

SHOPPING TIME OF FAMILIES OF EMPLOYED
AND NONEMPLOYED HOMEMAKERS

By

JANIE CROUCH HOPFER

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1980

Thesis
1980
H798s
cop. 2



SHOPPING TIME OF FAMILIES OF EMPLOYED
AND NONEMPLOYED HOMEMAKERS

Thesis Approved:

Sharon G. Dickes

Thesis Advisor

Carl Zalf

Elaine Jorgensen

Norman D. Durhan

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Deep appreciation and sincere thanks are extended to a number of individuals for their continuous guidance, able assistance, and unfailing encouragement from the beginning through the culmination of this particular study. The thesis advisor, Dr. Sharon Y. Nickols, Director of the Family Study Center, is respected as a dedicated professional and an understanding friend who readily provided direction as needed. Statistical programming and interpretation were understandable due to the diligent assistance of Karen Fox of the Family Study Center. Committee members, Dr. Elaine Jorgenson and Dr. Carl Hall, are recognized for sharing their time and expertise so willingly. Oklahoma State University Cooperative Extension Service administrators and co-workers are recognized for their understanding and encouragement in pursuing attainment of the master's degree.

Special thanks are reserved for my family: to my mother and mother-in-law for their unfailing faith in my ability and encouraging words and reassurance at crucial times and to my sister, Judy, who was my mainstay throughout this endeavor. Judy, a professional librarian, ably gave of her time, talents, and understanding when called on for assistance. It is my hope that each may share in the growth that took place as a result of this experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Objectives	3
Research Questions	5
Assumptions and Limitations	5
Definitions	6
Summary	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Introduction	9
The New Consumer	10
Shopping: A Time Consuming Activity	11
Household Time-use Studies	11
Management Strategies	15
Delegation	15
Dovetailing	16
Overlapping of Tasks	16
Household Task Adjustments	16
Summary	17
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURE	18
Introduction	18
Type of Research	18
Population and Sample	20
Instrumentation	21
Data Gathering	21
Data Analysis	24
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	26
Family Characteristics	26
Days Shopped in Previous Week	33
For Food	33
For Items or Services Over \$100	33
Family Members' Daily Shopping Time	35
Family Characteristic Variables and Shopping Time	37

Chapter	Page
Shopping Time by Homemaker's Employment or Nonemployment	37
Age of the Younger Child	39
Least Significant Difference Statistical Procedure	40
Not Significant Family Characteristics	41
Family Shopping Trips	45
Homemakers' and Others' Shopping Trips	46
Family Members' Shopping Trips.	48
Homemaker's Percentage Contribution to Shopping Trips	50
Summary	50
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	52
Comparison of Present Findings With Previous Research	54
Statements of Implication Based on Literature and Present Findings.	55
Recommendations for Further Reserach	57
Recommendations for Programming	58
Concluding Statement	58
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	59
APPENDIXES	61
APPENDIX A - 24-HOUR TIME CHART	62
APPENDIX B - INTERVIEW QUESTIONS PERTINENT TO THIS STUDY	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Family Characteristics of the Sample	28
II. Days Shopped in Previous Week by Residence	34
III. Family Members' Daily Shopping Time By Residence	36
IV. Homemaker's and Spouse's Daily Shopping Time by Employment or Nonemployment of the Homemaker	38
V. Daily Shopping Time by Age of the Younger Child	40
VI. Homemaker's Daily Shopping Time by Family Characteristics	42
VII. Spouse's Daily Shopping Time by Family Characteristics	44
VIII. Homemakers' and Others' Shopping Trips by Employment or Nonemployment of the Homemaker.	47
IX. Family Members' Shopping Trips by Employment or Nonemployment of the Homemaker.	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Today much attention is focused on women and paid employment outside the home. The two-earner family is not an unusual or passing phenomenon. Employed homemakers account for a substantial percentage of the present day labor force. Malabre (1978), staff reporter of The Wall Street Journal, states that the impact is forceful as evidenced by a conclusion of Ralph E. Smith, an economist for the Urban Institute in Washington, who closely studies women's labor force participation.

The rise in the number of American women who work for pay, he [Smith] says, amounts to a 'subtle revolution' looming at least as large as the Industrial Revolution that shook Europe nearly two centuries ago (p. 1).

Women are assuming new roles with additional pressures. Thus, adjustments must be made within the family.

These women hold the dual responsibility of homemaker and career women. Their two roles make varied and often conflicting demands on time. Allowed to run rampant, these demands are capable of creating havoc in the lives of family members and can produce significant stress for the women themselves (Schram and Vaughn, 1976, p. 45).

David L. Brown (1977), sociologist for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, says:

American society has undergone rapid and pervasive changes during this century, and few institutions have changed more than the family.

However, no change has had a more comprehensive impact on the family than has increased participation of

women in the labor force. Women's labor force activity signifies important changes in the economic and social structure of the family: on consumption patterns, on the division of labor among spouses, and on child rearing practices (p. 21).

Certainly contributing to the consumption patterns in determining economic stability are consumer decisions regarding family resource management.

Time is a limited resource. Linder (1970) states that:

Time, unlike other economic resources, cannot be accumulated. We cannot build up a stock of time as we build up a stock of capital. As it passes, however, time puts into people's hands something that they can use (p. 2).

It is a constant that must be managed since additional amounts cannot be created. According to a time-use study of household work by well-known authorities in the field (Walker and Woods, 1976), public and private living is very much controlled and organized by time which serves as a measurement of household activity.

Household activity continues to take on new and changing dimensions due to technological advancement and social changes. "Some activities formerly of relatively little importance have become major ones; for example, marketing for the household is more time consuming than it once was" report Walker and Woods (1976, p. 1).

Thus, given the current impact of the employed homemaker in the labor force and an understanding of stress created from assuming additional roles, a need exists to study time-use and household activity. Gross, Crandall, and Knoll (1980) report: "The sharing of household tasks between husband and wife has changed less over time than wishful thinking might see it" (p. 276). The employed homemaker has too much work and too little time.

Since present day shopping is a major household activity that is

more time consuming than it was previously (Vanek, 1974), a specific need exists to study shopping. A search of the literature supports this need further by indicating limited research dealing specifically with time spent shopping by different family members of employed and nonemployed homemakers.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the amount of time spent shopping by different family members of employed and nonemployed homemakers of selected Oklahoma families and to explore the influence of other family characteristics on shopping time. A better understanding of time spent shopping by the family members in employed and non-employed homemaker families could possibly help in identifying household activity that contributes to role strain of employed homemakers. The need for an emphasis on family role-sharing of household activity to alleviate role strain of the employed homemaker could possibly be identified by studying shopping time of the family members.

Recognition and enactment of various management strategies such as elimination of tasks, delegation of tasks, dovetailing which is "intermittent attention to two or more tasks until they are completed" (Deacon and Firebaugh, 1975, p. 199), and overlapping of tasks which is the "concurrent attention to two or more tasks" (Deacon and Firebaugh, 1975, p. 199), if used effectively, could perhaps help reduce role strain of employed homemakers.

The employed homemaker must deal with additional multiple role obligations and expectations which according to Sarbin and Allen (1968) created difficulties leading to role conflict and strain. Occupancy of

many diverse roles creates problems as an individual attempts to satisfy or allocate role obligations and expectations in such a way as to make life possible.

Because the individual occupies multiple positions, mechanisms must be found to prevent the dysfunction that would obviously result from the incompatibility and conflict existing among several of the roles. The problem is attenuated somewhat by the fact that certain roles can only be enacted successively during a given time period, and by the existence of socially accepted differences in the relative salience of norms associated with the roles (p. 538-539).

To illustrate: the employed homemaker's labor force participation role normally must be enacted during specified hours and, socially and historically, the homemaker's role as wife and/or mother is probably considered more important than the homemaker's labor force participation role when conflict arises. Resistance to change is ever present. However, the employed homemaker may initiate efficient management strategies in order to help alleviate conflict and strain arising from multiple role expectations and obligations. The employed homemaker may delegate to a paid worker weekly house cleaning and home baking. The incorporation of such delegation thus enables the family to enjoy a clean house and home baked goods without an undue amount of strain on the employed homemaker. Delegation is but one of a number of management strategies that can be used in coping with conflict and stress created by the assumption of multiple roles.

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To explore the relationship of shopping time by the homemaker and the spouse and selected variables such as employment of the homemaker, education of the homemaker and spouse, age of children, residence area, and occupation of the homemaker and spouse.
2. To determine if the employed homemaker experiences role strain

from additional multiplicity of roles in relation to the degree of role-sharing in shopping by the different family members as compared with the nonemployed homemaker.

3. To make recommendations from the data for further research.

Research Questions

Research questions postulated for the development of this study were:

1. What is the relationship between the shopping time of the homemaker or the spouse and selected variables such as employment of the homemaker, education of the homemaker and spouse, age of children, residence area, and occupation of the homemaker and spouse?
2. What is the relationship between the degree of role-sharing in shopping by different family members and role strain on the part of the employed or nonemployed homemaker?

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions and limitations guiding the development of this study were cited as follows. It was assumed that:

1. The respondent could read and comprehend the instrument used for gathering data.
2. The respondent was truthful in reporting background data and recording family members' use of time.
3. The week chosen to administer the instrument was a typical week for each family.

Limitations of this study were:

1. The geographic areas of the two sub-samples, a rural sample in

Alfalfa County, Oklahoma, and an urban/suburban sample in Guthrie, Oklahoma, may not have been representative of the state's population as a whole.

2. The sample was heavily, though not exclusively, weighted in the middle and upper-middle socioeconomic strata due to response of participants.

3. The wife/mother was the respondent for each family member's use of time.

4. The sample comprised families with two parents and two children only, thus it did not include the variety of family sizes or compositions which exist.

Definitions

Operational definitions for the major concepts and variables pertinent to the development of this study were cited as follows. Homemaker referred to the individual defined as housewife in a study by Lopata (1971), except that homemaker carried no sex bias in this current study.

A housewife is a woman responsible for running her home, whether she performs the tasks herself or hires people to do them. This distinguishes her from an employed housekeeper who maintains a dwelling belonging to someone else without having final responsibility for it (p. 3).

The terms employed and nonemployed homemaker referred to the same respective groups, employed wives and nonemployed wives, as defined by Walker and Woods (1976).

Employed wives are those gainfully employed 15 or more hours per week, nonemployed wives are those not gainfully employed or employed less than 15 hours per week (p. xx).

Shopping time reported in this study was defined as:

. . . all shopping, whether or not purchases were made, by any member of the household. . . . This shopping was for food, clothing, household supplies and equipment, or other types of purchases for the use of the whole family or its individual members. Time recorded included time for shopping in person, by telephone, by mail, or in home sales; time for putting purchases away; and transportation time involved in shopping (Walker and Woods, 1976, p. 219).

Education of the homemaker and spouse was defined according to Sanik (1979) as ". . . the highest grade, training, or degree completed" (p. 50). The variable residence area was used to refer to either an urban/suburban or rural area with these terms defined as follows:

According to the definition adopted for use in the 1970 census, the urban population comprises all persons living in urbanized areas and in places of 2,500 inhabitants or more outside urbanized areas. In all urban and rural definitions, the population not classified as urban constitutes the rural population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1971, p. ix).

Role expectations are comprised of the rights and privileges, the duties and obligations, of any occupant of a social position in relation to persons occupying other positions in the social structure (Sarbin and Allen, 1968, p. 497).

The role of homemaker used in the context of this definition referred to the social position, "homemaker," in relation to family members occupying other positions within the social structure, "family," of this study.

The term role strain used in this study referred to a cognitive state identified by Goode (1960) as difficulty felt in fulfilling role obligations. Multiple roles make demands on an individual's time, effort, and skill that may overwhelm an individual despite social structure features that contribute to integrating roles. Satisfying adequately the demands of only one or two of an individual's roles requires a majority of time and may result in neglecting other role obligations that have equally legitimate demands for time and energy. Thus multiple

role demands that exceed available resources for doing justice to all role obligations create the felt difficulty identified as role strain. With time being a resource limited to the given amount of 24 hours per day per individual, it stands to reason that the employed homemaker will experience role strain from assuming additional role expectations and obligations unless role-sharing and/or management strategies are incorporated to alleviate role strain.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine shopping time of families of employed and nonemployed homemakers with theoretical interpretation in regard to possible role strain on the part of the employed homemaker. The following chapter presents theoretical foundations for the present study and reviews relevant research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Studies including household work-time allocation by families and individuals in the United States first emerged in the twentieth century from household time-use studies by home economists and sociologists. These early studies of the 1920's and 1930's, sponsored by the Home Economics Bureau of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in a number of different agriculture experiment stations, analyzed the farm woman's work load. Today these studies provide excellent though limited historical information for the researcher.

The period from 1920-1940 was followed by a lapse of interest in time studies. Chapin (1974) reported the lapse was perhaps due to the amount of detail involved in compiling information and the expense of analyzing the vast quantities of data.

Interest in the way the homemaker was using time intensified in the late 1950's. The development of computer technology by then meant a savings in time devoted to data handling. In addition to computer technology, the interest increase was possibly

. . .spurred by the increased participation of women in the labor force, technological developments that changed household work, and changes in the roles of family members. These developments have made resources of time, energy, and money more and more interchangeable for carrying out the work of homemaking (Walker and Woods, 1976, p. 4).

Thus, comprehensive household time-use studies had been a topic of research since the early 1900's; however, discussion of shopping as a specific household activity or task was not as prevalent in research. This literature review focused on household shopping behavior, time-use, and management strategies for meeting multiple role obligations while reducing role strain. Household time-use research studies included were limited to those which reported in detail time spent shopping with focus on the United States studies.

The New Consumer

The 1970's brought the age of the new consumer with forces and implications for change created by the reshaping of the American household. The family model of two or three children with husband-breadwinner and wife-homemaker was no longer valid. The trend was toward smaller families, less marriage, later marriage, more divorce, and a substantial increase of women in the labor force. A reordering of priorities and values had occurred (Berry, 1978).

Berry (1978), a marketing specialist, cited a number of developments in America as having combined to create a new form of poverty for many Americans -- the "poverty of time."

The growing poverty of time is the result of a number of influences: including the fast rising proportion of women in the labor force; the spread of affluence; the growing amount of time devoted to physical and mental well-being; and the knowledge explosion (p. 491).

The gainfully employed homemaker found this poverty of time particularly significant as attempts were made to juggle household tasks around employment outside the home. What was needed was a more equitable distribution of household work within the family. Traditional pat-

terns of household work roles were not being adjusted accordingly.

Technology and reduction in family size have brought changes in the goods and services needed by a family to function as a unit. The average amount of time spent on household work had not been reduced to the extent that many assume, however. Much of this work is easier, but while the time required for some tasks has been reduced over the years, for others it has increased (Walker, 1975, p. 52).

Shopping: A Time Consuming Activity

The family of yesteryear was much more self-sufficient than today's family. Today the acquisition of goods and services for maintenance of the household operation constitutes a definite portion of the homemaker's time. Accordingly, Linder (1970) made the statement that

Shopping is a very time-consuming activity. Empirical studies show that housewives, for instance, spend a considerable amount of time in shops, and en route to and from shops (p. 58).

The homemaker's time consumption for this task could be reduced through role-sharing. It is evident that society's idea of the homemaker's time allotment to household tasks has not kept up with cultural change. Schram and Vaughn (1976) gave meaning to this resistance to change with the following statements.

The best explanation, however, is likely to be that Parkinson's Law is in operation--the homemaker's work expands to fill the time available. This is especially true when the homemaker is not employed, and once the pattern is established, it continues under new circumstances (p. 46).

Household Time-use Studies

The way homemakers employed outside the home, and those who are not, use their time has been the topic of much research. And contrary to what might be believed, employment of the homemaker outside the home did not mean that a more equitable distribution of household work

occurred within the home. The homemaker was reluctant to give up some household roles. Thus there was little likelihood of such a cultural change until role-sharing became more socially and psychologically acceptable.

In 1961-62 Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station conducted a project on time-use in household tasks under the direction of Manning (1968). A major objective of the study was to develop a technique for estimating or predicting the work load in Indiana homes based on factors in the family and the physical environment which affect use of time. One week's daily time records were recorded by the same 111 Indiana families during each of the four seasons of the year since the data gathering procedure had not previously been reported in this country. The cooperating families were husband/wife households with none of the wives employed more than 15 hours per week outside the home. There were 53 urban families, 41 rural farm and 17 rural nonfarm families. Time spent in all household tasks averaged 52.9 hours for urban families, 54.7 for rural nonfarm families and 55.4 for rural farm families with 90 percent of this time spent by the homemaker.

Families recorded the number of shopping trips taken, including those for shopping when nothing was bought, time spent planning purchases, travel time, and time spent putting away purchases. Seasonal variation in shopping was slight with the greatest fluctuation around special holidays. The time spent weekly during peak periods was over 6.5 hours with 3.2 hours being the least time spent shopping. Seven percent of the families made more than five shopping trips a week and about two-thirds made three or fewer trips. Generally, more shopping trips meant more time spent. Although the total shopping time increased

with the number of trips made, it did so at a decreasing rate per trip. Thus, additional trips might be assumed to be less inclusive and for more specific items. Fifty percent of the rural families, compared to 39 percent of the urban, made less than three shopping trips per week. Larger families averaged more shopping trips than smaller and the homemakers in larger families spent proportionately more time than those in smaller ones. Time spent shopping increased with an increase in the age of the children. Overall, this study concluded that the place of residence, whether rural farm, rural nonfarm or urban, and the family size affected the use of time to a greater extent than did season.

Foremost in the time-use research is that of Kathryn E. Walker of Cornell. Walker (1975) found that the average employed homemaker spent approximately two hours less time per day on housework than her nonemployed counterpart. Therefore the employed homemaker had a significantly longer total work week than the nonemployed homemaker. Walker's findings also showed that neither the husband nor the children spent significantly more time on household activities or tasks when the homemaker was employed outside the home.

The preceding statements were drawn from a large time study begun in 1967 in Syracuse, New York. The purpose of the study was

. . .the development of a measure with which to quantify the nonmarket production of the household. Household production or household work, as defined in this study, comprises the multiplicity of activities performed in individual households that result in goods and services that enable a family to function as a unit (Walker and Woods, 1976, p. 1).

Marketing or shopping was among the activities included in household production.

Family composition had been hypothesized to be important to the

amount of time spent in household production; thus, the sample was designed to control the number of adults and to stratify according to the number and ages of children. Families surveyed totaled 1,296 which represented husband/wife households with no children, stratified according to the wife's age; and households with one, two, three, four, five to six, and seven to nine children, stratified according to age groups of the youngest child (under one, one, two-to-five, six-to-11, 12-to-17).

Time spent on shopping by all workers was slightly related to the number of children with age of the youngest child having the highest correlation with shopping time of the major family composition variables. The distribution of shopping activity among families was the same in both employed and nonemployed wife households except for an increase in teenagers' frequency of participation in employed wife households. When wives were employed, their proportion of total shopping time declined only a small amount, from 58 percent to 53 percent. In households with either employed or nonemployed wives, the husband's time for shopping was a quarter of all workers' time. The family composition variable having the closest relationship to wife's time spent on shopping was age of the youngest child. Although the relationship was only slight, wives spent a little more time on shopping when children in the family were older. Wife's time spent shopping and husband's educational level showed only a slight association. Husband's hours of employment was the only variable related to his time-use for shopping. When husbands worked longer hours, a little less time was spent on shopping.

Sanik's (1979) study drew a comparison between time spent in household work in two-parent, two-child households in urban New York State

in 1967-68 (the Walker time-use study previously described) with time-use for household work in 1977. The twofold comparison included findings of an urban-rural area comparison in 1977 as well. Time spent shopping by all family members was expected to remain unchanged from 1967-77. However, the decade comparison was found to be significantly different. The mean family shopping time was 104 minutes per day in 1977 as compared to 70 minutes per day in 1967. In urban-rural comparison, the mean time spent shopping in each place was 1.7 hours per day.

Management Strategies

Delegation

An attempt to cope with the various obligations and expectations of multiple roles was possible by employment of management strategies. Reduction of role obligations was possible to a certain extent by assigning or delegating tasks. Gross, Crandall, and Knoll (1980) report that

The importance of utilizing the human resources of the various family members has long been recognized, but little is known about ways the services of family members can be assigned or delegated most effectively (p. 224).

Nichols (1966) found that homemakers receiving the most help from their children used a process which permitted initiative with limitations. The mothers shifted jobs within a fairly well-defined structure which included an explanation about tasks and some supervision and allowance for initiative. Thus it appeared that delegation as a management strategy for reducing role obligations was of maximum benefit when the delegation of tasks was highly individualized.

Dovetailing

Coordinating tasks so as to permit intermittent attention to two or more tasks until they are completed was called dovetailing by Deacon and Firebaugh (1975). Many household tasks lend themselves to dovetailing as a management strategy for accomplishing two or more role obligations. Some household tasks can be dovetailed quite easily while other household tasks may remove the task performer from the household or demand constant and full attention thus eliminating the possibility for dovetailing. Usually meal preparation can successfully be dovetailed with doing the laundry, nonphysical care of the children, letter writing, or general cleaning, for example. However, other household tasks, such as shopping, usually remove the individual from the household and thus cannot be easily dovetailed with other household tasks.

Overlapping of Tasks

Deacon and Firebaugh (1975) identify the management strategy of concurrent attention given to two or more tasks as an overlapping of tasks. This strategy was particularly appropriate where tasks had high continuity and were relatively simple. Differences in the attention levels required for tasks make overlapping possible. To illustrate, shopping as a household task might occur concurrently with nonphysical care of the children.

Household Task Adjustments

When seeking ways to alleviate role strain of the employed homemaker through household task adjustments, it must be remembered that

shopping as a household task does not lend itself as easily to some management strategies as other household tasks. Because of the inherent nature of shopping, much of the time involved with the task removes the individual from the household as evidenced by Linder (1970) in regard to amount of time in shops and en route to and from shops and thus restricts possibilities for dovetailing which can create efficient time-use for household tasks. Role-sharing in regard to the household task of shopping was perceived to be a logical solution to alleviate role strain of the employed homemaker. In addition, elimination of tasks, delegation of tasks, and the efficient use of other management strategies might be initiated to reduce role strain of the employed homemaker.

Summary

The 1970's brought the age of the new consumer with forces and implications for change due to the changing American household. Shopping became more time consuming with the family of today being less self-sufficient compared to the family of yesteryear, and the homemaker's time allotment to household tasks had not kept up with cultural change. Research supports the statement that the employed homemaker has a significantly longer total work week than the nonemployed homemaker. Management strategies are one way of coping with additional role obligations and expectations as a result of the assumption of multiple roles.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURE

Introduction

This research study was part of a regional time-use in household work project conducted by 11 cooperating states. Data was gathered from two-parent, two-child families between August 1, 1977, and December, 1978. The cooperating researcher of each state was responsible for comparative analysis between urban and rural areas in the state and for disseminating findings. All cooperating researchers had access to data from all the states for further studies.

According to Sanik (1979),

The objectives of the regional project were:

- (1) to establish a data bank for rural and urban families on use of time for household, paid and volunteer work and for non-work activities.
- (2) to compare similarities and differences in use of time in work (household, paid, and volunteer) among rural and urban populations in various geographic areas in the United States (p. 5).

This chapter describes procedures appropriate to this specific study. Included were research type, variables studied, population and sample, description of instruments, data gathering methods, and statistical procedures for analysis of the data.

Type of Research

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the amount of time

spent shopping by different family members of employed and nonemployed homemakers of selected Oklahoma families and to explore the influence of other family characteristics on shopping time. Current data were utilized for this study which was termed descriptive research as defined by Best (1977).

Descriptive research describes what is. It involves the description, recording, analysis, and interpretation of conditions that now exist. It involves some type of comparison or contrast and may attempt to discover relationships that exist between existing nonmanipulated variables (p. 15).

The survey method of data gathering was utilized and was considered a valid method for obtaining the information the objectives called for since that information had to be supplied by the families themselves. The interview was the manner by which the data were obtained.

The conceptual design of this study defined amount of time spent shopping by different family members as the dependent, criterion variable. This variable primarily determined the data to be gathered and the method to be utilized. However, for time-use to be an effective measure for shopping, it was necessary to determine what family characteristics might affect time spent shopping.

Being part of the regional project previously mentioned meant that the sample was restricted to two-child households and that comparative analysis between rural and urban/suburban areas was possible. Therefore the independent controlled variates selected were age of the younger child and rural or urban/suburban area. Season of the year and day of the week were two additional variables that could affect household time-use and shopping time in particular. Thus these two variables were controlled by interview scheduling.

The independent random variables were employment or nonemployment

of the homemaker, education of the homemaker and spouse, and occupation of the homemaker and spouse. Employment or nonemployment of the homemaker was a random variable with the assumption that employed women would be represented in the sample in proportion to their representation in the labor force for different stages of the family cycle in the population area. Education and occupation of the homemaker and of the spouse were selected as random variables related to the socioeconomic characteristics of the household.

Population and Sample

A sample of two-parent, two-child families was obtained from the rural farm and nonfarm population of Alfalfa County, Oklahoma, and the urban/suburban population of Guthrie, Oklahoma. Alfalfa County is located in the northwest part of Oklahoma. Cherokee is the most populated town in the county with 2,119 population. Per capita personal income in Alfalfa County was \$2,500 higher than per capita income in the state as a whole but typical of the northwestern part of the state. The urban/suburban families were from Guthrie, Oklahoma, a town of 9,575 population, located in the central part of the state. Guthrie is not in the Oklahoma City Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, but is within commuting distance of the City. Guthrie qualifies as an urban area itself according to the census definition, but it also has the additional influence of the greater Oklahoma City area. Numerous housing developments link Guthrie with nearby towns of similar size toward Oklahoma City. Per capita personal income in Logan County was about \$1,000 lower than per capita income in the state as a whole. However, the respondents to the time study survey appeared to have incomes above

the community in general. Educational level was fairly high for both the rural and the urban/suburban homemakers and spouses. The educational levels of the urban sample closely match that of a recent statewide survey reported in Voices of Oklahoma Families (Powell and Wines, 1978, p. 19). A large percentage of the rural sample holds college degrees with the entire population of Alfalfa County above the state average for median years of education (Powell and Wines, 1978, p. 181). The higher educational level may also reflect the proportion of young families in the sample.

A variety of sources was used to create a potential sampling frame. These included: school records listing two parents and two children, hospital birth records of mothers with two live births, city directories, and church cradle rolls. The sample was then stratified according to the age of the younger child: under one, one, two-to-five, six-to-11, 12-to-17 years of age. Using a random numbers table, random selection was made within each of these groups to represent each weekday for each segment of the year: fall/winter (September through December), spring (January through April), and summer (May through August). An equal cell size of 21 families in each age strata provided a sample size of 210 families in Oklahoma--105 rural and 105 urban/suburban. This same sample size and composition were used for data gathering by each of the 11 states cooperating in the regional household time-use project.

Instrumentation

Data Gathering

Each family selected from the stratified random sample was sent a

letter which explained the purpose and procedure of the project and requested their participation. The interviewer then contacted each homemaker to verify, through a series of questions, the eligibility of the family for the sample and to arrange an appointment in the home for the interview if the family was eligible. Interview dates were controlled so that upon completion there were five interviews, one for each of the five age strata, for each weekday (Sunday through Saturday) for each segment of the year in both rural and urban/suburban populations.

The instrumentation used by Walker (1976) in the 1967-68 time study at Cornell University was the basis for the instruments used for the 1977 regional project with a few adjustments made by Sanik (1979). Instruments consisted of a three-page form on which to record phone contacts to each selected sample plus eligibility verification questions and a record of the scheduled interview dates, an instruction book, and a time chart (Appendix A) and interview questions (Appendix B). Appendix B is a list of only those interview questions pertinent to this particular study. Validity of the instruments was verified through pretests conducted by Sanik during the development of the revised instruments and from final pretests conducted as field interviews which tested both format and interviewing procedure.

Specially trained interviewers gathered the data. Before the survey began, interviewers became familiar with all instruments. A video tape which had been developed for training interviewers was used by all cooperating researchers in the regional project. The tape described the procedure for scheduling interviews and the techniques for gathering and recording the data. In addition, each interviewer conducted a complete trial interview and was checked by the cooperating researcher

prior to beginning the actual project interviews.

In the initial interview, the interviewer assisted the homemaker in recalling each family member's time-use for the previous 24-hour period. These data were recorded on a time chart that accounted for 24 hours a day in 10-minute increments. The increments could be divided to record five-minute periods of activity and activities longer than a half hour were described by writing about the activity above the duration line. A letter or number symbol with the color of the marking indicating sex was used to identify each family member. To avoid the possibility of longer than 24-hour days, primary, secondary, and travel time were differentiated on the time chart as defined and explained in the instruction book.

At the conclusion of the initial interview, the homemaker was instructed to keep a time chart for the next 24-hour period. The interviewer returned two days later to pick up the time chart and to record supplemental background data from survey questions.

Only the homemaker was interviewed since this was the procedure used in the 1967-68 study and it had been judged successful in obtaining household time-use of all family members. Considerable time and expense in interviewing was saved by using this method in addition to having more control over consistency of the record when only one person was responsible for recording.

Shopping was one of the 10 household activities for which time was recorded for each family member six years of age or older. For this particular study, the only time-use data analyzed were that pertinent to shopping. Included were the shopping column on the time chart and all interview questions related to shopping practices or background

information. Instruments in the appendixes are only those from the total time-use regional project that included data pertinent to this particular study. Complete information and all instruments and materials used in the 11 state regional time-use in household work project can be obtained from Dr. Sharon Y. Nickols, Family Study Center, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078.

Data Analysis

Responses to interview questions pertaining to shopping, background information regarding variables used for this study, and shopping time totals (minutes) from the time chart were coded and key punched onto computer data cards. Percentage frequencies were used to describe the amount of time (minutes) spent shopping for each of the age strata six years or older for both rural and urban/suburban samples. Percentage frequencies were also used to describe family characteristics. Relationships between the variables were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOV), chi-square, t tests, and mean shopping minutes. The statistical significance level of .05 was used for all analysis interpretation of this study.

The total number of shopping trips per family, taken from the time charts, was coded and key punched onto computer data cards. For the analysis of shopping trips, data from only those families who recorded shopping time (minutes) and who had a child or children eight years old or older were used. The minimum age of eight years was selected because the researcher believed that eight years old was an age deemed to be responsible enough to assume a shopping role alone. To illustrate, an eight year old might be sent to the neighborhood store with a shopping

list of items to purchase. From the time charts, it was determined who shopped and the number of shopping trips. Five classifications were used for coding who shopped. The classifications were: the homemaker only, the homemaker plus other family member(s), the spouse and child(ren), the spouse only, and the child(ren) only. The number of trips per family for each classification was recorded as well as the total shopping trips per family. This method made analysis possible on a proportion basis. The percentage of total shopping trips made by each classification was determined and, by combining classifications, the percentage of shopping trips that involved the homemaker could be compared with the percentage done by other family members. In addition, the homemaker's employment status made possible the comparison between the employed and nonemployed homemaker. Chapter IV presents the findings based upon shopping time (minutes) and shopping trips' analysis.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Family Characteristics

This study of time spent shopping by different family members of employed and nonemployed homemakers of selected Oklahoma families included 210 respondents. One hundred and five of the respondents comprised a rural sample in Alfalfa County, Oklahoma, and the remaining 105 respondents made up the urban/suburban sample in Guthrie, Oklahoma. Each respondent represented a two-parent, two-child family.

Family characteristics are shown in Table I. the majority of both the rural and urban/suburban homemakers (73.3 and 78.1 percent) were 35 years of age or younger, with over 50 percent of the homemakers interviewed between the ages of 26 and 35 years. Over three-fourths of the spouses, 81 percent rural and 77.2 percent urban, were between the ages of 26 and 45 years, with the majority (49.6 and 57.2 percent) between 26 and 35 years. The remainder of the spouses, approximately one-fourth, were almost equally divided between the ages of 25 years or younger and 46 years or older. The mean age of the homemaker was 32 years with the mean age of the spouse 34 years. The age of the older child per respondent was almost equally distributed in the rural sample and the urban/suburban sample among the age classes of two through five years, six through 11 years, and 12 through 17 years with the largest percent (38.1 and 39 percent) in the age two through five years class.

The mean age of the older child was nine years.

Slightly over half of the homemakers (58.1 and 53.3 percent) had at least a partial college education. About 28 percent (28.5 percent) of the rural and 16.1 percent of the urban/suburban homemakers were college graduates. About 35 percent of the rural spouses (35.2 percent) had a high school education or less, with 46.6 percent of the urban/suburban spouses with a high school education or less. Almost 42 percent of the rural spouses (41.9 percent) were college graduates while only 24.8 percent urban/suburban spouses were college graduates.

Slightly over three-fifths of the rural respondents (61.7 percent) were full-time homemakers, with 50.5 percent of the urban/suburban respondents being full-time homemakers. Those wives who were employed were engaging in service, clerical, or management and professional jobs. The occupation of farmer or farm manager comprised 35.2 percent of the rural spouses occupations, with the largest percentage of the urban/suburban spouses (28.6 percent) being craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.

Almost three-fifths of the rural families (58.9 percent) had a family income less than \$20,000 while about two-thirds of the urban/suburban families (64.8 percent) had an income less than \$20,000. Twenty-one percent of the rural families did not know their total family income. Family incomes of urban families were more uniformly distributed over the various categories.

The majority of both rural families (79 percent) and urban/suburban families (94.3 percent) either owned or were buying their home. Only 3.8 percent of urban/suburban families were renting while almost four times that many rural families (15.3 percent) rented their home.

TABLE I
FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Family Characteristics	Rural		Urban/Suburban	
	Number Reporting	Percent	Number Reporting	Percent
<u>Age of Homemaker</u>				
25 years or younger	20	19.0	15	14.3
26 through 35 years	57	54.3	67	63.8
36 through 45 years	24	22.9	15	14.3
46 years or older	4	3.8	8	7.6
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0

TABLE I (Continued)

Family Characteristics	Rural		Urban/Suburban	
	Number Reporting	Percent	Number Reporting	Percent
<u>Age of Spouse</u>				
25 years or younger	10	9.5	10	9.5
26 through 35 years	52	49.6	60	57.2
36 through 45 years	33	31.4	21	20.0
46 years or older	10	9.5	14	13.3
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0
<u>Age of Older Child</u>				
1 year	0	0.0	4	3.9
2 through 5 years	40	38.1	41	39.0
6 through 11 years	30	28.6	31	29.5
12 through 17 years	35	33.3	29	27.6
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0
<u>Education of Homemaker</u>				
High school graduate or less	44	41.9	49	46.7
Vocational, technical, partial college	31	29.6	39	37.2
College degree	30	28.5	17	16.1
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0

TABLE I (Continued)

Family Characteristics	Rural		Urban/Suburban	
	Number Reporting	Percent	Number Reporting	Percent
<u>Education of Spouse</u>				
High school gradu- ate or less	37	35.2	49	46.6
Vocational, techni- cal, partial col- lege	24	22.9	30	28.6
College degree	44	41.9	26	24.8
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0
<u>Occupation of Homemaker</u>				
Service workers, laborers, opera- tives, craftsmen	12	11.6	27	25.8
Clerical and sales workers	15	14.2	18	17.1
Managers, adminis- trators, profes- sional workers	13	12.5	7	6.2
Homemakers (full-time)	65	61.7	53	50.5
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0

TABLE I (Continued)

Family Characteristics	Rural		Urban/Suburban	
	Number Reporting	Percent	Number Reporting	Percent
<u>Occupation of Spouse</u>				
Service workers, laborers, opera- tives	24	22.8	29	27.6
Craftsmen, foremen, kindred workers	10	9.5	30	28.6
Clerical, sales workers, managers	18	17.1	27	25.6
Farmers, farm managers	37	35.2	0	0.0
Professional, tech- nical, kindred workers	14	13.4	17	16.3
Homemakers (full- time), not em- ployed	2	2.0	2	1.9
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0
<u>Annual Family Income</u>				
Less than \$7,500	1	1.0	5	4.9
\$7,500 - \$9,999	14	13.3	8	7.6
\$10,000 - \$11,999	15	14.3	6	5.7
\$12,000 - \$14,999	14	13.3	12	11.4
\$15,000 - \$19,999	18	17.0	37	35.2
\$20,000 - \$24,999	5	4.8	18	17.1
\$25,000 - \$49,999	11	10.5	10	9.5
\$50,000 - over	5	4.8	4	3.8
Do not know	22	21.0	5	4.8
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0

TABLE I (Continued)

Family Characteristics	Rural		Urban/Suburban	
	Number Reporting	Percent	Number Reporting	Percent
<u>Home Ownership</u>				
Own or buying	83	79.0	99	94.3
Rent	16	15.3	4	3.8
Other	6	5.7	2	1.9
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0

Days Shopped in Previous Week

Frequency of shopping by residence for food and for items or services over \$100 during the previous week are shown in Table II. The total shopping days for each family represents the number of days during the previous week that one or more family members shopped for food or for items or services over \$100.

For Food

Almost three-fifths of the rural families (57.2 percent) shopped for food on one or two days with the percentage equally divided (28.6 and 28.6 percent) between shopping for food on one day and shopping for food on two days. Almost two-thirds of the urban/suburban families (64.7 percent) shopped for food on one or two days. Approximately 31 percent (31.4 percent) shopped for food on one day with the remainder (33.3 percent) shopping for food on two days. Almost one-fourth of the rural families (24.7 percent) shopped for food on either three or four days. Similarly, about one-fourth of the urban/suburban families (22.8 percent) shopped for food on either three or four days with the distribution equally divided between three days and four days. Exactly 3.8 percent of the rural and 3.8 percent of the urban/suburban families shopped for food on seven days during the previous week. The chi-square analysis indicated there was no statistically significant difference ($p = .76$) between families by residence and the number of days shopped for food in the previous week.

For Items or Services Over \$100

Shopping for items or services over \$100 during the previous week

TABLE II
DAYS SHOPPED IN PREVIOUS WEEK
BY RESIDENCE

	Rural		Urban/Suburban	
	Number Reporting	Percent	Number Reporting	Percent
<u>For Food</u>				
0 days	5	4.8	1	1.0
1 day	30	28.6	33	31.4
2 days	30	28.6	35	33.3
3 days	16	15.2	12	11.4
4 days	10	9.5	12	11.4
5 days	6	5.7	5	4.8
6 days	4	3.8	3	2.9
7 days	4	3.8	4	3.8
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 4.181$$

$$p = .76$$

For Items or Services

Over \$100

0 days	84	80.0	71	67.6
1 day	13	12.4	15	14.2
2 days	6	5.6	8	7.6
3 days	1	1.0	5	4.8
4 days	1	1.0	3	2.9
7 days	0	0.0	3	2.9
TOTAL	105	100.0	105	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 8.186$$

$$p = .15$$

was minimal. Four-fifths of the rural families (80.0 percent) and slightly over two-thirds (67.6 percent) of the urban/suburban families did not shop for items or services priced over \$100 during the previous week. Slightly over 12 percent (12.4 percent) of the rural families shopped for items or services over \$100 on one day with 14.2 percent of the urban/suburban families shopping for items or services over \$100 on one day. Less than six percent of the rural families (5.6 percent) shopped for items or services over \$100 on two days with 7.6 percent of the urban/suburban families shopping for items or services over \$100 on two days. A total of only two percent of the rural families shopped for items or services over \$100 on three or four days with a total of slightly over 10 percent (10.6 percent) of the urban/suburban families shopping for items or services over \$100 on three, four, or seven days. There were no rural families that shopped for items or services over \$100 on seven days. No significant difference ($p = .15$) was indicated by chi-square analysis between families by residence and the number of days they shopped for items or services over \$100 in the previous week.

Family Members' Daily Shopping Time

Table III shows the mean daily minutes spent shopping by residence including travel time for each family member and excluding travel time for the homemaker and spouse. Mean daily shopping minutes for the homemaker and for the spouse were determined from 210 homemakers and 210 spouses since the sample was taken from 210 two-parent, two-child families. However, household work activities were only recorded on the time chart for children six years or older. In

some families, neither child was six or older, in some only one child was six or older, while in others both children were six or older. Thus, there were 209 children of the 420 children in the 210 families

TABLE III
FAMILY MEMBERS' DAILY SHOPPING TIME BY RESIDENCE
(N = 210)

Family Member	\bar{X} Minutes	
	Rural	Urban/Suburban
<u>Including Travel Time</u>		
Homemaker	52.24	50.64
Spouse	17.52	17.36
Son (s) ¹	10.31	14.59
Daughter(s) ²	10.34	19.25
<u>Excluding Travel Time</u>		
Homemaker	38.89	37.16
Spouse	12.64	12.05

¹ N = 105 (R = 56, U = 49)

² N = 104 (R = 51, U = 53)

who were six years or older and therefore had household work activity recorded on the time chart. The ANOV test indicated no statistically significant difference in time spent shopping by residence for each family member. The greater variance was between rural and urban/suburban sons and daughters. The rural sons and daughters spent slightly less time, including travel, than the urban/suburban sons and daughters (20.65 percent and 33.84 percent) with the greater difference between the daughters (10.34 percent and 19.25 percent). Excluding the travel time of approximately 13 mean daily minutes associated with shopping for the homemaker and approximately five mean daily minutes associated with shopping for the spouse, residence was shown to account for less than two mean daily minutes' difference in shopping time for either the homemaker or the spouse.

Family Characteristic Variables and Shopping Time

The family characteristic variables examined included: employment or nonemployment of the homemaker, age of the younger child, education of the homemaker and of the spouse, and occupation of the homemaker and of the spouse. Statistical significance at the .05 level of significance was determined by the chi-square test.

Shopping Time by Homemaker's Employment or Nonemployment

The homemaker's and the spouse's daily shopping minutes by employment or nonemployment of the homemaker are shown in Table IV. The 22 minutes' (22.08 \bar{X} minutes) difference in employed and nonemployed homemaker's shopping time was determined statistically significant ($p=.006$)

TABLE IV
 HOMEMAKER'S AND SPOUSE'S DAILY SHOPPING
 TIME BY EMPLOYMENT OR NONEMPLOYMENT
 OF THE HOMEMAKER
 (N = 210)

Family Member	Employed		Nonemployed	
	Number Reporting	\bar{X} Minutes	Number Reporting	\bar{X} Minutes
Homemaker	86	38.40	124	60.48
Spouse	86	17.24	124	17.58

at the .05 level or less using a t test. Shopping times of the spouse by employment and nonemployment of the homemaker differed less than one minute and were determined to be not statistically significant at the .05 level by a t test. The nominal difference ($.34 \bar{X}$ minute) in spouse's shopping time by employment or nonemployment of the homemaker lent strong support to the theory of possible role strain in regard to the employed homemaker. The data failed to reflect a statistically significant increase in shopping time of spouses of employed homemakers. Likewise, the t test indicated no statistically significant difference in the shopping time of sons or daughters of employed and nonemployed homemakers (table not included). The homemaker's employment appeared to have no influence on the shopping time of sons or daughters. Thus, the employed homemaker may have experienced role strain in regard to shopping due to the additional employment role expectations and obligations and probably instigated management strategies in regard to shopping other than delegation to family members. The statistically significant ($p = .006$) difference in the mean daily shopping minutes of employed and nonemployed homemakers supports the theory of the use of some management strategies for coping with role strain.

Age of the Younger Child

The only family characteristic variable found to have a statistically significant association at the .05 level or less to daily shopping minutes was age of the younger child. The homemaker's mean daily shopping minutes ranged from almost one and one-quarter hours ($73.63 \bar{X}$ minutes) when the younger child was less than one year to slightly over three-fourths of an hour ($47.38 \bar{X}$ minutes) when the younger child was

from 12-to-17 years. The significance level was .04 for the homemaker and for the spouse; however, the mean daily shopping minutes for the spouse was considerably less at each age level. Table V shows the actual mean daily shopping minutes for both the homemaker and the spouse at each age level for the younger child.

TABLE V
DAILY SHOPPING TIME BY AGE
OF THE YOUNGER CHILD
(N = 210)

Age of Younger Child	\bar{X} Minutes	
	Homemaker	Spouse
Less than 1 year	73.63	22.26
1 year	48.27	25.12
2 through 5 years	54.35	11.07
6 through 11 years	33.57	2.56
12 through 17 years	47.38	26.19
	p = .04	p = .04

Least Significant Difference Statistical Procedure. The least significant difference statistical procedure (LSD) was used to determine homogeneous subset groups with a .05 or less statistically significant level difference. The subset groupings indicated distinct differences in mean daily shopping minutes between groupings. For homemakers, distinct differences in mean daily shopping minutes were found between homemakers with children under one year as compared to

those with children in the age levels of six through 11 years and 12 through 17 years. For the spouses, the subset groupings indicated distinct differences between mean daily shopping minutes of spouses when children were less than one year, one year, or 12 through 17 years as compared to spouses with children six through 11 years.

Not Significant Family Characteristics

Education and occupation of the homemaker and of the spouse were each found to be not significant in regard to the homemaker's daily shopping minutes. Table VI gives the homemaker's mean shopping minutes per day by these characteristics. No statistically significant difference was determined by ANOV between the homemaker's mean daily shopping minutes by the education of the homemaker or the education of the spouse. The homemaker's education accounted for less than four mean daily shopping minutes per day difference among homemakers while the spouse's education accounted for 7.5 mean daily shopping minutes per day difference among homemakers. The homemaker's and the spouse's occupations were each determined to be not statistically significant by ANOV in regard to the homemaker's mean daily shopping minutes. The homemaker's occupation accounted for a mean daily shopping minutes' variance of approximately 25 minutes ($24.69 \bar{X}$ minutes) among homemakers. The spouse's occupation accounted for a range of nearly 21 minutes ($20.98 \bar{X}$ minutes) difference in mean daily shopping minutes among homemakers.

The spouse's mean daily shopping minutes by family characteristics are shown in Table VII. Education of the homemaker, education of the spouse, occupation of the homemaker, and occupation of the spouse were

TABLE VI
HOMEMAKER'S DAILY SHOPPING TIME
BY FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS
(N = 210)

Family Characteristic	Number	\bar{X} Minutes
<u>Homemaker's Education</u>		
High school graduate or less	93	52.63
Vocational, technical, partial college	70	51.61
College degree	47	48.83
TOTAL	210	
p = .94		
<u>Spouse's Education</u>		
High school graduate or less	86	52.35
Vocational, technical, partial college	54	46.57
College degree	70	54.07
TOTAL	210	
p = .78		
<u>Homemaker's Occupation</u>		
Service workers, laborers, operatives, craftsmen	39	43.46
Clerical and sales workers	33	34.70
Managers, administrators, professional workers	20	47.75
Homemakers (full-time)	118	59.39
TOTAL	210	
p = .15		

TABLE VI (Continued)

Family Characteristic	Number	\bar{X} Minutes
<u>Spouse's Occupation</u>		
Service workers, laborers, operatives	53	48.58
Craftsmen, foremen, kindred workers	40	69.56
Clerical, sales workers, managers	45	50.11
Farmers, farm managers	37	50.74
Professional, technical, kindred workers	31	41.13
TOTAL	206*	
p = .34		

* N = 206 for spouse's occupation. Not included were 1 student, 2 disabled, and 1 nonemployed.

each determined not statistically significant by ANOV at the .05 statistical significance level. Homemaker's education accounted for less than seven minutes' (6.76 \bar{X} minutes) variance in mean daily shopping minutes among spouses. The spouse's education accounted for about four minutes' (3.90 \bar{X} minutes) variance in mean daily shopping minutes among spouses. The homemaker's occupation accounted for slightly over 7.5 minutes' (7.64 \bar{X} minutes) difference in mean daily shopping minutes among spouses. A range of almost 25 minutes' (25.92 \bar{X} minutes) difference among spouses was determined by the spouse's occupation.

TABLE VII
SPOUSE'S DAILY SHOPPING TIME
BY FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS
(N = 210)

Family Characteristic	Number	\bar{X} Minutes
<u>Homemaker's Education</u>		
High school graduate or less	93	13.95
Vocational, technical, partial college	70	20.71
College degree	47	19.47
	<hr/>	
TOTAL	210	
p = .56		
 <u>Spouse's Education</u>		
High school graduate or less	86	18.46
Vocational, technical, partial college	54	18.94
College degree	70	15.04
	<hr/>	
TOTAL	210	
p = .84		

TABLE VII (Continued)

Family Characteristic	Number	\bar{X} Minutes
<u>Homemaker's Occupation</u>		
Service workers, laborers, operatives, craftsmen	39	20.38
Clerical and sales workers	33	13.86
Managers, administrators, professional workers	20	21.50
Homemakers (full-time)	118	16.78
	<hr/>	
TOTAL	210	
p = .89		
<u>Spouse's Occupation</u>		
Service workers, laborers, operatives	53	41.78
Craftsmen, foremen, kindred workers	40	37.06
Clerical, sales workers, managers	45	50.11
Farmers, farm managers	37	49.48
Professional, technical kindred workers	31	24.19
	<hr/>	
TOTAL	206*	
p = .71		

* N = 206 for spouse's occupation. Not included were 1 student, 2 disabled, and 1 nonemployed.

Family Shopping Trips

The number of family shopping trips and family members participating in those trips were deemed necessary data for analysis in addressing the second research question. Literature supports the theory of possible role strain on the part of the employed homemaker due to the

assumption of additional labor force roles. Thus, the degree of role-sharing in shopping trips by different family members was analyzed in regard to the relationship between role-sharing and role strain on the part of the employed and nonemployed homemakers. Data from families who recorded shopping time (minutes) on the time chart(s) and who had at least one child eight years old or older were used for analysis of family shopping trips. The procedure for classification of shopping trips was described in Chapter III.

Homemakers' and Others' Shopping Trips

Table VIII gives a breakdown into two classifications for the percentage of the total family shopping trips by employment or nonemployment of the homemaker. The first classification was the percent of shopping that involved the homemaker: alone, or the homemaker and the spouse or child(ren), or the homemaker and the spouse and child(ren). Other family members comprised the remaining classification which represented the spouse alone, the child(ren) alone, or the spouse and the child(ren). Each classification was made up of 81 families which represented the families from the original 210 families that had at least one child eight years old or older and who participated in the household activity of shopping during the period covered by the time chart(s). The percentage of total family shopping trips that involved the nonemployed homemaker was 84.2 percent with other family members performing 15.8 percent of the shopping trips in nonemployed homemaker families. The employed homemaker was involved in 69.7 percent of the total family shopping trips with other family members contributing 30.3 percent to the total family shopping trips. A t test of the mean pro-

TABLE VIII
 HOMEMAKERS' AND OTHERS' SHOPPING TRIPS
 BY EMPLOYMENT OR NONEMPLOYMENT
 OF THE HOMEMAKER
 (N = 81)

Family Members	Employed		Nonemployed	
	Number Reporting	\bar{X} Percent	Number Reporting	\bar{X} Percent
Homemaker or homemaker and any other family member(s)	46	69.7	35	84.2
Spouse or child(ren) or spouse and child(ren)	46	30.3	35	15.8
TOTAL		100.0		100.0

portion of shopping trips by the categories of the family members of employed and nonemployed homemakers was made. Standard deviations in this analysis were quite large in most categories, probably due to the small sample size and the limitation of shopping being reported for only two days. It was therefore concluded that statistical testing of this relationship produced nonreliable results. Nevertheless, in the employed homemakers' families the spouse or child(ren), or spouse and children were involved in nearly twice as many shopping trips as those in nonemployed homemaker families. This observation along with the difference between the shopping trips involving homemakers who were employed or nonemployed supported the premise that some role-sharing was apparently taking place in employed homemakers' families. Another explanation of the difference between employed and nonemployed homemakers' involvement in shopping trips might be greater efficiency in the use of management strategies by employed homemakers.

Family Members' Shopping Trips

Table IX breaks down within classifications more specifically the shopping trip percentages shown in Table VIII. The homemaker alone made 41.2 percent of the total family shopping trips when employed as compared to 51.2 percent when nonemployed. The homemaker plus one or more other family members made an additional 28.5 percent when employed and an additional 33.0 percent when not employed. The spouse and one or both children contribute only 3.1 percent to the total shopping trips for employed homemakers and 1.4 percent to the total when the homemaker is not employed. The shopping trip percentage for the spouse alone is 11.1 percent when the homemaker is employed but only 4.1 percent for

nonemployed homemaker families. Although not tested for statistical significance, the direction of the relationship supports interpretation of some role-sharing. The child or children contribute 16.1 percent to the total shopping trips in employed homemaker families but only 10.3 percent when the homemaker is not employed.

TABLE IX
FAMILY MEMBERS' SHOPPING TRIPS BY
EMPLOYMENT OR NONEMPLOYMENT
OF THE HOMEMAKER
(N = 81)

Family Members	Employed		Nonemployed	
	Number Reporting	\bar{X} Percent	Number Reporting	\bar{X} Percent
Homemaker only	46	41.2	35	51.2
Homemaker plus spouse and/or child(ren)	46	28.5	35	33.0
Spouse and child(ren)	46	3.1	35	1.4
Spouse only	46	11.1	35	4.1
Child(ren) only	46	16.1	35	10.3
TOTAL		100.0		100.0

Homemaker's Percentage Contribution to
Shopping Trips

Cross-tabulations indicated that in almost one-third of the 81 families, the homemaker alone performs 75 to 100 percent of the total family shopping trips. In addition, the homemaker plus other family members perform 75 to 100 percent of the total family shopping trips in one-fifth of the 81 families. Thus, spouses, child(ren), or the combination failed to account for substantial shopping activity without the homemaker being involved.

Summary

A statistically significant difference was found between employed and nonemployed homemakers' shopping time. However, shopping times of the spouse by employment or nonemployment of the homemaker differed by less than one minute. The nominal difference in the spouse's shopping time by employment or nonemployment of the homemaker lent strong support to the theory of possible role strain on the part of the employed homemaker.

Family characteristics as a whole accounted for little significant difference in shopping time (minutes). No statistically significant difference in shopping time was shown by residence for each family member. The only family characteristic found to have a statistically significant association at the .05 level or less to daily shopping time was age of the younger child. As the younger child increased in age, the homemaker's mean daily shopping minutes decreased. Education and occupation of the homemaker and of the spouse were each found to be not significant in regard to the homemaker's daily shopping minutes.

The spouse or child(ren) or spouse and child(ren) were involved in nearly twice as many shopping trips in employed homemaker families as in nonemployed homemaker families. This supports the premise that some role-sharing was apparently taking place in employed homemaker families. Thus the homemaker, either alone or with other family members(s), was involved in a substantial percentage of the total family shopping trips.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine shopping time of families of employed and nonemployed homemakers with theoretical interpretation in regard to possible role strain on the part of the employed homemaker. The study was part of an 11 state regional time-use in household work project and utilized data from 210 Oklahoma families in rural Alfalfa County and urban/suburban Guthrie, Oklahoma.

The method of data gathering was personal interview with the information obtained from the homemaker. Instruments used were those designed for use by all the states cooperating in the project. Included were: an instruction book, a time chart on which to record family member's time by activity for 24 hours a day in 10-minute increments, and interview questions that included family practices in regard to household time-use.

The 210 families were two-parent, two-child families stratified by age of the younger child. The majority of the homemakers were 35 years of age or younger with at least a partial college education. The majority of the spouses were 26 through 35 years of age and had vocational, technical or college training beyond high school. Over 50 percent of both the rural and urban/suburban families had yearly family incomes less than \$20,000 while 21 percent of the rural families did not know

their total annual family income. Slightly over 50 percent of both the rural and urban/suburban homemakers were considered fulltime homemakers since they were either not employed or employed 14 hours or less per week. About 35 percent of the rural spouses were farmers or farm managers with the largest percent of urban/suburban spouses being craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.

Over 50 percent of all the families shopped for food on either one or two days per week. The majority of the families did not shop during the previous week for items or services over \$100.

No statistically significant difference was shown for daily shopping minutes by residence for each family member. Excluding travel time, residence accounted for less than two mean daily minutes difference in shopping time for either the homemaker or the spouse.

A statistically significant difference was determined by ANOV for shopping time (minutes) of the employed and non-employed homemaker. However, no significant difference was indicated by ANOV for shopping time of the spouse or of the child(ren) by employment or nonemployment of the homemaker.

Family characteristics accounted for little statistically significant difference in shopping time (minutes) of family members. Age of the younger child was the only family characteristic variable that had a statistically significant association at the .05 significance level or less to daily shopping minutes. Education and occupation of the homemaker and of the spouse were each found to be not significant in regard to the homemaker's daily shopping minutes and in regard to the spouse's daily shopping minutes.

The number of family shopping trips and the percentage of family

members involved in those trips were analyzed. The homemaker was involved in a substantial proportion of the shopping activity regardless of employment status. Spouses, child(ren), or the combination failed to account for much shopping activity without the involvement of the homemaker.

Comparison of Present Findings

With Previous Research

Previous research in regard to household time-use studies first began in the early twentieth century; however, those first studies were followed by a lapse of interest in time-use until a resurgence began in the 1960's.

Foremost among the United States time-study research was that conducted by Walker (1975) of Cornell and several similarities were found between that study and the present findings. Present findings agreed with Walker's conclusion that the employed homemaker had a significantly longer total work week than that of the nonemployed homemaker; however, no major statistically significant difference in shopping by the homemaker was found between employed and nonemployed homemakers. Findings were also in agreement with the Walker research that neither the spouse nor the child(ren) spent a substantial amount of time in shopping when the homemaker was employed. In the present study, age of the younger child was the major variable related to shopping time. This finding was also in agreement with Walker's research.

Statements of Implication Based on Literature and Present Findings

Literature supports the theory of shopping being a time consuming activity. The family of yesteryear was much more self-sufficient than the present-day family. Today the acquisition of goods and services for operation and maintenance of the family requires a substantial portion of time on the part of one or more family members.

Present findings indicated that the homemaker was involved either alone or with other family member(s) in a substantial portion of the total family shopping regardless of the homemaker's employment status. And that the spouse and/or child(ren) failed to contribute substantially to the total family shopping even when the homemaker was employed. Thus the employed homemaker undoubtedly experienced role strain as a result of additional role responsibilities and obligations of being in the paid labor force. Of major concern then was role strain in relation to how the employed homemaker might cope with the strain by initiating efficient management strategies or practices to reduce or alleviate the strain.

Several management options are available to the employed homemaker for dealing with role strain. Delegation is a technique for achieving accomplishment without having performed the task. Delegation might be to another family member(s) through role-sharing or delegation might extend beyond the family to paid workers or volunteers. Dovetailing and overlapping of tasks are strategies that the homemaker may personally employ to reduce the time required for particular task accomplishment. Shopping is more conducive to an overlapping of tasks than to

dovetailing since most shopping activity removes the individual from the household setting where other household tasks might be dovetailed with the task of shopping.

The homemaker is involved in a major portion of the household task of shopping regardless of employment status. Thus, consumer oriented training programs are needed for spouses and children to enable these individuals to feel comfortable and confident in assuming responsibility for the family shopping. There are implications here for consumer based 4-H programming in regard to being a wise consumer in the market place and also for programming in regard to the management of household task accomplishment of employed homemakers. However, a very necessary component for accomplishing a reorganization of responsibility in regard to family shopping is a willingness on the part of the homemaker to relinquish this responsibility.

With employed homemakers continuing to be involved in a substantial amount of family shopping there are implications applicable to the market sector of society. New advertising and new products geared to the employed homemaker attempting to save time and money are necessary and likely to be accepted by consumers. The limited resource of time is of major importance to the employed homemaker and thus convenience in regard to products and shopping facilities is very important also. Employed homemakers often find it necessary to shop at "off" hours with shopping for nonperishables taking place at lunchtime. Shopping is often done in stores located near work or on the way home. Marketers might find consultation with employed homemakers a valuable contribution in the development of marketing practices to reach the employed homemaker.

Other methods the employed homemaker might adopt for coping with role strain in regard to shopping include the use of consumer cooperatives and other newly developed services. Consumer cooperatives save money and time dependent upon how the cooperative is managed and what the consumer contributes to the cooperative. Electronic shopping is only in the beginning stages but holds much potential for time saving. Personal shoppers are another method the employed homemaker may find beneficial in reducing role strain associated with the household task of shopping. There are individuals and firms willing to do shopping for a fee even to the detail of selection, wrapping, and mailing of gifts with a personal enclosure. Somewhat uncommon today, this practice may well become commonplace as time demands become more intense with a steady rise of homemakers in the labor force. A somewhat more costly method for reducing shopping time related to wardrobe purchases is a personal profile analysis. Color, line, design, texture, and style are each summarized for use in wardrobe purchasing. Purchasers know what to look for to begin with rather than having to look at everything in hopes of finding something that appeals to them.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based upon the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made for further research:

1. Replication of the shopping trips analysis by other cooperating states to provide comparison among states.
2. Conduct a consumer shopping training program based on a needs assessment for spouses and children of employed homemakers.
3. Initiation of a longitudinal study of family members' contri-

bution to total family shopping of employed homemakers prior to and following family members' participation in a consumer shopping training program.

4. Initiation of further research in role-sharing of shopping with methodologies that include large samples and/or longitudinal design.

Recommendations for Programming

1. Development of consumer based programming by both the public and private sector in regard to being a wise consumer in the market place and also for programming in regard to management of household task accomplishment of employed homemakers.

2. Management strategy seminars for women in which they could explore alternatives for the accomplishment of household tasks.

Concluding Statement

Employed homemakers experience possible role strain due to the assumption of additional obligations and expectations as a result of labor force participation. Through studies such as this, researchers can identify household tasks that produce possible role strain. Once these tasks are identified, management strategies and methods can be initiated to alleviate or reduce role strain associated with the particular task.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berry, L. L. Forces for change and the new consumer. Vital Speeches of the Day, 1978, 44(16), 489-494.
- Best, J. W. Research in Education (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Brown, D. L. Women in the labor force. Journal of Home Economics, 1977, 69(5), 21-22.
- Chapin, F. S., Jr. Human Activity Patterns in the City. New York: Wiley, 1974.
- Deacon, R. E., and Firebaugh, F. M. Home Management Context and Concepts. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.
- Goode, W. J. A theory of role strain. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 483-496.
- Gross, I. H., Crandall, E. W., and Knoll, M. M. Management for Modern Families (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1980.
- Linder, S. B. The Harried Leisure Class. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
- Lopata, H. Z. Occupation: Housewife. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Malabre, A. L., Jr. As their ranks swell, women holding jobs reshape U.S. society. The Wall Street Journal, August 28, 1978, pp. 1; 21.
- Manning, S. L. Time Use in Household Tasks by Indiana Families. Lafayette: Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 837, 1968.
- Nichols, A. Organizational processes eliciting help. Journal of Home Economics, 1966, 58, 726-728.
- Powell, J. A., and Wines, M. Voices of Oklahoma Families. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Department of Institutions, Social and Rehabilitative Services and Oklahoma Department of Economic and Community Affairs, 1978.

- Sanik, M. M. A twofold comparison of time spent in household work in two-parent, two-child households: urban New York State in 1967-68 and 1977; urban-rural, New York-Oregon in 1977 (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 5334B-5335B. (University Microfilms No. 7910832)
- Sarbin, T. R., and Allen, V. L. Role theory. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology (2nd ed., Vol. 1). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
- Schram, V. R., and Vaughn, J. L. The employed homemaker's dilemma. American Vocational Journal, 1976, 51(6), 45-47.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Population: 1970 (Vol. IA1). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Vanek, J. Time spent in housework. Scientific American, 1974, 231(15), 116-120.
- Walker, K. E. Who shares in the family work? American Vocational Journal, 1975, 50(2), 52-54; 56.
- Walker, K. E., and Woods, M. E. Time Use: A Measure of Household Production of Family Goods and Services. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association Center for the Family, 1976.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

24-HOUR TIME CHART

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS PERTINENT
TO THIS STUDY

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS PERTINENT
TO THIS STUDY

1. Do you own or rent your home?

Own or buying

Rent

Other

2. On how many of the last seven days were the following done by someone in your household?

canning, pickling, making jams, and jellies

freezing food

preparing food for another day

shopping for food

3. On how many of the last seven days were the following done by a household member for your family:

shopping for items or services priced over \$100?

special housecleaning?

painting, redecorating?

washing or waxing motor vehicles?

repairing appliances?

working in the yard, garden, including harvesting?

working on outside areas of the house or property?

4. On how many of the last seven days did any household member chauffeur another household member:

to and/or from doctor, dentist or barber?

to and/or from paid work?

to and/or from school or classes?

to and/or from a social function?

to and/or from an organization, including church?

to and/or from an educational or athletic activity?

to and/or from a store?

[For each adult ask the following questions.]

1. What was the highest grade in school you completed?

[If degree mentioned note.]

2. Last week were you employed?

Yes

No

[For each employed ask:]

3. Was this

for pay?

for pay, but not at work, example, illness or vacation?

without pay, example family farm or business?

4. What kind of work did you do?

[If more than one job, ask following questions about the first or primary job.]

5. What kind of industry or business were you employed in?

6. How many hours did you work for pay last week?

7. What is the usual number of hours you work for pay a week?

8. If you were salaried, self-employed, or on commission, what amount did you earn last week?

[Use income before deductions.]

9. Did you have more than one paid job last week?

[If no, go to next section.] [If yes, go to question #10.]

10. What kind of work was this?

11. What industry or business was it in?

12. How many hours did you work for pay last week on this job?

13. What is the usual number of hours you work for pay per week on this job?

14. If you were salaried, self-employed, or on commission for a second job, what amount did you earn last week?

[Use income before deductions.]

15. Which category on this card represents the total income before taxes for your household in the past 12 months? This includes wages and salaries, net income from business or farm, pensions, dividends, interest, rent, Social Security payments and any other money received by members of your household?

BLOCK OUT ONE LETTER ONLY

—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	DK
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

A = under \$1,000 G = \$6,000 - 7,499 M = \$25,000 - 49,999

B = \$1,000 - 1,999 H = \$7,500 - 9,999 N = \$50,000 and over

C = \$2,000 - 2,999 I = \$10,000 - 11,999 DK = Don't know, not given

D = \$3,000 - 3,999 J = \$12,000 - 14,999

E = \$4,000 - 4,999 K = \$15,000 - 19,999

F = \$5,000 - 5,999 L = \$20,000 - 24,999

VITA²

Janie Crouch Hopfer

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: SHOPPING TIME OF FAMILIES OF EMPLOYED AND NONEMPLOYED
HOMEMAKERS

Major Field: Housing, Design, and Consumer Resources

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Frederick, Oklahoma, June 15, 1946, the daughter of William Joseph and Goldie Stapp Crouch; wife of the late David Alan Hopfer.

Education: Graduated from Walters High School, Walters, Oklahoma, in May, 1964; received Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics Education from Oklahoma State University in May, 1967; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1980.

Professional Experience: Vocational home economics teacher in the Crescent, Oklahoma, Public Schools, 1967-1971; Extension Home Economist: 4-H and Youth, Oklahoma County, Oklahoma State University Cooperative Extension Service, 1977 to date.

Professional Organizations: American Home Economics Association, Oklahoma Home Economics Association, National Association of Extension Home Economists, Oklahoma Association of Extension Home Economists, National Association of Extension 4-H Agents, Oklahoma Association of Extension 4-H Agents, Omicron Nu, Phi Upsilon Omicron.