AGRICULTURAL MODERNIZATION AND GENDER DIVISION OF LABOUR

The case of Heraklion, Greece

MARIA STRATIGAKI*

In Greece, as in other Mediterranean countries agriculture still employs a large proportion of the working population; in 1986 it was 28,5% (NSS 1986). This is a consequence of the structure of agricultural production which is characterized by a large number of small farms; in 1981 the average size was 3.6 hectares employing 1.9 working people (NSS 1981). The dominant element in Greek agriculture thus remains the peasant family farm, around which rural communities have traditionally been formed.

In social research, the peasant family has been the focus of much attention[1]. Social anthropologists have been interested mainly in kinship relations and in exchange patterns between families such as dowry and inheritance practices[2]. Most studies have traditionally treated sex differences as the consequence of the different roles imposed on men and women related to other sorts of divisions in rural communities such as private-public, inside-outside. Sex roles are considered as subject to general social evolution, often according to urban societal patterns and not as reflection of tensions between the sexes produced by the existing power relations[3]. Other social scientists, especially those of Marxist orientation, have analysed the peasant family in terms of a unit of production and its relationship to capitalist development. Many of them have produced creative theories about the articulation of the capitalist mode of production with other modes (Vergopoulos 1975; Psychogios 1987) or the articulation between different forms of production within the capitalist mode of production (Dedoussopoulos 1985; Hadjimichalis 1987) prevalent in Greek agriculture.

Nevertheless, most of them have treated the peasant family as a unified group of people behaving as one single actor in rural society as far as agricultural production is concerned. Contrasting relations between members of the family and forms of gender division of labour within the productive unit have not been considered as important issues for analysis. Instead, men and women, parents and children, are supposed to play complementary roles, all of them being devoted to agricultural production in the same way and with the same degree of interest[4].

* Department of Sociology, University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Peasant family production has to be analysed as a social structure where labour relations are interrelated with family relations, where often means of production are owned and exploited by different persons, where most workers are socially defined as 'assisting and non-paid family members' (this being the formulation formally adopted by the National Statistical Service).

As has been successfully demonstrated by Alice Barthez (1982), in family agricultural production:

- the division of space between the home and the field does not represent a transition from one social group to another, as happens in urban societies;
- one becomes a farmer through one's family (marriage or inheritance) and not through the labour market;
- the family income is governed by product sales and not by the family members' labour value.

The above characteristics of agricultural production complicate the analysis of both professional and family life. Further complications are added when power relations between the sexes are taken into account. Only in this way can certain contradictions be explained, however. For instance, why are some family members not paid although the products of their labour are sold in the market? The key issue explaining the persistence of this balance of relations within peasant families is the gender division of labour which follows the pattern of tensions between labour and family relations in particular historical periods and in different regions. The gender division of labour is legitimized through mechanisms of evaluation of different jobs and tasks which become male and female according to what benefits the more powerful sex and class[5].

In the particular case of rural communities in the Heraklion prefecture it is the process of capitalist integration as well as the patriarchal family structure which determine social transformation. Distribution of products is becoming more important than production, private consumption is increasing and mechanization of production is becoming crucial for competitiveness. Such changes transform the social structure in every respect and in conjunction with patriarchal attitudes and practices they affect the traditional gender division of labour. In what follows field research findings pertaining to the modernization of agricultural production as it is reflected on co-operatives and in mechanization and its effects on the gender division of labour, are discussed within the above theoretical framework.

THE HERAKLION PREFECTURE: A FIELD STUDY

Despite recent tourist development in the region, Heraklion has retained more of its active population in agriculture than Greece as a whole.

During the 20 years from 1961 to 1981 this population decreased in Heraklion by 35% and in Greece as a whole by 50%. In 1981 29.2% of the 42.462 persons active in the agricultural population were women, according to the census. Women employed in agriculture are recorded as: 77.4% assisting and non-paid family members, 20.1% self-employed, 0.6% employers and 1.3% wage workers. Although official statistics should be treated with caution (an important part of economic activity is informal and thus not registered) it is obvious that the dominant structure in agricultural production in the region is the peasant family farm.
According to indicators elaborated in recent regional analysis by Hadjimichalis (1987) the Heraklion prefecture is one of the most 'receiving' regions in the country (Table 1). It ranks fourth together with Achaia,

TABLE 1. *Provincial Differences between Gross Income and Gross Value Added in percentage terms for indicative areas of Greece*

Athens Region	1.60	Thesprotia	–0.65
Thessaloniki	1.05	Lakonia	–0.75
Argolis	0.90	Rodopi	–0.95
Iraklion	0.85	Kozani	–1.12
Ahaia	0.85	Aegean Islands	–1.20

Source: Hadjimichalis (1987: 219).

after Athens, Thessaloniki and Argolis. Moreover, in 1975 Heraklion was among the first regions as regards high agricultural wages, the large number of tractors per unit of cultivated land and the large proportion of the cultivated area owned or operated by small peasant producers having less than 5 hectares per holding.

According to Melas and Delis (1981), agricultural wages in Heraklion in the 1974-1976 period were higher than the national average (470 drs compared to 398 drs). However, the ratio of female to male wages was lower than the national average (68% compared to 76%). The prevalent forms of cultivation are vineyards, olive trees and vegetables. In 1976 Crete employed 24.2% of the total Greek labour employed in vineyards, which represented 25.6% of agricultural employment in the region. Vineyards require 90-120 days of work and olive trees 60-90 days per hectare. This is much less than tobacco (210-360 days) and much more than cereals (10-15 days) which are the other two important Greek crops. The growing of flowers, vegetables in glasshouses and other intensive cultivation has been increasing as a proportion of agricultural production over the last ten years.

Crete, consisting of four prefectures, has the highest percentage in Greece (except for the Cyclades islands) of active peasant families participating in agricultural co-operatives (83.8% in 1983 when the national

average was 73.6%, ABG 1984). Female membership is higher than the national average (12.1% cf. 10.6%, PCAC 1983). In the field study, lack of aggregate figures on the sex of co-operative members in Heraklion prefecture, made it necessary to identify women from the membership lists. In 18% of co-operatives, representing 24.4% of the total membership, it was found that women constituted 18% of members. Among them 20% were widows. Co-operative development in the region is related to both product processing before marketing (wine and oil extraction) and to small peasant family farm structures pushing for incorporation into co-operatives. Due to all these factors the region was considered appropriate for a field study on the impact of agricultural co-operatives on farming women's position[6]. This article uses the findings of the field study, emphasizing particularly the role of co-operatives and mechanization in the gender division of labour in production as well as in domestic and community reproductive activities.

Features of the sample

Five communities were selected which combined representative products and dynamic co-operatives (see Table 2). From the 3,340 peasant families

TABLE 2. *Population and Co-operative membership of Field Study Communities*

Community	Population(a)	Members of Co-operatives (b)	
		Women	Men
Archanes	3,690	347	972
Agios Myronas	869	55	243
Episkopi	1,270	39	319
Charakas	1,025	56	193
Tymbaki	3,988	56	442

Source: (a) NSS (1981); (b) Field study.

living in these communities, a random sample of 118 farming women was chosen. It was stratified into two equal groups: members and non-members of co-operatives. The sample consisted of 96 married women, 15 widows, 6 single and 1 divorced woman, of whom 41% were aged between 20-40, 48% between 41-60 and 11% over 60. Ten women were childless, 8 had one child, 46 had 2, 54 had 3 or more children. The great majority (89%) lived in households of not more than four members, the rest lived in households of five or six members.

When asked for their occupation 103 declared 'farming woman' and only 15 women declared 'housewife', though 32 mentioned 'housewife' as their second occupation. Husbands of 71% of the women interviewed were farmers. The rest were professionals, technicians, construction

workers, civil servants and clerks. Most of the women came from peasant families, 90% of fathers and 84% of mothers being farmers. If we add another 14% of mothers described as 'housewives', it is obvious that the mothers' origins were less diversified than the fathers'.

The women's educational level was generally low; 81% were elementary school graduates, 15% had finished some high school grades and 4% graduated from high school. A higher percentage of husbands (10%) held a high school certificate. 86% of the women were landowners, although in 60% of cases their land holding did not exceed one hectare. On the other hand only 30% of husbands owned less than one hectare. Only 12.5% of married women claimed that they were the farm head and only one woman that the couple was head of the farm; 30% of women were also agricultural wage workers. Very few women (11) had been employed in the packing section of the co-operatives.

AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATIVES: A MALE DOMAIN

In Greece, where the majority of farms are small, most of the farmers are organized into co-operatives[7]. In 1983, 73.7% of peasant families had one member active in an agricultural co-operative (ABG 1984), in order to gain the advantages of co-operation. This activity very seldom involves anything more than financial facilities for the supply of farm inputs. 70% of the 7.055 agricultural co-operatives were credit unions, 3.2% were commercial co-operatives and only 21% were producers' co-operatives, supplying for example olive mills or engaging in collective wine production.

In spite of this restricted activity, most co-operatives function more as a mechanism of political control by the state through the Agricultural Bank rather than providing a real opportunity for co-operation between farmers. Their officially declared total deficit of 55.7 billion drachmas, when fixed capital is only 26.3 billion drachmas, indicates the role of co-operatives as a means of indirectly financing farmers according to state policies[8].

Legal framework for women's participation

Until 1979 co-operatives operated according to law No. 602/1914. As it concerned all kinds of co-operation, no special reference was made to peasant family farms. Women were excluded indirectly by article 15, which demanded that members 'freely administer their property'. Women's property, through their dowries, was legally administered by their husbands.

According to law No. 921/1979, 'members of agricultural co-operatives must be persons over 18 years old whose primary or secondary

occupation is in agriculture' but 'members of the same family, if married' can also be members. This formulation in fact placed restrictions on married women (presuming that the head of the farm is the husband) as it presupposed that only one member of each peasant family can be a member. An exception is made if there is one more married person in the family, in order to provide for a situation where a married son lives with his parents.

Political changes imposed a new law, No. 1257/1982, for the 'restoration of the democratic operation of co-operative organizations'. According to its spirit, the Minister of Agriculture in his instructions made it clear that 'not only married women farm owners but also married women who are wives of members, if occupied professionally in agriculture' can be registered. Some women have been registered, mainly wives of political activists. PCAC (1983), indicated that women comprised 10.6% of its total membership.

In 1985, a new law, No. 1541/1985, was passed on 'rural co-operative organizations'. Under its provisions, membership rights are extended to 'adults, men or women, who are occupied personally, professionally and exclusively in any sector of rural economy, especially in the production of agricultural products, livestock, fish and apicultural products, as well as in rural manufacturing and domestic handicrafts'. Although at the time of the field study (summer 1985) this law had not been fully implemented by the co-operatives investigated, making it impossible to evaluate its impact on women's registration, expectations have never been very high.

It is true that laws have never been strong enough to change social practices, even when they consciously point out their preoccupation with equality. Reality is much too complicated to be described by laws. In the case of rural co-operatives, all human practices and attitudes, as well as state policies, contribute to the creation of a male culture, preventing women from becoming active in such organizations.

Over half of the female members of agricultural co-operatives interviewed during the field research claimed that they had been registered because of the lack of male members of the family (widows, orphans, non-married) or because their husbands/fathers could not be members of co-operatives (he is a civil servant, he cannot read, he is too old or he owns no land). The rest of the women put forward reasons concerning facilities offered by co-operatives (security, financial credit, marketing and processing of products, and so on).

The same pattern is visible in the answers of women non-members, with 73.7% of them putting forward reasons connected with their husbands: 'he is the member', 'one from each family is enough', 'a woman will be criticized', and so on. The remainder claimed their non-membership was due to such factors as lack of land ownership, lack of time, lack of sociability and inappropriate age. It becomes clear that membership is a

male prerogative. In practice, a woman becomes a member only in the following circumstances: a. no husband/father/adult son; b. no male farm ownership; c. no male eligible for administration or membership[9]. In addition, political antagonism in rural communities can cause husbands to require their wives to be registered, in order to support their favourite candidate more effectively at co-operative board elections. Whatever the circumstances under which women register in co-operatives, thus overcoming the first range of obstacles, once members they still face patriarchal practices and attitudes.

Only 25% of female members attend the general assemblies (compulsory annual meetings for approval of the budget), usually in order to get information 'from members and managers', or 'about new candidates and elections'. Women who do not attend general assemblies say in excuse: 'I am a woman', 'my husband goes', 'I have no time', 'I do not like it there', and so on. The above-mentioned justifications shed significant light on the role of co-operatives in rural society. The transference of political antagonisms to co-operative elections may result in some women attending assemblies. The others, not participating in political life which is traditionally male in small communities, do not go, as their gender identity prescribes.

Very seldom do women who attend assemblies dare to speak in public. Only three women out of the fifteen participating declared that they expressed their opinion, in the event that 'nobody else says what I am thinking' or 'because one should express one's own ideas'. The rest of the women remained silent because 'I am a woman', 'I have nothing to say', 'I will be criticized', or because 'the men are the ones who do the talking'.

If speaking in public demands special efforts from women, voting is a more usual practice and 75% of women members do vote at co-operative elections. Reasons claimed for abstention are lack of information, lack of time and lack of interest. Although voting constitutes the only contact with the co-operative which the member has to make *personally*, three women claimed that instead of them it was their husbands who voted 'under special authorization'. Unfortunately it was impossible to check if it was the women themselves who had been misled or if local electoral organizers had really allowed men to vote instead of their wives – a violation of the co-operative constitution.

In conclusion, we note that agricultural co-operatives in rural Greece operate as local political organizations transmitting the priorities of power politics at the state level. PASOK (Panhellenic Socialist Movement) Government strongly favoured the expansion of agricultural co-operatives and farmers' participation, since the agricultural sector is considered very important in the economic and political life of Greece. Rural areas have always produced electoral results advantageous to PASOK.

Co-operative organizations have been promoted as the most democrat-

ic form of co-operation in rural areas, so that farmers' participation is guaranteed and therefore, the implementation of the state's farm policy is facilitated. Capitalist integration of the agricultural sector imposes wider control of marketing of products (price bargaining, subsidies distribution etc.). Farmers' loss of control over their products is concealed by their participation in co-operatives which depend largely on the local branch of the Agricultural Bank. The decisions concerning marketing have been transferred from the peasant farm household to the co-operative in the form of collective decisions by managing directors. It is men who take decisions and assume responsibilities for financing and marketing since they in fact own and/or manage their wives' lands. These decisions are now taken in the public/political sphere, which has been expanded through modernization of the agricultural sector. Women remain in the home, which is simultaneously becoming more privatized, gathering reproductive activities and becoming less important in farm production. Even a significant part of household consumption is transferred from the family to co-operatives. This is a result of the opening of supermarkets by some of the most dynamic co-operatives which sell foodstuffs, electrical home appliances and other basic provisions.

During the transformation of the economic structure of rural communities, gender power relations have found appropriate conditions for stabilization, gaining advantages from the separation of distribution from production in the process of capitalist integration. Barriers have been erected against the participation of women as full, active members in co-operatives. These barriers serve both the relations of production and power relations between the sexes. Under these circumstances men control women's labour more effectively than in the past.

MACHINERY OF DOMINANCE: MECHANIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL TASKS

Another aspect of agricultural modernization is the mechanization of the productive process. In cultivation processes, for instance in cereals where labour-saving machinery has been introduced, women have been excluded from field tasks. They explain why they do not work in the fields any more: 'they do not need us because now they have machines!' (Gourdomichali 1986). On the other hand, male farmers who own agricultural machines extend their opportunities for work, as they provide contract services to landowners without machinery.

In areas like Heraklion, where cultivation is still labour-intensive in vineyards and olive groves, mechanization has not fully replaced manual labour yet. Nevertheless, machinery utilization has transformed the gender division of agricultural tasks. Implicitly, more sophisticated criteria have been adopted. Data collected suggest the breakdown of gender-

based agricultural tasks and their main prerequisities in terms of machine utilization and technical expertise (Table 3).

TABLE 3. *Gender Division of Labour by Agricultural Task*

Agricultural task	*Sex*	*Machine*	*Skill*
VINEYARDS:			
pruning	M	pruner	operational skill
branch collecting	F	NO	stooping
tillage (ploughing)	M	tiller	machine operation
sprinkling	M	sprinkler	chemical materials carrying weight
small branch cutting	F	NO	nimble fingers
leaf cutting	F	NO	nimble fingers
branch binding	F	NO	nimble fingers
grape lowering	F	NO	nimble fingers
grape harvest	F	NO	nimble fingers
transportation	M	tractor	carrying weight
raisin spreading	F	NO	stooping
raisin treatment	M	NO	chemical materials lifting weight
OLIVES:			
tillage	M	tiller	machine operation
tree shaking	M	NO	muscle power
gathering	F	NO	stooping
sacking	F	NO	stooping
pruning	M	pruner	machine operation

Source: Field study.

The main criterion for division into male/female tasks is machine or tool utilization. Male tasks are those requiring a machine while female tasks are those requiring nimble fingers and a strong back. Machines and tools demand technical skill for their correct operation. Machine operation entails responsibility as misuse can be damaging for plant productivity. Manual field workers have less responsibility, but work for a longer time on each plant. In cases where time is restricted (for example at harvest time) wage workers are used in addition to all members of the family.

When more than one person is needed for machine operation, women 'help' men. In sprinkling, women carry the sprinkler tank behind men who are sprinkling; in pruning, women pick up from the ground the branches which have been pruned. The first, done simultaneously, does not constitute a separate agricultural task according to farming women, but the second, done later, sometimes when men are back home, is identified as a separate female task. Obviously nimble fingers and flexible backs (for repetitive stooping) are female factors of production. They are for women what machine/tool use and correct handling of chemicals are for men.

Reasons put forward by women when asked why they do not do certain

'male' tasks are revealing. Answers can be classified according to their frequency as follows: a. lack of muscular strength, b. lack of technical skill, c. machine utilization, d. identity as 'male' task, e. personal inability, f. health risks, g. lack of time, h. lack of experience, i. prohibition by husband. Although most of the above reasons seem rational, two of them(c and d) are clearly not so. Instead they point to the existing gender division of labour, according to which machine utilization is connected with men and some tasks are just 'male' tasks. Women replying in this way do not look for rationality in what they do or do not do, but accept without question their position in the gender division of labour.

As demonstrated, men are increasing their control over the production process in agriculture, taking advantage of increasing mechanization in the course of capitalist integration of agriculture. The machinery and the technical skill required become tools for men's control of women's labour, whereas women are restricted to working with their fingers and bodies, doing long, repetitive, hard work. The absence of a labour market in the family productive system leaves the owners of means of production only one way to control the production process; namely their personal control of machines and skills. Workers (women and children) cannot be replaced because they are members of the family. In these conditions power relations between the sexes, through men's control of machinery operation in the production process, contribute to women's labour exploitation. However, since the structure of the productive unit is family-based, labour relations are not manifested in a classical way. Labour relations articulated within the family structure do not permit family members (wives and children) to develop usual strategies adopted by workers in other sectors. Women owing land without managing it develop a false consciousness as farmers while in fact they suffer a specific form of exploitation by devoting their non-wage labour to the family. This confusion assures the reproduction of both peasant family farm production and the patriarchal structure of the peasant household.

HOUSEHOLD ACTIVITIES: INCREASINGLY FEMALE

Changing the gender division of labour in farm production by granting control of commercialization and production processes to men has also had an important impact on reproductive activities undertaken in both public and private spheres. Modernization and the attendant capitalist integration of rural society have contributed to a clearer separation of the spheres of production and reproduction. Productive labour (paid) assigned to men is socially valued in contrast to reproductive labour which is assigned to women and devalued. Women's labour in the fields, which does not involve the operation of machinery and tools, is classified as 'secondary' although more time consuming. Women's restriction to 'sec-

ondary' agricultural tasks legitimizes their being assigned the greater part of reproductive tasks in order to fulfil their *raison d'être*.

Subsistence production, reported in 53% of households interviewed, is an activity of decreasing importance for farm households. Proximity to a large city (Heraklion) and successful commercialization of agricultural products are depressing the volume of subsistence production. As already mentioned, co-operatives often supply basic foodstuffs to their members who purchase large quantities for periods of a year. Raising poultry, livestock (rabbits, sheep, goats) and kitchen garden crops (vegetables, potatoes) is considered an occupation for women in 32%, for men in 23% and for the couple in 32% of cases where it is undertaken. Although based in the home, subsistence production is not as gendered as other domestic activities like food preparation and processing, which are exclusively female and equally negatively affected by commercialization and proximity to the city.

Where women are not living alone, they say they get assistance from husbands (22% of cases), sons (7%), daughters (42%), mothers-in-law (10%), mothers (7%), sisters (5%) and sisters-in-law (3%). Despite the significant contribution of men the greater part of domestic tasks are carried out by women. More specifically, some men help by sweeping and food preparation. On the other hand all female relatives help in 'all tasks', especially in sweeping, dish-washing, washing clothes and preparing food. As far as shopping is concerned, interview answers indicate that it is a task shared by both husbands and wives. Child care is not mentioned at all even when the women receive female help. Either it is included in 'all tasks' or it is not accepted that one should be helped to take care of one's child. It is not conceived as a domestic task but merely as a natural female duty.

Detailed figures provide evidence for a classification of domestic tasks from 'female' to 'shared' ones, as follows: child care, dish-washing, washing clothes, cooking, food preparation, sweeping, shopping, subsistence production. As subsistence production is declining in most households, shopping remains the only domestic activity almost equally shared between men and women. But shopping itself is also changing through the widespread commercialization of agricultural and consumer products. Men are in the habit of purchasing basic food supplies in large quantities as well as meat and fish. Women purchase for immediate use small quantities of vegetables, fruit, clothes and an increasing range of consumer goods such as detergents and child care products. The changing pattern of consumption which follows norms of urban societies affects shopping, which tends to become a female concern as the variety of household consumer goods increases. Therefore the majority of tasks involved in household reproduction tend to be strictly female.

This evolution is gradually depriving women of time which would

otherwise be available for participation in collective community activities (as often happens in rural south-west England as described by Bouquet, 1984). Lack of time was the reason given by 44% of women interviewed for not being members of local associations and social groups. Another 16% claimed that they did not like such activities, and 14% said that there were no such groupings in their village. Exceptionally, women described themselves illiterate or too old or sick, or alternatively believed that 'the husband's membership is enough'. The remaining 23% of women were members of social groups such as agricultural associations (13 women), cultural associations (12), religious groups (4), women's associations (6) and political parties (1).

Most of them registered after 1981 when political changes revitalized rural social life, offering expectations of social change. Political antagonism has been reactivated around the two poles of the major political parties (conservative and socialist). Under these circumstances, women's membership has been explicitly promoted, especially by husbands who are political activists. Nevertheless, women have not responded accordingly, because they have had to live with a strict gender division of labour continuously reducing their available time.

Going out for entertainment purposes shows a similar pattern in that 25% of women never go out, 31% pay visits to women friends or neighbours, 9% pay visits to relatives, 21% go to tavernas, 18% to cafeterias and clubs and 10% to cinemas. Visits to other houses, preferably to meet women, and often to help each other at domestic tasks, are the most frequent occasions for going out. Such outings do not mean exit into community life but simply contact with other women's domesticity.

The reproductive sphere, divided into domestic and community life, whatever the intentions of the political powers may be, reserves domesticity for women and the community for men. The patriarchal structure of rural society has proved stronger than capitalist pressures for popular participation aimed at legitimizing political integration.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The capitalist integration process in Greek agriculture is mediated through agricultural co-operatives and the utilization of machinery. Farmers' participation in co-operative organizations legitimizes the state's control of the market and contributes to the reproduction of political power. Machinery improves productivity and increases competitiveness in agricultural production. Private consumption is being extended and subsistence production gradually reduced. In this context, farmers are more dependent on state policies to secure their income and standard of living. Their control over the product of their labour is continuously initiated by Rubin, 1975) are revolutionary. In fact, as the preceding

ty, farmers as men must control women's labour more efficiently. The increasing distinction between production and reproduction offers an appropriate background. Men operate machinery and keep technical skills for themselves. They participate in co-operatives attempting to control the marketing of their family farm products and the supply of field inputs.

Gender division of labour, transformed through two different power systems (capitalist mode of production and patriarchal structure of society) becomes more oppressive for women. Unlike women wage earners, farming women are not under two masters (employers and husbands) but under one master who counts for two. They are burdened with a range of tiring manual chores of an agricultural kind, as well as having to carry out a whole range of domestic tasks in the growing reproductive sphere. Community is reserved for men, since women simply 'have no time to participate'.

Theoretically farming women have the option of escaping in two ways:
a. By giving up work for the family farm in favour of wage work on other farms. This is almost impossible in present social conditions. As long as women remain in this sector, they have to work for their own family and not for 'others'. Economic interest coming from landownership gives the material 'justification' for such an obligation.
b. By becoming the 'head of the farm' in real terms. This is possible only when there are no husbands, fathers or sons involved. Otherwise a woman 'head of the farm' would have to negate her family relations.

There is only one way for a farming woman to become a farmer or to do paid work: the *male way*. Nevertheless, farming women sometimes leave the agricultural sector in order to work in manufacturing or services. This happens either when they move to urban areas or when new job opportunities are created in rural areas. Such changes do not mean that their situation in relation to male power is improved automatically. On the contrary, it often deteriorates. Rural women working as wage workers claimed that they worked mainly for their dowry or the dowry of their daughters[10]. Others have had to accept piece-work at home, when agricultural mechanization in the area has confined them to the home[11]. In one way or the other, women's labour is socially devalued and the benefits of economic and social development in modern Greece are appropriated by men. As Handman (1981) has observed, social and economic evolution of the traditional rural society transformed women's position *vis-a-vis* men from one of submission to one of dependence.

Laws and policies prescribing equality remain a dead letter unless social changes in the mode of production and in the sex/gender system (a term initiated by Rubin, 1975) are revolutionary. In fact, as the preceding discussion has shown, changes that do not radically transform the patriarchal family structure and the dominant mode of production serve to worsen women's position.

NOTES

* I would like to thank Dina Vaiou and Kyra Veniopoulou for helpful comments.

1. For reviews of the Greek literature see Kovani (1987), Lambiri-Dimaki (1984) and Maratou Alipranti (1987).
2. cf. Campbell (1964), Piault (1985), Skouteri-Didaskalou (1976 & 1984) and Vernier (1977).
3. Contributions in Dubisch (1986) and Damianakos (1981) are representative of the approaches of the American and French schools to rural community and family structure in Greece.
4. For a feminist critique of French rural research of the same kind, see Lagrave (1983).
5. For an analysis of relations of production in agriculture, see Delphy (1983).
6. This research, which has been undertaken by the writer in collaboration with Heleni Alitzoglou, has not been completed.
7. For an empirical research on agricultural co-operatives in Greece, see Avdelidis (1981).
8. See introductory report to the Greek Parliament for the draft bill on 'Rural Co-operative Organizations', 17 February 1984.
9. This problem has been faced recently by more and more men due to the latest law requiring *exclusive* occupation in rural production. In Greece in 1981, 41.1% of farm heads did not give farming as their 'usual' occupation (Moisidis 1986). Especially in Crete, increasing opportunities in the tourist business are attracting more and more farmers.
10. cf. Lambiri (1965), Nikolaidou (1978) and Shapiro (1985).
11. For patterns of industrial development in Greek agricultural areas, see Hadjimichalis & Vaiou (1987).

REFERENCES

ABG (Agricultural Bank of Greece) (1984), Annual Report, Directory of Co-operatives (in Greek)

Avdelidis, P. *et al* (1981), *The Agricultural Co-operative Problem of the country* (Athens: EKKE) (in Greek)

Barthez, A. (1982), *Famille, Travail et Agriculture* (Paris: Economica)

Bouquet, M. (1984), Women's work in rural south-west England, in N. Long, ed., 143-159

Campbell, J.K. (1964), *Honour, Family and Patronage. A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Damianakos, S. ed. (1981). Aspects du changement social dans la campagne grècque, *Revue Grècque de Recherches Sociales,* (numéro spécial) 2-261

Dedoussopoulos, A. (1985). Simple commodity production, capitalism and commercial capital, *Politis,* (69-70), 3-11 (in Greek)

Delphy, C. (1983). Agriculture et travail domestique: la réponse de la bergère à Engels, *Nouvelles Questions Féministes,* (5), 3-17

Dubisch, J., ed. (1986), *Gender and Power in Rural Greece* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)

Gourdomichali, A. (1986), Farming women today: the impact of mechanization and 'professionalization' in agriculture, Paper presented at the KEGME seminar *'Building new strategies for Mediterranean women'* (Spetses, Greece)

Hadjimichalis, C. (1987), *Uneven Development and Regionalism: State, Territory and Class in Southern Europe* (London: Croom Helm)

Hadjimichalis, C. & D. Vaiou (1987). Changing patterns of uneven regional development and forms of social reproduction in Greece, *Society and Space,* (5), 319-333

Handman, M.E. (1981), De la soumission à la dépendance, in S. Damianakos, ed., 231-244

KOVANI, H. (1987) *Empirical Studies on Rural Greece* (Athens: EKKE) (in Greek)
LAGRAVE, R.M. (1983). Bilan critique des recherches sur les agricultrices en France, *Etudes Rurales*, (92), 9-40
LAMBIRI, I. (1965), *Social Change in a Greek Country Town*, Research Monograph 13 (Athens: KEPE)
LAMBIRI-DIMAKI, I (1984), Social research in rural Greece, *Synchrona Themata*, (23), 61-67 (in Greek)
LONG, N., ed. (1984), *Family and Work in Rural Societies* (London: Tavistock)
MARATOU-ALIPRANTI, L. (1987). Structural characteristics and traditional functions of the rural family: empirical studies, *The Greek Review of Social Research*, (66), 73-105 (in Greek)
MELAS, G. & D. DELIS (1981), *Farm Wages and Employment in Agriculture* (Athens: Agricultural Bank of Greece) (in Greek)
MOISIDIS, A. (1986). Non-farm employment in Greek agriculture: a first approach, *Greek Review of Agrarian Studies*, (4) 53-73
NIKOLAIDOU, M. (1987), *Women in Greece: Work and Emancipation* (Athens: Kastaniotis) (in Greek)
NSS (NATIONAL STATISTICAL SERVICE OF GREECE), (1981), *General Statistical Census* (Athens: NSS)
NSS, (1986). *Labour Force Statistics* (Athens: NSS)
PCAC (PANHELLENIC CONFEDERATION OF AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATIVES), (1983), Census of Co-operative Members (mimeo) (in Greek)
PIAULT, C., ed. (1985), *Familles et biens en Grèce et à Chypre* (Paris: L'Harmattan)
PSYCHOGIOS, D. (1987), *Dowries, Taxes, Raisin and Bread: Economy and Family in Rural Greece in the 19th Century* (Athens: EKKE) (in Greek)
REITER, R., (1975), *Toward an Anthropology of Women* (New York: Monthly Review Press)
RUBIN, G. (1975), The traffic in women: notes on the 'political economy' of sex, in R. REITER. ed., 157-210
SHAPIRO, R. (1985), Echange matrimonial et travail féminin. Les paradoxes de la modernité, in C. PIAULT, ed., 303-326
SKOUTERI-DIDASKALOU, E. (1976), *On Greek Dowry-Spaciotemporal Transformations*, Postgraduate Diploma in Social Anthropology, Thesis, University of London
SKOUTERI-DIDASKALOU, E. (1984), *Athropological Issues in the Women's Question* (Athens: Politis) (in Greek)
VERGOPOULOS, C. (1975), *The Agrarian Question in Greece: The Problems of Social Integration of Agriculture* (Athens: Exandas) (in Greek).
VERNIER, B. (1977), Rapports de parenté et rapports de domination. Etude de cas: 1) Représentation mythique du monde et domination masculine chez les Pomaques, 2) L'ordre social des ainés *canacares* à Carpathos et sa reproduction, thèse de 3eme cycle, EHESS, Paris