot of them but I mean they're good neighbours in that sense. Cordial, they'll say hi and what not, and that's what I figure a neighbour is.

And Joanne:

It's not, we don't do a lot of social things, we chat outside in the summer time or you watch over each other's homes so they weren't, you don't get to know them on a really close basis.
A good neighbour, therefore, was one who helped out in times of crisis, watched property, but kept their distance socially. Mary, for instance, was adamant that her neighbours were not friends.

**IV. Conclusion: The Racialization and Intertwining of Declining Fortunes and New Traditionalism**

In this chapter I have asked two inter-related questions: how is white, middle-class, familial identity, in the context of declining fortunes, spatialized; and what insight is gained by initiating a conversation between two different perspectives on the boundaries of suburbs. I have suggested that the perception that Surrey is a sea of trouble, crime and chaos, and that a relatively homogeneous living space is most desirable, guided residents' decisions about where to live, and was spatially manifested in the erection of symbolic and physical walls around those living spaces. Practices within the neighbourhoods reconstituted these places and fortified the walls that had been built, with the subdivisions seen as white, middle-class, familial oases. Symbolic geographies, in terms of knowledge about particular places and people, were central to these processes. Thus suburban exclusion appears to have been recreated, but in response to different imperatives, which in these case studies were the perceived disintegration of family life, a "fear" of falling, and the racial heterogeneity that surrounded the white, family, people of Berkshire and Glenwood.

Although forged within the general categories of declining fortunes and new traditionalism, practices and ideologies with respect to exclusion differed between the two neighbourhoods. Part of this difference is due to life course, with Glenwood expressive of a more settled, later "stage" and
Berkshire of those identifying themselves as "starting out", differences I consider further in the next chapter. But the differences can also be traced to financial security and its cultural and spatial expression. In Glenwood, there was seen to be nothing wrong with exclusivity and boundaries, and residents could afford (in terms of both time and money) to continue to isolate themselves and their children. These desires were not articulated in racial terms, maybe because non-white families were not seen to be a threat since they were so far away. In Berkshire, however, Glenwood was viewed as "snobby", and the desire for isolation was criticized on the grounds that children should learn to be part of society, whatever that was, and anyway, isolation would not work. Yet race was clearly invoked by residents, perhaps because of the immediacy of racial tension, especially at the high school. In both cases, then, we are beginning to see fractures, accommodations and recastings of declining fortunes and new traditionalism. In the following two chapters I further differentiate these ideals along the lines of gender and the meaning of the home.
CHAPTER FIVE
GENDER CLASS AND HOME: PLACING THE CONNECTIONS

And it's safe, you feel that once you get home you don't feel very vulnerable at all. It covers a whole spectrum of emotions, there's physical things about your home as well as emotional parts that are kind of intangible. Like when you get back from a long trip you're always happy to be at home because your home has that sort of, you walk up these stairs and you sit down on the chesterfield and say thank god I'm home. It's certainly not because our chesterfield is any more comfortable than the one you're [me] sitting on, but it's just that feeling you get when you get home, has a lot to do with that environment. It's kind of a family home. That's what this has become, a family home.

It's our investment, it's a growing investment, to me it's our investment to the future, we financially made some arrangements, we don't have a lot of insurance anymore, but what we have is in our house, and our house may be paid for in a few years. It's our investment for retirement, as long as we have this, and we've paid for it, we can sell it some day and it will be worth a deal of money. So if you're looking at pension plans that are going down the tubes and everything else, it's our security, it's what we have that's of value, so it's our safe place and it's our security for the future.

Contrary to common expectations, the first quote is from a man, the second a woman. I say contrary because the alignment of men with emotional and familial meanings of home, and a relation between women and the investment and social class aspects of housing, are not captured by contemporary understandings of the meaning of home in western, urban societies.1 Despite (and maybe because of) Peter Saunders' claim that

1 There are many "meanings of home" - security, haven, comfort, family, investment - to name a few, as outlined in Robert Rakoff, 1977, "Ideology in everyday life: the meaning of the house", Politics and Society, 7,1, pp. 85-105; and more recently in Richard Harris and Geraldine Pratt, 1993, "The meaning of home, homeownership and public policy" in L. Bourne and D. Ley, eds. The Changing Social Geography of Canadian Cities, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press. I focus on the meaning of homeownership in a particular way in this
gender doesn't differentiate meanings of home, gender is increasingly recognized as modifying the social relations of housing production and consumption. However, the links between gender, class and home are conceptualized in limited ways that perpetuate the masculinist view that homeownership has more class significance for men than women, and that the familial aspects of home are more important to women than men.

The positing of limited links between gender, class and home is common throughout the housing literature. Ray Forrest and Alan Murie's oft-cited "Affluent homeowners", for instance, flattens the familial aspects of their respondents' accounts of their housing moves. Forrest and Murie devote much attention to one executive and his housing history. On my reading of this executive's story, children and schools appear important motivating factors, yet Forrest and Murie ignore this to highlight the importance of housing subsidies and a concern with the investment value of housing. A consideration of men as providers would not necessarily mitigate

---


5 See especially p.348.
Forrest and Murie's story, but could enhance it by situating the affluent homeowner as male. \(^6\) Work on women and housing similarly fails to adequately consider the status aspirations embedded in homeownership for women. Although the differential access of women to homeownership is well documented,\(^7\) women's experiences of homeownership, in class terms, is comparatively unknown. But if we take the claim that analysis of the meaning of the home needs to be conducted at the individual, rather than household, level,\(^8\) then it follows that the possibility of multiple inter-relations between gender, class and home need to be acknowledged at the outset.

My aim in this chapter is to complicate our understanding of gendered and classed meanings of the home by documenting how homeownership has familial and status meanings for both men and women. However, by exploring these meanings through the lens of place, I also wish to show how they are determined by specific contexts, and, consequently, that relations between gender, class and home are also geographically variable. The concept of place I focus on in this chapter is that of "local cultures of property", a notion that acknowledges place-specific attitudes towards, and practices within, the housing market.\(^9\) I use the concept to demonstrate the variable contexts in which different meanings of home are produced and

---

\(^6\) Geraldine Pratt adopts a similar strategy in a reconsideration of her work on homeownership and identity, noting that homeownership appeared to be central to middle-class male rather than female identity. See Geraldine Pratt, 1990, "On the reproduction of academic discourse: class and the spatial structure of the city" paper presented at the AAG, Toronto, April.

\(^7\) Munro and Smith find, for instance, that women's "attainment" of homeownership is dependent on having a partner, not income, whereas for men income and occupation are the primary factors. Moira Munro and Susan J. Smith, 1989, "Gender and housing: broadening the debate", Housing Studies, 4,1, pp.3-17. See also Sophie Watson, 1988, Accommodating Inequality, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

\(^8\) Madigan and Munro, 1991, \textit{op.cit.}

\(^9\) In this sense my analysis builds upon Marc Choko and Richard Harris, 1990, "The local culture of property: a comparative history of housing tenure in Montreal and Toronto", Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 80,1, pp.73-95.
interpreted. In terms of the aims of the thesis, my consideration of actual homes in this chapter is also an attempt to suggest another imbrication of place and identity. As will be evident by the end of the chapter, actual homes and the ideals that construct them are insightful indications of the way practices and meanings of a place are drawn upon in situating identity. This chapter is also implicitly about the senses of home that are seen to be most appropriate to new traditionalist lives within the context of "declining fortunes".

Talking about class in relation to the home is fraught with dangers of misinterpretation, historically involving debates about different theories of class and the importance of homeownership to class consciousness and fragmentation. I therefore use the term class in a very specific way in this chapter. Working within a Weberian template, I focus on social class, which refers to a cluster of class situations (defined in relation to market capacities), that are linked by common life chances and consumption patterns. Social class includes both positions in relation to power and the market, and the consumption patterns and evaluations of that position. Social class is dynamic, emerging out of the process of class structuration. As Eric Olin Wright summarizes Giddens:

> Classes are the outcome of a process through which economic categories ... defined by market capacities, are transformed into collectivities sharing common lived experiences.

---


The home, as an investment, consumption item, and focus of status evaluations, is therefore critical to social class, as I show in this chapter. I am not, however, talking about how social classes, like the middle-class, are formed. Rather, I focus on what Giddens calls class "awareness", cognizance and acceptance of similar attitudes and beliefs, linked to a style of life. In other words, I am most interested in how people position themselves in class terms, via and through their housing situation. By focusing on the way people in Glenwood and Berkshire interpret their class placement, I continue my concern with identity and its negotiation and gendering. Such a concern may also facilitate an analysis of the erasures and closures associated with understandings of gender, class and home.

The chapter is in three parts. In the first, I develop the concept of a local culture of property and outline its contours in Surrey, highlighting its embeddedness in a discourse of declining fortunes. I illustrate the reworking of this culture by Glenwood residents in the second section, connecting it to dominant class meanings of home held by both men and women, although I also note the negotiation and instability of these meanings. The culture of property and meanings of home in Berkshire are the focus of the third section. I tell a story where the modification of housing as an investment by familial ideals and material constraints, results in very different, though no less gendered, meanings of home.

---


15 Giddens, op.cit. p.111.
I. Climbing the Ladder of Homeownership in Surrey

Meanings of home are necessarily drawn from context, and in the two case studies presented here were the outcome of the concept of climbing the ladder of homeownership. Housing in Berkshire and Glenwood was conceptualized in terms of a ladder: not only was there a transition from renter to owner, but it was seen to be natural and desirable to climb a ladder of ownership, from starter home to more luxurious (and expensive) home. The notion of housing career, where housing transitions occur over the life course, is not new. What appears to be different in these two neighbourhoods, however, is the stated importance of making money from housing. For most of the families I interviewed, the family home was explicitly an investment, and often the life course involved moving and "trading up" in housing. In this respect, the local culture of property that I detail in this chapter is in direct contradiction to both Forrest and Murie's findings, and Matthew Edel, Elliot Sclar and Daniel Luria's description of homeownership as running up a down escalator. More specifically, according to Forrest and Murie:

There is little to suggest that individuals have achieved social mobility through conscious manipulation of the housing market.

20 Forrest and Murie, op.cit. p.87.
Yet both these studies approach social mobility in entirely economic terms, focusing on whether homeownership create material benefits. Although important, I add a modifying subjective layer to these analyses: does the home signify mobility and a class position? In particular, I demonstrate that in Glenwood and Berkshire, the goal of achieving social mobility through housing was widespread, albeit unevenly realized.

This culture of climbing a ladder of ownership can be thought of as local in three ways. First, it may be specific to the Lower Mainland. House prices there have been steadily rising over the past thirty years, especially over the 1980s and 1990s. In this context, it has been possible to realize considerable capital gains from housing. According to research done by the Vancouver Sun for their series on the death of the middle class, a house bought for $25,000 in 1965 was worth $270,000 in 1992. The possibility of making money from housing was well known, either personally or through tales from friends. Doug's first hand experience is like many of the stories I was told that residents had themselves heard "on the grapevine":

I bought a house [in 1970], my first house was just a little $23,000 house, and the second house, the one that I bought previous to moving here, I bought for $60,000 and I ended up finding out that I could get $260,000 for it. So I ended up driving here, with the thought that I was going to transfer with my job, which I did. Things sort of went hand in hand, I was kind of lucky that way. Anyhow, we discovered driving out here that we could buy anywhere in Surrey, with a lot more baths, a lot more room, and have money in the bank. Which is what we did, sold the house, moved out here [Glenwood], we have money in the bank and we're happy as clams.

In addition, housing in Greater Vancouver continues to be seen as one of the few "sure bets" in this chaotic world. Despite lamenting the impossibility of

21 Discussed in chapter one.
23 His house in Glenwood cost $190,000.
homeownership for many in the middle class, the Vancouver Sun, for instance, quotes an economist who "doesn’t expect to see any change [in house price trends] - barring a total economic collapse - in the next ten years". In the Vancouver metropolitan area, then, climbing the housing, economic and social ladder was feasible, defining one scale at which the culture of property was local.

Second, the workings of the culture were local. There was a housing ladder within Surrey: moving up meant moving within Surrey, not "across the bridge" into Coquitlam, not to the more traditional elite areas of the Lower Mainland like Shaughnessy or West Vancouver, nor even further up the Fraser Valley to get more land. House prices were crucial in constructing a local culture. A house that cost $300,000 in Surrey would be at the top-end of the market there, but near the bottom in the City of Vancouver. Moving out of Surrey would invariably mean moving "down" the social ladder. By the same token, moving to Surrey (despite its negative image) could be moving "up", exemplified by Doug who I mentioned above. The realization of the local ideals of housing, therefore, was dependent on place-specific meanings.

The rest of this chapter is about the third sense in which the culture of property was local. The culture operated in specific ways within Surrey and therefore produced place-specific meanings of home. Different economic resources, and variable orientations toward new traditionalist families, resulted in different housing strategies and meanings, as I show in the following two sections.

II. The Alignment of Gender and Class Meanings of Home in Glenwood

For Glenwood residents, housing was a means to achieving social mobility, identification with a particular social class, and for most, Glenwood was at the top of the homeownership ladder. In the first part of this section I outline a general pattern of housing moves of those currently living in Glenwood, stressing that this trajectory was seen as a joint or family project. As a result, as I suggest in the second part, both men and women had much of their class identity invested in their housing, especially the housing position symbolized by Glenwood. I attempt to complicate this picture in the third part by considering the gender differentiation and contestation these housing careers implied.

a. Glenwood as the Pinnacle of the Housing Ladder

That housing was an investment (sometimes primarily) was a given for Glenwood residents. Debby, for instance, was concerned with the resale value of any house she bought; Brian was similarly aware of the financial return housing provided. Rather than being content with benefitting from the capital gain Glenwood homeowners happened to make, they actively tried to maximize this gain. The strategy Libby and David adopted was to sell their house every five years, as explained by Libby:

Just previous to this we lived over in Fleetwood. And we had built that home ourselves, and the game plan was that we would keep the home for four or five years, we would flip it, and we would move somewhere else. Well, there we were, four years along and the mortgage was just fitting nicely, we had another child on the way and we decided well, we're supposed to sell this house now. So we put the house on the market, the real estate man appraised it. Sunday we went out for brunch while he had his open house, and when we came home our house was sold. So we moved into here in 1987, so this was 1986. So then, we thought, my god, where are we going to live.
Moving into a house, paying off as much as they could on the mortgage, and then selling ("flipping") the house meant that large steps up the housing ladder could be made, for two reasons. First, the house would have appreciated so they could afford more, and second, they could borrow proportionately more because of increased income and lower debt level. Thus mortgage payments would stay the same or increase marginally, whereas the value of the home was significantly greater.

Kathy and Glen’s housing career was similar. They had bought in Langley because it was all they could afford - "housing was so much cheaper". After five years, they "decided to make a move" to "a nicer house". But, according to Kathy:

We ended up selling that house shortly after, two years after, just because the housing market was sort of booming and we got caught up in it, and thought we could make some money.

They then moved to Glenwood (partly motivated by Glen’s career change), and sold their first house in Glenwood after three years, again to realize a profit.

These are just two examples of the common housing aspirations of Glenwood residents; I summarize other experiences in Table 5.1. There is a further localization of this housing strategy worth pointing out. Not only was there awareness of the state of the housing market, but the financial benefits of housing were also sought and constructed (in a literal sense) through self-building. Of the families I spoke with, half had direct contact with self-building either through employment (Brian and Julie), relatives (Libby and David), buying from an independent contractor who had previously lived in the house (Doug and Louise; Pete and Anne; Gerald) or active involvement in building their house (Kathy and Glen; Debby and Steve). Contrary to Richard
Harris' findings about the working class nature of self-building in Canadian cities, self-building in Glenwood was a middle class strategy used to climb the housing ladder. Two instances are important to detail.

Brian and Julie were self-employed contractors who had built every house they had lived in. When "moving-up", they would sell their home, move back in with Julie's parents, and build another one. As Julie explained:

Brian had been building here [Glenwood] when we bought our lot in Somerset Estates. We wanted to live here but had to do one more step, wanted to be here, but moving from our first house, we just weren't ready for it, built this house, in Somerset where the lot was $47,000. Here the lot was $67,000 and we couldn't afford it. But in Somerset we realized we'd built too grand for the area, knew enough about the market, knew that if we didn't make our move quickly, our value would go down. So we decided to move up here. We wanted it, were really happy when a lot was available.

Similarly, Libby's cousin was a builder, and he used their house in Glenwood as an advertisement, and they were able to save money.

Technically, the above two examples are not self building. However, Glen and Kathy built all their own homes except their first, as a way to make money. Glen explains:

We went and bought a lot [in Langley] and built a house, without really knowing what the heck we were doing. It turned out to be quite lucrative in terms of making some money on the equity, it didn't mean money in our pocket, but it was tax free. We had a more valuable house and smaller mortgage, so when we were going to make the move to Surrey that was our objective, we weren't looking for a house, we were looking for a piece of property to build and move in to.

---

26 Another controlled subdivision in Surrey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Housing Career Before Glenwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>J: at home 27 &lt;br&gt; Brian B: self-employed builder</td>
<td>First lived in a house in Surrey, built by Brian; 4 years later moved to another house in a subdivision Brian was building in; then moved to Glenwood when the opportunity arose. They had made money on all their houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrie</td>
<td>K: at home  &lt;br&gt; Jim J: salesman</td>
<td>Bought their first house 10 years ago in Surrey, with the intent of selling it after five and &quot;moving up&quot;. Moved to Glenwood five years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debby</td>
<td>D: at home  &lt;br&gt; Steve S: self-employed contractor</td>
<td>Bought their first house in Surrey 9 years ago after renting an apartment for a year. Moved to Glenwood because previous neighbourhood was &quot;deteriorating&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby</td>
<td>L: physiotherapist  &lt;br&gt; David D: teacher</td>
<td>Bought a house in Fleetwood finishing university; with the aim of selling after five years. Family connections helped them &quot;make it&quot; to Glenwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>M: clerk  &lt;br&gt; Ernie E: teacher</td>
<td>Lived in East Vancouver (owned two houses there) for 20 years; wanted to get away from the &quot;rat-race&quot;, sold for profit and moved to &quot;fancier&quot; house in Glenwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mina</td>
<td>M: nurse  &lt;br&gt; Gerald G: doctor</td>
<td>Glenwood first house they owned since migrating from England. Chose it because of location, affordability and it &quot;looked nice&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>S: at home  &lt;br&gt; John J: teacher</td>
<td>After renting for 2 years, bought a house in Fleetwood 8 years ago; 4 years later moved to Glenwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>K: teacher  &lt;br&gt; Glen G: business owner</td>
<td>Lived in a co-op for two years, then bought in Langley, quickly moved to another Langley house to maximize their capital gain; then to Glenwood as part of Glen’s new business; had sold and built another house in Glenwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>J: physiotherapist  &lt;br&gt; Rob R: engineer</td>
<td>After moving from Calgary lived in Kamloops 10 years; moved to Glenwood as part of Rob's job transfer. Wanted a controlled subdivision because of investment value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

27 I speak of these women’s labour market experiences and current activities in more detail in chapter six.
### Table 5.1. (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Housing Career Before Glenwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>M: nurse</td>
<td>Lived on acreage in Surrey until moved to Glenwood seven years ago. Moved so that children would have safe space to play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmond</td>
<td>D: self-employed contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>R: at home</td>
<td>After renting for a year, bought house in Coquitlam; 3 years later moved to Glenwood, with financial help from parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>E: manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>A: clerk</td>
<td>Could only afford to live in Newton after marriage; became concerned about safety and desirability of neighbourhood and their investment, so moved to Glenwood. Were struggling to pay the mortgage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>P: electrician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>K: at home</td>
<td>They bought their first house in Maple Ridge 10 years ago; moving to Glenwood 4 years later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>G: sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>V: at home</td>
<td>Been in Glenwood five years, in two different houses (current one bigger and more expensive). Previously, lived in North Surrey, moved when mortgage &quot;under control&quot; and could increase value of housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>M: sales (home-based)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>L: at home</td>
<td>Owned two houses in Burnaby (see text), then sold for more luxurious surroundings in Glenwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>D: training manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-building, or more specifically buying a lot, picking a house design and contracting out the actual building, was a way to increase the financial return on the investment, since it meant the profit from both the land and the house would accrue to the owner-occupier.\textsuperscript{28} Importantly, self-building also provided an escalator up the housing ladder.

\textsuperscript{28} James Barlow, 1992, "Self-promoted housing and capitalist suppliers: the case of France", *Housing Studies*, 7,4, pp. 255-67 talks about the different forms of profit in residential development.
b. Aligning Gender, Class and Home in Glenwood

Climbing the housing ladder was a joint strategy, involving men and women. It was a familial goal: either money for retirement (seen clearly in the quote from Anne with which I began this chapter), or to provide an appropriate environment in which to raise children (detailed in chapter four). In other words, the housing ladder was familial, a point that has implications for the meanings of home expressed. In particular, it meant that the social class location of both female and male residents of Glenwood were drawn from the homes in which they lived.

For men, their Glenwood homes (see Figures 5.1 and 5.2) indicated substantial affluence and success in the housing market. The following long quote from Glen summarizes this:

I'm the type of person, if we were in the first house we were in, which was a nice house but compared to this place we're in was a dumply little house. I was perfectly happy there, and I'd still be happy there. This is like a palace for me, in fact my brother, the first house we built was quite similar to this one, when I have business associates home for dinner, the home is the family. It's not the building, I couldn't care less, I mean hey it's great to have a nice house, but I bring business associates over for dinner, I like to bring them to my home, not my house, my home, my brother said "make sure you tell Hank that you built that house while you were still a teacher, 'cos, as our customer, he might look around and think we're making too much money". I think it's rich, we couldn't afford to buy this house if we hadn't built it. I think it's rich, I couldn't afford the mortgage that most of my neighbours have, I'd have to sacrifice our entertainment, food, we couldn't afford it.

Two things are notable in this passage. First, Glen drew part of his class identity from the house and its location. He seems pleased that he is surrounded by people with higher incomes, indirectly endowing him, in the Glenwood imagination at least, with more income than he earns. Notice, for instance, his repetition of "I think its rich", signalling perhaps his concern
with income and its communication through housing. Second, Glen is well aware of what Glenwood as home means in class terms, and has also formed an impression of what I may think of it. Consequently, he tried to downplay the ostentation of Glenwood. He wants me to know that he would have been happy in "a dumpy little house" and that home is family. Yet it was also clear that home to Glen was something you had, and something to flaunt to business associates and relatives.

What seemed most important were others' opinions of the men, based on the house. Work, and work colleagues, were definitely important referents, illustrated in the experience of Doug. He had recently moved from "maintenance" to "training" for a large crown corporation and the meaning of his house accentuated this move and helped bridge the difference between his old and new class positions at work. His maintenance workmates tended to be critical of his residence:

> When I first moved in here people described me as a plutocrat, and they said look where Doug lives, look at that fancy subdivision, and I described it as nice subdivision in Surrey.

Although he tries to downplay it, it became obvious in his response that he liked Glenwood and identified with it. This is what he told his workmates:

> It's a controlled subdivision, I tell them all the things like you can't have vinyl siding, you've got to have hidden gutters, blah, blah blah, so I describe how nice it is. I also say what I told you, you can't drive through here to go anywhere, we don't have people with cars jacked up in the front yard. And I guess the people that moved in here, maybe I'm a bit of a snob, had a little more money, if they didn't have the money they were going to go to some of the other places in Surrey so financially the people that are in here can afford to buy new cars and not have them jacked up in the driveways. That did appeal to me. ... When you look around I don't know if you noticed the street lamps, there's special streetlamps and they only go in certain subdivisions where the developer wants to pay more.
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Figure 5.1. Display Home Plan, Glenwood
Source: Chrisdale Homes Advertising Brochure.
Figure 5.2. Glenwood Homes
What is interesting here is that home was not just the house, but also the Glenwood subdivision. The uniformity that was desired to separate Glenwood residents from the chaos of Surrey was also used to place its residents in class terms. Like Glen, Doug saw Glenwood as a place for people with more money and with a different aesthetic that emphasized "class" and "taste" rather than the tackiness exemplified by cars in yards. In this respect, the money Doug had made from his previous house allowed him to move to Glenwood and helped position himself as different from those with whom he worked.

Status in the eyes of friends and acquaintances was also important. Ernie seemed especially concerned with how others thought of him. He made his friends experience the "niceness" of Glenwood:

> Whenever I invite people over I give them instructions so that they come through the front, even though its shorter from the back. I want them to take that drive, because it's a nice drive.

He wanted people to see, and admire, his home in its context. One plausible interpretation of Ernie's actions is that he was hoping people would position him economically in terms of the house and neighbourhood.

Living in Glenwood houses was also important to the class perception of the Glenwood women. Since most of them were at-home mothers and had clear housing related status aspirations, housing became one of the most important referents of their class situation. This centrality of home was further reinforced by their time and emotional investment in their homes. A certain pride in their homes and their neighbourhood was almost universal. According to Kathy:

> When we first drove into this subdivision and we were describing it to our in-laws and things, it was labelled "executive subdivision". We came from, you know, much simpler homes, we had never seen anything like this. We
thought it was the most gorgeous subdivision we had ever seen. With the trees down the road and the cobblestones entrance and the split entranceway and they made it pretty grandiose, flags flying all over the place. I know at first when we were describing to people how to get here we'd say look for the green and white flags at the entrance to the subdivision, it was almost tacky. We were really pleased with it, we thought it was really quite fancy, quite special.

Although she wants to deny that what the area and house looked like were important to her, my impression was that the acquisition of material possessions was an important marker in her self-identification and how she was perceived by others. This was confirmed later in my visit. I had finished speaking to her husband, and went to look for her to thank her and say goodbye. Glen couldn't find her anywhere, and the children didn't know where she was. She was finally located in the garage, sitting in their brand new car with a friend who had been invited around to see it. She was very proud of it, telling me that she was showing off her brand new car. It is possible, therefore, that Glenwood could be both "grandiose" and important to the social class of Kathy, especially as determined by others like her friend.

Again, labour market position was important to the particular class meaning drawn from Glenwood homes. Anne sensed that her neighbours’ incomes were far greater than hers, a factor that made her extremely proud of living in Glenwood, especially when she compared it to her previous Newton neighbourhood. She recalls:

Some people that I work with like to call this snob hill. They do, because they are more expensive priced homes, this is one of Surrey’s higher priced areas, that’s why they call it snob hill.

Lastly, some felt the neighbourhood signified a class beyond what they felt comfortable with. On the one hand, Ruby says:
When we were building I was afraid it was maybe too uppity. When I first saw it I thought wow, this is really, this is kind of uh, I don’t know, very fancy looking I thought. Just the homes and everything were nice, it’s something I never dreamed I’d ever live in, you know, so I’m really glad to be here.

But now,

I feel better about the fact that it’s not as uppity because Abbey Glen has gone in and the homes are much bigger, but it really was a concern. I just didn’t want my kids to grow up snobby, and also being in a private school, some private schools can have that reputation, and I didn’t want that, I didn’t want to be like that and I don’t want to live in a place like that.

Ruby was concerned that her children would think they were better than they actually were, given their home and its location in Glenwood. However, by comparing Glenwood to other subdivisions north of the freeway that were more "uppity", Ruby felt more comfortable with the class signals sent by Glenwood. Nevertheless, the point remains that class was an important referent of home for the women of Glenwood.

c. Gender Divisions and Glenwood Homes

Even if housing was a joint strategy and social class indicators of home were important to both men and women in Glenwood, gender divisions remained. Any conclusions about gender, class and home, therefore, need to be multi-layered. I explore two aspects of the layering of meaning and gender identity here: gender differentiated linkages of the status and familial aspects of home; and the gender division of labour necessary to produce classed meanings of home.

Family, children, privacy and haven are well known meanings of home; ones more often associated with women than men, and sometimes seen to be in conflict with the investment value of housing. In Glenwood, where
gender did matter was in the meshing of the two ideals of housing. For men, the two ideals often clashed. As I indicated above, climbing the housing ladder meant moving spatially. Yet stasis was required to raise children in an appropriate environment - Glenwood. This was especially evident for the self-employed men whose wives didn't work in the paid labour force,\(^{29}\) exemplified in the lives and decisions of Steve and Debby. Steve felt his familial obligations were to "provide a nice home, that's essential", something he was "very comfortably" doing currently. But since housing to him was also an investment and status indicator, he was also faintly disappointed with his Glenwood house. I asked if he was comfortable living in Glenwood:

> Very comfortable and maybe sometimes too comfortable, I thought maybe we'd move every five to seven years if the finances were in order, we'd make that extra jump up, to something a bit bigger. We're looking at Panorama Ridge, but it would have to be the exact right move.

Later he says:

> I've got dreams and goals, I think I'd like to move, one more move is right I think, pre-retirement. ... My house is also an investment.

His desire to make money out of his house and exemplify his class position, is at present in conflict with the desire to raise children in the appropriate place. When he refers to the "exact right move" above, he means that they want to find a neighbourhood exactly like Glenwood in familial terms. Debby is most articulate about these concerns:

> It has to be worthwhile to move, otherwise you're just spending money on real estate fees. And we're afraid that we'll move and get less out of the community than what we've got. That's why a lot of people here move two or three times within the same area.

\(^{29}\) I provide more details on their activities in chapter six.
They had been discussing leaving Glenwood, but had stayed because of the family environment I document in chapter six. In this example, the familial and class associations of home were incompatible at present.

Such tensions were not inherent to Glenwood men, others found ways of resolving class and familial meanings of home by moving within Glenwood. Kathy and Glen, whom I discussed above in relation to self-building, had lived in their first Glenwood home for three years when the urge to move for financial reasons struck. However, this urge was moderated by familial concerns, most forcefully articulated by Kathy. As Glen recalls:

> Now, we've often said, I mean we'd like to build another house, we've made so much money on this one it's crazy, as long as you watch things you can do really well, but we wouldn't want to live anywhere else now, we have the ideal spot. Jokingly, there's a lot beside us that's still vacant, and we jokingly said it would be nice to buy that lot, build, stay here while we're building, and then move

They sold their house, bought another lot in Glenwood, and built another house. In this way, he felt he was in a win-win situation: doing the right thing for his family, himself and his finances. Importantly, however, the other aspect of gender divisions in Glenwood is also clear. Kathy did all the work of the move:

> There were all kind of costs for moving, my husband was too busy to build again, so he said if you want to do it you can do it, you can sell, you can build, you can do it all by yourself. So I thought well, you gotta do it. So that's how we ended up with this lot, and I did the contracting. I was the builder, all myself. It took about four months and in the mean time we went through incredible upheaval because we weren't in a financial position that we could stay in the first house while we were building this one, we needed to sell it. So then we were out of a place to live, so we moved into this dump out in Chilliwack, it was so bad that we didn't even have to pay our rent. And I commuted each day with the kids, brought them to school here, stayed here and supervised the building and finally we moved in.

It was Kathy's work that allowed them both to achieve social mobility.
At the same time, Kathy's account suggests the more seamless interweaving of status and family in Glenwood women's interpretations of home. As well as being concerned with investment, Kathy evocatively describes her home in familial terms:

I often think, I walk in this house, and this is our little cocoon, and how the kids view it, I think they must walk in this house and I think they feel safe. This is their space, they're safe here, these walls will protect them. You're just so contained in here somehow. And I think that's what I like about our home. It has that feeling of security, warmth, it's ours, we have the space in the backyard, I absolutely love that, again it's privacy, it just has a good feeling in it, it's a home.

Her identities as mother, homeowner and homemaker seemed to coincide, a not uncommon response. In addition to the house as a retirement fund, Sue saw Glenwood and her current home as "classy". Yet a longer quote reveals how class and family neatly coalesce:

This particular home financially makes me feel really stable, it's my dream home, I feel like we're a success, we've reached our goal in our home. We have a really nice home, we live in a really nice neighbourhood, it's nice. I hope and feel that this is a warm place for kids to be and will always feel comfortable coming back. Like when you're out and away or whatever, it's home, it's our goal, and we've met our goal.

Anne is an exception to the general trend of the alignment of status and family for women. With her home sparsely and cheaply furnished when I visited, Anne’s goal, as the children get older and the mortgage payments decrease, is to make the house "fancier" and more "elegant". Only then, she thinks, will it be more fitting to the neighbourhood, and only then could she afford it. Her house at present, then, conflicts with what a home in Glenwood should be, because of a perceived tension between having a "nice" house, and having a family:
Just make it fancier, but I don’t really see a need until the kids become a little more civilized adults because I think that once you have all those nice things you’re definitely much more stressed with the children, even when it was new it was very tough. We went to visit friends in Coquitlam not too long ago and they have a beautiful 4000 square foot home, it’s just huge, but the husband and the children are allowed to sit on one tiny little spot in the family room on a certain couch and that’s it. It’s elegant and it’s lovely and beautiful, but it’s not really home, so no sense in doing that till they get older. We couldn’t afford it number one, and it was driving me absolutely crazy when we first moved in trying to keep it spotless and shipshape and everything.

*d. Homemaking and the Gendering of Identity*

Gender divisions sustained the social mobility and class meaning drawn from home by both men and women in Glenwood. With few exceptions women were responsible for "homemaking" practices: vacuuming, laundry, cleaning, flowers etc. Both women and men operated with a spatialized gender division of labour that assigned the outside to men and the inside to women. According to Rob:

Most of the outside stuff’s mine, most of the inside stuff’s hers. She does almost all the cooking, I’ll do the occasional breakfast and that sort of stuff. She does most of the housework, that’s about it. I look after the pool, the garbage, the back, I look after anything that’s broke.

Pete was telling me that there really was no gender difference in his house, but Anne interjected:

I think he thinks that it’s my job to maintain the inside here and his job to maintain the outside, most of the time, and my job to primarily organize the things that the kids do with the school and their appointments and stuff. And then Pete primarily takes over the job of looking after the outside and the cars and that stuff. I always have had an idea that taking out the garbage is men’s work, so he does that because to me that’s men’s work. Like you know it’s my job to organize the housework, if it’s not done, that’s up to me.
Pete did not disagree, and as I outline below, outside work was central to his self-definition.

What is interesting here is the ways such gender divisions of labour connect with meanings of the home. By "outside" most people meant gardening. Gardening as men's work not only distances them from the day-to-day running of the house, but also re-creates the class- and appearance-based meanings of the home. Men's participation in gardening reaffirmed their concern with the appearance of the house and was also motivated by a similar concern.

For most men, they gardened because they had to, not because they enjoyed it. According to Edward:

I generally hate getting out there [garden] to do it but when I'm out there I enjoy it. It's not a passion of mine for sure... I enjoy getting things done. I weeded the front bed the other day, it's a big bed, it was a good feeling. When I cut the grass I always feel good after having done it. I like to maintain it. ... After doing it I get a sense of accomplishment and pleasure.

The activity of gardening gives similar results to the sense of accomplishment he had from the home. Ernie gardens explicitly for the aesthetics:

People really look after their gardens here, they're out slugging away. We do that too, it's nice to maintain it. I think that's part of why the place is nice, because it's well manicured and people's lawns are usually very nice and their gardens are nice, their flowers are great.

Gardening, in both cases, was necessary but not enjoyable, a man's job to keep the home looking nice and continue contributing to class identity.

There were exceptions to this trend, dependent on the man's occupation. Pete, the only manual worker I spoke with in Glenwood, did a lot of renovation work around the house. Consequently, he was connected to it in ways other than appearance and accomplishment. One of Pete and
Anne's reasons for moving to Glenwood was the potential for landscaping it held for Pete, he wanted "a long front yard, lots of room to landscape". Pete has always wanted to start his own landscaping business, and does a bit on the side. Until now, however, it has been to his own garden that he has devoted most attention. He told me in detail about the landscaping he had done, including a gazebo and hot tub out the back, two pillars out the front, an underground sprinkler system, lighting and lava rock. He was very connected to his garden, evident in the following description, which was one of many:

My grass is not looking any good right now but it usually does, but with winter coming on it needs to be aerated and fertilized. And then next spring I'll lime it again and fertilize it and it will look good right away. People actually come up and they feel the grass because they don't think it's real.

Thus although the connection between home and status was important to him, his home also meant more, a place to express himself, and, possibly, find alternative employment. Anne is especially keen on the latter:

I've had someone come here once and wanted to know the name of our landscaper because she'd employ them, and I should have told her you'd do it for her. And charge lots and lots of money.

In this respect, it was the work of Pete that secured Anne's class identity. She wanted to fit into Glenwood, which she could do via housing but not via income or mothering practices, and Pete's landscaping was essential to this. For Pete, however, gardening was his connection to his home, rather than the opposite direction of causation: a particular construct of home leading him to garden. It was also his connection to his neighbours, who admired his lawn. In terms of taste, Pete was also very different. In contrast to the subdued tones of the other houses, I would call his landscaping garish: stark blue lights, trailer in the driveway and large house
number. Not only did his garden signify something apart from the other men in Glenwood, it also looked different.

The gender division of labour in the home did not go unquestioned; as Libby says, "it's a constant battle". Nevertheless, as rationalized within the inside-outside distinction, the domestic work of women in Glenwood served to produce the class location of both men and women. In this respect, I have aimed in this section to present a more complex relation of gender, class and home. Constructs of home were used, regardless of gender, to situate the self in a geography of class, although the way these intermingled with familial constructs varied by gender. For men, class and familial expressions of home were more often at odds with each other, whereas femininity encompassed both, with some exceptions. In the next section I attempt to add a geographical layer to these complex inter-relations.

III. Home and Family in Berkshire

A culture recognizing the investment value of housing was evident in Berkshire, as was the ideal of social mobility through housing moves. For most, their Berkshire house was the first one they had owned, and making that first step was crucial to climbing the housing ladder (see Table 5.2). However, Berkshire residents were on a very different rung of the housing ladder. Whereas Glenwood families had been steadily moving up for quite some time, Berkshire families were on the bottom. These different situations and material circumstances partially account for the different meanings of home I will outline below. But the notion of a housing ladder was also modified by familial concerns, a factor that impacted the classed and gendered meanings of home.
For most residents I spoke with, home was a family place and ownership was essential to the good family life. What this meant was that familial ideals intermingled with investment values in the housing careers of those in Berkshire. Three examples are illustrative.

First, ownership was something to be attained before having children. According to Fran "we waited to have children till we had a downpayment". In particular, children created a financial burden that threatened the ideal of ownership, evident in the following extract from a discussion Mark, Joanne and I had about homeownership:

**Joanne**: That was one of the things, one of the reasons that we didn't start a family until we were in our 30s, because that was one of our goals was to buy a house before we started a family because it would make things so much easier. You know, like from moving just having the security and the kids being able to grow up in the one area.

**Mark**: I think there's also a financial planning standpoint it's a lot easier to save money without children than with children.

**Joanne**: Definitely.

**Mark**: So if you were to have children in a renting situation, that would create a lot of pressure.

In other words, the goal of homeownership, especially as the right environment for children (Darlene says "when you've got children you want them to be in your home"), meant that housing careers began before having children; a strategy Lyn Richards finds common in her Australian study. At the same time, however, once you owned or were buying your first house, then moving up the ladder would happen anyway. Liz is astounded and proud, for instance, that in their seven years in Berkshire their house doubled in value.

---
### Table 5.2. Housing Careers of Berkshire Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Housing Career Before Berkshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>B: nurse</td>
<td>Owned house in Calgary previous to Berkshire; were living in Surrey because of affordability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>S: sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>D: at-home</td>
<td>Bought in Berkshire after moving from Winnipeg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>R: salesman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>F: at home</td>
<td>Moved from Calgary to Berkshire 5 years ago; this the first house they had owned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>A: engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>M: nurse</td>
<td>Rented in Delta until moving to Berkshire 7 years ago; were looking to &quot;move-up&quot; within 1 year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>S: clerk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>L: at-home</td>
<td>Owned house in New Zealand, but Berkshire was first house had owned in Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>B: sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>M: lab assistant</td>
<td>Rented in Guildford for 3 years, then bought in Berkshire. Can’t afford to move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>G: clerk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>Had lived in Berkshire for 14 years, staying on after divorce. Was contemplating moving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese</td>
<td>T: at home</td>
<td>Had owned a small, old home in Delta for 3 years before moving to Berkshire 7 years ago. Were currently building a new house in an area much like Glenwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>H: business owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>S: sales assistant</td>
<td>Previously owned in Newton, made enough money there to move to Berkshire 2 years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>K: sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherri</td>
<td>S: sales assistant</td>
<td>Owned house in Surrey before building this house in Berkshire 7 years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>D: electrician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>L: teaching assistant</td>
<td>Owned old house in Newton, wanted a newer house, were the first residents of Berkshire 7 years ago. Bought a (bigger) Berkshire house after speaking to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>J: plumber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traci</td>
<td>T: at home</td>
<td>Rented in Guildford for two years, then bought in Berkshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>T: security guard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>J: sales (home-based)</td>
<td>Berkshire was the first house they bought; they also had recreational property in the Okanagan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>M: sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>I: at home</td>
<td>Bought in Langley 7 years ago, moved to Berkshire for health reasons 4 years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>H: maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>P: clerk</td>
<td>Lived in a Surrey house 15 years; moved to Berkshire for more room and better investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>K: mechanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second, moving up for family reasons - more room, basement, bigger backyard, was far more important than in Glenwood. Indeed, it was often primary. Of those who had owned previously (see Table 5.2), all moved for more space and of those who were moving out of Berkshire all were doing so for reasons of space. This is not to say that investment was irrelevant, it was more a side-effect. Pat and Ken, for instance, wanted a two story house to accommodate their teenagers, which they found in Berkshire. Yet this was also a financial move. Pat lamented the amount of money they had spent increasing the size of their old house:

I don't think it's worth it actually. I can't remember the exact figures but in our other house when we added on it seemed to me it cost us an awful lot of money and I don't think we got all that much out of the house. Although if you figure that it was great for us at the time, because we really needed the extra room, it's good, but I don't think we got when we sold it what I thought we could have got because of the addition.

The move to Berkshire, therefore, was also for investment:

We really did need a bigger house, although we could have managed, but it had a lot to do with how much my house was going to be worth in ten years, but we've put less money into this house but it's going to be worth way more than the other one. So we decided that that was the main factor after the fact that we needed more room. We were only going to get so much for that house, it was not going up that much. So it was kind of a good investment to move here.

Third, self-building still happened in Berkshire, but for familial rather than investment reasons. Marie was looking for a lot to build a new house on, because that way she could get the right combination of bedrooms and other rooms on the right floors, in the right location (see her comments about not living in an Indo-Canadian neighbourhood in chapter four). Sherri and Dan had built their Berkshire house from scratch so that they could build their "dream home", as Sherri explains:
I wanted a certain kind of kitchen, I wanted so many cupboards, I wanted a fireplace. All these things I figured I could get if I built instead of getting a plan. I wanted a laundry room with cupboards. That was pretty well why, so that we could get everything that we wanted. And stay there. Forever. Instead of buying a house and saying well I could live with this for five years.

So they found a house plan they liked and hired a contractor to do the building. Although they got their dream home, they wouldn’t do it again:

It was a nightmare. The house was supposed to be done in three months and it wasn’t done after almost a year. And we were commuting from Vancouver at the time because we’d sold our house. So yeah it was a nightmare, we ended up finishing it ourselves.

a. Family, Ownership and Investment

How do these articulations of ownership and familial processes impinge upon gender and class identities in Berkshire? Whereas Glenwood homes symbolized social mobility and financial success, class mattered in a very different way in Berkshire, for both men and women. Homeownership definitely signified attainment and placed Berkshire residents "above" those living in places like Whalley. Ron says his home is his RRSP (retirement fund), George gets a sense of accomplishment from owning, and Kurt says:

Robyn: How important is it that you own your own home?
Kurt: Really important!
Robyn: Why?
He laughed, as if it were a silly question
Kurt: Equity, security, it’s yours. we rented for four months and it was like 13 or 14 hundred dollars a month and it went nowhere.

Women felt similarly. As examples, Joanne saw her home as financial security; Sharon was proud of what they had achieved in terms of housing; and Therese was just as keen to move out of Berkshire into a bigger house in an "executive subdivision", as was her husband Hal. Yet in Berkshire this
was where the alignment of gender, class and home ended. The notion of a housing ladder, and especially Berkshire's position at the bottom of it, was interpreted differently by men and women.

For men, living in Berkshire sometimes led to feelings of inadequacy and regret. Sid lamented their decision to buy in Berkshire:

We would have been better off buying in Coquitlam, a house that we didn't find as appealing, for financial reasons, the houses there, the house that you [his wife Barbara] didn't like that was the estate sale would easily be three hundred and fifty thousand now.

Although convinced by Barbara at the time about the importance of other factors like location of schools and style of house (especially brightness, for she describes the house in Coquitlam as "too dark"), Sid maintains that the investment value of housing should be primary. He would like to "make one or two more moves, then you would have made enough in your real estate to retire".

The twin goals of housing - investment and a signal of attainment - were clear to Tim. Living in Berkshire, and his house especially, fulfilled neither of these goals and he didn't feel especially attached to it:

To me I don't think it does [mean anything special] because I know there's one more step we've got to make. We don't have to but I think once the kids are a bit older and that we might find this a bit small. It's hard to get really attached to it because in the back of my mind I think we're going to move to a bigger house eventually. I won't retire out of this house.

At the moment, however, because of his labour market position - "I could be out of a job next year" - he was hesitant to upgrade:

I know it's a prestige thing having a nice big house over there [Glenwood] and be able to show it off and all that but I couldn't sleep at night because of worry about the mortgage. And then Traci also doesn't have to work whereas she'd have to if we had a bigger mortgage, I'd
love to have a house over there but financially it doesn’t make sense, and emotionally.

Presently for Tim, living in Berkshire meant that class and familial constructs of home were in conflict. The pride he derives from Traci not working (see chapter six) was threatened by what he wanted his house to symbolize.

Women, on the other hand, saw a clear conflict between family homes and executive or "fancy" homes. This was obviously related to the homes in which they lived; plainness and simplicity were valued, as seen in Figure 5.3. Because they had wanted to sample the family atmosphere of a place before they moved there, Sharon and Kurt had rented a house in the same street in which they were now living for three months. For Sharon, this house was definitely temporary, it was not her kind of home:

The house that we rented had a really grand entrance, big staircase, very nice. Vaulted ceilings, an open fire in the living room, it just had three bedrooms upstairs and a master bedroom that was just huge, I could fit my whole living room suite in there. And it had a huge ensuite, it was "hotel-ish" to me. It couldn’t be a home.

The house they subsequently bought was quite different and was a home:

Everything was to my taste. That’s what I liked about it, it was not such a grand style of home. It was a home. But the yard was done tastefully, and the decorating was good, to me anyway.

Although in terms of status Sharon liked the house they were renting, she felt that it was too ostentatious for her family and impossible for her to furnish. Since it expressed status beyond that of their household, it may have mitigated their attempts to create a "family home". This conflict between the home she would like and the one signified by that house is more than my interpretation. Kurt’s parents, whose sole possession was an RV in which they lived and travelled, were vocal in their disapproval of the ostentation of certain houses and what they saw as Sharon and Kurt’s materialism.
Sharon's tension here, therefore, is a reflection of her attempts to confront these views, and her articulation of them to me. Their current house represented an accommodation of the tension, being sufficiently "tasteful", but also homely.

Others in Berkshire felt a similar disjuncture between home and a particular aesthetic. Barbara, who had vetoed the purchase of an older Coquitlam house on comfort grounds, echoes Sharon in the following:

We're not so much, like, a lot of the homes that you see around are very what I would call ostentatious with lots of ornateness and all the rest of that. I would like more simple, plain, nice lines. I think a lot of these homes that are going up now are trying to be showy or something like that. That does not appeal to me at all. I like comfort, I like warmth, I like to feel safe, a room where people can feel at home.

She felt at home in Berkshire, especially in her sewing room downstairs, where she could be alone and do things she liked. Sherri expressed a similar sentiment, specifically in relation to family:

Sometimes I think children may be better off not living in as fancy of a home because that’s maybe what they would come to expect life to hand to them.

And Marie:

We've been through houses just seeing what's out there and the new ones, my god. I don't know who they're building them for because they're all big show homes, they're not even practical to live in. Everything is just brass and high ceilings and really fancy, and that's why they're so expensive, I guess. I figure I'd have to be retired to afford that kind of house. Sure you could live in it but would you feel at home in it?
Figure 5.3. Berkshire Homes
There was one exception to the trend of valuing family simplicity over status claims: Ingrid. She had planned to live in Berkshire for only a few years but finances had meant they were still there seven years later. Her house did not fit in with her impression of her social class:

It’s not quite as pretty a house, externally or internally or the general appearance of the outside. But it’s more suitable. No, not necessarily so. It’s not as pretty a home. ... There are some people you know that I don’t feel comfortable bringing into this house because I’m not very proud of it, it’s not as pretty as I’d like it to be, so literally there’s some people I haven’t invited over. Ever. For that reason.

In particular, she hadn’t invited her old teaching colleagues over, feeling, I surmised, embarrassed about the size, layout and decorations of the house. Here, the social class signified by her home did not seem appropriate to the way she identified herself.

In addition, for Mary, the monetary value of home was not important:

My house is my home. Like my husband’s company wanted us to rent it out if we moved and I said no, this is my home, it’s not a piece of rental property. And I feel strongly about that.

The class meaning of home for these Berkshire residents was thus clearly differentiated by gender. A discourse of social mobility through housing was in the background rather than foreground; modulated by home as a family place. But the discourse seemed to matter more to men than women: men were dissatisfied with their Berkshire house in status terms; whereas women thought "fancier" homes could not be familial and were therefore more content with the social class indicated by their housing. That more women worked in Berkshire than in Glenwood would seem to have something to do with this gender difference, but since I did not probe the issue I can only speculate why and how. It may be that since women in
Berkshire were situated in class terms at work as well, home became less important compared to Glenwood; compounded by a division between work as work and home as family. In terms of men, it appeared that their home-based and work-based class positions were similar, as indicated in the table. For both men and women, therefore, the linkages of home and work were central, but in different ways from Glenwood.

b. Gender Divisions in Berkshire Homes

Gender was also a factor in the work done around and in Berkshire homes. Like Glenwood, the division of labour between inside and outside reinforced the association of home with class for men, and family for women. Gardening was masculine. George, from Berkshire, states simply: "I do most of the outdoor stuff - wash the cars and cut the grass" Liz similarly commented that "Jesse does yard work, I don't. I clean the inside of the house, he does the outside".

Beyond the assumed "naturalness" of this divide was the sense that doing the gardening was very much part of what was demanded of being a "home-owner" in a particular place. Kurt described his Berkshire neighbourhood as a place where "everybody takes care of their yards" which motivates his yard work:

   "It looks tacky if you go driving along. I mean look at us, when the weeds start to grow in the spring, I mean it's killex time, and get the fertilizer going, get the lawnmower going."

In Berkshire there was silent pressure to maintain the garden, as Hal explains:

   "For me it's personal. I like to keep the lawn mowed and looking neat, but I don't think there's any direct pressure, I think there might be a small bit of silent pressure. You take a look at your neighbours' lawn and it looks nice and yours looks terrible, but that's about it."
The point I would like to draw out here is that gardening was something required and that coalesced with the men's identity as homeowner.

However, gardening was sociable in Berkshire, contra Glenwood. The practice of gardening also reinforced the identities of homeowner and sometimes father. Being out in the yard was a time to watch the children playing on the street, even if it was only, as in Mark's case, sitting in a deckchair on the front lawn, pretending to work. Gardening was a male social occasion. Joanne describes it thus:

And that's kind of a social time for the men. Because they're, in most cases in the summer time, other than the summer I was off, it's the men who are doing the lawns and stuff so that's their little social gathering.

This was especially the case for Tim, who lived in another part of Berkshire and proudly told me he knew everyone in the neighbourhood. He was telling me about how much gardening he did, when the following exchange occurred.

Tim: You're cornering me here! The garden takes an hour of my three days off!
Traci: [interrupting from the family room] What he does outside is stand around and talk to the neighbours.
Tim: Yeah, I do a lot of that!

Tim did not remember the details of his conversations, although he did note that they were about gardening, sport and the blockwatch group he coordinated. For their household, it seemed that being outside was a masculine concern.

A further exception to this general trend is that some men were connected to their home beyond the obligations of ownership. Ken has two teenagers and works shift work as a mechanic at what he described to me as "the best job in the world". On his days off he would either play golf or do things around the house. The day I visited he had bottled wine and had the
hot tub tested. He was always busy around the house, not necessarily in the garden, but generally making things. He'd put in a hot tub, extra concrete out the front and side, and was contemplating building mouldings for the walls/ceilings since his wife had bought him a new saw for his birthday. These activities around the house meant that it had completely different meaning to him. When I asked most men where they felt comfortable in the house they would give me somewhere like the living room because it was quiet. For Ken, however, his feelings about the house, which he was clearly attached to, were related to his handiwork there. He liked two places in particular:

I like the family room when it’s rainy out, I put a gas fireplace over there too and watching television or whatever. I like the den when I’m working, that’s where my computer is, where my domain is.\(^{31}\) I built a desk, an L-shaped desk it’s about eight feet by two feet, one part of the L is my computer and the other part of the L is actually the desk, and there’s two chairs that slide in so one can work on the computer and the other on the desk. I like to work there when I want to do my own thing.

Ken’s attachment to a specific part of his home was directly related to his modification of, and creativity within, it.

Overlaying the inside-outside distinction was a discourse that stipulates that whoever works outside the home does not have primary responsibility for the house. Importantly, the Berkshire women saw the gendered division of labour that resulted as not a gendered product but one of circumstance. I asked Therese whether she thought men and women should have specific roles and she replied:

Not necessarily, like our roles aren’t divided because whether we’re a man or a woman, it’s more that when we had kids he was making more money so it made more sense for me to be the one. Now if it had been the other

\(^{31}\) He later told me that "work" is playing computer games, or designing new things to build around the house.
way round, he would have gladly stayed at home, he always says that. I don't, [pause] I'm not home with the kids because I'm the mother, we don't think like that, it's just that's how it's worked out for us. We both have our roles, I look after the house mostly, but that's because I've got the available time during the day. But he, my husband, he'll do anything, he'll pitch in, he'll take over, it's whoever has the time really. No, I don't think there should be male and female roles defined.

And again, according to Linda:

I think because of the career he has it's just worked out that way that I do the homemaker type things and he does the nine till five business ... it's pretty typically, older style type arrangement but that's what works because of the situation.

What is insightful is a consideration of the major exception to the gender division of labour. In Berkshire, Henry worked shiftwork and Ingrid ran a craft business from home. In contrast to many of the women who were apologetic about their partner's involvement in home-making, Ingrid was apologetic about her lack of participation:

Somehow we thought we had it figured out nice and even but Henry ends up doing most of it. He gets to vacuum. My son doesn't want to grow up to be a man because then he'll have to do too many dishes.

Henry confirms this description, he does the vacuuming, the laundry, and the dishes, while Ingrid does the tidying. He is also responsible for the two boys when he is at home and on weekends. This division of labour is related to a different perception of home for Henry. His description of the house was much more "attached" than other men, focused on the children rather than a physical description:

Well, there's a room for each boy, they have their own space even though they don't really use them very much other than Karl likes to have his organized and Joshua has been using his a little bit more lately, has all his stuffed toys up there, for him it's sort of becoming a bit of a place to play but not for Ethan so much, it's a place to be organized. Our room is kind of nice, I like it, it's
comfortable and peach coloured. We have a large bathroom upstairs, we use all the space, it's great the boys fit and us. Once in a while they'll go out and play in there, it's an extra playroom. The family room gets used a lot, we have lots of toys in the fireplace, it's a toy storage area, and the TV is in there, and a table for junk. And the dining room looks like that [full of craft stuff] a lot.

It seems, then, that there is a relation between who does what around the house and perceptions of the home. In particular, the gendering of the domestic division of labour coincides with gendered meanings of the home.

c. Contesting Home

Contestation of the gender division of labour seemed more apparent in Berkshire, in the sense that it was more openly discussed. There was definitely tension in many households. Sharon was telling me that she did everything when Kurt interjected:

That's a load of shit. I vacuum at least once a week.
Sharon: When did you vacuum?
Kurt: I do vacuum a lot for you and I do a lot of bathroom cleaning for you. Last week, I did the whole house, vacuumed for you, did all your bathrooms and everything.

Interestingly, Kurt designates the bathrooms as Sharon's domains. Mary also tells of the underlying and recurrent tensions in her home:

My husband vacuums. He does the kitchen in the evening. But he demands that I help him. He will unload the dishwasher. And he washes the cars. ... Oh yes, gardening, I forgot, my husband does the lot (said sarcastically). I don't do much gardening, I don't have the time. And actually there's not a lot to be done in the garden.

In Mary's situation especially, her lack of feeling for her home, in any of the ways so far considered, is underscored and partially explained by the practices within it. As she continues later:
It's a place where there's a lot of stress too. It's a lot better after 8 o'clock when the kids have gone to bed and it's peaceful then.

Some of these tensions were expressed spatially. For some households, the home could only be a family place for women. This was most evident in the case of Joanne, a Glenwood resident who worked out of her home. When she started in her current job after the birth of her second child, the spatiality of home and work had to be redefined, with home being defined as family time and family space. The story is told by her husband Mark, indicating that it was more a problem for him than her, and was indicative of gendered power relations:

One of the things that Joanne got caught with when she first started working was that she would come home and walk into her office and do the stuff she wanted to do when the kids would come in the door and there was a price to pay for that. It was really apparent really quick that a rule had to be set down that when we walk in the door work is over until the kids go to bed and then you can go ahead and do stuff, but our undivided attention is now with children. If that means going out and taking them for a walk in the summertime, or whatever that entails. If it means sitting down at the bottom of the stairs and looking at what they did that day and reading a book to them, so be it.

In this example, constructs of home were called upon to legitimate home as the natural domain of familial rather than work practices.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has been a multi-layered analysis of place, class and gender. In terms of place, I have suggested that a local culture of property, itself an interpretation of the purpose of homeownership within a particular housing market, framed residents' discussions of class and home. This culture was local in at least two senses. It was at the Surrey scale that I
have suggested the local culture of property operated, with the position of
different subdivisions on the housing ladder in Surrey well known. I have
also shown two smaller scale manifestations of the culture of property, for it
was worked out in different ways in different places. The neighbourhood
was also important, moreover, for what it symbolized. Berkshire was a
"starter" neighbourhood, a place to buy your first house. Glenwood was
nearly at the pinnacle of the Surrey hierarchy, marked by its "executive" style
and high house prices. Both these characteristics, as I hope to have shown,
impinged upon the class identities drawn from home. Finally, I have
considered the house itself as a place in which gender and class meaning is
constructed and expressed. Given the salience of all three scales in the links
between gender, class and home, it seems imperative, therefore, that any
investigation of these links be cognizant of context.

I have also explored the myriad and multi-directional links constructed
between gender, class and home, suggesting along the way that it is not
possible to tell a simple story where home is important in social class/status
terms for men, and as a familial domain for women. Instead, the cultures of
property and family in specific places and times set the conditions of
possibility and impossibility for gendered meanings of the home. Housing in
both case studies was understood in terms of a ladder of ownership: where,
and in what type of, house you lived were not only important indicators (for
others and oneself) of social class, but economic gain and hence social
mobility could be achieved through housing moves. The residents of
Glenwood actively used the booming Greater Vancouver housing market and
self-building to maximize the monetary value of housing and facilitate social
mobility. Climbing the housing ladder was a joint or family strategy in
Glenwood. Consequently, both men and women participated in it and drew
part of their class identity from housing. In this respect, gender didn't matter. Where gender did matter was in producing capital gain and maintaining the value of housing. Looking after the house - keeping it clean and presentable, taking responsibility for its "tasteful" decoration, in some cases doing the unpaid labour associated with self-building, and in other cases maintaining the outside as well as the inside - was primarily a "woman's job", with the consequences that women's work was necessary, though not sufficient, to men's escalation through a status hierarchy.32 Gender mattered in different ways in Berkshire, for gender divisions were evident throughout home-based meanings and practices there. Since familial concerns modified the housing ladder strategy at the outset, and since these concerns seemed more important to women, then the class meanings of home varied by gender. Men tended to be dissatisfied with their class position indicated by living in Berkshire, whilst women thought living in anything more more fancy (especially in terms of house style) would mitigate their attempts to create a family home. In both case studies, therefore, gender was central to the maintenance of home and status, but it varied as to whether women saw themselves as benefitting from this work.

Just as the gendered analysis of home I have presented is complex, so too is the social class story I have told. As Giddens points out, social class is a fragmented category, precisely because it represents a cluster of situations. The houses in which these residents of Glenwood and Berkshire lived were central to their class identification, but how they mattered differed. In some cases housing clearly conveyed material benefits that made the life chances

32 Interestingly, Marion Roberts comes to a similar conclusion in her study of British council housing. Marion Roberts, 1989, "Designing the home: domestic architecture and domestic life" in Graham Allan and Graham Crow, eds. Home and Family: Creating the Domestic Sphere, London: Macmillan, pp.33-47.
and class identification of an electrician like Pete more like those of his self-employed neighbours than his tradesmen workmates. For others, the evaluations of others were more important, a process that can also be seen in Berkshire men's dissatisfactions with their housing situations. In both cases, however, it seemed that houses united and expressed a "style of life". In Glenwood, this clustered around a specific definition of taste and success, a definition that others may find tasteless. In Berkshire, housing as family drew residents, symbolically at least, together. A final common element worth drawing out is declining fortunes. Although in the background of most of this chapter, it bubbles to the surface when it is remembered that housing was perceived to be one of the few economic certainties in the contemporary period. It was thus invested with considerable meaning sometimes used as a hedge against unemployment. The connections between home and new traditionalism have also been in the background in this chapter, a point I attempt to remedy in chapter six.
CHAPTER SIX
LIVING NEW TRADITIONALIST LIVES? IDEALS AND
PRACTICES OF MOTHERHOOD IN BERKSHIRE AND
GLENWOOD

I. Motherhood, Paid Employment and New Traditionalism

Definitions of motherhood, especially in relation to the desirability and consequences of full-time paid employment, are central to current discussions of family and gender.\(^1\) Discussions and evocations of new traditionalism similarly pivot around the presumed conflicts between being a mother and a paid-worker, suggesting that women "choose" one or the other.\(^2\) The importance of paid work to interpretations and understandings of being a mother in the 1990s was underscored by my interviews.\(^3\) In both Berkshire and Glenwood, women and men were trying to live the new traditionalist ideal of male breadwinner, female homemaker. Men, for instance, were quick to point out to me the virtues of at-home mothers, for both them and their children. Others would tell me in great detail about how important staying at home was to them, often assuming that as (they supposed) a career woman without children, I would be critical of their choice to be at-home mothers. Blatantly obvious, to both them and myself, however, was the importance of


\(^3\) That a similar discussion was not occurring with respect to fatherhood is telling, a point I come back to in the concluding chapter.
material circumstances in these attempts to live what was seen as the ideal family life. My conversations with women who worked (mainly in Berkshire), for example, were punctuated with accounts of the difficulty of combining work and motherhood, and of finances as their only or primary reason for being in the paid labour force.

My aim in this chapter is to explore the inter-relations between ideals of motherhood and practices of motherhood (especially in relation to maternal employment) within the general context of new traditionalism. How are ideals and practices linked? What framework guides the interpretations (by both men and women) of motherhood? With respect to place, how is this intersection of ideals and practices experienced in, interpreted through, and influenced by, place. Does place, in a symbolic and material sense, exacerbate contemporary tensions of motherhood or help smooth them over? I argue that although the ideals with respect to mothering were the same in the two neighbourhoods, because of financial pressures practices with respect to maternal employment varied. In Berkshire there was a disjuncture between what women preferred to do and what they did do, with the result that their employment was understood in new traditionalist terms. In Glenwood, living a new traditionalist model was both desired and possible. It was not only material circumstances that underlay this variability. Each of the two neighbourhoods provided distinctive repertoires of meaning that impacted women's interpretations of their lives. In Berkshire, these repertoires exacerbated the tensions they were felling, whilst in Glenwood they lay the groundwork for practical and ideological support for new traditionalist forms of mothering.

This chapter is therefore an extension of Isabel Dyck's work on suburbs as places for the negotiation of the meaning of motherhood, where
she demonstrates the active negotiation of meaning in a suburban context, and the material reconstitution of space along the way. My analysis is different than Dyck's in two important respects. First, I am concerned with meaning at a scale much smaller than Dyck's focus on the three municipalities of Coquitlam, Port Coquitlam and Port Moody. By working at the scale of the neighbourhood, I consider micro-geographies of motherhood ideals and practices, examining the circulation of meaning within a particular site. As such, my analysis is also an antidote to recent considerations that have examined motherhood and paid employment at the regional scale. Judith Stacey situates her *Brave New Families* squarely in the Silicon Valley and its economic and social changes, for instance. Yet regions are not homogeneous; many places and spatialities exist within a region, as Pratt and Hanscn's work on local labour markets shows.

Second, although I detail some practices of mothering, my primary concern is with the cultural and symbolic elements of place and motherhood. Do a set of meanings become attached to, and circulate within, a site like a neighbourhood? What effect do they have? In other words, I substantiate and extend Dyck's documentation of the street as an extension of the home space. Yet it may be the case that Dyck's findings are confined to a particular context. As she notes:

---


6 Geraldine Pratt and Susan Hanson, 1994, "Geography and the construction of difference", *Gender, Place and Culture*, 1, 1, pp.5-30.

7 Dyck, 1989, *op.cit.*
Where values are perceived to be homogeneous, social contacts act as a means by which local norms are crystallized and transmitted.\(^8\)

But what understandings of the neighbourhood and motherhood result if values and practices are heterogeneous? My focus on the cultural, interpretive, aspects of place facilitates an examination of frictions as well as supportive elements of neighbourhoods, for the local may not always be supportive. Thus in what follows I am alert to the multiplicity of ideals and practices in relation to place, as well as their potential contradictions, in an attempt to examine how families in these two places were experiencing contemporary family life.

In the next two sections I demonstrate the imbrication of place within the interpretation and tensions of contemporary motherhood in the two neighbourhoods. I focus on three aspects of motherhood: maternal employment, involvement in the school system, and independence of children, though I place most emphasis on the first. Section two is about Berkshire, where I sketch how a new traditionalist ideal meshed with material constraints to produce a number of different models of motherhood. The coexistence of these different models in Berkshire, along with a culture of privacy, exacerbated the tensions of motherhood. Glenwood is the focus of section three, outlining how new traditionalist versions of motherhood were actively supported.

II. Berkshire and the Tensions of Mothering

Berkshire was a site of enunciation for contemporary frictions of motherhood and contradictions within femininity; a situation produced by the meshing of new traditionalism with the desire for homeownership and

\(^8\) Dyck, 1989, op.cit, p.337.
financial constraints. As a result, there was an almost even division between women who were at-home full time, working full time, and working part-time. Such a combination of activities in close proximity led to conflict. In other words, Berkshire entailed an interpretive framework that exacerbated contemporary frictions of motherhood. Variable gender identities (of both men and women) were not only copresent, but clashed; the tensions of motherhood were played out and expressed through the neighbourhood.

a. *New Traditionalism, Materialism, and Multiple Practices of Mothering*

That new traditionalist motherhood was an ideal to be aspired to was a given in Berkshire. In particular, most (I note the exceptions below) men and women wished to live a family life where women remained at home with the children. The "family unit" was seen to be under threat from a number of sources: weaker commitment to the institution of marriage; discrimination against single-earner families in the tax system; television and other factors that "would take the kids away"; proliferation of single-parent families; and the general "busyness" of people today, which made it harder to do things together. Yet economic necessity, the primacy of having enough money to live at a particular standard, placed constraints on the capacity to live this ideal.9 Like the people Katherine Newman interviewed who wished to remain at home full time with their children but couldn't afford to,10 the men and women of Berkshire felt and articulated a contradiction between their material and familial values. It was generally believed that the current generation was forever wanting more. As Barb noted sarcastically:

---

9 Within this standard homeownership was non-negotiable; having a home of one's own was a given that often necessitated other financial sacrifices.  
I find it very materialistic. You've gotta have that hot tub in the backyard, you know, and whatever.

Bruce felt pressure from his daughters:

We certainly experience this pressure from the kids, which is a result of peer pressure they experience, they have to have the cool things, the clothes, the right kind of runners.

Children were central to George's description of greater material demands:

I guess just because of the levels of expectations of kids is higher in material ways, electronics and toys and TV, I think TV has a lot to do with it, more for kids to desire. They want everything, and they expect everything. I know our kids get a lot more than I did.

These material demands and expectations meant that the practice of mothering for two-thirds of the Berkshire women I spoke to did not accord with their new traditionalist ideal, as shown in Table 6.1: they were engaged in paid employment either full or part time. However, these practices were understood in conventional ways, with it being generally agreed that the prime reason women did (and should) work was to satisfy material expectations. Pat, who had worked on and off since her children had been born, summarized these material expectations aptly:

More women work, and work to better ourselves, to get more things for the family or whatever and of course the more you have the more you have to work and ....

In other words, whether women worked or not was seen as a financial rather than a self-development or career move. Discussing the viability, practices and desirability of working motherhood almost entirely in financial terms formed the broad context in which the women and men in Berkshire interpreted and understood their familial related gender identities.

---

11 There was one important exception to this - Joanne - whom I talk about below.
Table 6.1. Labour Force Activities of Berkshire Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER AND AGE + OF CHILDREN</th>
<th>PARTNER</th>
<th>PARTNER'S OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traci</td>
<td>beautician</td>
<td>2 - 4 and 11 months</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>security guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>2 - 7 and 5.</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>3 - 6, 4 and 2</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>sales rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>2 - 3 and 1 month</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>physiotherapist</td>
<td>4 - 15, 13, 11 and 9</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>sales rep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. At-home Mothering as Financial Compromise/Sacrifice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER AND AGE + OF CHILDREN</th>
<th>PARTNER</th>
<th>PARTNER'S OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>sales rep</td>
<td>2 - 4 and 2</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>sales rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>school assistant</td>
<td>2 - 11 and 9</td>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>plumber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Full-time Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER AND AGE + OF CHILDREN</th>
<th>PARTNER</th>
<th>PARTNER'S OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>3 - 16, 13, 11</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherri</td>
<td>sales asst</td>
<td>3 - 11, 12 and 14</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>electrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>2 - 16 and 14</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>electrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>3 - 16, 14 and 12</td>
<td>Sid</td>
<td>sales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Working Full-time out of Financial Necessity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER AND AGE + OF CHILDREN</th>
<th>PARTNER</th>
<th>PARTNER'S OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>3 - 9, 7 and 4</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>sales asst</td>
<td>2 - 8 and 6</td>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>sales rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>lab assistant</td>
<td>2 - 10 and 4</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese</td>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>3 - 11, 8, and 4</td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>business owner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Part-time Work

* Current occupation, or one immediately before children.
+ Years, unless otherwise stated

However, there was no uniform labour market experience in Berkshire since new traditionalism and materialism intertwined in multiple ways. I discuss the four major models below: at-home mothering as a result of both familial and financial concerns; working motherhood for purely financial reasons; working motherhood for financial and self-identity considerations; and part-time work as "the best of both worlds". I discuss the circumstances of one couple in-depth to illustrate each type; focusing on the gender identities and representations each practice entails. Wherever relevant in
each story, I highlight the salience of place. However, the primary purpose of these stories is to document the myriad practices within Berkshire.

i. At-Home Mothering as a Financial and Familial Compromise

Traci and Tim, the first couple I spoke to in Berkshire, are emblematic of a situation where economics and familial values coincided so that women became full-time caregivers. Both are young - in their late 20s - and are at the limit of their financial capability in their current, and first, house. Tim is a security guard on shiftwork, a schedule they took advantage of four years ago when their first child was born. Then, Traci continued working as a beautician, while Tim looked after the baby during the day, and informal daycare filled in the gaps. However, since their son was born eleven months ago Traci hasn't returned to paid work. Although she misses the adult contact provided by working, she will not work, even part-time at the moment:

.. but it's just not possible for me to go back to work because I wasn't making enough money to be able to have two kids in daycare plus we'd need another car and car insurance and gas and that. I used to get phone calls from the receptionist at work all the time asking me to go back to work, and I'm like well if you're going to pay for daycare and everything else then maybe I'll think about it, but I really enjoy the time that I have at home with them. I think that I didn't have kids for someone else to be raising them for me.

When I asked her specifically whether it was two children that made the difference, she replied:

Yes. There's no bulk discount at the daycare. It was a decision actually we had made before Justin was born, that I would be staying at home because we weren't really getting ahead, even with my working. The one thing that I find that I miss is the tips that I made from work because that was always easy cash, we didn't have to run to the bank machine all the time, but the other money that I
earned, we didn’t know where it went to and we don’t seem to be any farther behind because I stay at home.

Such economic justifications for staying at home were complemented by other, non-financial reasons. As she says in the quote above: "I think that I didn’t have kids for someone else to be raising them", and:

When I was working I felt like I wanted to stay home, I wished I could stay home and I was glad when we kind of figured out that it actually works out better for me staying home without having to pay for an extra car and gas and that baby-sitter.

At the same time, Traci wanted to make it clear to me that she was also giving something up financially by not being in paid work, indicating, I think, a certain level of defensiveness.12 Both Traci and Tim made it clear to me that sticking to their family values involved financial sacrifices. According to Traci:

I look at friends of ours that have more than we have but I wouldn’t give them up to have the things that they have. I can’t imagine not being a mother.

Place was at least a tangential factor in Traci’s practices and interpretations of at-home motherhood. Remaining at home was part of a short term housing strategy: they would stay in Berkshire even though Tim wanted to move, since moving would mean a return to the labour force for Traci. Her experiences of being a mother were also drawn from place. On the one hand, the centrality of Berkshire meant that access to shops, parks and other facilities without a car was good. Yet being at home made her feel more tied down, partly because she was responsible for two other children during the day (for which she was paid). As she puts it:

12 I realize that Traci's statement about finances contradict each other, saying that she is both suffering and staying even financially. The contradiction is itself interesting, indicative of the multiple ways paid labour force decisions are explained.
I think before we tended to have, like Tim and I used to be able to pick Caroline up and go off somewhere, but now since I'm home I have to take care of my sister's son so we've got an extra kid, then the little girl from across the street comes over so I have to be home by 3 o'clock for her to come over and for my sister to pick up her son and that so I actually find that I'm tied down to the house more and end up having less time to do things now that I'm home all the time than I did at work. It seems odd, it seems like it should be the other way round. Plus when I was working Tim tended to help out around the house more so there wasn't as much to do around here so it left me with more free time.

The ambivalence Traci feels about full-time motherhood in practice rather than in theory is related to Tim's position, a point to which she alludes. Tim's involvement in both housework and childcare declined dramatically when Traci stopped working - Tim says "When Traci was working I put a lot more energy into the kids" - and Traci sometimes felt isolated and tied down. Tim would like Traci to work: "I mean I like Traci staying at home, but I wish she could work financially, I wish she could". His financial incentive is that they could move out of Berkshire into a bigger and better house. Nevertheless, he is willing for Traci to remain at home, because of the clear personal and practical benefits he derives. I asked him whether childcare was easier when he was home during the day and he replied:

I think it's great, we have a lot of time together, Traci used to work, ever since we've had Justin Traci has stayed home. When she was working I would look after Caroline on my days off, now we have a great time together, I really enjoy it, and now being home and having Traci home I find that I'm not as tired as I was before. Cause I was coming home after my last night shift and staying up all day looking after her, so I wasn't getting to bed for a whole day or something. This way's better.

This is Traci's description of Tim's involvement:

With his shifts he doesn't have that much time, usually they're bathed and in their pyjamas by the time he gets home on the day shift and then when he's working nights he sleeps all day and gets up in time to have supper and when he gets home in the morning he's straight to bed.
What I have tried to demonstrate in this discussion of Tim and Traci is one way new traditionalism and materialism intertwined in Berkshire. Because of Traci's low wages, it made financial sense for her to remain at home, something they had both wanted anyway. Although Traci's experience of at-home mothering was more ambiguous than she envisaged, both Tim and Traci appear happy with the bargain they have struck, since it fits in with the dominant ways they see themselves.

Whereas Tim and Traci made monetary sacrifices, the economic position of Ingrid and Henry remains precarious because of their belief that Ingrid should remain home with their two daughters, now aged five and seven. Ingrid, who states that she doesn't work full-time even though she runs a craft business.13, and the week I spoke to her (a couple of weeks before Christmas) was what she termed a "work week", doesn't think she has the energy to work:

I know how much energy, emotionally and physically, it takes to teach. I don't see how I could do it and still have enough left over for the kids. I don't know how people do it. It might get to the point where the kids are more independent, but I really don't want to. When Henry was unemployed I went through the motions of applying for a job, but the prognosis out there is not good. So it was discouraging to have to go through the motions of applying, and I was, you know, if I had to, I'd do it, but it wouldn't be by choice. And if I did it would only be part-time.

She agrees that she needs another interest beside the children, and this is why she keeps her craft business going: she finds it "very fulfilling and therapeutic". Interestingly, however, her business started by accident, originally in partnership with a friend. Just before her friend pulled out of the arrangement:

13 Her craft work is sporadic, averaging one day a week working at home and then another day on the weekend. Times like just before Christmas (when I interviewed her) are more hectic. Then, she would put aside an entire week for her business.
We were at a craft fair and I had one pine cone wreath which I had made as a display item to fancy up our clothing display and somebody saw it and wanted to buy it so I sold it. I thought well I'll just make a few more for the next fair. So I started to make craft items to sell with the clothing and it sort of took off from there.

Not only does Ingrid erase her paid work (describing herself as an "at-home Mom") but she describes her work as an accident, something she does that is secondary to her primary mothering job.

ii. "Working Makes Me a Better Mother"

Although dominant, new traditionalist ideals were by no means universal in Berkshire. For Joanne and Mark it was obvious that they should both work. For Joanne, working was both financial and self-motivated. I asked her whether she'd had much time off work when having her two children and she replied:

The first time I didn't, I only had, well I had to go back to work when my daughter was three months old, and then after my son was born I had about a year and a half off, which was nice.

Robyn: Did you consider staying at home full-time?
Joanne: No. It wasn't something, it wasn't an option. I like to work, and having my year and a half off, plus finances dictate that I work.

However, she was not about to accept any job, for she and Mark had calculated that "if you were at $25,000 or less it would make no sense to get back to work". Subsequently, according to Joanne:

So that's why it took me a lot of time to find a job too. 'Cause there would be no use me going to work if you were going to come out even. But for myself, fortunately being in sales you have a little bit more earnings potential plus I like to work, so I think I'm a better mom for my kids when I'm working.

Paid work, for Joanne, was necessary to her identity as both a mother and a career person. She could never imagine staying at home full-time, nor could
she do without the things her money brought the family like holidays. Her investment in her work, however, entailed adjustments at home, especially since "having Joanne off work for a year and a half was kind of back in the glory days" for Mark. Both were working with traditional familial models that had to be changed.

When I went back to work, it took us a while to get adjusted to. Some incredible debates. But you know I get stressed out because you want your house to be somewhat livable, but you're also cooking, cleaning and buying groceries still and you're still doing all the stuff you did when you weren't working, but in less hours a day. It was really stressful.

Both agreed that they still had many things to work out, especially with respect to household chores. Nevertheless, they seemed comfortable talking about these issues with me, and with each other (I interviewed them together) and were willing to concede that Joanne's working entailed a different model of fatherhood for Mark.¹⁴ For instance, because Joanne worked, he realized he would have to "pitch in" with both the children and the housework.

iii. "I Need to Work but I would Prefer Not to"

For some Berkshire families, financial concerns meant that women worked out of financial necessity, not by choice. Sherri, whose two children were teenagers (I couldn't interview her husband because he worked shiftwork), had always worked as a sales assistant in a department store since:

I've never really had the option, finances. I've never actually had the option of staying at home. I only worked,

¹⁴ By comfortable I mean an absence of tension. Uncomfortable would describe my conversation with Sid and Barb. Not only did Sid dominate the discussion, but when discussing household chores Sid's version was very much at odds with Barb's and Barb became visibly quiet.
when they were really little, I only worked Thursday, Friday, Saturday. So it wasn't that bad. When we bought the house, I worked that whole time. But they were still, my daughter I think was five when I went back full-time.

The discourse of at-home mothering was felt strongly by Sherri. She seems to want to justify her working: commenting that "so it wasn't that bad" and "I only worked" - and also pointing out the ages of her children when she returned to work. The pressures seemed more acute now, with teenagers, because of the trouble they could find. Living in Berkshire exacerbated this because of the problems at the high school. Sherri wished she could have "done it differently":

If I could have been a stay at home mom I would have done it. If I had to do it all over again, I'd work full-time right from the minute I got out of the hospital and had those kids, and I'd quit when they were teenagers, maybe not teenagers, maybe 10 or 11 I'd quit. Because that's when they've got sports activities, field trips, it's mom can you make this, mom can you make that, and when they're little they're not as vocal. I don't know, maybe they wouldn't be as disappointed if you couldn't make it because their mom works and they just accept it more when they're little. My daughter is always asking me to give up work. It's hard, so yeah, and I would really like to be at all those things.

Pat, also with teenagers, was in a similar situation when they were younger:

When Ken went back to school I had to go to work, somebody had to bring in some money. My husband went back to school just after our daughter was born, to get his apprentice, so I went back when [daughter] was a year old, and I worked for a few years, and then when we moved to Surrey I didn't work, and then I worked part-time and then I just worked casual.

For these women the tensions of contemporary motherhood were particularly acute. Often, the notion that they shouldn't be working remained, with the result that men's practices didn't change. Pat's husband,
Ken, for instance, worked shiftwork, yet still didn't do any housework. His support for Pat's working habits was also minimal. Currently, she was trying to work four, nine and a half hour days per week instead of five, eight hour days, so that she would have more time at home. Ken was "not too pleased with it" and "I sometimes wonder whether it's worth it". His refusal to change thus made Pat's attempts to live a non-traditional model of motherhood more difficult.

iv. "Part-time is Best"

Given the persistence of both financial concerns and new traditionalist ideals in Berkshire, it should come as no surprise that some thought working part-time was best. Neither working nor staying at home were viewed in entirely favourable terms. Marie, who seemed embarrassed to tell me that she had never worked full-time but had always been a relief nurse since qualifying ten years ago, works on weekends and occasionally in the evening. With two grandmothers close by, baby-sitting is not a problem; she works these shifts to maximize the amount she earns for the time she works.

Working is not only a financial decision, for staying at home is not what it's cracked up to be, not what I thought it would be like. It's hard staying at home, just as hard as a job, that's for sure.

Robyn: What's most hard about staying at home?
Marie: Dealing with kids, it is, it's hard, it depends how many you have, but like I have three and sure they fight and they're bored and you have to keep them out of trouble, they fight over what to watch on TV. This one (four year old) will watch videos all day, I have to play with her, thank goodness they're in school all day and thank goodness their Dad's home on the weekend to keep them entertained too. I don't know what I'd do with three of them all day.

She later adds:
Robyn: Do you work for the money?
Marie: That, and just for my sanity. I like to do something different. I mean staying at home is fine but I mean I don’t want to spend my whole life staying at home with kids, I like my job. People always laugh when I walk in the door [at work]. They say "Marie’s here for her day off". It’s different, it’s a nice change.

Working full time would be similarly problematic:

With me, I have no problem if I don’t work full time, I couldn’t work full time and do all this, I don’t think, I don’t know what kind of life that would be, if I worked full time and he [husband] worked full time, we’d get up, get the kids to daycare and come home, make supper and stuff, I don’t know, I don’t think I could do that.

The number of negatives in this passage are telling of Marie's dislike of "career women". They are seen as selfish:

I don’t think women, I mean people, they want a lot more now, quicker. But meanwhile there’s two people working all the time, and things are more expensive, but whatever you want to do. If I wanted to pay our mortgage off and stuff I would go work full time, but why have kids if I’m going to work full time?

Marie (her husband didn’t want to be interviewed) clearly highlights the fine line between familial and material concerns that women were expected to walk in Berkshire. She seems to be saying that working for financial reasons was okay, as long as you didn’t work too much (that would be detrimental to the children), and didn’t earn too much money (that would only feed into increasing material expectations). Therese provides a good example of the former response. She has always worked part-time, and is currently studying part-time and anticipates completing her course in a couple of years, beginning work when her children enter high school. She feels like she has "to do something else" apart from mothering, but also feels compelled to stay home whilst the children are still at school. Her husband, Hal, would also prefer her to remain at home because of the children.
Familial values were currently dominant in their household, but only until the children were older. The experience of Sharon almost exactly mirrors that of Marie. A sales assistant who had her first child in her early 20s, she returned to work when her first child was seven weeks old. She has worked part-time ever since, and wouldn't work full-time because:

> Every day I'm off for lunch, so my kids can come home, or I'll take them stuff over. They're only small once, you only have them little once. I could work full-time but I don't want to do that.

She also didn't want to leave the paid labour force:

> I don't want to quit. I like getting out, but I get bored at home, that's mainly why I went back and I wanted money. For the bills and stuff. You have to. For everything extra now.

Again through these examples, the virtues of paid work for its own sake are downplayed in favour of being explained in terms of financial contributions and necessary breaks from the children. Motherhood is still interpreted as a primary, if not full time, occupation.

To summarize, the way materialism and new traditionalism meshed within each Berkshire household produced divergent models of motherhood, especially in relation to women's participation in the paid labour force. In effect, new traditionalist ideals were interpreted and modified by material concerns. I have only referred tangentially to the spatiality of the two dominant discourses, for often it was more the specific circumstances of each family, rather than location, that produced difference. In the next section, however, I consider the place-specific cultural milieu that surrounded these practices of mothering in Berkshire.
b. Berkshire as a Symbolic Context for the Interpretation of Motherhood

Place provides a useful lens into contemporary contradictions of motherhood in at least two ways that I explicate here. First, the Berkshire neighbourhood provided an immediate context in which motherhood was interpreted; living in Berkshire shaped the subjective experiences of motherhood there. In particular, the coexistence of many models of motherhood in the one place meant that the pitfalls of the different models were clearly apparent and the problems endemic to each model magnified. A second way that motherhood was spatialized in Berkshire was through resident's relations to, and expectations of, the neighbourhood. In comparison to Glenwood where the neighbourhood was constructed as a resource for mothering, this was not the case in Berkshire, which often exacerbated feelings of isolation. Together, as I show in this section, these two influences of place highlighted the pitfalls of both new traditionalist and modern motherhood.

i. The Clashing of Different Practices of Motherhood

The coexistence of many different ways of combining domestic and waged work within Berkshire seemed to frame many of the women's understandings of themselves as mothers. More specifically, the problems of certain models of motherhood were highlighted. This was certainly not something I was prepared for during my interviews. However, I was alerted to it by Mary, who spoke at length of her feelings of isolation. As a part-time worker, she sensed financial pressures from the women around her that worked full time. For instance, she felt that working women like the women across the road didn't know how to "cut back" in financial terms. She says:
For example, I make a grocery list every week and I make a menu, and I'm almost a joke amongst the neighbours because I make menus and I write down exactly what we're going to eat for supper and what I need. To me I can't see how I can do the groceries without that. So I do that for the ingredients and also I can balance the meals, so that it's economical. And my meals are also from sale flyers whatever on sale each week. So that's about an hour job, but it saves me a lot of money by buying what's on sale. But my neighbours, they're not as regimented, they think I'm weird.

At the same time, she felt excluded from at-home mothering:

The truth of the matter is part-time is okay, I think it's the best of both worlds but it causes a lot of stress sometimes because you're not a full-time paid worker and you're not a full-time mother. You don't have the income of a full-time person, you don't have the time of a full-time mother, so what's a benefit can also work against you. The problem is part time is that you're stretched to your limit because you're in both worlds.

You don't belong in the corporate world and you don't belong in the home world, stay at home mothers look upon you as if you have everything I think. You've got income, you've got a job, you've got excitement. Full-time working mothers look at me and think you're lucky you're at home half time you've got more time with your family, more time with yourself, and it's wrong. A lot of working women, a lot of them have extras, they spend a lot more, they don't know how to cut back.

To a certain extent Mary's dissatisfaction is due to the lack of help she receives from her husband and confirms Duffy and Pupo's claim that part-time work "leaves intact patriarchy, the power structure and the family form".15 "You're so lucky if you have a husband that helps", she told me, "because I'm like a basket case by the time I get to bed". But what is also going on, I think, is a lack of support and compounding of her distress because of the social relations within Berkshire. Right next door to Mary was a woman at home full-time (Fran, whom I interviewed), who seemed to enjoy

---

a supportive relationship with some of the neighbours. The other women in
the cul-de-sac, Mary felt, were so busy with jobs and children that she and
her children could not interact with them.

Ingrid mentioned further conflict that partially derived from the social
relations within the neighbourhood and especially different models of
parenting. She feels that parenting is a touchy subject, and that discussions
of parenting "really set people apart". She uses an example from the
neighbourhood to illustrate this:

I parent differently from the woman next door, she thinks she does it right and I think I do it right. No, I don't think I do it right but I don't agree with what she's doing. She thinks she does it right. Anyway, parenting is so touchy it's not something you talk about unless you're in agreement with somebody.

I then asked her why parenting was so touchy and she replied:

Because, for some reason that has no validity at all, people think that the way children behave reflects on the morals of their parents, so that what my son does reflects on me as a parent, which isn't true because it's a misconception to think that you can control your kids, as if you can predict what they're going to do. You just can't do that. So I don't know, people feel really vulnerable. Either that people feel certain this is the way to do it, and so there's some kind of barrier. But nobody knows what the outcome is gonna be, it's not always the result of parenting but very often it is. People think their kid is going to turn out great but you don't know.

Mary provides a further example of parenting not being discussed:

With neighbours you talk about daily things and activities, but sometimes it's a problem to talk about child raising. For instance a couple of neighbours were talking about a problem with their daughter and they didn't think that my experience mattered and so I just had to swallow my opinion and think, well, they don't know, but there was not credit given to me, maybe she has seven more years experience than us, and to me that was frustrating.
In a similar vein, Traci, at home full-time with two preschoolers, felt isolated, both practically and emotionally. There was a general lamenting of the absence of a strong network of women. Darlene, at home full time and newly arrived in Vancouver, found it especially difficult to carve out a life for herself and her children. Part of this was that most of her neighbours worked full time; another factor was the general unfriendliness she felt.

What I have tried to indicate in this section is how the copresence of a number of different models of motherhood and parenting styles became an interpretive framework in which motherhood was understood. After the interviews I was left with a sense that not only would most prefer to be at home full-time, but that they felt that the cultural climate of the subdivision made them more acutely experience the tensions between their ideal and their practical compromise. What these examples also point out are the ways familial tensions were gendered, and interpreted specifically in relation to maternal employment, highlighting the reason I focus on the issue here. In other words, contradictions inherent in attempting to live new traditionalist lives under material constraints were not only felt by women, but interpreted as women's problems. There were a number of examples of this.

After sensing that Traci may have been feeling "left-out" at home, I asked her whether staying at home was undervalued:

I think so, I think a lot of times people tend to look at you as being lazy like why aren't you out there working, but I think it's kind of a double-edged sword because when I was working I kind of felt like people thought that I was neglecting my kids for working. It's really hard, and then when you stay home they look at you as if you're laying on the couch all the time eating chocolates watching Oprah Winfrey or something.

For Ingrid, the undervaluation was itself gendered:

It's largely the fact, I think, that women are doing it to each other because whichever route you choose you seem to be
the brunt of criticism, either an at-home mother or a working mother.

This blaming of women, (and by implication feminism) is most forcefully put by Mary:

I love having options, and appreciate that, but now that we've been given that option I'm not sure that it is an option. I think we're being pushed to our limit.

She continues:

I think a lot of what's happened in society is women's fault and I see it in the working mothers and I was really saddened during the economy drive [she went doorknocking for the Girl Guides], the stress. I think it is really sad, women are stretched to the limit and they're financially dependent on the income and I think there's a lot of women don't want to be there [work] but they've got to be there now and there's a lot of very torn women, they're out working and their heart wants to be at home. So I think I don't know if it's totally the fault of women or not but I think a lot of women realize it was the wrong choice, these dual roles.

The activities of women, as mothers and wage-earners, were therefore the exclusive focus of attention and criticism.

ii. "The Neighbourhood doesn't matter" - Parenting, School and Gender

In chapter four I outlined how the population of Berkshire was constantly changing and how walls around the home were built. I continue this story here. In contrast to Glenwood were extensive networks developed within the subdivision, in Berkshire it seemed that neighbourhood-based contacts were difficult to make and sustain, and were sometimes seen as undesirable. As a result, the neighbourhood as a whole, and the meanings circulating within it, were not particularly supportive of different employment and mothering decisions, as I suggest in this section.
Schools are often seen as important in establishing contact between parents. Although there was an elementary school in the middle of Berkshire Park, where the children of the adults I interviewed went, it was not pivotal in establishing social networks. None of the women I spoke to, except Therese, were active in school affairs. Generally the reason was lack of time:

I don't go to PTA and stuff, I stay away from that, working and different things I don't really have time. [Marie]

I don't mind doing my fair share but I don't want to, I work part-time too. [Sharon]

Most would participate in organized fundraisers, such as "fun night" or a volleyball tournament, but these were occasional. Notably, in contrast to Glenwood, these were social rather than educational events.

That the school did not bind parents was also symptomatic of a more general relationship between people and the neighbourhood. It was felt that neighbours weren't friends. Sherri "couldn't say that it's [Berkshire] friendly" and "I don't really have time, I don't coffee klatch". Linda summarized the situation:

Again it's the same thing I haven't really developed close friendships with any of them in particular because of that time thing. They're certainly very pleasant people and I enjoy their company, I enjoy the contact that I have with them. But we don't talk really, I guess because we have an avenue for that within our church. There isn't that need others find fulfilled within their social context, school or neighbourhood whatever.16

Barb and Sid developed social and support networks through hockey, as did Sherri. Even after living in the neighbourhood for four years Barb still had no close acquaintances there, except a woman she worked with. Liz and Jess kept up with old neighbours. Marie, Tim and Traci relied on extended family

16 I deal with church and religion explicitly in chapter seven.
networks. Mark would sit on his front lawn and watch his toddlers play, but wouldn’t converse with his neighbours beyond saying hello.

This distinction between friend and neighbour created a social distance that meant that perceived differences between mothers were not discussed. Mary, for instance, feels left out from the mothers who are at home full-time:

I don’t see them too much because they’re busy. I think there’s a definite jealousy because she [any mother] wants to be at home with the children at least part of the time. But then I don’t have the money to do lots of things.

Much of Mary’s dissatisfaction could be due to her impression of her neighbours. My point here is that the way neighbours and the neighbourhood were defined in Berkshire meant that she was never able to explore these difficulties with the other women in her cul-de-sac. She thus felt the tensions between her practical and ideal models of motherhood more acutely.

Where social networks existed within Berkshire they were not extensive. Typically, two or three women would see each other often. Fran, for instance, was close to a woman across the road, primarily because their children were similar ages and they were both at home. Marie enjoyed a similar relationship with the woman behind her and although she lived five doors away from Fran did not know her. Within these contexts supportive activities like car-pooling and shared baby-sitting were evident, akin to Isabel Dyck’s findings.\textsuperscript{17} But these networks were limited and were seen to be "cliquey" by others. For instance, a woman like Traci who saw herself as "not extroverted", found it difficult to find others with whom to share experiences. She notes that two of the women in her cul-de-sac get together, but she doesn’t feel comfortable joining them. Moreover,

\textsuperscript{17} Dyck, 1989, \textit{op.cit.}
dependence on small networks in a context of transiency,\textsuperscript{18} meant that women's relationships within the neighbourhood were constantly changing. Fran's friend, for instance, was moving elsewhere in Surrey, and Fran was sure it would affect her. Similarly, since Linda was moving, Liz wondered how she was going to arrange play and babysitting for her children. On the other hand, Ingrid's experiences of being at home had been brightened when Darlene moved in:

> I didn't know the neighbours very well until the lady next door moved in, she's a very extroverted person and she's also home with her kids, as opposed to the way it was before when most of the women were working. So she's made a whole different atmosphere to the neighbourhood.

Darlene, for instance, arranged for the women in her cul-de-sac to have drinks one evening before Christmas.

My point is not that the neighbourhood was overtly unsupportive. Rather, I have been trying to point out how people's relation to the neighbourhood sometimes exacerbated the contradictions of contemporary motherhood. In particular, when this different relation to place was layered upon the copresence of different practices of maternal employment, a cultural milieu was created that exacerbated the disjunctures women felt between their ideals and realities. Undoubtedly, women and men there felt that a new traditionalist model was most appropriate, but this model was modified in practice by financial concerns and the perceived material expectations of children (and themselves). These ideas circumscribed the possible experiences of being a working mother such that paid work was defined as enjoyable and fulfilling if it was done for financial reasons only. Since the neighbourhood formed an immediate context through which mothering experience was interpreted, the heterogeneity of Berkshire exacerbated these

\textsuperscript{18} Of the fifteen families I interviewed, five were contemplating moving.
tensions, making clearly apparent other models of motherhood. Parallel was a different relation to place: the school, neighbours and neighbourhood were not central, it was individuals. Consequently, motherhood was experienced individually, and differences between neighbours not explored.

III. Supporting New Traditionalist Motherhood in Glenwood

New traditionalist ideals were strong in Glenwood. The validity and supremacy of living in a male breadwinner, female homemaker family was obvious to those with home I spoke. Different, however, was the extent of financial pressures, which meant that it was possible to fulfil these ideals in Glenwood. The number of women who were at-home mothers in Glenwood was certainly a factor in this coalescence of ideal and reality, and I document some of the reasons women were at home in this introduction. What I wish to focus on, however, is the symbolic climate created by, and part of, this situation, for it nourished new traditionalist families in a number of ways. In the first part of this section, I examine how Glenwood was seen as a place for and of the traditional nuclear family, and how this affected interpretations and practices of mothering. I then analyze how a different relation to place, particularly expectations of place, reinforced new traditionalist motherhood and turn to an examination of the exclusionary implications of these interpretive repertoires.
Table 6.2. Labour Force Activities of Glenwood Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number and Age+ of Children</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Partner's Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerrie</td>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>2 - 8 and 6</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>sales rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>secretary</td>
<td>2 - 6 and 8</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>sales rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>2 - 9 and 7</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debby</td>
<td>designer</td>
<td>2 - 7 and 3</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>cook</td>
<td>4 - 7,4, twins 3</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mina</td>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>2 - 5 and 2</td>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>school asst</td>
<td>3 7,5 and 2</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>florist</td>
<td>1 - 13</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>training manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>computer analyst</td>
<td>3 - 9,4 and 1</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>self-employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Full-time Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number and Age+ of Children</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Partner's Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>physiotherapist</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>3 - 13,12 and 10</td>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>2 - 18 and 15</td>
<td>Ernie</td>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Working Full-time out of Financial Necessity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number and Age+ of Children</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Partner's Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>2 - 8 and 6</td>
<td>Desmond</td>
<td>self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby</td>
<td>physiotherapist</td>
<td>2 - 8 and 6</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>2 - 7 and 3</td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>electrician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Current occupation, or one immediately before children.
+ Years, unless otherwise stated

At the outset, it is necessary to establish the range of maternal employment practices in Glenwood, as they formed the basis of the local culture I focus on later. Whereas many Berkshire women were forced to work for financial reasons, most Glenwood women were able to choose whether to work or not. Their husbands were in relatively stable, professional, managerial or sales jobs that provided a steady flow of money. Exceptions were those like Pete, Anne, Libby and David, whose capital gain on housing, not their current income, allowed them to buy into Glenwood. For these households, the women worked out of financial necessity. This
absence of financial imperatives translated into half of the women working neither full-time nor part-time, summarized in Table 6.2. Of these, three actually worked from home - Louise, Veronica and Julie - but didn't consider themselves working mothers. Again, like Ingrid in Berkshire, they explained to me that they were "at-home" although they also had paid employment. Of the five who did have paid work, one was part-time and the other three worked for purely financial reasons: if they could afford to they would not work.

Another reason women did not participate in the paid labour force in Glenwood was unhappiness with their labour market experiences, a factor suggested by Kathleen Gerson. Paid work experiences were described negatively, most especially by Debby. Not unusually, the arrival of the first child prompted many women to leave the labour force. When I asked Debby, who now has a 4 year old and a 7 year old and had worked when her first child was young, whether she could afford to quit work, she replied:

Yeah, we had waited to have kids, thinking that I wasn't going to work. If you could ever afford it, everybody lives up to what they make. A lot of people who say they can't afford it could.

However, this wasn't the way it worked out:

The people I worked for, they talked me into coming back for a minimum of six months, then I got holidays for the full year, I was up to four weeks of holidays, and I got every second Friday off, I was the only female so my boss said you gotta try.

Her description of her life then, a reluctant working mother ("they talked me into it") suggests why she subsequently quit:

19 Both Louise and Veronica averaged one day a week at their jobs, whereas Julie put in full days at the family business. Julie's description of herself is tied to her religious beliefs, which I consider in depth in chapter seven.

20 Gerson, op.cit.
My sister looked after him (son), I dropped him off on my way to work, in the West Burnaby area, so I would leave here at 6.30 and drive every morning. So I'd get him up, drop him off then I'd go and have lunch two or three days with him. My husband used to drive me crazy, he'd say I never see him, I said the kids come first, the house comes second and you come third but don't worry I come fourth. I'd be up at 2 in the morning trying to get stuff caught up, making the dinner for the next day, because I didn't want to put TV dinners on the table. We probably rushed too much.

A combination of factors thus led Debby to stay "at home" - she could afford it since the mortgage was not large, her husband was in a secure and well-paying job, she felt she was being pushed too hard at work (and at home), and her daycare arrangements were unsatisfactory. It is the implications of the number of women at home that I focus on in what follows.

a. New Traditionalism in Glenwood

The nourishment of new traditionalist family forms and gender identities in Glenwood was partially the outcome of the interpretations and practices I described in chapter four. As residents wished to be isolated from other types of families, they saw Glenwood as a place for the nuclear family. In chapter four I showed how some moved to Glenwood because of what it was not: not Whalley, not chaotic, not single parents. But in terms of family, Glenwood was valued for what it was: a place for the nuclear family and those concerned with their children's welfare. This was expressed more explicitly than in Berkshire. The familial spatial strategy was especially clear to Anne:

You put your children in an area where people are roaming the streets and they're going to develop a set of values with that type of people. So as a parent it's a bit of family planning, you know I wouldn't say I would alienate my children from other children, but the way I see it these days, it's pretty important to put them in the right place and let them have as much freedom as they can in the one environment, making sure that that's the right environment.
I don't know what you do as a parent, if they get into the wrong environment, then I think you've got a whole set of problems.

Glenwood was the right place, for here people were different:

I'm not saying that all the people here are perfect or that there's really good company, but certainly people that take the time to put their children in lessons, to teach their children, who want their children to be looking nice, are on the right track. Those are the kinds of people you might want your children associating with.

The vision of Glenwood as different was common to all. According to David:

I think a lot of people in this area that I know have kids really do [put a lot of effort into parenting], it's probably been a conscious choice to have a family and it's important to them and they want to do well.

And Ernie, whose teenagers had been raised in East Vancouver:

I think that people have a common interest and that is that they want to bring their children up in a nice pleasant neighbourhood. And they want a good education for their kids and they want their kids to have good values. In the two and a half years that we've been here and kids have been playing up and down the street I haven't heard any bad words, any cursing words at all.

And Veronica:

I think it's really easy here, I think this is the place, if you're in this situation, and you value this type of life, then I think this is the place to live for it. Because like I said before, you hardly meet any other types of families, even though I've met lots of people who might not have the same values or whatever, but the way it looks from the outside is mom, dad and the kids, and all that kind of stuff. And all the parents turning up to all the games.

I could fill pages with quotes about Glenwood as a family place. The point is that it was commonly acknowledged that certain family forms naturally belonged in Glenwood. A good parent was defined as one who
would always, or at least often, "be there" for the children. When I asked Debby what qualities were important to her as a mother, she replied:

A lot of available time for them, doing lots of different things. I just bought my son and I tickets for Joseph, spending time camping, spending time going to a play like that.

However, being there, in the right quantity was not possible if both parents worked. As Michael puts it:

In some ways you're almost forced now to have two people working. But with two people working you can't get as involved as parents. It has to make a difference. There's more women at home here, and there's also more men that are doing jobs that don't require them to be always working normal hours. So you'll see more men at school, or some of them working different shifts, and they actually care about what's going on at school, and go up there and get involved.

Despite the preceding quote, the notion of "being there" was gendered in Glenwood. It was women who should remain at home; an ideal family requires a woman who was "there". Doug is explicit:

I think there always is that, mom's home or something like that so we can't come home and party. I don't know, I think you feel more secure if there's someone at home, someone to come home to, in case something does happen. Jeff is in high school right now but when he was growing up I think it was nice to come across the field and find mom in the house.

These opinions were not only held by men, although this is an interesting point that I will consider later. Women at home thought their life was the best way to do things. Although Ruby, for instance, often had difficulties at home, she felt it was the right decision:

Friends would say I could use someone to help me out [with four small children] but all I could think of was that this is something I would like to do for myself, they couldn't do what I do, you know they wouldn't take the same interest as me and I wouldn't want anyone in my home anyway. I like doing it [childcare] all myself. I suffer
at times because of this since it's a lot, but I'm happy I can do it. I wouldn't want anyone in the house, both of us have worked on this, and we believe in it, it's something we think we should do.

Even women in the paid labour force articulated similar feelings. Pete and Anne, who work split-shifts in order to afford the house and save on childcare, don't view their situation as ideal. We were talking about Pete's activities with the children, and whether he actually spent more time with them than other fathers because of Anne working afternoon shifts and therefore not being home most evenings. But Anne was quick to interrupt: "It's different, I don't think it's ideal, I think ideal is being at home all the time". Pete added: "But they get to be with one or the other all day". So even though the ideal, especially for Anne, would be for her to be at home all day, Pete saw their situation as second best, because at least one of them could "be there".

Although Jennifer's job as a physiotherapist seems natural to her, it is not without its problems:

I don't think it's easy to work, there's a lot of obstacles, you know after school care and day-care, you know it's sort of harder having been through it, it's not the best thing for your kids, if you can stay home it's probably ideal, but if it's not the best thing for you, you have to compromise.

As a final point, I would like to note some exceptions to these familial values. Being at home full-time was not ideal for Libby:

There's been many times in my life when I've thought I really didn't want to go to work, but I do get a lot of satisfaction out of work, I work with wonderful people. I also think that I'm the type of individual who couldn't be home all day.

Notably, however, Libby was definitely in the minority. Most women and men in Glenwood thought it best (for men, women and children) that women not work in the paid labour force.
Specific mothering practices were also implicit in this ideal of being there. Good mothering, ensuring the safety and development of one's child, necessitated the isolation of children from problematic outside influences and their involvement in appropriate activities. Afternoons like Kathy's resulted:

that's when the fun starts when you're driving all over the place to get one to piano lessons, one to swimming lessons, one to skating lessons, so between 2.30 and the dinner hour a lot of time is spent taxiing kids around to their activities.

Moreover, organized play and activities were the norm, partly because of fear for their children's safety. Although Libby felt that children needed some independence, she didn't allow her daughter to "roam the street":

I find that if she has to go more than four or five houses either way, it is more an arranged event, as opposed to just popping over. She may go across the street, but not in the same way, I think we do tend to guard our children quite a bit.

Kathy’s experiences at the school led her to generalize:

I find most parents in this area, maybe because one’s busy it makes the other feel that they should have their kids involved, so most of us have our kids very involved in many extra-curricular activities.

b. Local Culture of At-Home Mothering

Certainly the extent of arranged play for children I documented above is not uncommon. But it was also facilitated by the number of women at home and the local culture that produced and sustained it. In Glenwood, the neighbourhood based social networks were based on the number of women at home. According to Debby:

Most of the ones I know here are home, it’s very strange, I would say out of my son’s class, I can only think of maybe

21 Dyck, 1989, op.cit.
two or three that weren’t at home moms, unusual, especially in Surrey. It’s a strange neighbourhood that way, just knowing my sister-in-laws and stuff, the neighbourhoods they live in the moms are at work. When you’re at home, every day you walk your kids to school, and you get them, and as you’re leaving the school, they say can David come over to my house to play, we all sort of do that. Across the street, we all went to the park on Wednesday, and all went to Dairy Queen afterward. So if you’re home you’re exposed to them more,

As Debby points out, the number of women at home became the basis of social as well as child-centred networks. As she later explains:

But the moms, I went out a couple of weeks ago with a girl across the street, she’s away now, to look at fabrics, to make curtains for her house. And we’ll go for coffee together.

However, it was not only the presence of women that nourished new traditionalism; this situation was bolstered by a different relation to place. The neighbourhood was a central component of parenting practices, for it was seen as a resource to be used. I asked Kathy whether she thought anyone would feel uncomfortable living in Glenwood, and her answer is notable for the matter-of-fact way she sees Glenwood - which she defines as a "community" - as a resource. She says:

I often feel really quite sorry for, just on this street anyway, and I’m sure there’s more around, the family that would maybe just be comprised of an older couple, there’s one on this street, and they just never come out of their house, they have nothing in common with anybody else, they just don’t come out of their house, and there’s another family around the corner where both the man and the woman work pretty well full-time and they don’t have any children, and they don’t seem to reap the benefits of the community. They have a house here, and that’s it, and maybe they’re really happy in their house, but that’s not what a community is. So I often think of them and think too bad, they’re really missing out on a lot. And why are they in a big house in an area like when they don’t use the yard, use their neighbours, use the park?
Kathy was referring to more than the physical amenities of Glenwood. The help of neighbours, especially in parenting, was also central. Since everybody knew everyone else, then ensuring that children "stay out of trouble" was relatively easy. As Debby puts it:

You don’t see kids hanging around at night, parents are pretty good about that, if I saw someone’s child hanging around I’d phone them and they’d phone me. We have a strong parents' committee at the school very strong.

The neighbourhood could also be supportive for non-nuclear families. Edward and Ruby had been concerned about their neighbour’s children, since both parents worked late and left the children unsupervised. Living in Glenwood, however, made a difference, demonstrated in this interjection into my conversation with Ruby by Edward:

I heard that you were talking about our neighbours. There seems to be less care put into their kids, yet they’re in a neighbourhood where other people can look after them. In a neighbourhood full of those kind of problems, there’s lots of single moms, they might care for them, but they have their own problems.

Relations with the elementary school are also indicative of this different relation to place, which in turn nourished certain mothering practices. The school was the centre of Glenwood’s social network, as outlined by Kathy:

The school was sort of the same way, everybody that went to the school was in this little area, you knew everyone, everyone that went to school you knew where they were coming from and what they were like. The teachers were very stable in the school, they liked the school, the kids have made good friends, the adults have made good friends, and it’s just like a nice big family.

A number of women that I interviewed were some of these active mothers. Sue told me about her "little job" at the school, which involved coordinating the participation of thirty parents (mainly mothers) in the classroom. She said she spent a lot of time on the phone every morning.
Similarly, before Kathy returned to work she was in charge of fundraising. The school sometimes cut across the division between those women who were and were not in the paid labour force, especially for women like Libby who worked afternoons or evenings. Libby was at the school most mornings, like the morning of our interview:

We got them off to school, it was probably 10 o'clock before I got back, but it was the first day back [at school in September], so all the moms kind of chit-chattered, what are you going to do, are you going to help out on this committee, who's doing that, it was kind of getting oriented, the fundraising is already up and going, it's a really close-knit school that way.

Involvement at the school was expressive, at least partly, of the importance parents placed on education. According to Jim:

[If they] want to have a field trip and here all they have to do is say we'll have a field trip and they'll have a fleet of minivans parked in the lot... They do get the support from the parents, which is good. There's always parents helping out at the school, especially in the younger grades, there's always a parent in the classroom just helping with the art or whatever. Getting things ready and letting the teacher do the teaching.

The school also cemented and initiated social networks to an extent that didn't happen in Berkshire. Men were often involved, for instance, in school dances or garage sales, as were most neighbours. As a result, there was much more of a sense that Glenwood was a specific, family-oriented place. These varying relations to place formed a context of interpretation of motherhood, as I show in the next section.

---

22 Importantly, as I show in chapter seven, there was another parental network in Glenwood focused around a nearby religious school.
c. Glenwood New Traditionalism as a Context of Interpretation of Motherhood and Fatherhood

The valorization of at-home motherhood by the people I interviewed was reinforced by the meanings circulating within Glenwood: the local culture provided a supportive environment for those who had chosen to remain at home. Rather than feeling isolated and bored, the women represented themselves as busy and fulfilled. There was some sense of defensiveness in their responses, a reaction, they said, to society's treatment of women who choose not to work in paid employment. Unlike the suburbs of the 1950s, therefore, they viewed their identity as mothers as unusual and something to be justified. Within Glenwood, however, they felt such justification was unnecessary. Instead, it provided an outlet for their energy and intellect. Their days were full, they seemed aware of their privilege, and there seemed to be a tone of pride when they described their days to me. None were considering going back to work, they essentially had full-time jobs in maintaining the neighbourhood. Kathy's experiences before returning to work are perhaps the best example. Her description of her day is detailed and content:

When I was home, and there are a lot of women that are home here. It would be typical to get up with them, 7 o'clock 'ish, get their breakfast, get them out the door to school, and now often I would walk the kids to school even though I'm only like a minute away, it's a sort of social thing to do to get up in the morning and walk the kids to school. The kids like it, and then you see all the other ladies or men there and stop and have a chit chat and there might be a coffee afterwards, that was the big highlight of the day when I wasn't working. And often those coffee meetings that we had would have a purpose, you know they would be a meeting of a committee, many times in the morning I'd get the kids off to school, quickly come in, clean up the kitchen then head off to a coffee meeting and that would usually last till 11.30 at which point I would

23 I talk later about why she returned to work.
always leave because my kids came home for lunch. Sometimes it would go on till 2.30 and so a lot of hours in the day were spent with the other people in the area, with school related business.

Motherhood was professionalized, consisting of "committee" meetings, and, as the following quote suggests, was an occupation:

I was always very proud of the fact that I was an at-home mom. And sometimes on application forms or whatever when it asks you for your occupation I would put down mother, not housewife or unemployed, and I was really proud of that.

The culture sometimes had a material effect. Louise had left her previous job as a retail store manager for medical reasons just before moving to Glenwood. After settling her family into her new home she planned to return to work full time, but when I spoke to her three years later was still at home. For Louise, the neighbourhood, and especially local culture, supported her decision to stay home.

When we moved out here I met a girlfriend that we had lived in the same apartment 18 years ago when our kids were younger. She's lived out here (north of the freeway, and in Glenwood for the past five) for 18 years so she took me under her wing and introduced me to the area, and got me started in aerobics and I met a whole slough of new friends that was really great, we all did a lot together. If I hadn't met her again I think I would have been looking for a job, because J was in school, and I would have been home all day. I hadn't decided whether I was going to start my craft again or not, so that made a big difference, there was a social life there which I'd never had before because I was always working.

Not all women at home used the local culture to affirm their full-time investment in motherhood. Julie points out the culture's imbrication in materialism, its focus around and expression through consumption. This conflicted with Julie's belief that children should not be spoilt and led her to distance herself from others in the neighbourhood:
No, I don't really have a lot, don't talk to them much, don't have much discussion. They're all talking about things that are important to them, like what size boats they own, where they went on holidays, I don't want to be caught up in that, I don't think that's what life is about.

Although her religious beliefs supported her decision to stay at home, she felt isolated in Glenwood. Rather than the openness and camaraderie described by others, this is her description of the neighbourhood:

Because of the income of most of the people in this neighbourhood, it makes it a very, basically unfriendly neighbourhood, and it's not because of any problems in particular, but I don't really know any of my neighbours, and I'm not blaming them, I'm blaming me too, it's because of the lifestyle of the people that live in this neighbourhood.

For other working mothers, the culture was a context for their experiences. In most cases, it encouraged the establishment of a symbolic divide between at-home and working mothers, a divide with either ambiguous or exclusionary implications. Anne, forced to work for financial reasons, recognizes the material benefits her children receive from living in Glenwood.

I think it's a bonus having some women who can afford to stay at home who really would like to take more of an interest in things and get a lot of the stuff done and I think that's why our school benefits and our kids benefit.

Her children benefit because they are in an environment composed of parents who care, unlike her previous Newton neighbourhood:

With a family you also have to look at do I like the surroundings I'm in, if the children across the road are not nice, and these ones are not this, .. do I want my children to have that close contact with those children, there's no way of escaping it and then they start behaving like those other children.

Even though she couldn't be at home full-time with her children, Anne's perception of the neighbourhood's good mothering practices meant that she relied on the subdivision in a symbolic and practical way, as an appropriate
and beneficial environment for her children. In this respect Glenwood eased
some of the tension she felt in being a working mother. In particular,

I've done some talking to some of the moms, and I've
found the ones that have spare time and what not, are very
with it ladies, and can definitely get the job done. They
can, they can organize, they can plan, they can implement,
they get a lot of stuff happening and done and whatever.
That's a bonus, you're not dealing with ladies who just sit
on their behinds all day, these ladies are busy, if they've
got the time and take an interest, they will get the job
done.24

At the same time, it made her practical attempts at combining home and paid
work more difficult. The women at home were so busy, Anne felt, that

I can take my kids to the daycare in the morning, but who's
going to take them to school, the daycare doesn't provide a
ride. So now I've got to find a mom to help me. Now a lot
of the moms in the area don't mind helping occasionally,
but they do have lives, nice social lives, and a lot of them
are into aerobics and they go for coffees or teas and they
like to do things, the moms in this area do things, they
don't just stay at home and do housework all day, so they
don't mind helping but I don't think there's a lot of people
that want to be tied down to pick up children.

And later:

Being that I work full time and I do work afternoons, I find
it really difficult to arrange play, that's the only thing in this
neighbourhood sometimes. There are some neighbours'
kids, that will come and play and as they're [children]
getting older it's getting easier. But for parents with small
children, you don't see children playing out in the streets
very often. So you really have to find out, the preschools
are really popular and again I think it's because the children
don't have the same contact sometimes on the street as
other areas do, the parents first of all, being upper class or
having a little bit of money can afford to send their children
to preschool, they want to give the children the best, and
also I don't think the children get child stimulation that
easily in this area so you're looking for something like that.

24 She was referring, for instance, to fundraising, buying and putting in
playground equipment.
Similarly, relative newcomers like Jennifer found the social networks too tight. She preferred more fluid social relations - people dropping in unannounced (she tried this with me, not telling Rob that I was coming) rather than formal dinners. The parenting culture of Glenwood was stifling to children, she felt, and difficult for her.

It seems to me, we’re pretty free we let her ride her bike out on the street, but most kids her age (7) are not even allowed out of their house alone, period. So it’s not like they can all play together, you have to make appointments and the kids that are allowed out take advantage and they’re always at your house.

She didn’t agree with the extent of control, since there would always be an element of danger in everyone’s lives. Moreover, it meant that organized activities were the only alternative:

I think that’s another thing about not letting their kids out to play, if you want them to be healthy and active you’ve got to put them into sports and pay for lessons, because there’s no other stuff, I mean there doesn’t seem to be a lot of other ways that they can amuse themselves. Rob used to play street hockey in Winnipeg, kids don’t seem to do that anymore.

Such a cemented new traditionalism also made it harder for women who were working. Kathy had been at home with her three children until the week before I interviewed her and was generally regretting her decision. The job opportunity had come up so she had taken it, but:

I don’t really know why I’m working now, I really don’t. When the job came along I thought oh no, what have I done now. I’m still thinking that.

Her current schedule is a constant source of worry to her and of conflict between her and her husband Glen. It was also a concern for the children:

I find the children, tonight there was this conflict here, conflict here, tears here, tears there. I think they are missing me, I’m very much a part of every minute of their lives and all of a sudden I’m not there.
The contrast between the description of Kathy's day above, when she was not in the labour force, to the following description, is striking and indicative of her problems in making the transition to being a full-time paid employee, especially in Glenwood:

Now that I'm working I leave at 7.30 every morning, the 2 children that are left at home are 10 and 12, so they get themselves off to school, so they're here for an hour in the morning by themselves. My eldest boy goes to the same school with me. So I don't get home now till 5 o'clock at night. I try to get a quick dinner, quicker than I usually used to prepare, on the table, and by 8 o'clock at night I have work to do, so I work from about 8 till 11 on my own homework. Between 11 and 11.30 I'll try to do a quick bit of housework, and then I'll go to bed.

Certainly part of Kathy's discontent is the process of adjusting from domestic to paid work, and her husband's refusal to adjust his schedule. But I think her previous experiences of being at home in Glenwood also contributed. She missed the local network and felt apart from it, yet her family and household work (cleaning, involvement in her children's homework and activities) continued to be guided by standards she and others had set when she wasn't working. In this respect her return to work was made more difficult by the local culture of mothering.

The meanings circulating within Glenwood nourished the reproduction of the "old" nuclear family as the best environment for children, and supported women pursuing this option. Conversely, non-traditional mothers, those working either full or part-time, faced a number of more localized problems in Glenwood, not only presenting practical constraints for these women but also highlighting their dissatisfaction with their situation and their desire to be at home.

Central to these new traditionalist families in Glenwood was a particular notion of masculinity. Like the traditional nuclear family where it
has been alleged that being a breadwinner was central to the definition of masculinity, men in Glenwood derived material benefits and a sense of self from this local culture, which they in part produced.\(^{25}\) Materially, a bargain was struck in many of the households, either implicitly or explicitly, that men would be the main wage earner and therefore be absolved from most of the domestic activities. This was most evident with Steve and Debby, as Steve describes:

Debby's responsible for them during the day when I'm at work, so when I get home I take over. I try and spend as much time with them as I possibly can, Debby does a lot of work around the house that gives me the free time to be able to go and do those things, like on a weekend things are caught up, grass is cut and whatever else, so that I can just go. I've got to admit, that I'm lucky in that regard, that I'm not a guy who has to come home and look at grass one more time.

More symbolically, many of the men also felt that their wives should not work. Being a provider was an important component of their masculinity, as was the satisfaction of being able to support a family without a wife's economic contribution. Glen's experiences and thoughts about fatherhood are revealing:

Funny enough I heard some radio talk show program about house husbands and people think what's wrong with that guy, he's supposed to be the breadwinner, and Kathy was concerned with people saying what kind of a mother are you, going back to work. I come from a very large gregarious family and Kathy comes from a very small, totally different upbringing. When our first child was born, she was very uncomfortable, holding him, changing him, I had to give him his first bath because she was afraid.

But Glen then corrects himself:

\(^{25}\) In a different context, Lillian Rubin, 1994, Families on the Faultline: America's Working Class Speaks About The Family, The Economy, Race and Ethnicity, New York: Harper Collins, also shows the importance of at-home mothering to masculinity. She finds that working class men appreciate their wives income, but "they can't fully shake the feeling that they've failed at their primary task"; p.78.
But you know, I have some pretty strong feelings about the male-female thing and the feminist movement. I'm old fashioned - what's wrong with having a situation where the guy goes and works and the mother brings up the kids. I think bringing up the kids is too bloody important to pass off to daycares, or baby-sitters. I grew up in the traditional nuclear family, not perfect by any means, but mom was home, dad worked, even when I was in my mid-teens and I would come home and yell mom and when I didn't hear a response I remember that sinking feeling like what's going on, something's not right, the world is supposed to be the same way.

He then projects this gendered ideal onto his own family:

I think my kids probably kind of like coming home and finding mom at home, and a lot of their friends their mothers work and they come home and they make themselves a sandwich and sit in front of the TV, it's a lonely sort of feeling I think. Our kids are very fortunate, and they're also fortunate that Kathy's so into mothering, some people say she's supermom.

My discussions with Glen about family, feminism and politics were lengthy. As the interview progressed (and the tape ran out), it became increasingly clear that his sense of self was clearly derived from having Kathy at home. When we were talking about the family's current turmoil with Kathy's return to work, he stated that it was her decision, and that she didn't need to work financially. As a result, he said, he was not going to pick up any of the slack. One interpretation of this exchange is the embeddedness of Glen's identity in having a wife that did not work. Kathy confirms my suspicions about Glen and the satisfaction he derived from Kathy not working. We were talking about whether at-home mothers were undervalued, and she was explaining to me that she never personally felt undervalued. She was:

proud of the fact that I was an at home mom, ... really proud of that. And that was my husband's feeling too, he was really proud of the fact that his wife didn't work.

For Doug, women at home were central to family:
I think there always is that, mom’s home or something like that so we can’t come home and party. I don’t know, I think you feel more secure if there’s someone at home, someone to come home to, in case something does happen. James is in high school right now, but when he was growing up I think it was nice to come across the field and find mom in the house. But it just can’t happen for a lot of people. We were just lucky.

It was also central to his identity in a way surprisingly similar to Glen.

Yeah, Louise and I talked about this the other day, that’s one of the reasons, I always tell her get a job. [laughing] But actually when it really comes down to it I’m glad she’s at home with James because I think he’s a good kid, he keeps out of trouble. Maybe this is a wrong statement, but the kids that seem to have the trouble are the ones that are latchkey kids, not all of them, but you wonder, and I can remember growing up, the first thing I did when I walked in the door, was yell up the basement stairs, mom, I’m going out to play, but there was always somebody there.

In this section I have tried to suggest how the traditional nuclear family was encouraged and sustained in a particular place-specific way in Glenwood. On the initial basis that many women did not have to work for financial reasons, local social networks developed around the school and "at home" mothers, cementing the importance of at home mothering. Again, the social networks and cultures within the neighbourhood provided a context through which motherhood was interpreted, though to different effects than in Berkshire. On the one hand, a supportive environment for at home mothers was created, ameliorating the isolation and tension often identified in the literature. On the other hand, this new traditional motherhood was exclusionary; women working or unable to participate in the social networks were excluded. Further, it was also partly an exercise in male power: men derived satisfaction from their wives not working.
IV. Conclusions

Attempts to live new traditionalist lives, even in single family neighbourhoods designed and chosen by residents solely for that purpose, remain fraught with difficulties, especially for women. Material pressures, and the social and symbolic contexts of "family places" mediate these attempts in sometimes problematic ways, as I have tried to demonstrate in this chapter. In Berkshire, the "ideal family" where mothers were at home all day was necessarily modified by financial constraints, producing a neighbourhood marked by a heterogeneity of mothering practices. The symbolic climate created by this diversity, along with a different relation to place, highlighted the "other side" without encouraging its exploration. Consequently, the disjuncture between ideals and realities was acutely felt. In Glenwood, increased affluence was paralleled by the creation of a new traditionalist neighbourhood, with a local culture that nourished at-home mothering and spatial and temporal control of children. The case studies offered here, both separately and in comparison, demonstrate both the continuing power of traditional notions of family, and also their modification by, and interpretation within, context. The case studies also highlight how women's experiences of new traditionalism, can, in certain contexts, be more fulfilling than attempts to combine paid work and motherhood. Through this analysis of the micro-geographies of the practices and ideals of motherhood and maternal employment, I have also suggested that local spaces and meanings are ambiguously implicated in the interpretation of motherhood. Cognizance of the cultural context highlights how the local is not necessarily supportive of motherhood practices. Indeed, place-based interpretations are supportive of some models and not others.
In the summer of 1993 I had my first interview in Surrey. It was thus with a mixed sense of trepidation and excitement that I knocked on Julie and Brian's door in Glenwood on a pleasant summer evening. When I arrived Julie was on the phone with a client,\(^1\) so Brian agreed to "go first". He spoke quietly of his work as a builder and father, clearly pointing out the ways his church and his belief in God guided his family and business lives, including, in some instances, praying for business advice. About an hour later, Julie had finished on the phone, and she made us a cup of coffee before sitting down for "her turn". She too, told of the centrality of Christianity in her life, especially as a mother. Her religious beliefs formed a lens through which she interpreted her relation to others (including her neighbours), her social philanthropy, and her decision to stay at home full time. To say that I was unprepared for Julie's and Brian's stories is an understatement. All my preconceptions about what I would find were shattered: Julie was at-home full time (I expected women to be working in order to afford to live in Glenwood); she was disconnected from others in the neighbourhood (I anticipated motherhood support networks); and she was openly religious. As someone whose life is unaffected by religious beliefs, I had presumed that others would be similarly secular. Yet my conversations with Julie and Brian directly challenged my position, forcing me to confront the role that religious belief played in the lives of those I interviewed and my

\(^1\) They ran a construction business.
representation of those lives. This chapter is my attempt to explore the importance of religion in these people's lives.  

A discussion of religion also continues other themes that I have developed through the thesis. Religious beliefs, especially Christian and evangelical norms, have been linked to strong adherence to traditional family forms and norms, and have also been identified as underlying some of the force of new traditionalism, perspectives I review in the first section of this chapter. My aim, therefore, is to investigate how the links between family, gender, mothering and place (discussed in chapter six), are intersected and underlain by religious beliefs. In particular, I use religion as a way of both deepening and disrupting the stories I have told so far about white, middle-class family life in Surrey. I depart from the format I have adopted in the rest of the thesis in the second section; presenting narratives of four of the people with whom I spoke. Although these narratives remain representations of the stories I was told, since I have selected segments and arranged them, by presenting them with minimal editing (in comparison with the rest of the thesis) I hope to let the residents do more of the talking than I. Bringing these two issues - thinking about new traditionalism in terms of religion, and the stories I was told - together in the final section, I suggest that religious belief and the churches that support it simultaneously enhance a positive

2 I should note that I do so with some hesitancy because of my own secularity, for, in comparison with my partial (and potential) connections with homeownering and familial ideals, religious belief has never been a part of my life. Moreover, guidance in presenting and talking about religion is sadly lacking in an academic context. However, as I continued to come across more religious families in Berkshire and Glenwood, I became convinced of the necessity of trying to represent their experiences.

3 I use the terms religious belief and religion interchangeably. There are many definitions of religion. For an overview see R.B.Martin, 1989, Faith Without Focus: Neighbourhood Transition and Religious Change in Inner City Vancouver, MA thesis, UBC, pp.43-45. Because of the people I spoke to, who were evangelical Christians, my working definition of religion is of a Christian belief system based on the Bible.
experience of at-home mothering and fracture a family's relation to their neighbours and neighbourhood.

I. Religion and Linking New Traditionalism, Family, and Gender

Until recently, it has been commonly believed that adherence to a set of religious beliefs implies conservative attitudes toward gender, as well as confidence in the merits of the traditional nuclear family. The rise of new traditionalist familial beliefs and conservative family and gender politics has commonly been linked to religious values, for instance, particularly fundamentalist religion since it is more often based on a literal or strict reading of the Bible. Jennifer Somerville, for instance, traces the politicization of the family to the involvement of church-based organizations in New Right politics. Moreover, surveys in the United States have consistently shown that adherence to Christian values, and more strongly church attendance, are positively correlated with conservative family values and strict gender differentiation. Differences within religious affiliation are also evident, with fundamentalist beliefs shown to imply more conservative family values.

Recent work has focused on evangelical Christianity, questioning the strength of the links between evangelicalism, anti-feminism and pro-family

---

4 On these reasons see Clyde Wilcox and Elizabeth Adell Cook, 1989, "Evangelical women and feminism: some additional evidence", Women and Politics, 9,2, pp.27-49.
6 For an example and overview see Bradley R.Hertel and Michael Hughes, 1987, "Religious affiliation, attendance, and support for "pro-family" issues in the United States", Social Forces, 65,3, pp.858-82.
attitudes. Clyde Wilcox and Elizabeth Adell Cook suggest that evangelicalism is not homogeneous with respect to anti-feminism, and that there "is a fair degree of support among evangelical women for some feminist issues", like opposition to sexual discrimination. Judith Stacey's ethnography of the kin networks of two women in Silicon Valley evocatively displays the myriad links between evangelicalism, family life, and feminism. Surveying the evangelical movement, Stacey finds that "the rise of evangelical feminism paralleled that of secular feminism", and:

Evangelical feminists are serious about both their evangelicalism and their feminism, and each belief system modifies the other. They bring feminist criticism to their Christian communities and theology, and their deeply felt Christian commitment shapes their feminist ideology.

Now this consideration of feminism and anti-feminism may appear somewhat tangential to my interest here. Yet recognizing, as Stacey does, the complexity of evangelicalism with respect to feminism, allows different stories about gender relations to be told. Contrary to Stacey's expectations, for instance, decision-making in the Christian marriages she comes across was theoretically, but not practically, characterized by "patriarchy in the last instance", evident in the following anecdote:

Eleanor [the founder of the evangelical movement with which one of the women was associated] was hard-pressed to supply an empirical illustration of an occasion when she

---

8 I focus on evangelicalism here since it was the form of Christian expression of the people with whom I spoke. Broadly, "evangelicals believe in the full truth of the Bible and in its usefulness as a practical guide to the conduct of everyday life". Judith Stacey and Susan Elizabeth Gerard, 1990, "We are not doormats: the influence of feminism on contemporary evangelicalism in the United States" in Faye Ginsburg and Anna Tsing, eds. Uncertain Terms: Negotiating Gender in American Culture, Boston: Beacon Press, pp.98-117; p.100.
9 Wilcox and Cook, op.cit. p.29.
10 ibid. p.43.
actually had done so [yield to her husband's authority]. In fact, the couple claimed, they resolved all their conflicts through discussion, and soft-spoken Paul [Eleanor's husband] conceded that he was more likely to yield to loquacious Eleanor than the other way round.13

Stacey's work is also useful for the ways in which she shows that despite substantial religious commitment, both her ethnographic "subjects" construct diverse postmodern family and employment arrangements. Divorce, for instance, means that extended family networks are common and important; unemployment of the male "head of household" (due to deindustrialization and disability) disrupts the dichotomy of male breadwinner and female housewife. In both cases, therefore, religious commitment is associated with non-traditional families, challenging the conventional wisdom outlined in the previous paragraph. In the narratives and discussion that follow I want to explore in more depth such ambivalent relations between evangelicalism and preference for new traditionalist families and gender relations. In contrast to Stacey's findings, I suggest that overt religious commitment supports a traditional family form.14

I also tack an additional element onto the above discussion: place, and specifically relation to place. Studies in neither urban geography nor the geography of religion adequately deal with this issue. Feminist geographers' analysis of suburban environments, family, and gender relations, have not identified religion as either an important or complicating factor.15 Indeed, the

12 Stacey, op.cit. p.141.
13 ibid. p.133.
14 I should note that my research is not as extensive as Stacey's. Instead, religiosity was an issue that arose through the interviews, and one I only explored when people themselves mentioned it.
city is often assumed to be a secular place, and religion is only seen to matter to those explicitly concerned with the geography of religion. In the geography of religion, although faith is increasingly situated in a broader context of social and material relations, a context that sometimes includes place, the imbrication of family, faith and neighbourhood remains thinly understood. Thus my aim in this chapter is to both complicate the story I told in the previous chapter through a consideration of religious commitment, and to make some suggestions about the relations of faith, family and place.

II. Four Stories of Faith, Family and Place

Surrey forms a western edge to the Lower Fraser Valley, a region which is known for its high levels of religious affiliation. It is useful to sketch very broadly the religious characteristics of Surrey, for much of what I have to say in this chapter may be a product of its location. In Greater Vancouver in 1991, as shown in Table 7.1. Surrey Municipality had the sixth smallest percentage of its population describe themselves as with "no religious affiliation", clustering with other outer suburbs. Protestant denominations were by far the most common (which include evangelical groups), but "other" religions were also important, most probably Sikh and Hindu. Christian High Schools were nearby both Glenwood and Berkshire, and the Christian-

16 Reginald Bibby, 1987, Fragmented Gods: The Poverty and Potential of Life in Canada, Toronto: Irwin Publishers, finds that Canadian urban centres are no more secular than rural centres.
17 For an important exception see James Duncan, 1990, The City as Text: The Politics of Landscape Interpretation in the Kandyan Kingdom, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19 As seen on Figure 4.5, in Berkshire the school was actually in the study area. However, none of the families I talk about in this chapter attended that school.
dominated Surrey School Board has just started the first publicly-funded "back-to-basics" school in the Lower Mainland.

Table 7.1. Patterns of Religious Affiliation in Greater Vancouver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matsqui</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Rock</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley City</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt Meadows</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Van City</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ridge</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver City</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Not surprisingly given this context, in Berkshire and Glenwood I came across six families who were openly religious. By this I mean that they spoke about belief in God and involvement in a church as an important facet of their lives. All were involved in evangelical churches.\(^{20}\) I detail four of these stories here.

\(^{20}\) None of these four families went to the same church, nor did they refer me to each other.
a. Bruce and Linda

Bruce and Linda were members of an international church; their links to the neighbourhood, Surrey and British Columbia were subsequently tenuous. Their Christian beliefs instigated moves from New Zealand, to Halifax, and finally to Berkshire, in the short space of three years. Meeting in New Zealand after Linda (a Canadian) went to participate and work in a church-based outreach program, their subsequent moves (all their children were born in New Zealand) were partly related to jobs for Bruce, especially the move to Surrey where he had a job lined up. But there was another important factor, as Bruce outlines:

Actually, the reason that we came here was essentially because of the church that we belong to, and that's really the main reason that we came to Canada. We initially felt called, if you like, to go to Halifax and after being there for that period of time and nothing sort of coming together we wondered whether that was really the place for us to settle and then at that time, after six months, uh, the church formed in Vancouver, so we then felt that it was right for us to come out here and just be here in support of that pastor of the new church. So that's what essentially brought us out here and then the job prospects were better and I actually got this job before we moved out here and the company moved us out here.

As Linda recalls, moving to Surrey was also work-related:

We lived in Halifax for a year and spent that year with my parents. In their home, because Bruce didn't come with a job, he came anticipating getting one when we got here and he'd worked for 7 years in New Zealand, we thought it would be fairly easy with his background to be able to pick something up but Halifax is just not a major city or employment centre. So anyway we spent that year really just looking, sending out resumes, going to interviews and all sorts of things, nothing really happened until we decided that we'd come out here. And then I guess it took us about 6 months ago to finally tie something down and actually get out here.
Once they had decided to come to BC, the location of their church in Surrey was a major factor in where they lived, moderated by finances. They wanted to be close to the "hub of the church".

Mobility was a source of tension between them. Linda was concerned for their four daughters, and wanted them to finish their schooling in the one place. Moreover she was happy with the Berkshire Elementary School, and had instigated a search for a bigger house within the same school catchment area. Yet Bruce saw this as Linda's criterion, not his. Moreover, he could foresee being "called" to somewhere distant in the near future, and would be willing to pack up his family again, evident in the following exchange.

Bruce: Our life is like that, the life that we lead with God is like that, we're very much in a place where we're willing to do whatever God is directing us. Our church is in a significant state of change where people are being scattered by God all across the globe like never before, just in the last year. We haven't at this point felt any nudging that we should be moving, but we're certainly open to the possibility. It could be another five years or it could be two.
Linda: I'm a creature of habit, I'd like to stay here for a while.
Bruce: But the honest answer to that is we don't know because that's the way it is with our lives. Our priority is to follow God.

The geographical mobility of this family is impossible to comprehend without an understanding of their church. Founded in New Zealand, its goal was to establish missions in the Western world, with an increasing emphasis on Eastern Europe. In particular the aim was to reach out:

Linda: Basically the whole emphasis of our church has always been on loving God and loving each other and we really feel that the burden on God's heart is to reach to the people that have been really longing to him, and have been hurt by traditional churches, or neglected by traditional churches. So it's really, we really feel that it's God reaching out to those people by means of us going and being there for them.
Bruce: Essentially people like us who have a yearning for God. And have never really had that fulfilled because of
the situation. And that’s a fairly common sort of scenario in the church generally worldwide. The established churches don’t really let us see truly and believing in God. That’s what we feel. Are you aware of the Charismatic movement? A spiritual renewal that went through the main churches, and then it petered out, most of the people in our church came via the Charismatic movement.

Church centres were few, but widespread: four in New Zealand, three in Canada, two in the United States, two in the United Kingdom, and one in Eastern Europe. Moreover, connections between the different centres were tight. Bruce and Linda know many of the Canadian and New Zealand members, and are aware of what is happening elsewhere:

Bruce: It really is truly as close as you can get to an international, global family. We do the best we can through e-mail and videos, all kind of things. We are really involved in each others lives in a very different way. All the churches have a computer, and video, and video editing machines, that sort of communication, keeping up with each other in that way is a big part of it. Probably because our emphasis is essentially on the family, the emphasis on the family, relationships, and living for God in an active way and every aspect of that. That’s really the thrust of the church in a nutshell, if you wanted to get a photograph of what we’re like, who we are.
Linda: Yes, it’s really just an expression of the life of a family, an extension of us as well as them.

Not surprisingly, both Linda’s and Bruce’s connections to the neighbourhood were slight. Linda was active in the school, mainly because she was home. But for neither were neighbours friends, nor did the neighbourhood matter to the way they lived and interpreted their lives.

Linda: We don’t have a lot to do with the neighbours on a social level, in an ongoing way.
Bruce: The main reason for that is that we’re really involved with our church, that takes up a large chunk of our time. It’s not just any ordinary church that you go to on Sundays and forget about for the rest of the week, the church really involves all of our life and our life is centred around the church. All of our real friends are in the church, it’s not that we wouldn’t be friends with these people it’s that we don’t have the time to get involved with them socially. We do, we do socialize.
Linda: As much as we can, have a cup of coffee. Chat
when we're out there. We know the parents of the kids that are the same age as ours.
Bruce: But to answer your question I wouldn't call them friends, our friends are in the church.
Robyn [to Linda]: Do you have contact with mothers in the neighbourhood?
Linda: Yes. Again it's the same thing I haven't really developed close friendships with any of them in particular because of that time thing. They're certainly very pleasant people and I enjoy their company, I enjoy the contact that I have with them. Not talk really, I guess because we have an avenue for that within our church. There isn't that need that others find fulfilled within their social context, school or neighbourhood whatever.

In terms of new traditionalist families, the virtues of a traditional nuclear family were clear, and its demise was lamented. It was a conscious decision for Linda not to work in the paid labour force, even though she was a trained physiotherapist. Indeed, her involvement in the church had meant she'd never practiced physiotherapy, since in New Zealand she spent so much time on church-related business that she couldn't commit to a full time job. When the children came along, her decision was easy:

Linda: Yes. It's been good, I mean we've been able to do that really. I feel very privileged to have been able to be at home. With Bruce having a fairly good job we've been able to do that. We felt that it was important, especially in those younger years.
Robyn: Think working mothers facing more problems?
Linda: Do you mean these more things to consider in taking a career? [yes] Well I guess all those things have existed and it's just a matter I suppose of what your priorities are and what you're willing to compromise on. For me the kids were a priority. I mean we have kids and I wanted to be able to invest myself in them and enjoy them and to me that was my goal for that time. I have never regretted doing that, felt that I've missed out. I think that's a challenging role in itself.
Bruce: It's more like you would have missed out if you hadn't been here for them, wouldn't it? If you'd been at work and not been involved with the kids growing up.
Linda: Yes.
Bruce: A feeling of having given something of value.
Linda: For sure, and I mean even now, and I'm not working I find it demanding keeping up with them all, and helping them with their homework and all that kind of thing, I think what if I wasn't home when they got home from school,
who would help them, what would be going on? It's demanding enough without having a job.

Gender divisions were starkly evident in their marriage and attitudes towards non-nuclear families. They both believed that men and women were naturally different and had different strengths they brought to parenting.

Robyn: Single parents can be good parents?
Bruce: I think some can do it more effectively than others. That's for sure, but I don't believe that any single parent, a dad or a mom, can really bring what's necessary in terms of love, security, discipline. The whole practice that you need, a secure husband or whatever. I do think that single moms, it's much more difficult because of discipline. Yes, I really do think that it takes a mom and a dad to provide the full spectrum of what a child needs to be fully secure.
Linda: I agree with that. I think friends of ours that have been in that situation of having to raise kids on their own in our church particularly, there is a lot of support, to help make up that lack. Just for myself too I know that I can lose objectivity and I don't see what's really happening in a situation and I need Bruce to come in and say the kids just ran all over you, you need to do this and that. He can give them stronger direction because that's where I tend to err on the side of being too soft. I just need that balance.
B: I need Linda to remind me that sometimes the soft touch is better. So I think it's important to have that complementary sort of situation, able to bring what's necessary or the best thing that's most appropriate. It's good to have a mother coming from a different objectivity.

Although their opinions of single parents were not that different from others I spoke to, the reasons underlying these opinions were. Rather than speaking of time demands, it was the natural differences between men and women (and the natural propriety of marriage) that made nuclear families more desirable:

We think the family is invaluable in terms of its contribution to society. To humanity. It's a very important part of our future, I think it's alarming that the family is being devalued, the institution of marriage becoming less important, less sacred really, as it has been traditionally, people flitting in and out of marriage on a whim. I think it's definitely a deterioration. It can only have negative effects on the generation to come and I think one of the largest contributing factors to problems we now face in today's younger generation is because of the lack of discipline that
is inherently there in a good strong solid family. As important as motherhood is and as important as the role of the mom is, moms are really not designed, women are not designed, and are able to bring the kind of discipline that is necessary in a family. Typically they're softer.

b. Ingrid and Henry

Ingrid and Henry belong to a local evangelical church, a belonging that shaped their familial practices in different ways to Bruce and Linda. Rather than directly shaping their family lives, the church (or more specifically spirituality) provided a forum for discussion and interpretation of motherhood and fatherhood; forums that disconnected them both from local social networks. Neither believed in a strict division of labour in the home, nor did they think there were natural roles for men and women. Ingrid described Henry as more nurturing:

Yeah I think the way I really see, uh, our family dynamics Henry is a more nurturing father than most, he’s not the macho type person, he’s really a wimp with muscles. In a typical family a mother is the more nurturing figure the one who kids run to. [pause] I think Henry is the ideal father, as far as being the head of the house in the way I’ve heard it described that the man will set aside his priorities and put those of his wife and children first, I think Henry tends to do that more than most men. He’s very supportive of me in what I do. I definitely think by nature he’s at home.

Concomitantly, gender in a marriage and as parents was something to be worked at, as Ingrid explains:

As for roles I think when we were first married it was very confusing to adjust to not being single, a rediscovery of who you were, as part of a relationship, I mean it was really a struggle to find out who we were going to be in this marriage. I had different expectations. So that took a long time to iron out. As far as parenting, you know how some people in a marriage they’ll grow psychologically and emotionally faster than the other partner or they grow at different rates, we seemed to be always on the same sort of path, going side by side, we have been exposed to different points of view, we went to step parenting which we tried and sort of chucked because it wasn’t working for
us. We recognized that our family must be dysfunctional so we thought of counselling, but we've been on this road together and we just have sort of developed the same point of views and approaches to parenting. We've agreed on the developmental approach of Gordon Neufeld, so we've been in agreement on these things, and I know a lot of my friends, it hasn't been the same for them, they will be seeing the light in terms of how they want to go about parenting and the partner is not with them at all. It's a struggle.

Church connections were central to the ways both Ingrid and Henry lived this "struggle". If he had the choice, Henry would prefer not to work and stay at home with his two boys. Nevertheless, he directed a lot of emotional and practical energy into raising his children, and found support and an outlet for articulating his ideas in a church-related group. He recalls:

We go out to see my mother every Friday. It's sort of a tradition, it's kind of a break for us, she makes us a meal and the boys have piano lessons on Friday as well. We'll then either watch TV at her place on a Friday night, or we'll go off to a we call it a Bible study group, it's not really a Bible study group, it's more just talk about books and things that are interesting. It used to be based on the church group but it isn't any longer it's just a group of people who get together and we've been meeting for 13 years. It's kind of our spiritual mainstay.

Robyn: What do you talk about?
Henry: Just things that are, anything from parenting to there's a couple of singles in our group, and the rest couples, if there's something to talk about, psychology, just a broad range of topics, sort of how we decide to live our lives, how the world works. A lot of the people that are left are like minded, not exactly, we don't have all the same perspectives and points of view but we're all basically reflective people, to a degree at least.

Robyn: What do you mean by that?
Henry: Well just you know all interested in thinking about our situations and how we react, the way we parent. For us that would be a big factor.

How do you think about parenting?
Henry: We like to think that we parent differently but I think we probably still parent reactively. We have a certain philosophy, a developmental philosophy, we've taken a number of courses, workshops on parenting with Dr Neufeld out at UBC. His philosophy is that the development perspective, he would maintain that there's a need for children to attach to their parents as opposed to their peers, it's necessary for them to have a lot of contact with their parents, rather than sending them off to this and
that and involving them in different things and so we sort of respect that, try and do that. We don’t want to over involve our kids and that it’s not necessary for them to have their friends around all the time as well but unfortunately because we’re busy people too they do tend to do that.

As a result, Henry found the neighbourhood intrusive, and something that interfered with how he wanted to parent. For instance, he disliked the constant interruptions of the neighbourhood children, and had ended up putting a sign on the door saying "do not disturb". Moreover, he saw himself as very different from others in Berkshire:

We’re very different, some here seem to be very controlling people, so we sort of are hesitant to have our kids controlled by them too much I suppose, even when they come here the conversation is what they want.

In sum, Henry’s experience of fatherhood (itself not particularly new traditionalist) was very much conditioned by his church-related experiences and his desires to distance himself from the neighbourhood.

Ingrid’s experience of being an at-home mother was similarly seen through the lens of the church and spirituality. For her, their neighbourhood church was more important:

Every other week I coordinate a mother’s morning out program at our church so a lot of time would be devoted to preparing for that. It will also be three hours one morning setting up at the church, decorating, setting out tables, craft, and so on, and then the following morning is at least a 3 hour commitment. We run the program which is for mothers of preschoolers, it starts at 9.15 and we have a speaker and we do a craft and dismiss at 11.15 which means that the rest us have to stick around for another hour, the organizers, to clean up.

Robyn: What do you talk about at meetings?
Ingrid: Last time was a developmental approach to child psychology from Neufeld out at UBC. We’ve had one speak on friendship among women, we’ve had another psychologist speak on psychological boundaries, another counsellor on the elements of a healthy relationship, marital or otherwise. Next week we’re having someone give demonstrations on hospitality. So there’s a whole bunch.
Robyn: Women from different places?
Ingrid: Yeah, it's a community outreach thing. Women come from the neighbourhood, it's advertised through flyers and at the church and women who attend a similar group in Newton have been coming. We've got upwards of 50 ladies come to each session, and it's largely by word of mouth. We have childcare so they bring their children.

Later she speaks of the same group that was central to Henry, in relation to parenting in general:

Anyway, parenting is so touchy it's not something you talk about unless they're in agreement. This group we meet with in Chilliwack, we all have the same philosophy and approach to parenting, we support each other, so that's my support group that I need.

More importantly, Ingrid's interpretation and experience of being at-home were through the church. As she said, "the people that I associate with are all moms at home, and many of my friends are homeschoolers". As a result,

we encourage each other, we encourage the moms with children at home, there's a basis of understanding that it is very difficult what we do, to stay home and parent preschoolers. We don't feel we have to justify what we're doing, just by making that choice we already have a definite mindset that this is the right thing to do. We were fortunate in being able to do this, and survive on one salary, and be home with the kids.

c. Julie and Brian

Julie and Brian had been involved with a Burnaby evangelical church for over ten years. Brian was now an elder in the church, which meant that, among other things, he conducted Bible study, read at church on Sundays and was always available to speak with other church members. Their religious beliefs were central to everything they did. When I asked Julie if they took guidance from the church, she replied:

Very much so. Basically we read the Bible together every day, we don't follow a religion, don't follow a creed or set
of rules, it's a real simple lifestyle really as far as there is nobody that tells us what we can do, it's our own conscience, what we feel is right. Basically the Bible is our guide, it helps us in everything we do, when we buy property we would pray on it. I know it sounds, if this is something you're not familiar with, this sounds weird. I don't see it that way, it's part of our lifestyle, I don't impose it on other people.

Central to their interpretation of the Bible was a strict demarcation of women's and men's roles in the family. Julie's life was not only organized around the church, but was largely determined by what was expected of the wife of an elder. Here is her account of the day I interviewed her:

I'll rise early. We have the kids home, then I'll take them to Canada Games Pool in New West cause I don't like the pools in Surrey. Then I went in to pick up a lady from our church, she lives in East Van, our church is in Burnaby, took her to buy a dishwasher. A lot of the older ladies in the church are dependent on the younger ones. I typically do lots of things for people at the church, visit sick people. My husband is very involved in the church, he's an elder in the church and so this is part of it, to help out, at times, things a wife is expected to do. So some of my time is spent doing that. When I came back I worked in the office till supper time, quick bite of supper, had an irate customer on the line for an hour, spoke to you, have another customer. Usually finish in the office around 11, 11.30.

Further, Brian's church involvement dictated Julie's workload at home. When I asked her who did what around the house, she replied:

[laugh] really straightforward - it's terrible .. Brian does not really do much. He puts the coffee on in the morning, and sometimes at night. What else does he do? He washes the floor on Saturdays. And he's very good when he comes in to pay some attention to the kids. They're generally sick of me at that time, sick of hearing me say 'go do something'. But as far as, he's not really interested in the house. And I don't really mind, he works very very hard, so I feel that you know, I can deal with it.

Robyn: What do you think about that?
Julie: I can honestly say I don't feel chippy about the way it is, because I believe in life I have to do what we do best, and we hire people that do things better than us. We will work harder to build more houses to make more money to pay for the people to do things that we don't do as well and that's sort of our motto. Neither of us are really into
gardening, so we have a gardener. If we want to paint something outside we hire a painter, so those kinds of things, Brian is an electrician, but he would never try and fix an appliance, we would call the guy, he might charge you an hour or something, but he'll fix it efficiently. We both agree on that and it's the same with household chores. I mean I could get Brian to do my dusting or my vacuuming but I probably wouldn't like it and so I don't monkey in the things he does best. If he's trying to design a house I don't go in and say that's not right, what about moving the bathroom and he has a tremendous load with the church that I realize that he's carrying. That's a very pastoral part of his work, he does lots of reading and lots preparing he speaks a lot at the church publicly, he has a group of senior university students that he works with every Sunday and often on Friday nights so he prepares that level of instruction you're preparing pretty intense, it's part of a Bible study, so it takes hours and hours. It's only natural if he's working hard at the church and he has so much to do that I can't expect him to start saying I think you should split my household chores. If I get really at the end of my wire trying to work all my schedule out, we just sit down and I say look, we have company every Sunday usually, 14 people. I'll say on a Saturday I need some help. I only ask him when I really need it.

Part of this gender difference was that Julie should be at home with the children. Before their first child was born nine years ago, Julie was a computer analyst, but stopped working soon after, as she recalls:

I was a computer analyst. I had studied computer programming, worked and studied at the same time. When I became pregnant with my daughter, only been married about a month, because of Brian's age we wanted to start our family right away, was planned. We had been going steady for a long time and had known each other for years, we were engaged for well over a year before we were married, when Brian built our house then we moved into it, and that's the way I do things. When she came along actually I was in the middle of a part of a taskforce at work, a two year project and I still had a few months left on the project, so after I had her I went back to work. But I knew that wasn't the ideal and I knew that long-range I didn't want to do that. However, although I had planned all that, and I went back and my mom looked after her while I was working, it was really hard for me to quit work.

It was her religious beliefs that encouraged her to quit work, but they also made her life as an at-home mother more bearable:
And to come home and be just a mom, help. Crawling the walls. I had always been busy, I had always done both study and working, and then just before I had my daughter, Brian convinced me to quit studying, if we were to have a family, he wanted me to, and you know, I agreed, I should stay home with the baby, it was just such a shock to my system, I found it really hard. What happened was that I got myself really involved with working with the people at the church, I really put myself out, all those different activities that we were involved in at the time and we had an outreach in our own home in Surrey at that first house, and while I worked I couldn’t really do much with it other than teach at it, it started with the kids - little girls would always talk to me, that’s how it started, I would be singing "Jesus loves me" and they would say 'where did you learn that’ and I said is there no Sunday school where you go, there wasn’t, so I started one. We thought here we are and they don’t even know about Jesus, we should really start something here in our home and so we did. We started a Sunday school but we had it on Mondays, we had it in our home. Before we finished we had 85 children coming, regularly, in our basement, we would have Christmas, Easter, all the neighbour mothers and fathers, it was fabulous, we really enjoyed that work. That was a really negative for us to move, because we didn’t have a basement, we had a gospel hall near the old neighbourhood, and we spent a year merging the children into it. We’d truck them to church before we moved, got them settled, then moved. Going to a church was a bit scary for the parents, not a funny religion, just gospel. We got to really know the children, it helped me become a mom, extended myself at that, planned outings on Saturdays, with my sister and brother-in-law and the kids, rent a bus and take off. Really enjoyed it.

Glenwood, however, was very different. Julie was deliberately not involved in any social or school-based networks. In particular, she was worried about the materialism of many of the parents of children her daughter knew:

I find it’s the parents causing that pressure, brand name clothes and stuff is a real big thing. Very, she has to wear the right kind of jeans or else the cop over there will say those are tacky. These kids are 9! A very very strong feeling, everything’s money oriented, I probably know more about this than Brian, I always seem to be going off about it, because this is constant. Today’s gonna be western today, and they’re expected to dress western, that means cowboy boots, jeans, I say I’m not buying you all that, and then a couple of weeks later is clown day, in full clown regalia, and the kids stand there looking like Hollywood.
Actually we're on a waiting list for the Pacific Academy, she's 2nd and she might get in in September. You don't have those kind of things. They're all in uniform, that's not the reason you go to school, it's not competition between each other it's education. In the long run it's probably equally as expensive, when you read the list of requirement, you have to have absolutely everything matching, all seasons, it's a little extreme, but at least there won't be that awful fighting between parents, tensions.

No, I don't really have a lot, don't talk to them much, don't have much discussion. They're all talking about things that are important to them, like what size boats they own, where they went on holidays, I don't want to be caught up in that, I don't think that's what life's about. Life isn't about things. I have things and I appreciate them, I believe that what we have is from God, and I'm thankful for them, and I don't see them as just mine. With Brian's upbringing in the mission field, things that we have, if we decided to go tomorrow to the mission field that would be ok. I'm not attached to things, it's here and I enjoy it today. I'm thankful for it, but it's just on loan to us I don't see it as a life goal of mine being what I have attained, jewelry, where they got their hair cut.

In terms of parenting, they believed that they should spent time with their children, which often meant that the children did everything they did.

We believe in taking time out and taking quality time with them, and they know that when we have a bite of supper together and then go to a park, that that's all their time, and they're not gonna get that all the time. We're always here for them, I'm here all the time, we never have baby-sitters, I don't know, it might have been several years ago when I last had a baby-sitter out. We take them everywhere we go, we eat out a couple of times a week and they go with us, there's nothing we don't do. We're very involved in the church and all the related activities, and they come with us to everything if I go to visit sick people they come, if we go to a wedding, everything. So they have a very broad scope.

Perhaps more telling is that although Julie classified herself as an at-home mother, most of her days were spent organizing their family business. Her mother sometimes came over to watch the youngest, who was eleven months, but other times she would attempt to juggle a busy work schedule with the two children who were not yet at school. A good family life, for
Julie, was doing everything together, even when she was working. But this concept was spatialized also. Home was sacred; what went on in the home was controllable and special, and she wasn’t willing to send her children to daycare. She was not particularly concerned about the "right" neighbourhood for her children, since,

... the family unit is within these four walls. And I continually enforce that, we don’t preach home schooling because I believe that you have to survive in this world, but you don’t have to be part of that world. That may sound really weird, but you can go through life living in your own world, but being part of the world out there. When you go home inside these four walls is what we believe and no-one can take it. However, to function you have to go out there into the world and deal with people in business, and whatever, and likewise at school, I think it’s a wonderful education for children to teach each other that social thing, it’s very important. We have some people at church that do home-schooling, it’s different watching their kids then try to make friends with other kids is really scaring because their only outlet has been with their mom, this one kid comes in at Sunday school and says I don’t like that you say you have to like that, but they have never learned that. So I think, to answer your question, I could live in east Vancouver in a little shack and still retain the same values have my same family life cause that’s inherent. I, when we go and visit my sister we live in a hovel, but that doesn’t change your family life, ..... 

Finally, mothers and fathers were inherently different. I asked Julie to describe her and Brian as parents.

As a mother I’m strict, and I know it’s because of everything I try to accomplish, and sometimes I regret it, and I tell the children I'm sorry. I’m tender, emotional, even though I’m stern I’m also very loving. I have expectations of them, but I give a lot too.

Brian? Strict, but he’s, when I say strict, I’m using that word because I’m continually exposed to people who aren’t disciplining their child, it’s not a big part of their life, Brian and I are continually focusing on the children and are we doing it right, we discuss it a lot, and we’re on the same wavelength and we are just totally contrary spare the rod thing, I believe if the child does something wrong you discipline them for it and you do it now and they know what they’re being disciplined for and basically an old
Biblical rule. As far as, from that point of view, that’s fatherhood as a strict side. It took us quite a while to agree on how to raise children, what I thought children should have. You can’t just be cold with them, have to be kind, they have to be loved. As the kids became older Brian became sort of shy of, not sure, now what do I do, this big girl still saying "Daddy tuck me in" and he’s like she’s a big girl she can do it. And I tell him that she still needs him and he should kiss her goodnight and as long as she asks for it do it.

d. Edward and Ruby

For this couple in their late 20s, religion, church, family and neighbourhood were fused: they had moved to Glenwood solely to be near a Christian school - the Pacific Academy; their church was now in the neighbourhood (in the school gym); and their ties to the neighbourhood were through the church. They both tell of the centrality of the school in their residential location decision, for they wanted to be within walking distance of the school.

Edward: We came here because of the school basically. And we had some friends of the kids in the school, disillusioned with the public school system, and our own beliefs, Christian beliefs. We don’t expect the school to teach our kids that, but we don’t want the school to talk against the teachings of the scriptures. In a public school they teach a pretty solid anti Christian message, it’s not deliberate but it’s real. Everything but, everything goes but Christianity. Christianity is not a politically correct thing to teach, I guess, because it was so predominant in the past that in an attempt to get it out of the system you’re not even allowed to talk about it. I know some Christians who teach in the public school system and their hands are tied. Because it becomes, to introduce Buddhism, anything else, crystals, anything, but not about your beliefs in Christianity because then you’re imposing your dogma. And so this school, although it has a very good scholastic record, not exceptional, but well above average that was the primary reason for coming here. When we moved here it was in an old school, in Coquitlam, my former boss went there, so when we moved here all it was a few stakes in the ground we moved here and we started seeing it go up

Robyn: Could you tell me more about the school?
Edward: School started in Vancouver long time ago, moved to Coquitlam for five years. School non-denominational
Christian, started by a Pentecostal minister but not that bent now. Teaches from the Bible Christian beliefs, without any kind of agenda.

Ruby: We have four children. First one in 86, it was Expo, and I walked around that place pregnant, it was a blast, good exercise. And then in 88 we had another, and then about a year and a half later we had twins. When we were expecting twins we realized we had a five passenger car, we needed something bigger for the six of us so we decided to buy a van, and around the same time we thought about our eldest, in a couple of years he would be going to kindergarten. Where we lived I thought, I just don’t, I don’t know about the school here, and then we started hearing friends who had kids in Pacific Academy, it’s a Christian school, and somewhere along the way too we had become Christians, so our church was very important to us. Anyway, we heard lots of stuff about the school and I started thinking, why don’t we just look into where the school is and maybe we’ll, everything is changed in our life, let’s maybe even consider moving. We started thinking all these crazy things. So we thought first let’s find out where the school is, and I thought it was in Burnaby, but it was in Coquitlam. But they had bought property in Surrey, so thankfully we heard, so we came out here to search. I swore I’d never live in Surrey, and we lived looking over the Port Mann bridge, and everyday I watched that traffic and thought how awful if you work in Vancouver and live in Surrey. Anyway, the school is in Surrey. Really close to here. So we went looking, there was nothing built yet but we saw the property, and then we called a friend who’s a real estate agent and she brought us around this area and basically this was about the third piece of property that we saw and we went for it. We could almost see the school from here. So that’s why we bought in Glenwood. ... Mainly it comes down to we’re here because of that school. If that school was in Burnaby or Abbotsford, but Abbotsford’s too far for my husband, to commute, but anywhere in the outlying area we would have followed that school.

Subsequently, their church also moved to the school, as Ruby explains:

Now we’re so happy we’re here because it’s really close to the school and also we’re really thrilled because we found out that a church just like the one we’d been attending for 7 years in Coquitlam was opening up in the school gym. And it’s a sister or brother church, whatever you want to call it, from the one we were attending. So that was totally awesome. We thought wow. Our kids can walk to school, and we can walk to church on Sundays. And for other functions. It was like really neat how that worked out.
The church was a focus of their activities through the week. They held a Bible study group in their home once a week, and Edward was on a committee that oversaw the running of the church. He consequently had church business meetings a further night of the week.

Perhaps more importantly for the argument I have been making throughout the thesis about the understanding of gendered identities, the church-based social network was crucial to what Ruby called her "sanity" in remaining home full-time. She had eagerly stopped a well-paying job in a bakery with the arrival of her first child, and had no plans of returning. Staying at home, she felt, was important for the stability and security of her children; something they couldn't get from a single parent:

... lately there's been just so much about the family in the media and the stuff with Quayle and what he said about Murphy Brown and all the single parents in an uproar. That one was blown way out of proportion. I actually have a copy of his original speech, and it was beautiful, what he said was so caring and compassionate and understanding that had some of the single parents actually taken the time to read what he said, they would have seen that he was not putting them down in anyway, but he was sympathetic. But it made me think about a lot of things, about what single parents were feeling and why they were feeling quite down and I worry about things like that, I feel bad that there's so many single moms out there, and single papas, and I think if they have the choice, they would prefer not to be in that situation. On the one hand I feel sorry and bad, but on the other but then I wonder why are they in such an uproar. Is their situation really ideal, that's what he's saying, it's just not the best, but not to put it down. Anyway, but family in general, I just am worried about where families are going. There just seems to be, it's like something is being lost, like a family with a mom and dad from the first marriage, with their own kids, seems to be growing more or less a thing of the past, like my kids are going to grow up with a lot of friends that have step sisters and brothers and second and third removed from second and third marriages and they have two or three dads, and that the grandparents are different. It just seems so mixed and so confusing, and not stable. I worry about that because I can't see how that could be good for little kids. Because I can see that kids need stability.
She was glad for the proximity of the church:

We've now found this church and that people in the neighbourhood are attending, and so I'm finding other couples, like with little kids and having babies, wow, I didn't know these people three years ago and we've all been living here around the same time but none of us knew each other and it's the church that brought us together. I can walk over to a friend's house now, and before I was travelling out to Coquitlam to see my other friends. Basically I met all these people and all these gals, that we all have the same things in common since we started going to the church and that's what brought us together. Otherwise I'd probably be very lonely and crying to my friends in Coquitlam 'come and see me over here'. So that for me was great.

More specifically:

I found a great gal who also has her kids in my school, we go to the same church now, and we found each other, and she does watercolor painting which I've always wanted to do, so she comes home when the twins are in bed and we paint.

Finding a baby-sitter was no problem according to Ruby:

Very easy, because we've got the church connection and the school connection. So all I have to do is pull out my school directory and I've got up to grade twelve, which is really nice and then I know the background of a lot of the families, and when you have that you just know the foundation and whether they come from good stock, and that makes it really easy. I don't even have to meet the girl first, or the young man, I know everything beforehand. I ring them and I say who I am and they say 'oh I know someone that goes to that church' and it's really great, it's really easy to find a baby-sitter because of those connections. When we moved here it was hard, because I didn't have the church connection and I didn't have the school connection. So we didn't know very many people in this neighbourhood at all, so that was hard. Again, I'm really grateful for those people. I would be lost without them.

Again, there was definitely a sense that mothers and fathers were different. According to Edward:

Sure. I think the Mom, although Ruby does more of the disciplining, she's still more the safe haven when that's my
role. By the time I'm the discipliner Mom's burnt out for the day. I'm more the physical player, playing with them, laughing with them. I guess we each have a different job as a role model for them. I think it's important for us to present to them the gender difference that society today is trying to clone, neuter people. I don't think of myself as sexist or discriminatory, but I think there's a different role in families especially for a mother and a father. I hope to pass that on to my kids correctly. I think that the kids have to hold a different respect for their mother than their father. Respecting her as, I think they have to respect my authority as greater but to respect her, mother as more fragile, but to know that to cross the line with their mom is going to bring some repercussions from me. And not necessarily vice versa. Like I think, especially with the boys as they grow older, have to know that from their mom they can go there to cry on her shoulder but they can't go there with a problem to confront her, she's not the one to confront, certainly verbally and not physically, whereas they'd probably be able to get farther than that with me. Daughters are strong willed, but I think more for the sons, show some different kind of respect, whereas I would expect them to respect my authority, do I come across a dictator, my authority is gonna be the final one, I don't want them going to mom to over-rule my authority. Although we tend to do things in a kind of conspiracy, which it has to be. It has to be a conspiracy to ever win in any kind of discipline or planning with the kids cause it's four on two, we don't stand a chance. We do work, I guess both of our responsibilities are to work together, how the roles we choose to play different roles I guess, if we tried to work individually it would be much more difficult. I see in a lot of families, and maybe it just appears from the outside, where one person tries one tack and the other person doesn't, where it appears to the kid that the mother is just floundering, it's very typical. The mother is trying to develop discipline and the father has a hands off attitude, or his career takes more time and he doesn't seem to put in the effort to that. It's not just the time but at least sit down and back up what mom says, but it gets to the point of belittling what the moms says and she doesn't stand a chance. Teamwork is one of our strengths, we've had to do that, we work as a team, are very supportive of each other in what we do with the kids, especially in front of them. Sometimes we will say, now come on couldn't we just do this, you know, we'll question it but not over-rule it, unless it's something we think I don't think we can do that. If Mom says there's no way we can do that, then I'll say okay, otherwise it undermines her authority.

Despite these differences, and their preference for Ruby to remain at home, they both recognized that being at home could be hard. When Edward
arrived home from work, for instance, he would take over since Ruby would inevitably be tired and "her fuse is a little shorter". He continues:

But it's hard, I feel like I'm the lucky one, I get to go to work. It's not that I don't like being with them, but it's a tough job to be all by yourself with the four of them. When I have to I have them for an evening when she goes out to a jewelry party or a shower or just coffee with one of her friends, she's only gone for two hours but you sort of hold your breath, they require a great amount of energy to keep your sanity.

Ruby, on the other hand, feels guilty about not spending enough quality time with them.

I don't spend a lot of time doting on my kids. I have not mentioned that I sit and read with them, I'll do that at bedtime if I have to. Eric will look at a book on his own, but Emma was very tired so she didn't want to read, but if I have a chance and they really persuade me, we'll work on a puzzle together or something like that, but I don't know what it is I'm doing, but I'm doing things I just don't seem to do a lot of doting on the kids, and as a result they've become very independent and they really do, the twins will be up in the playroom and they'll play for hours. I have to check on them, occasionally, but I can just sort of do my own thing whilst they're off playing separately. But at times, they just are whiny or crying or are not happy or they need something, they're constantly going between us, so everyday is a little different. It sort of goes like that.

And later:

Well the one thing I guess that I think sometimes is it's good that I don't doddle over my kids but then I feel guilty. I think well I'm at home and I should be spending more one on one with them. I don't know why but I just don't do that a lot, I think it's a little selfish on my part, so if I could do better, if I could improve as a mother, I would say I would spend more one on one with each of my kids. Now, one is really easy, I cuddle with her, that is all she needs. Nothing else. My oldest he would love if I would spend time building a dinosaur skeleton with him, and my youngest girl would love it if I coloured with her, and the twin boy would love it if I read with him, so there's things that I know I should be doing with them more often but I don't. I think it's just pure laziness on my part. . . . I often will wake up in the morning thinking, okay, today I'm going to try and do this with Eric or whatever, but it just doesn't
happen, and day after day will go by. And I feel really guilty but I certainly don’t make that a priority.

III. Religion and New Traditionalism in Berkshire and Glenwood

That it’s hard to draw a thread running through these four narratives should come as no surprise given the diverse relations between evangelicalism, family and gender, both within and between families. Religious beliefs constituted family lives and gender identities in different ways. In this section I attempt to highlight some commonalities in relation to gender and place.

a. Place

One consistent element in the above narratives is the different spatiality evinced by the families I spoke with who had strong Christian beliefs. In the previous three chapters I suggested that the cultures within particular places and symbolic geographies connecting place and social relations are important frames of reference for the material construction and understanding of identity. The above narratives necessarily disrupt these representations, in complicated ways. It seems clear that (in these four cases at least) ties to the neighbourhood, both socially and symbolically, are lessened by strong religious affiliation.

Both church and God provided guideposts and forums in which to discuss and cement the centrality of family; bearings that did not necessarily involve the neighbourhood. Thus unlike other residents, for whom the social relations and cultural meaning of the neighbourhood were important markers of identity, for Christian residents Christian beliefs were more important. In terms of motherhood, for instance, all four women I discussed here, at-home
full-time by choice, found added support for their model of motherhood through church-based networks. With already definite opinions derived from Christian beliefs about the family, church-based support groups helped them interpret these choices in a wider context. Thus Ingrid, who sometimes felt alone in Berkshire (at least until her current next door neighbour moved in, as I documented in chapter six), sought support elsewhere, ironically exacerbating her isolation in her neighbourhood. Similarly, Julie’s daily activities were church-based, as were Linda’s. Interestingly, for men, church was replacing or overlaying place-based interpretive frameworks. Church networks and beliefs appeared to provide opportunities for discussing fatherhood that were not evident in the neighbourhood. Henry provides the most blatant example of this dynamic, but it can also be subtly seen in Bruce’s narrative.

For Ruby and Edward, faith, family and gender formed a different spatiality, being fused in the one place. Thus for Ruby, establishing church-based networks also meant neighbourhood ties. Yet it is this religious network that also highlights fissures in Glenwood; the existence of "multiple" Glenwoods that so far hasn’t been evident. Ruby didn’t associate with anyone other than those she had met through the church. Similarly, Julie’s Christian derived social conscience and anti-materialism led her to distance herself from other mothers in the neighbourhood. Moreover, she thought that enrolling her child in the Christian school would take her away from the materialism that was rife throughout Glenwood. In this respect, Julie was tapping into a well-known division in Glenwood. Kathy told me a story about the differences between the Christian school residents and the public school residents. She says:

We have at the end of the street a lot of people go to the Christian private school, I don’t know them very well.
Maybe that's something you want to investigate. I sort of find that there is a rift between public school people and Christian school people, they don't tend to socialize that much. The kids don't socialize that much either. A point in case one year we were raising money to put up a playground in behind the school and we were selling fresh orange juice and I went down to one family that lives at the other end of the road and I know the lady fairly well and she's got a few kids, and I mean who doesn't need fresh juice when they have little kids but she said no, she wasn't interested in buying any and I said it was for a playground and she said my children won't be going to the public school, they'll be going to the Christian school and I said it's not just for the school, it's the playground which you back on to, and you'll be able to make use of it, and she just said no, my children won't be playing in that area. They just did not want any involvement.

Monica, however, thought that the large number of "churchgoing people" in Glenwood meant that it was more family oriented. Kathy's response was more common, signalling the ways church and school mattered in the neighbourhood culture. Either way, the school was seen to matter in the neighbourhood culture. In this respect, a consideration of religion is necessary to an understanding of the neighbourhood dynamics.

b. Family and Gender

In terms of new traditionalism, what is added by this consideration of evangelical Christians in the two neighbourhoods is not immediately clear. Given the diversity of experiences and varying positions with respect to gender and family, it certainly cannot be said that these religious families always adhere more strongly to new traditionalist values than their neighbours. Since, as I have argued throughout the thesis, new traditionalism was a pervasive cultural and gendered value in both the neighbourhoods, the religious families of the two neighbourhoods do not appear to be significantly different. Certainly the traditional nuclear family was upheld and these women did not engage in paid work, but this
description would hold for many of the people I interviewed. A more subtle reading of these narratives helps discern other differences, of which I outline two here: the gendered differentiation of parenting practices; and views on the "demise of the family".

Partly based on a strict reading of the Bible, women and men were seen to operate very differently in families, especially in relation to parenting. With the exception of Ingrid and Henry, mothers and fathers were seen to be naturally different; with mothers more nurturing and "soft", and fathers more stern. I am not denying the existence of a gendered definition of parenting in the other households, but I am suggesting that the rationale for the division in these religious families was subtly different. Mothers and fathers were seen to be naturally different.

By implication, this natural difference of mothers and fathers upheld the virtue and necessity of a traditional nuclear family with two parents, a factor most evident in the references to single parents above. Whereas the other families I have represented saw single parenthood as problematic because of poverty and the limited time one parent would have to both work and be a parent, these religious families decried the number and situation of single parents in terms of the lack of two different perspectives in the family. Both "tenderness" and "discipline" were seen to be necessary to raising children, adding another layer to the problematic status of single parenthood in the new traditionalist family’s imagination. Examples of this opinion can be found in two of the narratives: Ruby’s discussion of Murphy Brown, and Linda and Bruce’s conversation about parenting.

Ingrid and Henry have been noticeably absent from the threads I have been drawing together so far, for good reason. Their stories highlight the multiplicity of religious affiliations and articulations of family and gender.
Especially in terms of the gendering of parenting practices, Ingrid and Henry represent a departure from the trends I have described, both in this chapter and in the rest of the thesis. As parents, their gender identities were reversed, in the sense that Henry was more involved with the children than any other man I spoke with. Gender identity within their relationship and family was something to be worked out, not pre-given. Religion was central to the process of working at it, for it was guided by their spirituality. In addition, Christian-based support groups provided a forum to discuss parenting and gender. This example also indicates the diverse uses of religious belief; a factor I consider more fully in the following concluding section.

IV. Fragmented Gods?

In 1987, Reginald Bibby published a controversial and bestselling book on the state of religion in Canada, entitled *Fragmented Gods*. Bibby's thesis was that church and religion in Canada had become like consumption goods: items on a shopping list to be picked off the shelf selectively by consumers, and package marketed by its producers, the traditional churches. Through this analogy Bibby claimed that religion was something only associated with certain ritual occasions - weddings, funerals, births - and had "ceased to be life-informing at the level of the average Canadian". As a result:

Religion, Canadian-style, is mirroring culture. A specialized society is met with specialized religion. Consumer-minded

---


individuals are provided with a smorgasbord of fragment choices. Culture leads; religion follows.23

In some senses the stories I have told here dispute Bibby's claims, although notably none of them belonged to "traditional" churches. Beyond this observation I do not wish to make any claims about Bibby's thesis. Instead, I think Bibby's work has insightfully highlighted the embeddedness of religious belief in broader cultural and social movements, and would like to use it to examine the relation of religion to other issues I have considered in the thesis. In other words, I want to signpost how the religious views of these families do not exist in a vacuum, but are embedded in broader themes.24

Foremost, the values of the housing market and the local cultures of property appeared unassailable. All four families I have described here undertook similar spatializations of identity to those I outlined in chapter four. Living in the "right" neighbourhood, away from welfare families, single parents, and non-whites was a clear goal. In Berkshire, for instance, Bruce was vociferous about renters, being instrumental in the efforts (described in chapter four) to hassle the landlord about his/her tenants and ensure that a "family" moved in. Similarly, it was Edward whom I quoted in relation to the intertwining of family and housing in Glenwood. The local cultures of property and class meanings of home outlined in chapter five were partly constituted by the families I considered here. Julie and Brian, for instance, had consciously used their home as an investment and Ingrid was disappointed with the class location signalled by her house. But in many respects these findings should come as no surprise. Religious beliefs

23 ibid. p.233.
24 Something that has recently occupied geographers of religion. See the comments in Chris C. Park, 1994, Sacred Worlds: An Introduction to Geography and Religion, London and New York: Routledge, p.26; and Cooper, op.cit.
themselves function in a cultural milieu. What is interesting, however, is the conflict the ensuing dialogue could produce, as outlined by Julie.

Julie: Yes, giving up the business, we've thought about it a couple of times, once after the birth of our third child. Thinking about the hours we were putting into the business, and where we thought, or where we know our values are, and our priorities, you know it's virtually many things that we want to do but we don't do because we're so busy in the business trying to make ends meet. Part of the lifestyle that we've become accustomed to, you know, and sometimes we say why don't we quit, forget about this big racket, what do we want. That's what I mean, I'm not attached to anything, it would probably be harder on the children than on us.

My discussion of the ways religion complicates our understanding of new traditionalism, gender and their spatiality has been far from extensive. Rather, I have tried to signal some of the ways a consideration of religion modifies the claims I have made in other chapters, using religion to add another layer of complexity to the analysis. Contrary to Stacey's findings of the importance of feminism to evangelical discourse, for the families I spoke with, the desirability of the traditional nuclear family was given, and in most cases, went along with a rigid gender differentiation. It was gender differentiation that distinguished these families, not the new traditionalist ideal. More importantly, their relation to the neighbourhood was a disjointed one. Whilst children may have played with their neighbours, the parenting identities of their mothers and fathers were played out in different, church-related spaces. Finally, I have tried to conceptualize religious belief as imbricated with the social and cultural axes of power I have identified throughout the thesis. Thus, I have also outlined ways that religious cross-cuts the issues of home ownership and social mobility.
CHAPTER EIGHT
PLACING NEW TRADITIONALISM AND SUBURBAN, GENDERED IDENTITIES

There is, at present:

[A]n increasing uncertainty about what we mean by "places" and how we relate to them. How, in the face of all this movement and intermixing, can we retain any sense of a local place and its particularity.1

I have demonstrated in this thesis the continuing salience of place - broadly defined as a constellation of social and cultural relations in a particular site - in everyday life. Building upon Doreen Massey's poststructuralist-inspired rethinking of the notion of place, I have suggested that the places we imagine, in which we live, and through which we move, endure as sites for the grounding and interpretation of identity. Although globally situated at the nexus of international flows of capital, money, cultural practices and power, places - as site-specific manifestations and understandings of these flows - remain relevant. A number of articulations have been evident in the thesis: links between places and identities continue to be constructed as part of social processes; images of place (what I have termed symbolic geographies) are part of situating the self; and cultural meanings circulating within specific places influence the experience of gendered subject positions.

My thesis has been far more than a rumination on "place", however. I have used a concern with place as an entry point into an analysis of suburban gender and class identities in Surrey, British Columbia. How, in the 1990s, are white, middle-class nuclear family identities gendered and

experienced in and through place? I first situated the people in the two case studies I conducted, placing their lives in the context of two widely circulating and interdependent discourses: new traditionalism and declining fortunes. I then demonstrated how traditional models of family and gender remain pervasive signposts, but are modified in response to the pressures of homeownership and different economic positionings (understood in terms of the discourse of declining fortunes). This modification is, however, class and place specific; the ability to live an idealized new traditionalist life is dependent upon the "possibility" of a male breadwinner wage and the meanings circulating within the residential neighbourhood. Symbolic geographies and place-based interpretive repertoires were part of the processes whereby gendered and classed familial identities and practices were forged and interpreted, as was the placement of the family in bounded, homogeneous neighbourhoods, amidst the perceived socially chaotic Surrey landscape.

The preceding two paragraphs summarize the major arguments of the thesis. In the rest of this concluding chapter I draw out their implications for my three major interpretive lenses: poststructuralist conceptions of place and identity; new traditionalism; and suburban scholarship.

1. Poststructuralist Articulations of Place and Identity

In chapter one I set up the thesis as an examination of the "double articulation" of place and identity from a poststructuralist perspective. By "double articulation" I mean, following Doreen Massey, first the embeddedness of places in "global" social relations, and second, the embeddedness of identity within such places. I used the tools of poststructuralism, especially the foregrounding of culture, discourse and
representation, to first pry apart and then explore linkages between a place - suburban "single-family" subdivisions - and the gendered, classed and raced identities constructed there. I have shown how homologies between suburbs and specific identities are constructed. In chapter three, for instance, I demonstrated how practices of planning, zoning and building were guided by the principle of "everything in its place". Not only could a piece of land have only one use and meaning, only one set of social relations were deemed to be possible there, and naturalized as such. In these respects the thesis confirms that relations between suburbs and gender are socially constructed, and has layered a different historical and geographical context onto these understandings. Poststructuralist tools, however, have also complicated these analyses in two important ways.

First, a non-juridical conception of power situates residents differently and multiply in suburban environments. It was undoubtedly the case that the meanings of spaces within Surrey as envisaged by planners, builders, and developers, were drawn upon and reconstituted by residents (evidenced in chapters four, five and six). Through their familial practices, residents materially reinscribed their neighbourhoods as places for and of the idealized nuclear family. What is also notable about these practices, however, is that they were far more than accommodations to relations of power or expressions of resistance, they were also part of processes of domination and subordination. In particular, boundary-making practices created and reconstituted exclusion. In this respect, my analysis demonstrates Gillian

---

Rose's assertion that voices emanating from the local are not a priori oppositional, but can also be hegemonic.³

An alertness to the potential instabilities and multiplicities within places and identities that goes along with poststructuralism has also allowed me to bring out some of the contestations and contradictions within suburban residents' relation to place and therefore of the relations between gender and suburbs. I highlighted in chapter seven, for example, the fissures within Glenwood along religious lines, and the subsequent presence of two sets of cultural understandings and social networks there. Sometimes the two coalesced, especially around the issue of maternal employment; at other times they collided, such as in relation to material concerns. Similarly, in chapter six I examined the cleavages within cultural meanings circulating in a site, especially in Berkshire. By being attentive to disjunctures within place-based meaning systems, I have shown how the local context can exacerbate, as well as smooth over, contemporary difficulties in combining paid work and motherhood. It is certainly the case that residents construct and draw upon their suburban subdivision to their own ends, but negative associations are also felt. I have therefore demonstrated the usefulness of taking account of the tensions and contradictions within places, identities and discourses, as well as their inter-relations.

How does this analysis inform attempts to reconceive the concept of place? With respect to spatializations of the subject of feminism, I have confirmed my earlier observations that the subject's relation to place is fettered, emphasizing the intertwining of places and identities. On the other hand, my analysis has highlighted the limitations and implications of

poststructuralist conceptions of place. Conceiving of place as fluid and multiply situated, symbolic and material, local as well as global, was essential to "putting place in motion" and emphasizing its potency in the lives of white middle-class families I spoke with. But such a conception is exceedingly difficult to hold on to in a social world where place is continually fixed and essentialized. Indeed, the analogies between the concepts of place and identity could be taken one step further: just as identity is fixed in and through social process, so too is place. For instance, the planning of Surrey drew rigid boundaries between spaces of different social relations, and the institutional sites subsequently created - especially elementary schools and places of worship - became foci of meaning and activity. More tellingly, place is fixed in the construction of identity, certain identities appear dependent on essentialist notions of place. Residents of Glenwood and Berkshire essentialized the meanings of places within Surrey in deciding where to live (the meaning of Newton, for example, was understood solely in racial terms), and evoked a singular characterization of their neighbourhood in describing themselves and their relation to it. It is not just academics that fix place in order to understand it.

It is worth reflecting on the implications of these findings for valorizations of non-essentialist senses of place. Certainly the fixing of place, especially in symbolic geographies of Surrey, was problematic and exclusionary. Yet singular and unchanging meanings attached to a particular site are not always and everywhere undesirable and regressive; a point I was alerted to by Jane Flax's question that in valorizing multiplicity (in relation to identity) are we forgetting the pain associated with fractured identities? For

---

instance, a unitary and fixed notion of Glenwood as a place made it possible for the women there to have a more positive experience of at-home mothering. In this respect, a fixed sense of place, necessarily constituted by, and layered upon, new traditionalist ideals, led to a situation where certain women's experiences were neither isolating nor alienating. On the other hand, there were multiple senses of, and relations to, place in Berkshire, which seemed to exacerbate tensions around maternal employment and was not openly supportive of any model of motherhood, especially attempts to combine paid work and motherhood. It is important to note that these speculations are context-specific, and are directly related to the experiences of those in the "centre". Nonetheless, it seems imperative that the political and practical implications of non-essentialist senses of place be further explored, and the meanings surrounding and constituting multiplicity acknowledged.

II. "New" Traditionalism and Declining Fortunes

By considering the intertwining of gender, class and family in the lives of Glenwood and Berkshire residents I have tried to present some of the complexities of declining fortunes and new traditionalism. Both discourses were clearly important in shaping residents' experiences and perceptions, but in their reworking fractures and closures become evident. Declining fortunes, or the notion that the standard of living long enjoyed by middle-class families is no longer attainable, was articulated by nearly all those I interviewed. Yet its relation to people's material circumstances is questionable. Although the economic position of Glenwood residents did not appear at risk, "fear of falling" was a pervasive feeling. It may be the case, then, that they were picking up on sentiments that have been strongly expressed by the
Vancouver media and other commentators. The pervasiveness of a discourse of declining fortunes therefore requires further investigation. Moreover, I have highlighted the importance of the familial aspects of declining fortunes, for the loss of the "family wage" was deeply lamented. In terms of new traditionalism, my findings confirm its interpretive power, but paint it in more complex hues with respect to class, feminism, gender and the definition of "new".

Patricia Hills Collins has criticized the neglect of race and class in the dominant images of motherhood. Through this thesis I have made a similar argument with respect to new traditionalism: the concept as currently used is embedded within, and a response to, a white, affluent middle-class experience. I have shown that a stable, substantial male income, and a supportive residential environment, are necessary to live this life. "New traditionalist" is not an accurate portrayal of homeowning families where the male wage is either small or precarious. In these respects my analysis confirms similar observations about the current campaign for "family values". As Judith Stacey puts it:

The revisionist idiom of "careers" and self-development suggests ignorance of how few adults in the postindustrial United States enjoy the luxury of joining a "new familism" by choosing to place their children's needs above the demands of their jobs.

By examining the inter-relations between new traditionalist ideals and practices I have been able to go beyond acknowledgments of the class specificity of new traditionalist ideals. Indeed, the desired way of life

---


6 Judith Stacey, 1994, "Scents, scholars and stigmas: the revisionist campaign for family values", Social Text, 40, pp.51-75; p.64.
captured by new traditionalism is not class specific. What is confined to the affluent middle-class is the one-to-one correspondence between new traditionalist practices and ideals. Even for those (such as in Berkshire) who cannot afford to live the new traditionalist ideal, it still has powerful effects, forming an interpretive lens for women's labour market experiences. Political interventions into new traditionalism, therefore, must do more than declare it unrealistic, but investigate, for instance, why and how new traditionalist understandings are propelled and gain their force. It must also situate women's accounts in the context of their labour market experiences, something I have only sketched here. I have also demonstrated the racialization of new traditionalism, for its potential was seen to be most realizable in an all-white neighbourhood, a point I come back to in the next section.

My investigations also have implications for understanding the position of feminism within new traditionalism. As I outlined in the introduction, feminism - as a set of ideals and practices - has been identified as an oppositional subtext in new traditionalism. Here, the claim is that feminism operates as an unsaid, an absent presence that draws together the myriad components of the discourse. Feminism definitely operated as the unsaid in my discussions with residents and understandings of their lives. It was an absent presence, for example, in discussions with men and women about domestic labour, which invariably took the form of explaining why men did not do more around the house, or why women did more. Such stories only make sense if they are seen as reactions to feminism: these residents were aware that what they were doing was against what they saw as the (misguided) feminist norm. Similarly, as I indicated in chapter six, the women who were at home full-time asserted that being at-home was better for
children, and that working was selfish, responses that could be characterized as anti-feminist. Most tellingly, many of the tensions women were feeling, especially in Berkshire, were indirectly blamed on feminism: the difficulties of contemporary motherhood were attributed to the diverse choices women now had. Moreover, feminism was not entirely absent, but present through me. As I explained in chapter two, I was invariably positioned by interviewees as a "career woman", and therefore someone to whom different life choices had to be explained.

Analyses of feminism and new traditionalism have pointed out that the two are multiply and often contradictorily related. In my case studies, sometimes the understandings were obviously anti-feminist, asserting the naturalness of a strict gender division of labour and the negative effects of maternal employment on children. That motherhood was an option, rather than a duty, and that there were different models of motherhood, is in some respects "post-feminist". And everyday struggles within the home that I signposted in chapter five were undeniably "feminist", representing women's struggles to implement different forms of gender relations. These accounts indicate more than the multiple positions of feminism within new traditionalism discourse. They also tell a story about images of feminism. Feminist ideas and feminists are construed stereotypically and constructed monolithically. It is essential, therefore, as Stacey suggests, that feminists ensure they are not read as anti-family.

Although important, this focus on feminism reproduces the invisibility of men in new traditionalist discourse, a factor I have tried to remedy here. Questions such as whether men derive material or emotional benefit from

7 See for example Elspeth Probyn, 1993, "Televisions' unheimlich home" in Brian Massumi, ed. The Politics of Everyday Fear, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp.269-83; and Stacey, op.cit.
8 Stacey, op.cit. p.68.
these ideals and practices, whether they contest it, or whether their experience is fractured, are all ignored. I have tried to break the framing of home and family as "women's issues" by putting men in the picture, suggesting that men and masculinity are central to understanding new traditionalism. A traditional model of family life, in a "home of one's own", appears to be central to men's sense of themselves, regardless of class. Men in Glenwood, for instance, saw their wife's non-participation in the paid labour force as a badge of status. Despite the non-traditional models of motherhood practiced by most of the Berkshire women, the definition of provider was not redefined either symbolically or practically, although "fatherhood" was modified slightly. By focusing on instabilities in contemporary femininity, we lose sight of the lack of change and fracturing or so it appears at least in masculinity.

These variations about new traditionalism also facilitate a more nuanced understanding of its newness. As I pointed out in the introduction, the ideal of the nuclear family has been a powerful force throughout the twentieth century. The general contestations induced within new traditionalism are also not without historical precedent, for they are surprisingly reminiscent of the 1950s anxieties about maternal employment recently laid out by Veronica Strong-Boag.9 A comparison with Strong-Boag's analysis elicits two important discontinuities, in addition to the role of feminism. The first is the absence of fears about working women becoming "masculine" and losing the "softer" side of femininity. Indeed, it appeared to be accepted that women and men shared as many similarities as differences, with the exception of strict, biological gender division envisaged by some
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religious families. Definitions of motherhood may have been under threat, but women's identities as women were left alone. Second, and relatedly, masculinity, or "manliness" in general, was not seen to be threatened by involvement in childcare and domestic chores. What was contested was men's definitions of themselves as providers. The terms of debate appear to have shifted from discussions of masculinity and femininity in general to contestations of the gendering of parents and breadwinners.

III. Suburban Scholarship

Suburbs and the City of Surrey have been present throughout the thesis, but they have thus far been implicit in the analysis. When considered explicitly, the specific characteristics of Surrey assume greater importance, whilst the designation "suburban" and "Canadian" are destabilized. My focus on a quite conventional suburban site - the "single-family subdivision" - has been neither novel or trendy. Nonetheless, through a careful examination of family lives in suburban places I have been able to show some of the more subtle changes occurring in one suburban fabric, adding an important layer to analyses of contemporary suburban landscapes. In particular, I have suggested the characteristics of "new" suburbs, like social and housing diversity, and wider economic opportunities, thread through the everyday vocabulary of those living in the "old" suburbs. The different living arrangements and housing types within a place like Surrey are imbued with meaning and reworked from the perspective of the nuclear family, and become central elements of identity formation.

By emphasizing the old within the new, the substantial irrelevance of an urban-suburban, Surrey-Vancouver City, divide becomes apparent. It was the symbolic and material differences within a suburb - Surrey - that
motivated and explained familial practices. As I demonstrated in chapter three, Surrey is a mosaic, encompassing city and suburb. The places, meanings and social relations that form this patchwork thus assume the part of the "urban" in conventional suburban narratives. The impetus behind the boundary making I outlined in chapter four, for instance, was not anti-urban, but anti parts of Surrey. Residents were responding to, and fleeing, different family and class constellations within Surrey. Similarly, the social class meanings of home (chapter five) were drawn from the location of the house and the meaning of the subdivision within Surrey. Finally, "suburban" was not an adjective used to describe people's lives. Those I spoke with felt they were "city" people; suburban was a designation that more rightly belonged to those living semi-rural existences. They were too caught up in the hustle and bustle of city life, they said, to be truly suburban. This indicates that continuing to work with an urban-suburban dichotomy misses the complexity of the suburban fabric and underlines Roger Keil's and Klaus Ronneberger's suggestion that the core-periphery model of urban development should be replaced by the notion of a nodal, fragmented, disparate urban fabric.10

The minimal relevance of "suburban" as a category was directly countered by the significance of Surrey. The specific characteristics of Surrey were central determinants of my narrative and the accounts of the men and women I interviewed. This is especially the case in relation to race, a factor that I have touched upon briefly. Living a middle-class family life in the two neighbourhoods was not just white (all the people I spoke with were white) but was racialized. In particular, they can be seen as constructions of whiteness. Gender and class identities were dependent on a symbolic and
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material distancing from Surrey's Indo-Canadian community, a distancing that was also spatial, with families deliberately not locating in Newton and choosing a "non-Indo-Canadian" house style. Yet it has also been difficult for me to more fully explore the racialization of middle-class family living in Surrey. Part of the problem was my positioning - I was not alert to racialization until many of the interviews were completed. Unlike my "feminist presence", my whiteness meant that race was not a topic of discussion; I therefore colluded in excluding race from my account.

I have, however cursorily, been able to point out the spatiality of whiteness. Ruth Frankenberg uses the notion of social geography - the social constitution of place - to explore how whiteness is constructed, but her social geographies are generic rather than specific.¹¹ My claim is that the historical geography of a particular place - in this case Surrey - is a critical element. It was the characteristics of Surrey that made manifest the whiteness of the identities, and influenced the particular form they took. Moreover, I have shown how racialization is not isolated but is constructed in tandem with class and family. It was the racial and familial characteristics of Indo-Canadians that were isolated and differentiated. Similarly, there was an increasing Taiwanese presence in Glenwood, I was told, but it didn't appear to be an issue as long as gardening and status standards were maintained. Whiteness, therefore, is dependent on specific social geographies and its articulation with other social relations.

This discussion of racialization highlights the import of my conclusions for analyses of differences between urban fabrics in the United States and

Canada. The classic comparative work here is now nearly ten years old,\(^{12}\) and current observations are sorely needed. Some of my analysis confirms Michael Goldberg’s and John Mercer’s claims about the difference between the two landscapes, but others challenge it. One issue that may be peculiarly Canadian is the impact of a buoyant housing market, largely propelled in Vancouver by immigration, on suburban living. For those already in the housing market, rapidly escalating house prices (as occurred in the Lower Mainland in the mid to late 1980s), protected and enhanced the economic position of the middle-class families in the two case studies. Studies in other Canadian cities, and other parts of the Lower Mainland, are therefore needed to investigate a possible divergence in living standards of the middle class in Canada and the United States.

The cultural analysis I have conducted here, with its focus on the intersection of the new with the old, suggests a convergence of trends within the two countries. The diversity (income, race, family type) of Canadian suburbs is commonly regarded as a positive difference, boosting the claim that Canadian cities are less segregated than those south of the 49th parallel. Yet it was precisely this diversity that propelled the exclusionary practices I documented. By focusing on the interpretation of diversity, the assumed more liberal or socially progressive nature of Canadian cities is challenged. Again, more research is needed. The important point is that analysis should go beyond the documentation of difference, as its interpretation and meaning are equally important.

IV. Situating the Knowledges Produced in the Thesis

I suggested in chapter two that good scholarship is situated in that it acknowledges from where and how it was produced. I would like to return to this point in this final section of the thesis, for the stories I have told, and the conclusions I have reached, are necessarily situated and partial. Here, I consider the partiality and situatedness of my claims. Such a consideration does not negate the arguments I have made. Rather, it is intended as an aid to understanding the limitations of the thesis. I temper my claims with respect to two broad categories: the interview process and the alternative interpretive lenses I could have employed.

Both who I interviewed and the interview process affected what I have presented here, though it is impossible to document this with any certainty. It may have been the case, for instance, that people with stronger family values were more willing to be interviewed. My focus on new traditionalism may therefore be a product of the sample. My sense is that this was only the case in a couple of interviews, but I cannot substantiate the point. Further work using different research strategies is required to answer this question of "bias". In addition, my claims are based on a small sample and are therefore limited. Further research in other locations is needed to ascertain the specificity and generality of my analysis. One final methodological point is that residents were only interviewed once, for a relatively short period of time. By conducting second interviews I could have explored specific issues further, and would have also given residents the opportunity to clarify what they meant and to disagree with my interpretations. It is therefore necessary to realize that the account I build here is based on "public" stories told to me in a formal, one-off interview situation, an account that may miss some of
the nuances of these stories and may not accord with how those interviewed see themselves.

A second way to acknowledge the partiality of my account is through a focus on the interpretive lenses I employ. My analysis of the interviews was obviously influenced by my theoretical and personal baggage, highlighting some factors and neglecting others. The stories I tell of gender, class and family, and of the importance of new traditionalism and declining fortunes in understanding these categories in two Surrey neighbourhoods, are necessarily overlain, and possibly disrupted, by other categories and social relations. These factors may be just as important, but I have not considered their relevance in the thesis. As I suggested above (p.301) race, racialization and whiteness have been largely absent from my account. Moreover, I have not addressed the significance of immigration and ethnicity in middle-class life in Surrey. In Berkshire, for instance, it may have the case that in-migration to the neighbourhood was an important element of its local culture. Relatedly, what effect did childhood experiences and family background have on the expression and interpretation of new traditionalism and declining fortunes. Did people who were children of immigrants articulate declining fortunes differently? What was the relation of those whose mothers' worked in the paid labour force to new traditionalism? These issues remain unexplored in the thesis, but are crucial given the implicit claims made within both discourses about the lives of families today and fifty years ago. Finally, new traditionalism, declining fortunes and place are not the only possible interpretations of the interviews. Life course, for instance, may provide alternative explanations of mothering practices and differences between the two neighbourhoods. In sum, the claims I make in this thesis are necessarily qualified by the research strategies and interpretive lenses employed.
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## APPENDIX 1

**SOCIAL PROFILES OF GLENWOOD AND BERKSHIRE, 1991 CENSUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Glenwood</th>
<th>Berkshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>2810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Type (% families):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband-wife without child at home</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband-wife with child at home</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned dwellings (%)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Children (% total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mother tongue&quot; (% pop.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female labour force participation rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women with child at home</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women with child under 6 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women with child under &amp; over 6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women with child over 6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income ($)</td>
<td>59,492</td>
<td>51,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Glenwood Women/Men</td>
<td>Berskhire Women/Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial/admin</td>
<td>24/28</td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>7/4</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and related</td>
<td>7/0</td>
<td>6/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine and health</td>
<td>7/0</td>
<td>10/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, literary, recreation</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>29/9</td>
<td>30/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>10/18</td>
<td>8/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>15/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, horticulture</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment operator</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>3/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material handling</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machining and Related</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Fabricating</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>0/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Trades</td>
<td>0/13</td>
<td>0/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, 1994, Profile of Enumeration Areas in British Columbia - Parts A and B, Reference numbers A9105 and B91905, Ottawa: Statistics Canada
APPENDIX 2

INITIAL CONTACT LETTER

Dear <Name>:

I am a PhD student at the University of British Columbia conducting research on family life in Surrey. I am trying to find out whether the design and facilities of your neighbourhood are adequate for raising a family, and what you think of it as a place to live. I am also interested in how men and women are juggling the demands of work with raising a family.

As part of this research I would like to interview parents of school age children in your neighbourhood. If you would be willing to talk to me about your family and your neighbourhood it would be a great help to me and may help us plan better suburban communities in the future. I would like to speak separately to the parent or parents in the household. Each individual interview will take about an hour, and will take place in your own home at your own convenience. All names will remain strictly confidential. I will be the only person who will know that I interviewed you, and when I write up my results I will use false names and alter any identifying characteristics.

I do hope that you will consider being interviewed as part of this project as your opinions are important to me and to the planning of subdivisions. If you would like to be interviewed as part of this project, please contact me by leaving a message at the above number, or at my home at 222-1060. I will also be calling you by phone next week to talk about this research.

If you have any questions about me or my project, please contact me, or my supervisor Dr. Geraldine Pratt, at the above number.

Yours sincerely,

Robyn Dowling

P.S. I found your name and address in the City Directory, which is in the Guildford Public Library. It is a book that lists the names and phone numbers of people that live in a particular street.
APPENDIX 3

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Preamble
As I said in my letter, this interview is about Glenwood and what you think of it as a place to live and raise children. I’ll ask questions about why you decided to live here, what you think of family, and also your impressions of Surrey. I want to emphasize that there are no right or wrong answers to what I am asking. I am interested in your opinions and impressions, no matter what they are. If you don’t understand what I’m asking you or want to ask me any questions, please stop me at any time.

I would prefer to tape the interview because that means I can listen to you instead of taking notes, but if you don’t want me to tape it, I won’t. Of course I promise not to repeat anything you say, and I’ll change names and other characteristics when I write up my results.

I’d like to start with where you lived before Glenwood.

Can you describe to me the places you have lived in your adult life, starting with leaving your parents’ home, and telling me your reasons for moving between places.

The next group of questions are about Glenwood, what you think of it and your reasons for living here.

How did you come to live in Glenwood?
* house-hunting - other n’hoods, other houses, realtor, marketing?
* what sort of neighbourhood were you looking for?
* who made the decisions?
* was affordability a major issue?

To someone who hadn’t been here, how would you describe Glenwood?

Do you know your neighbours? * Provide details
* How did you get to know them?
* Can you describe them to me?

How many other people do you know in Glenwood? How often would you see them?
Can you describe them to me?

The next set of questions are about your daily routine in Glenwood and your attitudes toward parenting.

Going into as much detail as possible, can you describe a typical weekday?
* How long has this been your routine
* if women not work, how long out of labour force
* are you satisfied with this routine?
What about a weekend day?

How do you and your husband/wife divide the household chores?

Who takes most of the responsibility for the children?
   *do you think that's ideal?

Do you think, ideally, that there are specific roles for women and men in families?

Do mothers and fathers have different roles?

What does family mean to you?

We hear in the media that family values are declining in today's society? Do you think that's the case? Does that worry you? Glenwood?

Is it hard to be a family in Glenwood?
Could you have a good family life if you didn't own your home? in a townhouse? anywhere?

*throughout the interview you've mentioned the house a fair bit. I'd like to focus specifically on the house for a few minutes.*

What does this house mean to you?
Do you have to own?

How do you feel when you walk in the door?

What part of the house do you feel most comfortable in?
   *describe other parts of house

What changes have you made to the house since moving in?
Are there other changes you'd like to make?

What changes have you made to the backyard and garden?

My final questions are about your overall opinion of living here.

Are you comfortable living in Glenwood?
What do you like most about living here?
What do you dislike about living here?
What would you change?
Would you prefer to live anywhere else?