

DECISION-MAKING PERCEIVED BY YOUNG HOMEMAKERS  
IN THEIR PURCHASE OF SELECTED  
HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

By

GLENNA DURRILL LACKEY

Bachelor of Science

Abilene Christian College

Abilene, Texas

1960

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, 1967

JAN 12 1968

DECISION-MAKING PERCEIVED BY YOUNG HOMEMAKERS  
IN THEIR PURCHASE OF SELECTED  
HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

Thesis Approved:

*Helen M. Kinney*

Thesis Adviser

*Gertrude M. Means*

*D. D. Durham*

Dean of the Graduate College

659317

## PREFACE

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Florence McKinney, Professor and Head of the Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics, for her guidance, assistance, and encouragement.

Special acknowledgment is extended to the young homemakers that made up the sample and gave so willingly of their time.

Sincere gratitude is expressed to the General Foods Fund, Inc. for the fellowships which they have set up at Oklahoma State University. One of the General Food Fund Fellowships for 1966-67 helped provide the writer the opportunity to study toward an advanced degree.

My deepest appreciation is given my husband Charles. Without his cooperation and understanding, this study could not have been accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	4
Assumptions. . . . .	4
Limitations. . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE. . . . .	7
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA. . . . .	21
Method of Procedure. . . . .	21
Information About the Families . . . . .	23
Information Concerning Selected Household Equipment. . . . .	29
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	53
Summary and Conclusions. . . . .	53
Recommendations. . . . .	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	61
APPENDIX A . . . . .	64
APPENDIX B . . . . .	70

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Age of Husband and Wife . . . . .	24
II. Level of Education of Husband and Wife. . . . .	25
III. Income Level and Percentage of Parental Financial Assistance. . . . .	27
IV. Sources of Income Other Than Employment and Parental Assistance. . . . .	29
V. Extent and Method of Acquisition of Selected Household Equipment . . . . .	31
VI. Most Recent Purchase of Equipment . . . . .	32
VII. Extent of Shopping Done for Equipment Purchased . . . . .	33
VIII. Sources of Information Used in Making Purchase Choice . . .	36
IX. Level of Education of Wife Compared to Average Number of Sources of Information Used . . . . .	37
X. Price of Equipment Purchased. . . . .	39
XI. Length of Planning Period Compared to Purchase Price. . . .	40
XII. Method of Payment Planned Previous to Purchase. . . . .	41
XIII. Reason Money Was Available for Specific Purchase. . . . .	43
XIV. Factors Influencing Selection of Household Equipment. . . .	44
XV. Reason Considered Most Important for Purchase . . . . .	48
XVI. Situation Influencing Time of Purchase. . . . .	49
XVII. Pattern of Purchase Decision. . . . .	50

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The importance attributed to the ownership of household equipment and the rapidly growing variety of equipment available contribute to an increased need and opportunity for decision-making. As people move economically, socially, and geographically, their success is increasingly measured by the kind and amount of household durable goods they possess. Newly established families use durable goods to help promote their status as a separate entity. Technological advances contribute to the inventory of more and wider varieties of household equipment, and greater discretionary incomes makes these goods available to more people. Advertising attempts to persuade homemakers that equipment is necessary in order to get household work done efficiently and with the least expenditure of time and effort. Advertising also attempts to sway opinion and to influence decisions. Families can no longer rely heavily on past experiences or tradition and routine; they must make many choices without any precedent to follow.

Ownership of household durables and automobiles often constitutes the major portion of a young family's assets. Many of the items included today by young people were considered luxuries or were nonexistent a few years ago. In acquiring these goods the family is a spending or consuming unit rather than a producing unit, thus increasing the importance of the decision-making process.

Today young people under 25 years of age account for half the United States population. During the five-year period 1960-1965, the fastest growing age group was that of persons 20 to 24 years of age, and this age group is expected to increase at an even faster rate in the next five-year period. This is the group which creates the greatest demand for advanced education and which plays the greatest role in family formation and the establishment of new households. It is also the group which supplies the initial demand for household equipment for newly established homes.

A high percentage of these young people are enrolled in institutions of higher learning. According to the 1966 Digest of Educational Statistics (6), 45.6 per cent of all persons 18 to 21 years of age were enrolled in institutions of higher learning in the fall of 1965. Total school enrollment in the United States included 46.3 per cent of persons 18 to 19 years of age, 19.0 per cent of persons 20 to 24 years of age, and 6.1 per cent of persons 25 to 29 years of age.

During the next ten years young families (those headed by persons under 25 years of age) will increase by 40 per cent, or about twice as fast as the nation's population (10). Many of these will also be college students. In 1965, 3.2 per cent of all college students 18 to 19 years of age were married, 13.2 per cent of students 20 to 21 years of age, 35.3 per cent of students 22 to 24 years of age, and 71.1 per cent of students 25 to 34 years of age (6).

These young families are in the beginning stages of the family life cycle. This is the period when together they formulate their methods of making decisions and attempt to determine what is most important to their family.

In studies of young families, many young homemakers reported difficulties in the management of their homes and especially in making decisions. Hillman (18) found in her study of 150 young married rural couples in central Ohio that 85 per cent of the homemakers in the study expressed interest in information concerning home management, which was the subject of greatest concern to them; this included purchasing and management of household supplies and furnishings. In a study of 104 young families, Schubert (29) reported the problem area of most concern in management was making major decisions.

The American Home Economics Association in its statement of philosophy and objectives listed twelve fundamental competencies in personal and family living (19). Five of these are directly related to the decision-making process. It is hoped the study being reported will contribute to the advancement of the competency, "To make and carry out intelligent decisions regarding the use of personal, family, and community resources."

Decision-making is an integral part of management. As decision-making is better understood families can be better assisted in intelligently using their resources to achieve the values and goals they have established. It is believed that further knowledge about the decision-making process young college student families see themselves as using and their attitudes about this process will be of value to those working with young people. This information should be of special interest to teachers in the areas of home economics, consumer economics, economics, and sociology. Marketing specialists may also benefit from added information about the information seeking and buying patterns of young couples. The young couples themselves may gain from an awareness of



what they perceive themselves as doing.

This study was undertaken to gain some understanding of the decision-making process young families use in the purchase of household equipment. It was based on the young homemaker's perception of decision-making in her family.

#### Statement of the Problem

The overall purpose of this study was to gain some understanding of the manner a group of young homemakers perceived their decision-making in the purchase of selected household equipment and the factors that influenced their decisions.

The specific purposes of the study were:

1. To identify the sources of information used for making purchase decisions and the frequency with which each source was used.
2. To identify the factors considered important in selecting alternative choices.
3. To determine the level of the wife's educational attainment in relation to the extent of information sought.
4. To ascertain the influence of parents on decisions made.
5. To determine the manner in which these purchases were made.
6. To determine why it was considered important to have the item purchased.
7. To discover the extent of planning for future major purchases.

#### Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. The homemaker will recall fairly accurately the information

requested since it is based on the most recent purchase made from a specific list of items.

2. The information important to the homemaker will be recalled, and this will also be the information she will retain as the basis for future decision-making situations.

3. The household equipment listed is important to the homemaker; therefore, she will actively participate in the purchase process.

4. The random sample of selected young homemakers will accurately represent the families of the married male student population 18 through 25 years of age at Oklahoma State University.

5. Patterns of decision-making being developed in the early stages of the family life cycle will influence the decision-making process used in the future.

#### Limitations

Certain limitations exist in the study which should be taken into consideration:

1. The study was limited to a selected group of young families. The family was living in town housing other than that made available through the university. The husband was enrolled as a full-time student at Oklahoma State University and was 18 through 25 years of age. Application of the findings to other young families is limited by the small size of the sample, the age group involved, and by the college status of the husband which creates a special pattern of family life and finances.

2. The findings of this study were based on the homemaker's perception of what the family did and only to this extent does it reflect

what was actually done. It does not include the husband's opinions. Studies that have been conducted in which the husband was included show that his inclusion would probably have altered the findings to some extent.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Specialists from many fields of study, including Home Management, have concerned themselves in discovering how decisions are made. Studies have been conducted over a period of years to develop the concept of decision-making. More recently studies have been made of decision-making in the selection and purchase of household equipment. These studies considered specific geographic areas or age groups, methods of payment, or aspects of the selection process. The research studies reviewed in this chapter influenced the present study and will serve as a comparison for the findings of this study.

Decision-making is the interactions of family members in the process of dealing with problem situations which involve using resources for attainment of goals (23). Some decisions are routine or habitual, requiring little conscious thought; others are genuine, or rational, decisions made with deliberation. Katona (20) recognized genuine decision-making situations as purchase situations in which expenditures are subjectively thought to be major and which are fairly rare, past experience has been unsatisfactory, the product is new or has not been purchased before, there is a difference between the purchaser's customary behavior and that of the group to which he belongs or an important reference group, there are strong new stimuli or precipitating circumstances, certain personality characteristics exist.

The purchase of major household equipment represents genuine decision-making situations in which the persons involved need to identify their problems concerning household equipment, gather meaningful information concerning these problems, weigh carefully the alternatives, make and carry out decisions, and evaluate their decisions.

Halliday (17) defined "rational" to mean reasoning, weighing, and information-using in the report of the study she presented at the Home Management Conference at Michigan State University in 1964. She stated her findings showed that the primary influence on the extent to which respondents reasoned, weighed, and used information was the importance with which they viewed the decision; this subjective importance also influenced the kinds and sources of information they used.

Knowledge of alternatives may be acquired through everyday living or by making a conscious search for it. In a study of money management practices in 1964, Gover (15) found that there was little difference between 213 married women from three different socio-economic levels with respect to the degree to which they engaged in the various management activities listed and with respect to the relative importance of the activities as measured by the proportion of wives engaging in the practice. Average differences between groups in the percentage engaged in any particular practice was less than eight per cent. Some practices engaged in by the three socio-economic groups included in the study were buying items when stores offer specials, 49 per cent; comparing prices at different stores, 45 per cent; comparing store prices with catalogue prices, 22 per cent; and using consumer magazines before making major purchases, 18 per cent.

In 1962 Inman (11) studied 270 high school graduates who had been married for less than two years. Results of the study showed that neither the extent of home economics courses in junior or senior high school, 4-H projects, class standing, size of school attended, or length of marriage beyond 18 months influenced significantly the responses made to statements about the selection, care, and use of equipment.

In Models of Man, Simon (30) presented the idea that, rather than maximizing some satisfaction or goal, people tend to accept a "good enough" solution rather than the "best," and that this is a more accurate description of what really happens in decision-making.

In 1964 Udell (33) studied shopping behavior in the selection of small electrical appliances. When asked about sources of information used, the 705 respondents reported their most useful source of information in providing shopping information was past experience with the product brand, followed by discussions with friends, relatives, and neighbors, mail-order catalogues and circulars, newspaper advertising, television advertising, magazine advertising, and consumer rating magazines.

The main sources of information used before purchasing large-expenditure items of equipment as identified by 160 normal-family spending units in Lansing, Michigan, were reported by Van Syckle (34) in a study made in 1951. These were, in the order of importance, shopping around and "looking," advertising seen or heard, salesmen, friends or relatives, and articles read about the item.

Respondents in the 1962 study by Inman (11) indicated the resource they used most in helping to decide upon a purchase consisted of lay

people -- parents, friends, and salesmen.

In his 1965 study of Consumers Union, Strickling (32) reported that warranty cards packed with appliances to be returned by purchasers included promotion, advertising, friend's recommendation, brand reputation, and store salesman as the accepted sources of information; however, they did not include CU ratings as a source of information or influence.

In a study of attitudes and opinions of 111 single, engaged, and married home economics majors at Oklahoma State University in 1966, Keith (21) included a list of 28 possible sources of influence in the selection, use, and care of household equipment. More than 85 per cent of the respondents indicated their own knowledge and judgment as the primary influence, followed by Food, Nutrition and Institutional Administration classes, household equipment course, people who own the equipment, friends and/or relatives, and parents. Other influences were magazine articles, commercial demonstrations, Housing and Interior Design classes, and Consumer Reports magazine.

Factors influencing the selection of major household appliances were reported by 735 women graduates of Ohio State University who participated in a study by Rose (27) in 1959. Rose found the most important factors influencing selection of the major appliances were cost, brand or make, expected performance, used appliance, quality, size, construction, model, appearance, used similar one before, relatives, special features, discount, friends, and husband.

Qualities and characteristics of large-expenditure items of equipment reported by respondents in Van Syckle's (34) study as most important were, in their order of importance, durability, easy or inexpensive

upkeep, efficient, economical or satisfactory performance, meets a specific personal preference, appearance beautiful or smart, and suited to the situation in which it is to be used.

The respondents in the 1966 study by Keith (21) were asked to indicate the factors they believed would be the most important influences in selection of household equipment. Need was given as the major factor, followed by efficient performance, care and convenience, durability, and variety of jobs performed. Other factors, in the order of their importance, were original cost, brand, cost of upkeep, guarantee, and appearance.

In his talk at the General Session of the 1962 Annual American Home Economics Association meeting, Gault (13) stated that once the decision to buy a major appliance was made, only two factors were considered. The most important factor considered was price, and the second was status or prestige.

Sources of dissatisfaction with a purchase decision of major household equipment were reported by approximately 33 per cent of the purchasers of refrigerators, freezers, and washers, and by about 50 per cent of the purchasers of ranges in a 1962 study by Goetz and Hotchkiss (14) of 277 Arizona families. The primary sources of dissatisfaction in the purchase decisions of both new and used models were desire for newer, higher end-of-line, or different models.

In her study in 1959 of married women graduates, Rose (27) reported that the primary factor which would influence selection of replacement equipment was a desire for special features and that these would be obtained by trading up.



Van Scykle (34) defined the period of planning for a purchase as beginning at the time when the purchaser recognized his intention to buy and included either budgetary planning, consideration of details of the item, or both. Her study showed that income, price, expected service life, or type of item did not affect whether or not planning was done; however, she found that 90 per cent of the purchases of household equipment were planned. Eighteen per cent of the planned purchases involved a planning period of one day to seven weeks, and 53 per cent involved a planning period of two months to one year.

A similar definition for planning period was used by Udell (33) in his study of shopping behavior in the selection of small electrical appliances. When respondents were asked when they had tentatively decided to purchase the product which they bought, 83 per cent stated they bought within one month, 50 per cent within one week, and 22 per cent on the same day they made their tentative purchase decision. Seventy-three per cent of the purchases were planned prior to shopping in a store, although 13 per cent of the decisions to purchase were made during the first store visit and 13 per cent after visiting a retail store. Nearly 60 per cent of the respondents reported they had shopped for the small appliance only in the store where the purchase was made; 16 per cent said they had shopped in the store of purchase and one additional store, and 22 per cent in three or more stores. Of those who indicated they had made a tentative decision to buy before shopping in a store, 65 per cent believed that they had sufficient information and were ready to buy when they made their first visit to a retail store.

The Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan (26) conducted a study during 1953 of the kind and extent of deliberation that accompanied the purchase process of four major household durables. The sample consisted of 360 families living in all parts of the United States who had purchased a television, refrigerator, clothes washer, or range during the two-year period prior to the study. Findings of the study showed that one-third of the durable goods purchasers consulted only one source of information, which was most frequently friends or relatives, and one-third obtained information from reading material. Forty per cent went into more than one store before they made their selection. About 35 per cent of the buyers considered more than one feature of the product other than price and brand; other features most frequently considered were mechanical properties, size or capacity, and appearance. About one-fourth were considered careful buyers who engaged in highly deliberate decision-making. This occurred most among those with a college education, those with incomes between \$5,000 and \$7,500, and those under 35 years of age. There was a tendency toward deliberate behavior among people who felt no urgent or immediate need for the product and those who either had no previous experience or had an unsatisfactory experience.

Three types of shopping behavior were described by Evans (9) in his study of shopping behavior as related to one type of major consumer durable. In the first type of behavior, both the brand and the dealer were selected in advance and the shopping consisted of going to only that one dealer. In the second type only the brand was preselected and two or more dealers might be visited in order to secure the "best deal." In the third type of behavior neither the brand nor the dealer were

chosen in advance; the purchase was made only after comparison shopping of both brands and prices.

Studies made of patterns of family decision-making in recent years show that husbands and wives make decisions regarding household equipment together more often than separately. When Van Syckle (34) studied practices regarding the planning and purchasing of large-expenditure items of equipment, she found that both planning and purchasing of equipment were done largely by husband and wife together. Planning was done together by 84 per cent of the respondents but only 59 per cent of the purchasing was done together; the wife had the primary responsibility for purchases that were made alone.

In 1964 Burchinal and Bauder (1) studied the family decision-making and role patterns among Iowa farm and nonfarm families. The 1033 wives participating in the study reported that decisions on the amount to spend on small appliances and the actual purchasing of both small and large appliances were shared responsibilities, indicating an equalitarian pattern.

In Wolgast's (36) study of purchasing decisions made in 1954 through 1956, a nation-wide sample of urban family heads of households and wives of heads of households were interviewed. When respondents were asked who in their family made decisions to purchase household goods, 54 per cent reported that both equally made these decisions, 25 per cent reported the wife only, and 11 per cent reported the wife predominantly. Only four per cent reported the husband had sole responsibility for these decisions, and another four per cent reported the husband had the predominant responsibility.

A study of married student households at Utah State University in 1964 by Edwards (8) included decision-making concerning household equipment purchases. Edwards found 77.4 per cent of the decisions concerning the purchase of a washer, clothes dryer, refrigerator, range, television, and stereo or hi-fi were made by the couple together.

In 1961 Schlesinger (28) investigated how 120 college-educated couples perceived their decision-making. He found the respondents believed that wives were dominant in decisions made in the area of home management and husbands were dominant in decisions made in the area of money management, including the purchase of major appliances. His study further showed that beginning families appeared to be in a "joint" decision-making stage during which both husbands and wives cooperated in most areas, including home management and money management. Beginning families had the most joint decision-making, the highest amount of participation in decision-making discussions, the most satisfaction in the areas of decision-making included in the study, and the largest amount of consultation in decision-making of any of the family stages.

In her study of the attitudes and opinions of selected single, engaged, and married home economics majors at Oklahoma State University, Keith (21) asked the respondents whether they thought the husband, the wife, or both would make decisions concerning the purchase of major household equipment. Of the respondents, 97.3 per cent thought the husband and wife together would make such decisions. The majority, 58.6 per cent, also felt there would be joint responsibility in decisions concerning the purchase of small household equipment, although 41.4 per cent thought the wife would make these decisions.

Several studies have been made concerning the actual and anticipated ownership of household equipment and the means used to acquire this equipment. Research carried on by the Bureau of Census and the United States Department of Commerce and reported in Consumer Buying Indicators (5), February, 1967, showed the percentage of total households owning selected items of household equipment as of January, 1967. Air conditioners were owned by 20.5 per cent of households, clothes dryers by 30.1 per cent, washing machines by 71.8 per cent, refrigerators by 84.6 per cent, and television sets by 93.2 per cent.

Merchandising Week (31) reported the Saturation Index of wired homes as of January 1, 1967, on both a national and regional basis. Oklahoma is included in the four state West-South-Central region. More than 70 per cent of wired homes in this region had ranges (including gas ranges), refrigerators, and black and white television sets. Vacuum cleaners, automatic clothes washers, and room air conditioners were in 35 to 70 per cent of the homes. Clothes dryers and color television sets were in fewer than 30 per cent of the homes.

A March, 1967, report in Merchandising Week (35) stated that households whose heads were under 35 years of age accounted for 34 per cent of the washing machines sold in the United States. These households also purchased 30 per cent of the refrigerators sold, 29 per cent of the television sets, and 31 per cent of the vacuum cleaners.

A study made in 1966 by Manning and Gayle (24) on the relationship of family life cycle definitions to family financial activities showed that younger families were relatively heavy purchasers of household durable goods. Outlays for household durable goods were relatively high in Stage 2, accumulation, and Stage 3, grade school, as defined by

Fitzsimmons. This corresponded to relatively high outlays in Stage 3, pre-school family, and Stage 4, school-age family, as defined by Duvall. Using Glick's family life cycle stages, outlays for durable goods were relatively high in Stage 2, birth of first child to birth of last child.

Attitudes concerning purchase behavior based on income groups has changed in the past few years. The buying patterns of new consumers, influenced by age and education, is determined more by their expectations than by their income (7). To achieve this, credit is often used. More young families use credit and involve a higher percentage of their income than does any other age group (10).

In a 1954 study Merriam (25) interviewed 171 homemakers under 30 years of age whose husbands were the sole wage-earners. Equipment owned by these families, in the order of frequency, was refrigerator, washer, automobile, television, and vacuum cleaner. Approximately 50 per cent of this equipment was purchased on installment credit.

In 1962 Goetz and Hotchkiss (14) studied factors influencing purchase decision-making and methods of financing selected major household equipment of 277 Arizona families. They found an average of 70.5 per cent of the refrigerators, ranges, freezers, and washers reported in the study were purchased for cash; only 29.5 per cent were purchased on credit. Nationally, 48 per cent of all household appliances were bought on credit at that time. Approximately 25 per cent of the refrigerators, ranges, and freezers and 16 per cent of the washers in the study were purchased used.

In Edward's (8) study of married student households at Utah State University, 22.1 per cent had used credit during the year preceding the study to purchase household durable goods. The kinds of household

durables, in the order of their frequency, were television and furniture, washer, refrigerator and stereo or hi-fi, and clothes dryer.

Many young families receive household equipment as gifts. The 495 respondents in the study by Rose (27) received an average of five appliances each as gifts. The most commonly received gifts were electric mixers, coffeemakers, toasters, electric skillets, electric irons, and vacuum cleaners. However, they also reported receiving a total of 43 ranges, 47 refrigerators and freezers, 29 washers, and 23 clothes dryers as gifts. In addition, the study showed each respondent had purchased an average of two used appliances.

Christenson (3) studied the major economic contributions by parents to 60 young married couples. Parents of most of the 60 couples made economic resource contributions and other major economic contributions to their newly married children either at marriage or during the first year of marriage or at both times. Household equipment and furniture were the second most often contributed items.

In a study by Clark and Warren (4), 107 wives of the parental families were interviewed concerning contributions made to newly married couples. They found that more families gave furniture and household equipment in the first year of marriage than in succeeding years of marriage, and that furniture and household equipment were given by about 40 per cent of the families in the first year. Goods were both new and used.

Several studies have been made regarding household equipment young people anticipate having in their own homes. Many seem to expect that married life will automatically bring all the facilities and equipment which were found in their parents' homes. Young people today consider

many household appliances essential to their everyday living which were once considered luxuries.

In a study of 189 high school juniors and seniors, Cateora (2) found that most teen-agers expected their first home after marriage to be well supplied with appliances. The majority expected to have refrigerator, range, clothes washer and dryer, and air conditioning. Many also expected to have a dishwasher and freezer.

More than 90 per cent of the college students participating in the study by Keith (21) desired 21 of the 42 pieces of household equipment listed and expected to have 17 of the pieces. Over 50 per cent of the students desired 39 of the 42 pieces of equipment and expected to have 37 of the pieces listed. More than 98 per cent of the students expected to have hair dryers, refrigerators, electric clocks, hand irons, electric radios, ranges, vacuum cleaners, and clothes washers.

In a 1962 study by Guthrie (16) of perceived financial security of urban families, respondents were asked how important they thought it was to the well-being of their family to have the things other families in their neighborhood had. The study revealed two trends in the responses of families; first, families avoided any reference to "keeping up with the Joneses," and, second, they felt that it was important to provide their children with similar things that neighborhood children and schoolmates had.

In the present study the writer incorporated aspects of the decision-making process into an interview schedule to be used in personal visits with a selected group of young homemakers. The items were concerned with decisions in a purchase situation as the homemakers



perceived them. The next chapter will discuss the instrument used, the sample of young homemakers selected, and analysis of the data.

## CHAPTER III

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Method of Procedure

This study of perceived decision-making in the purchase of household equipment was begun by reviewing research studies and other literature related to the subject in the areas of home economics and marketing. As the specific area of study and subject group to be used was defined, a questionnaire was developed to be used in personal interviews. The instrument was pretested with young homemakers known to the researcher. It was revised to incorporate their suggestions and to clarify some items; it was then retested with additional young homemakers and developed in the form used in this study. The interview schedule contained both structured and open-end questions. A copy is included as Appendix A.

Subjects for this study were wives of students enrolled during the 1967 spring semester at Oklahoma State University. The husbands were full-time students 18 through 25 years of age. A random sample was drawn from the list of married men students living in town housing other than that made available through the university. Town housing was selected because it presented a wider variety of living situations than did housing furnished through the university. Town housing included furnished and unfurnished apartments and houses, and mobile homes.

A total of 1,630 men students were married and living in town housing during the spring semester out of a total school enrollment of 9,546 men students.

A letter was mailed to each wife selected in the random sample approximately a week prior to the intended interview (Appendix B). The letter requested her assistance with the study. The researcher followed each letter with a personal interview with the wife. Repeat visits were made where necessary until the wife was either found at home or until a time for the interview could be established. All visits were made during the period from May 12 through May 31, 1967.

Generally the subjects were most willing to cooperate and were interested in the study. Only one person requested that she not be included in the study, and three others were unable to participate due to their time schedules. Three families had moved out-of-town. Sixty-eight interview schedules were completed. Thirteen of the subjects indicated they had not made any purchases of the equipment listed since they had been married and filled out only the last portion of the schedule; 55 subjects completed the entire schedule. Only one of these 55 did not answer the questionnaire completely enough for it to be used and therefore had to be omitted.

The wife was given the interview schedule and asked to complete it herself. The subjects asked very few questions and these were generally when they thought there was something unusual about their purchase situation that they should explain. Random questions to the wives indicated the meaning of the questions was clear. There was no hesitance observed in answering any of the questions; generally the

subjects were very definite about the purchase and the purchase situation.


The frequency and percentage of responses were determined for 54 purchase situations, including 38 items of equipment purchased new and 16 items purchased as used equipment. Data concerning the families involved in the study and their long-range planning was determined from 67 responses.

#### Information About the Families

The 67 respondents were asked questions concerning their age, length of marriage, number of children, education, and income. Their responses are reported in Tables I through IV.

Although the age limitations imposed in the study, 18 through 25, applied only to the husbands, all of the wives were also within these age limits, as shown in Table I. Ages of the wives ranged from 19 to 24 years with 20 as the most frequently reported age and 21 as the second most frequently reported age. More than half (58.3%) of the wives were 21 years of age or younger. The husbands were somewhat older than the wives. The average age of the wives was 21.4 years and the average age of the husbands was 22.6 years. More than half (52.2%) of the husbands were 23 years of age or older. The most frequently reported age of the husbands was 22 years, and only one husband was less than 20 years of age.

Thirty-one (46.3%) wives reported they had been married from one to three years. More than three-fourths (79.1%) had been married three years or less, and 22 (32.8%) had been married less than one year.



Eleven (16.4%) had been married three to five years; only three (4.5%) had been married more than five years.

TABLE I  
AGE OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

Years of Age	Wife 67 = 100%		Husband 67 = 100%	
	No.	%	No.	%
19	5	7.5	1	1.5
20	18	26.9	5	7.5
21	16	23.9	10	14.9
22	11	16.4	16	23.9
23	5	7.5	14	20.9
24	12	17.9	14	20.9
25	--	----	7	10.4

Most of the families (71.6%) had no children, and of the families that had children, the majority had only one child. Nineteen (28.4%) of the 67 families had children, and 15 (78.9%) of these 19 families had one child. Four (21.1%) of the 19 families had two children each, and no family had more than two children.

The level of education of the husbands and wives is reported in Table II. Forty-eight (71.6%) of the 67 husbands were either seniors or graduate students; nine (13.4%) graduate students were candidates for Master's degrees and six (9.0%) were doctoral candidates. Almost half (49.2%) were classified as seniors.

Only 16 (23.8%) of the wives had no college credit although nine of the 16 had received some type of special training beyond the high

school level. Two (3.0%) wives had received Master's degrees, and three (4.5%) had received Bachelor's degrees. The highest level of education obtained for more than half (52.1%) of the wives was the sophomore level of college. At the time of the study 26 (38.8%) wives were enrolled in college, two (3.0%) as graduate students.

TABLE II  
LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

Highest Level Obtained	Wife 67 = 100%		Husband 67 = 100%	
	No.	%	No.	%
Completed high school	7	10.4	--	----
Received special training <sup>a</sup> other than high school	9	13.4	--	----
College:				
Freshman	11	16.4	2	3.0
Sophomore	8	11.9	6	9.0
Junior	11	16.4	11	16.4
Senior	15	22.4	33	49.2
Received Bachelor's degree	3	4.5	--	----
Received Master's degree	2	3.0	--	----
Master's degree candidate	2	3.0	9	13.4
Doctoral degree candidate	--	----	6	9.0

<sup>a</sup>One wife reported special training in addition to college studies.

The wives were also asked to indicate the extent of formal training in home economics they had received. More than half (56.7%) had taken one or more home economics courses in senior high school, and 31 (46.3%) had taken home economics in junior high school. Only four (6.0%) wives

indicated they had never received any formal training in home economics. Thirteen (19.4%) wives had carried out home economics projects as part of their 4-H Club activities. Two-fifths (40.3%) had taken courses in college; 27 wives had taken from two to 60 hours credit with an average of 16 hours credit. This included all areas of home economics and was not limited to a specific area.

The majority (65.7%) of husbands and wives contributed to their family income by working either part-time or full-time. However, more wives worked full-time than did husbands. An equal number, 23 (34.3%) of husbands and wives were not employed. Twelve (17.9%) husbands worked full-time and 32 (47.8%) worked part-time. Most of the husbands who worked full-time were military personnel attending school under the provisions of the Officers Commissioning Program; one was a high school teacher.

More than half of the wives, 35 (52.3%), were employed full-time, nine (13.4%) were employed part-time, and 23 (34.3%) were not employed. Eleven (16.4%) wives were not enrolled in college and were not employed, but of these, nine (81.8%) had children. Of the 26 (38.8%) wives who were enrolled in college at the time of the study, 12 (46.2%) were not employed, seven (26.9%) were working part-time, and seven were working full-time.

The approximate monthly net income, "what they had to spend each month," was determined for 52 families. These findings are shown in Table III. This question was not included on the first 15 interview schedules. Income was primarily derived from salaries, assistance from parents, loans, and scholarships. The range of incomes of these families was \$160 to \$800 per month. The median income was \$302.50, and the

TABLE III

## INCOME LEVEL AND PERCENTAGE OF PARENTAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Monthly Income	Families 52 = 100%		None		Parental Financial Assistance							
					0% - 25%		26% - 50%		51% - 75%		76% - 90%	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
\$160 - \$200	7	13.5	4	7.7	2	3.8	1	1.9	--	---	--	---
\$201 - \$250	9	17.3	5	9.6	3	5.8	--	---	1	1.9	--	---
\$251 - \$300	10	19.2	5	9.6	3	5.8	--	---	1	1.9	1	1.9
\$301 - \$350	9	17.3	1	1.9	6	11.5	--	---	1	1.9	1	1.9
\$351 - \$400	6	11.5	5	9.6	1	1.9	--	---	--	---	--	---
\$401 - \$450	4	7.7	1	1.9	2	3.8	--	---	1	1.9	--	---
\$451 - \$500	3	5.8	3	5.8	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---
\$501 - \$800	4	7.7	4	7.7	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---



average income per month was \$337.80. Fifty per cent received \$300 or less, and 53.8 per cent received from \$201 to \$350 per month.

Table III also includes information concerning parental financial assistance. Over half (53.8%) of the 52 families did not receive parental financial assistance, which included the seven families who had monthly incomes in excess of \$451. Twenty-four (46.2%) families received assistance from parents. Of these 24 families, 17 (70.8%) families received 25 per cent or less of their monthly income, one (4.2%) family received 26 per cent to 50 per cent, four (16.7%) families received 51 per cent to 75 per cent, and two (8.3%) families received 76 per cent to 90 per cent.

The manner in which financial assistance was received from their parents was reported by 67 families. Of the families who received financial assistance from their parents, more (42.9%) received it in the form of school tuition and fees than in any other manner. Two other forms of assistance that were received by an equal number of families, 32.1 per cent, were regular assistance and assistance as it was needed. Assistance in the form of gifts was received by 28.6 per cent of the families. Some families reported receiving assistance in more than one form.

In addition to salaries and parental assistance, these young families reported receiving income from eight other sources, as shown in Table IV. Forty-two (62.7%) families reported receiving income from one of these sources and several families reported income from more than one source. Thirteen (30.9%) of these 42 families reported loans and scholarships as a source of income. The second most frequently mentioned source was savings, which was reported by ten (23.8%) families.

Other sources of income in the order of their frequency were farming and livestock, National Guard and Reserve pay, GI Bill, trust fund, and child support.

TABLE IV  
SOURCES OF INCOME OTHER THAN EMPLOYMENT  
AND PARENTAL ASSISTANCE

Source	Receiving 42 = 100%	
	No.	%
GI Bill	3	7.1
Loan	13	30.9
Savings	10	23.8
Scholarship <sup>a</sup>	13	30.9
Farming and livestock	4	9.5
National Guard and Reserve pay	3	7.1
Trust fund	2	4.8
Child support	1	2.4

<sup>a</sup>Includes assistantships and fellowships

#### Information Concerning Selected Household Equipment

Nine major items of household equipment were selected to study in detail. They were clothes washer and dryer, range, refrigerator, room air conditioner, sewing machine, stereo or hi-fi, television, and vacuum cleaner. These items were selected because they were commonly acquired by young couples establishing homes and with which the couples generally had had little or no previous purchase experience. These items also represent an expenditure for an item that is generally used for an

extended period of time. As many as eight of the nine listed items of household equipment had been acquired since marriage by six families either as gifts or through purchase. One family had acquired none of the selected items. However, a total of 288 items of equipment had been acquired by the 67 families interviewed with an average of 4.3 items per family.

Of the nine items listed in Table V the one most frequently acquired since marriage was the television. This item was owned by 55 (82.1%) of the 67 families. Almost as many (71.6%) had vacuum cleaners. These were the only two items of equipment owned by more than 50 per cent of the families. Ownership of the other items listed, in descending order, was refrigerator, range, stereo or hi-fi, room air conditioner, clothes washer, sewing machine, and clothes dryer. The clothes dryer was the only one of the nine items that fewer than 40 per cent of the families owned, and it was also the only item that no family had received as a gift. Approximately half of the families who had televisions and vacuum cleaners had received these items as gifts. The sewing machine, too, was often received as a gift. More than half of the clothes washers and dryers, room air conditioners, and stereos had been purchased new. The range and refrigerator were purchased more often as used items than as new ones.

Sixteen (23.9%) of the families in the study lived in mobile homes. One family had received their home as a gift, seven had purchased new mobile homes, and eight had purchased used homes. All of the mobile homes came equipped with a range and refrigerator and many had clothes washers and air conditioners. Since these were included as a part of

the mobile home and had not represented individual purchase situations, the respondents considered other purchases in completing the interview schedule.

TABLE V  
EXTENT AND METHOD OF ACQUISITION OF SELECTED  
HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

Equipment	Families 67 = 100%		Method of Acquisition					
			Received as Gift		Purchased			
	No.	%	No.	%	New		Used	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Clothes dryer	7	10.4	--	---	5	7.5	2	3.0
Clothes washer	29	43.3	6	9.0	15	22.4	8	12.0
Range	30	44.8	7	10.4	7	10.4	16	23.9
Refrigerator	32	47.8	5	7.5	9	13.4	18	26.9
Room air conditioner	29	43.3	6	9.0	16	23.9	7	10.4
Sewing machine	28	41.8	12	17.9	7	10.4	9	13.4
Stereo - hi-fi	30	44.8	7	10.4	22	32.8	1	1.5
Television	55	82.1	27	40.3	23	34.3	5	7.5
Vacuum cleaner	48	71.6	30	44.8	14	20.9	4	6.0

The respondents were requested to complete the interview schedule in regard to their most recent purchase of one of the nine items of equipment listed, as shown in Table VI. Fifty-four of the respondents had made a purchase of at least one of the items listed, which included as the most recent purchase 38 new and 16 used items. More television sets had been purchased than any other item, and it was the only item purchased by more than one-fifth of the families. Ten families had purchased a stereo or hi-fi, and nine families each had purchased room

air conditioners and sewing machines. Other purchases in the order of frequency were vacuum cleaner, clothes washer, refrigerator, clothes dryer, and range. All of the vacuum cleaners and all but one of the televisions, stereos, and clothes dryers were purchased new. All of the ranges and refrigerators were purchased used, and one half or more of the clothes washers, dryers, and sewing machines were purchased used.

TABLE VI  
MOST RECENT PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT

Equipment	Units Acquired		Purchased			
	54 = 100%		New		Used	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Clothes dryer	2	3.7	1	1.8	1	1.8
Clothes washer	3	5.5	1	1.8	2	3.7
Range	1	1.8	--	---	1	1.8
Refrigerator	2	3.7	--	---	2	3.7
Room air conditioner	9	16.7	7	13.0	2	3.7
Sewing machine	9	16.7	3	5.5	6	11.1
Stereo - hi-fi	10	18.5	9	16.7	1	1.8
Television	13	24.1	12	22.2	1	1.8
Vacuum cleaner	5	9.2	5	9.2	--	---

The respondents were asked to consider their most recent purchase of one of the items of equipment listed. The time lapse between the most recent purchase and the date of the interview ranged from a minimum of one week to a maximum of four years. The average period of time elapsed since the purchase had been made was nine months.

Information seeking activities included shopping in stores and comparing brands of equipment as well as studying literature available and talking with persons whose opinion on this subject was respected. Respondents recalled the number of stores in which they shopped, the number of brands of the item of equipment they compared, and the number they actually considered. They were also asked the number of shopping trips they had made to purchase the item of equipment. This information is summarized in Table VII.

TABLE VII  
EXTENT OF SHOPPING DONE FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASED

No. of Items	Stores Shopped 54 = 100%		Different Brands Compared		Brands Considered		Shopping Trips	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0 <sup>a</sup>	5	9.2	--	----	--	----	--	----
1	12	22.2	12	22.2	24	44.4	21	38.9
2	6	11.1	5	9.2	24	44.4	14	25.9
3	12	22.2	17	31.5	6	11.1	10	18.5
4	7	13.0	15	27.8	--	----	9	16.7
5	8	14.8	2	3.7	--	----	--	----
6	3	5.5	3	5.5	--	----	--	----
7	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	----
8	1	1.8	--	----	--	----	--	----

<sup>a</sup>Five items were purchased directly from individuals.

More than half (55.5%) of the respondents shopped in one to three different stores. Five (9.2%) persons had purchased the equipment directly from an individual and had not shopped in any store. Only one person shopped in more than six stores. The average number of stores shopped in the selection of the 54 items of equipment was 2.8.

Almost three-fifths (59.3%) of the families compared three or four different brands in making their purchase selection. Seventeen (31.5%) families looked at three different brands, which was also the average number compared, and 15 (27.8%) families looked at four different brands.

In addition to the number of brands compared, the respondents were asked the number of these brands they actually considered in making their selection. The number of brands compared necessarily limited the number of brands considered. An equal number of families, 24 (44.4%), considered only one or two of the different brands at which they had looked. The remaining six (11.1%) families considered three different brands, which was the most any family reported actually considering. The average number considered was 1.7.

One shopping trip was all that was necessary for almost two-fifths of the families. Twenty-one (38.9%) families made the purchase selection on the first shopping trip, and 14 (25.9%) families reported only two trips necessary to make their selection. However, nine (16.7%) families reported they made four or more trips before making their purchase.

Most families sought information to help in making their selection of the item of equipment which they were considering. Some families secured information before they actually began shopping, others during the time they were actively shopping, and others at both times. Five

sources of information were the most any family reported using and 85.2 per cent of the families used three or less. Seven (13.0%) families reported they did not use any source of information, 17 (31.5%) families used only one source, and 14 (25.9%) families used only two sources. Eight (14.8%) families referred to three sources of information, six (11.1%) families to four sources, and two (3.7%) families to five sources. The average number of sources of information used was 1.9.

Eight sources of information were listed in the interview schedule, as shown in Table VIII. Advertising was the source used by the greatest number of families, although friends were reported as the source of information used most often before beginning to shop. Manufacturer's handouts were most often used during the period of shopping. Advertising and friends were the two sources reported used by more than 50 per cent of the families. Fewer than one-fifth of the families referred to information from consumer publications or home economics classes. Sources of information, in the order of their use, were advertising, friends, manufacturer's handouts, parents, magazine or newspaper articles, consumer publications, and home economics classes. No family reported using Extension publications as a source of information. Since this information depended on the memory of the respondent, the actual number used may have varied from the number reported.

Table IX shows the comparison of the educational level of the wife to the number of sources of information reported used. Generally, the average number of sources used was about the same, varying from 1.1 to 2.3, until the graduate level was reached. The wives who were either graduate students at the time of the interview or who had already received a Master's degree reported an average of 3.5 sources of



information used. However, statements made by the wives seem to indicate that factors other than the educational level obtained by the wife needed to be considered. These included the educational level obtained by the husband, his influence on the purchase situation, length of marriage, and whether the item of equipment was purchased new or used.

TABLE VIII  
SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED IN MAKING PURCHASE CHOICE

Source of Information	Before Shopping		Obtained During Shopping	
	No.	%	No.	%
Advertising	22	40.7	8	14.8
Consumer publications	3	5.5	2	3.7
Extension publications	--	----	--	----
Friends	24	44.4	5	9.2
Home economics classes	4	7.4	--	----
Magazine or newspaper articles	8	14.8	4	7.4
Manufacturer's handouts	5	9.2	10	18.5
Parents	13	24.1	1	1.8

The respondents were asked if they believed they had sufficient information on which to make a satisfactory decision. Only two (3.7%) believed that they had not obtained sufficient information. One reported satisfaction with the decision made and one reported dissatisfaction; however, both stated they would find out more about different brands available and do more shopping around another time.

TABLE IX  
LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF WIFE COMPARED TO AVERAGE NUMBER  
OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED

<u>Highest Level Obtained</u>	<u>54 = 100%</u>		<u>Average Number of</u>
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Sources Used</u>
Completed high school	6	11.1	2
Special training other than college	6	11.1	2
College:			
Freshman	10	18.5	2.1
Sophomore	7	13.0	1.1
Junior	8	14.8	2.3
Senior	12	22.2	1.8
Received Bachelor's degree	1	1.8	2
Graduate student	2	3.7	3.5
Received Master's degree	2	3.7	3.5

Seven (13.0%) families made a written comparison of the information they obtained. These families also reported a higher than average number of sources of information used, number of stores shopped, and number of brands compared and considered. These seven families reported an average of 3.0 sources of information used, 3.6 stores shopped, 4.3 brands compared, and 2.1 brands considered. The averages for all 54 respondents were 1.9 sources of information used, 2.8 stores shopped, 3.0 brands compared, and 1.7 brands considered.

Some families considered both new and used items of equipment while other families considered only new or only used items. Over half (53.7%) of the 54 families considered only new equipment. Fifteen

(27.8%) families considered both new and used models, and ten (18.5%) families considered only used models.

The price ranges families considered differed for new and used models of equipment. About 85 per cent of the families who purchased new items of equipment considered the medium price range and almost the same per cent of families who purchased used items considered the low price range. Thirty-two (84.2%) of the 36 families who purchased new items of equipment considered models in the medium price range, 14 (36.8%) families considered models in the low price range, and seven (18.4%) families considered the purchase of models in the high price range. Sixteen families purchased used items of equipment, and 14 (87.5%) of these families considered the low price range. Four (25.0%) of these families considered the medium price range, and only one (6.2%) family considered the high price range.

Twelve (22.2%) families considered more than one price range. Five (13.2%) families of the 38 who purchased new items considered items in two price ranges and five considered items in three price ranges; 28 (73.6%) considered only one price range. Of the 16 families who purchased used items, one (6.2%) considered two price ranges and one considered three price ranges; 14 (87.5%) families considered only one price range.

The prices paid for the items of equipment purchased varied from a low of \$17 to a high of \$900. The most frequently purchased items cost \$50 or less. Approximately half (48.2%) of the items cost \$100 or less, and three-fourths (75.9%) did not cost more than \$200, as shown in Table X.

TABLE X  
PRICE OF EQUIPMENT PURCHASED

Range of Price	54 = 100%	
	No.	%
\$ 0 - \$ 50	15	27.8
\$ 51 - \$100	11	20.4
\$101 - \$150	12	22.2
\$151 - \$200	3	5.5
\$201 - \$250	6	11.1
\$251 - \$300	3	5.5
\$301 or more	4	7.4

The lowest price paid was \$17 for a used room air conditioner, and the highest price paid was \$900 for stereo component units, Table XI. The average purchase price paid for both new and used stereos, room air conditioners, and televisions was in excess of \$150. The average purchase price paid for the six other items was less than \$100. Vacuum cleaners had the lowest average purchase price, \$45.40.

The planning period was understood to begin at the time the respondent recognized the intention to purchase the item and undertook consideration of information related to the item and/or means of payment. The planning period for the 54 items of household equipment purchased ranged from one day to one year. One day included a minimum of a few minutes through a 24-hour period. Ideally the planning period covers the time required to consider all alternative purchases yet at least one of each of six items of equipment were purchased in one day,

and the planning period for the range and clothes dryers did not in any instance exceed two weeks.

TABLE XI  
LENGTH OF PLANNING PERIOD COMPARED TO PURCHASE PRICE

Equipment	Purchase Price		Planning Period Range
	Average	Range	
	Dollars		
Clothes dryer	85.00	20 - 150	1 day - 1 week
Clothes washer	96.66	30 - 175	2 days - 3 months
Range	60.00	60	2 weeks
Refrigerator	67.50	35 - 100	1 day - 5 months
Room air conditioner	183.89	17 - 300	2 weeks - 12 months
Sewing machine	88.06	20 - 220	1 day - 12 months
Stereo - hi-fi	246.90	25 - 900	1 day - 2 months
Television	180.31	75 - 550	1 day - 6 months
Vacuum cleaner	45.40	22 - 75	1 day - 6 months

Table XI also shows the comparison of the range of planning period for each item of equipment to the average purchase price paid. On the basis of this sample, the purchase price of the equipment did not influence the length of time the purchase was considered.

Cash was preferred to credit as the method of payment by almost two-thirds of the families, Table XII. Before shopping 34 (62.9%) families had decided to pay cash for their purchases while only 18 (33.3%) families had decided to use credit. Two (3.7%) families were undecided about the method of payment at the time they began shopping; however, both of these purchases were made on the basis of a one-day

planning period. Twenty (37.0%) families which purchased new equipment and 14 (25.9%) which purchased used equipment had decided to pay cash. Sixteen (29.6%) families that purchased new equipment and two (3.7%) that purchased used equipment had decided to use credit.

TABLE XII  
METHOD OF PAYMENT PLANNED PREVIOUS TO PURCHASE

Equipment	54 = 100%					
	Cash		Credit		Undecided	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New	20	37.0	16	29.6	2	3.7
Used	14	25.9	2	3.7	--	---

When the method of payment decided upon was compared to the purchase price, credit was used more often than cash for items priced \$101 to \$150 and more than \$300. More items were purchased in the \$50 or under price range than in any of the other ranges and a higher percentage of these items were purchased with cash than in any other price range; 12 items compared to two items. Seven items in the \$51 to \$100 price range were purchased with cash and four with credit. Five items in the \$101 to \$150 range were purchased with cash, seven with credit, and two items in the \$151 to \$200 range with cash, one with credit. In the \$201 to \$250 range, four items were purchased with cash, two with credit, compared to three items with cash in the \$251 to \$300 range. Two of the three items that cost more than \$300 were purchased with credit. The two families who had not decided which method of payment to use prior to shopping purchased items in the lowest and highest price ranges.

Cash was used as the method of payment for all nine air conditioners, seven sewing machines, six stereos, four televisions, three vacuum cleaners, two clothes washers and one clothes dryer, range, and refrigerator. Credit was used as the method of payment for nine televisions, three stereos, two sewing machines, and one clothes washer and dryer, refrigerator, and vacuum cleaner.

Of the 18 families who used credit, 16 (88.9%) families had decided upon the size of payment they could afford to make before they began shopping. Two (11.1%) families had not decided upon the size of payment.

Over half of the respondents, 31 (57.4%) reported they were able to make the purchase because they had money available although the money may not have been specifically for that purpose, Table XIII. Eight respondents (14.8%) stated they had saved money for this particular purpose, and another eight respondents stated they allocated a certain portion of their income regularly for major expenses. Seven (13.0%) reported they had been able to acquire their purchase by making special efforts to economize in order to obtain it. This purchase did not represent a sacrifice nor was it considered a deprivation by the great majority (87.0%) of the respondents.

In planning for and selecting an item of household equipment, many factors were considered. Seventeen factors recognized in other research studies as being influential were listed for the respondents to rate, Table XIV. Each respondent chose the five which she believed to have been most influential in her purchase selection and listed these in their order of importance. Brand reputation was most often placed as the most important factor, with price second. Both of these factors were given by slightly more than one-fifth while all the other factors

were given by less than one-tenth. Although price received less consideration as the most influential factor in the selection of an item, its consideration was mentioned more often than any other factor in second, third, and fourth place; fifth place consideration was shared between price and general appearance.

TABLE XIII  
REASON MONEY WAS AVAILABLE FOR SPECIFIC PURCHASE

Reason	54 = 100%	
	No.	%
Money saved for specific item	8	14.8
Money available and unassigned	31	57.4
Budget included allocation for major expenses	8	14.8
Special efforts made to economize	7	13.0

When each first choice was weighted five points, the second choice four points, the third choice three points, the fourth choice two points, and the fifth choice one point, a weighted score for each factor resulted. When the total number of ratings for each factor was considered, price was ranked first with a weighted score of 150, and brand reputation was second with a score of 126, followed by guarantee with a score of 84, general appearance, 66, and construction, 56. The sixth ranked item was size followed, in order, by special features, past experience, credit arrangements available, and friends' recommendation. The remaining factors, all of which received weighted scores less than



TABLE XIV

## FACTORS INFLUENCING SELECTION OF HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

Factor	Order of Importance										Total Weighted Score
	First		Second		Third 54 = 100%		Fourth		Fifth		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Advertising	1	1.8	3	5.5	--	----	2	3.7	2	3.7	23
Brand reputation	12	22.2	6	11.1	9	16.7	5	9.2	5	9.2	126
Color of finish	--	----	--	----	2	3.7	4	7.4	2	3.7	16
Construction	5	9.2	4	7.4	3	5.5	3	5.5	--	----	56
Consumers magazine ratings	2	3.7	--	----	--	----	2	3.7	--	----	14
Credit arrangements available	2	3.7	1	1.8	1	1.8	4	7.4	5	9.2	30
Friends' recommendation	3	5.5	2	3.7	1	1.8	1	1.8	2	3.7	30
General appearance	1	1.8	9	16.7	5	9.2	2	3.7	6	11.1	66
Guarantee	4	7.4	9	16.7	6	11.1	4	7.4	2	3.7	84
Parents' recommendation	2	3.7	1	1.8	1	1.8	--	----	5	9.2	22
Past experience	1	1.8	2	3.7	3	5.5	4	7.4	2	3.7	32
Price	11	20.4	10	18.5	11	20.4	8	14.8	6	11.1	150

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Factor	Order of Importance										Total Weighted Score
	First		Second		Third 54 = 100%		Fourth		Fifth		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Relatives' recommendation	3	5.5	1	1.8	--	----	--	----	1	1.8	20
Size	1	1.8	2	3.7	4	7.4	7	13.0	5	9.2	44
Special features	3	5.5	2	3.7	4	7.4	2	3.7	4	7.4	43
Store salesmen	1	1.8	1	1.8	2	3.7	5	9.2	3	5.5	28
Used appliance	2	3.7	1	1.8	1	1.8	--	----	3	5.5	20
Unusable answer	--	----	--	----	1	1.8	1	1.8	1	1.8	--

30, were salesmen, advertising, parents' and relatives' recommendations, used appliance, color or finish, and consumers magazine ratings.

The respondents considered price the most important factor in the selection of the household equipment listed and considered credit arrangements available as being the ninth most important factor. Only 13 (24.1%) respondents listed credit as one of the five factors they considered most important. Thirty-four (62.9%) respondents had decided to pay cash for their purchases before they began shopping, and 18 (33.3%) had decided to use credit. This may help to explain why credit availability was not perceived as having more influence.

Of the 54 families who had made a purchase of one of the selected items of household equipment, 21 (38.9%) families received financial assistance from their parents; 33 (61.1%) families did not. When the presence or absence of assistance was compared to the influence parents had on the purchase either as a source of information or as a recognized factor influencing the purchase, no relationship was seen. The wives in 15 (71.4%) of the 21 families who received assistance did not believe parents had been a source of information in this purchase, and 19 (90.5%) did not list parents' recommendation as one of the five factors that had most influenced the purchase. Of the 33 families that did not receive financial assistance from parents, 25 (75.8%) wives did not believe parents had been a source of information in the purchase, and 26 (78.8%) did not indicate parents' recommendation as one of the five factors that had most influenced the purchase. Only 25.9 per cent of all 54 wives reported parents as a source of information, and 16.7 per cent gave parents' recommendation as one of the factors that had most influenced the purchase. Parents were placed fourth of eight sources

of information given, and parents' recommendation was placed thirteenth as a source of influence of 17 given.

For most of the respondents, the most recent purchase represented "something I wanted very much," Table XV. Over half, 28 (51.9%) gave this as the primary reason for the purchase, especially in the acquisition of televisions, stereos, and air conditioners. All ten of the stereos, 11 of the 13 televisions, and six of the nine air conditioners were purchased for this reason. Fourteen (25.9%) respondents considered the item of equipment purchased as necessary to keep house. This reason related to purchase of all of the vacuum cleaners, refrigerators, range, and three air conditioners, one clothes dryer, and two sewing machines. Eight (14.8%) respondents believed they would save money by having this item, which included six sewing machines, one clothes washer, and one television. The saving of time was considered the most important reason for their purchases by three (5.5%) respondents. They had purchased two of the clothes washers and one clothes dryer. Only one (1.8%) respondent considered the fact that she was used to having it at her parents' house as the most important reason for her purchase of a television.

Approximately half (48.2%) of the respondents thought almost all their friends had the same item of household equipment at the time they made their purchase. Eighteen (33.3%) respondents thought few of their friends had one, and ten (18.5%) respondents thought about half of their friends had the same item of equipment. However, their responses to this question indicated they had not especially considered the extent of group ownership in their decision to purchase the item of equipment and believed that this had not been an influence.

TABLE XV  
REASON CONSIDERED MOST IMPORTANT FOR PURCHASE

Reason	54 = 100%	
	No.	%
Save money by having it	8	14.8
Save time by having it	3	5.5
Necessary to keep house	14	25.9
Used to having it at parents' house	1	1.8
Something ... wanted very much	28	51.9

No particular time or event was recognized as influencing the time of purchase by one-third of the 54 respondents as shown in Table XVI. The item of equipment that they bought was an original purchase and the fact that they "did not have one" was the greatest influence on the decision to purchase at the time they did. One respondent said they bought in the summer when they had more time to shop, and several reported the purchase of air conditioners during the summer. A special sale was the stimulus for 15 (27.8%) of the families, and breakdown of existing equipment created a need situation for nine (16.7%) families. Money available as a gift or income tax return influenced four (7.4%) families. Two respondents gave no reason for buying at the time they did.

Each young wife was asked if she and her husband had shopped together or separately and who did she think made the decision to purchase the particular item. Forty-three (79.6%) wives stated they had shopped with their husbands for the item, and 11 (20.4%) stated they had shopped separately.

TABLE XVI  
SITUATION INFLUENCING TIME OF PURCHASE

Situation	54 = 100%	
	No.	%
Gift of money	2	3.7
Income tax return	2	3.7
Special occasion	6	11.1
Special sale	15	27.8
Breakdown of existing equipment	9	16.7
Other	2	3.7
Original purchase	18	33.3

The majority of the wives perceived the decision to purchase the particular item of equipment as being a decision made by the husband and wife together, Table XVII. Thirty-one (57.4%) wives believed it had been a joint decision compared to eight (14.8%) wives who believed the decision had been made together but that the husband had been predominant and seven (13.0%) wives who believed the decision had been made together but that the wife had been predominant. Only four (7.4%) wives thought they had made the decision alone, and four thought their husband had made the decision alone. In one instance the wife was in the hospital and the husband had to shop and make the decision alone; in others, the item being purchased was to be a gift.

Both shopping and purchase decisions were usually made by the husband and wife together. Shopping together was reported by 43 (79.6%) of the respondents and the purchase decision was made together by 31 (57.4%) of the respondents. The husband was predominant in 22.2 per

cent of the decisions not equally shared, and the wife was predominant in 20.4 per cent of the decisions not equally shared.

TABLE XVII  
PATTERN OF PURCHASE DECISION

Decision By	54 = 100%	
	No.	%
Wife only	4	7.4
Husband only	4	7.4
Together	31	57.4
Together, wife predominantly	7	13.0
Together, husband predominantly	8	14.8

Purchases may be either planned or made on impulse. Slightly more than half (53.7%) of these purchases were considered seriously for a long time or were part of a long-range plan. Almost half (46.3%) were made on impulse. Twenty-two (40.7%) respondents considered their purchase as part of a long-range plan, and seven (13.0%) stated they had thought seriously about the purchase for a long time. Sixteen (29.6%) respondents stated they had considered the purchase seriously but for only a short time, and nine (16.7%) stated the purchase was definitely not planned.

When the manner in which the decision was made was compared to the length of planning period involved, 23 (42.6%) families reported a planning period of one week or less, and 26 (48.1%) families reported a period of not more than two weeks. Forty-one (75.9%) families

reported a planning period of not more than one month. Ten (18.5%) purchases were made with a planning period of only one day.

A very high percentage of satisfaction with the way they had reached their decision to make the purchase was reported by the respondents. Only one wife who had purchased new equipment and one who had purchased used equipment reported dissatisfaction.

Fifteen (27.8%) respondents, including the two who had expressed dissatisfaction, reported they would do something differently the next time they made a major purchase. Eight reported they would seek more information and do more planning. Two reported they would better plan the use of available money in order to pay cash or to be able to arrange more satisfactory credit terms. Five reported changes concerning the item purchased rather than the purchase process; one would not buy equipment that had been damaged, and four would buy higher end-of-line models.

Each of the 67 respondents, including those who had not made a purchase of any of the items listed since they had been married, reported on the long-range plans they had for major purchases. Most of the respondents had a plan which they considered definite although half (50.7%) had not decided yet on their next major purchase. Forty-three (64.2%) respondents stated that they and their husbands had a plan for future major purchases and 39 (90.7%) of these 43 respondents considered the plan to be one they would carry out; three (7.0%) considered the plan very tentative, and one person omitted this question. Twenty-four (35.8%) stated that they did not have a long-range plan for major purchases.



The respondents were fairly evenly divided between those who had decided and who had not decided on their next major purchase. Thirty-four (50.7%) respondents stated they and their husbands had not yet decided on their next major purchase, and 33 (49.3%) respondents stated that they had decided. Of these 33 families, 18 (54.5%) had decided upon a definite time to make their purchase.

More clothes washers and washer-dryer combinations were planned as future purchases than any other item. The second most frequently planned future purchase was an automobile, followed by furniture, color television, stereo, and range. Items planned for by only one family each were refrigerator, freezer, vacuum cleaner, lawn mower, motorcycle, extension for a mobile home, and luggage trailer.

Saving money was the means being used by 22 (51.2%) of the 43 families who had made long-range plans to obtain their planned future purchase. Twenty (46.5%) families were window shopping, 13 (30.2%) families were studying pamphlets, advertisements, and consumers magazines, and one (2.3%) family was looking for a suitable model. Five (11.6%) families stated they were not doing anything at the present time but were anticipating the time they would finish their college education and have a higher income. One (2.3%) respondent indicated she was entering contests. Everyone who reported they were doing something to obtain their planned future purchases indicated they were actively doing something to make this a reality; no one indicated they were only hinting to be given the item they wanted. Several respondents reported doing several things simultaneously to obtain their planned future purchases. Four (9.3%) respondents did not answer this question.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary and Conclusions

This study was undertaken to gain some understanding of the manner a selected group of young homemakers perceived their family's decision-making in the purchase of household equipment and the factors they recognized as influencing their decisions. Following a review of literature related to the subject, the study was clarified and limited. An interview schedule that included both structured and open-end questions was developed and administered through personal interviews to 67 selected young homemakers whose husbands were full-time students at Oklahoma State University and were 18 through 25 years of age.

Of the 67 husbands, 48 were either seniors or graduate students. Fifty-one wives had attended college previously or were attending at the time of the study. Five had received a Bachelor's degree or Master's degree, and two were enrolled as graduate students.

Approximately half of the wives in the study were 19 to 21 years of age, and approximately half of the husbands were 23 to 25 years of age. The average age of the wives was 21.4 years and the average age of the husbands was 22.6 years.

More than half of the young homemakers had taken one or more home economics courses in senior high school, and two-fifths had taken

courses in one or more areas of home economics in college. Only four reported they had not received any formal training in home economics.

The majority of the wives had been married three years or less and had no children. More than three-fourths of the wives had been married three years or less, one-sixth had been married three to five years, and three had been married more than five years. More than one-fourth of the wives had children, and only four of these had more than one child.

The income of these families was from several sources including part-time and/or full-time employment of husbands and wives, assistance from parents, loans, scholarships, savings, farming and livestock, National Guard and Reserve pay, GI Bill, trust fund, and child support. The average monthly net income for 52 families was \$337.80. Slightly over half of these families did not receive assistance from parents. One-third did not receive more than one-fourth of their monthly income from parents. Assistance was received more often in the form of tuition and fees than in any other form.

An average of 4.3 items of the nine household items selected for this research had been acquired by the 67 families since marriage. The most frequently acquired items were the television and vacuum cleaner. Ownership of the other items listed, in order of frequency, was refrigerator, range, stereo or hi-fi, room air conditioner, clothes washer, sewing machine, and clothes dryer. Approximately one-third of the items acquired had been received as gifts, one-fourth had been purchased used, and two-fifths had been purchased new.

The interview schedule was completed in regard to their most recent purchase of one of the items listed by the 54 respondents who had purchased one or more of the selected items. Almost one-fourth of the

items of equipment purchased were televisions, one-fifth were stereos, one-sixth were room air conditioners, and another one-sixth were sewing machines. Approximately two-thirds were purchased new and one-third were purchased used.

Information-seeking activities included comparison shopping of stores and brands and obtaining available information concerning the item of equipment to be purchased. The majority of families shopped in one to three different stores, compared three or four brands, actually gave serious consideration to one or two brands, and made their purchase after not more than two shopping trips.

The majority referred to advertising and to friends as their major sources of information. Other selected sources of information to which they referred, in the order of use, were manufacturer's handouts, parents, magazine or newspaper articles, consumer publications, and home economics classes. Advertising and friends were considered among the major sources of information in studies made by Udell (33), Van Syckle (34), and Inman (11).

When the educational level of the wife was compared to the number of sources of information reported used, no difference was noted in the number of sources used by wives who had completed high school, who had received special training, who had attended or were attending college, or who had received Bachelor's degrees. An increase in the number of sources used was noted for those wives who were graduate students or who had received Master's degrees.

The families who had made a written comparison of the information they received also engaged in more information-seeking activities than did those families who had not made a written comparison. The seven

families who had made a written comparison reported a higher average number of sources of information used, number of stores shopped, and number of brands compared and considered.

The majority of families considered only new models of equipment in the low or medium price range. Slightly less than one-fifth considered only used models, and slightly more than one-fourth considered both new and used models. One-half of the families shopped for models in the low price range, and two-thirds in the medium price range; only eight families considered models in the high price range.

The planning period extended from one day to one year. Slightly less than one-fifth of the families purchased within one day of the time they had decided to acquire this item of equipment, slightly less than one-half within two weeks, and three-fourths within one month. These proportions are slightly lower than those reported by Udell (33); however, his study was limited to small appliances.

The purchase price of the 54 items of equipment varied from a low of \$17 to a high of \$900, although approximately half of the items cost \$100 or less, and three-fourths did not cost more than \$200. Apparently, the purchase price did not influence the length of time the purchase was considered. Van Scykle (34) reported similar findings in regard to the effect of price on planning.

Cash was preferred to credit as the method of payment for the items purchased. Slightly fewer than two-thirds of the families had planned to pay cash for their purchase before they began shopping and one-third had planned to use credit; two families had not decided upon the method of payment to use before they began shopping. This is a slightly higher rate of credit usage than that found by Goetz and

Hotchkiss (14). The purchase price was not related to the method of payment used other than in the lowest and highest price ranges. A higher percentage of items in the \$50 and under price range were purchased with cash and a higher percentage of items costing more than \$300 were purchased with credit.

Almost three-fifths of the respondents had the money available to make the purchase although the money may not have been saved specifically for that purpose. Eight respondents saved money specifically for that purpose, and another eight allocated part of their income regularly for major expenses. Seven had made special efforts to economize. This purchase did not represent a sacrifice nor was it considered a deprivation by the great majority of the respondents.

Two factors, price and brand reputation, were recognized by the respondents as having a major influence upon their purchase decision. These were also the two most important factors influencing selection of major household appliances in the study by Rose (27). Other factors, in order, were guarantee, general appearance, construction, special features, past experience, credit arrangements available, friends' recommendation, salesmen, advertising, parents' and relatives' recommendations, used appliance, color or finish, and consumers magazine ratings. The extent of influence of parents as a recognized factor influencing the purchase and as a source of information was not affected by whether or not the parents gave financial assistance.

Slightly over half of the respondents did not believe the most important reason for their purchase was that it was necessary to keep house or would result in a savings in time or money; the most important reason was that it was something they wanted, especially in the

acquisition of televisions, stereos, and air conditioners. Fourteen respondents believed their purchase was necessary to keep house, eight believed the purchase would result in a saving of money, and three thought their purchase would result in a saving of time. Only one respondent considered the fact that she was used to having it at her parents' house as the most important reason. However, the respondents avoided any inference that the extent of ownership by their friends influenced their decision to purchase.

No particular time or event was recognized as influencing the time of purchase by one-third of the respondents. A special sale was the stimulus for 15 families, a special occasion for six families, and money available for four families. Breakdown of existing equipment created a need situation for nine families; two respondents gave no reason.

Both shopping and purchase decisions were usually made by the husband and wife together. Shopping together was reported by slightly less than four-fifths of the respondents, and the purchase decision was made together by almost three-fifths. The respondents believed the husband and wife each were predominant in about half of the purchase decisions not made together. Studies made by Burchinal and Bauder (1) and by Wolgast (36) had similar findings although the husbands predominance was not as great in Wolgast's study.

Slightly more than half of the purchases were planned, and slightly less than half were made on impulse. However, all but two of the respondents indicated satisfaction with the way they had reached their decision to make the purchase; 15 reported they would do something differently the next time they made a major purchase.

The extent of long-range plans made for future purchases of household equipment was reported by each of the 67 respondents in the sample. Three-fifths had a long-range plan which they considered definite, and about half had decided upon their next major purchase. To carry out their long-range plan, half of the respondents who had such a plan reported they were saving money. Other families were window shopping, studying pamphlets, advertisements, and consumers magazines. Several families were waiting until they had completed their college education and had a higher income before carrying out their long-range plans.

#### Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this study, the writer recommends that further research be conducted with:

a. larger samples of the young married college student population. This could be done either on the Oklahoma State University campus or other campuses. Results could be compared and analyzed to validate the method and findings of the present study.

b. young families who are not college students to ascertain if patterns of decision-making reflect differences in educational level, socio-economic status, or occupational level.

c. both husband and wife included in the sample but participating separately to learn if and to what extent differences exist in their perception of their decision-making patterns.

d. homemakers representing other stages in the family life cycle. Decision-making in times of crises or following disruptive events might merit special investigation.



Each of the studies suggested as well as the one reported in this study should prove helpful to educators. Particularly in the areas of home management, family relations, and marketing, the teacher and the extension worker could find this information useful in curriculum and program planning.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Burchinal, Lee G. and Ward W. Bauder. Family Decision-Making and Role Patterns Among Iowa Farm and Nonfarm Families. Iowa: Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Station, Research Bulletin 528, 1964.
2. Cateora, Philip R. An Analysis of the Teen-Age Market. Texas: University of Texas, Bureau of Business Research, Studies in Marketing No. 7, 1963.
3. Christenson, Kay Hoff. "Economic Resources of Young Married Couples and Major Economic Contribution From Their Parents." (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Nebraska, 1965).
4. Clark, Alma Beth and Jean Warren. Economic Contributions Made to Newly Married Couples by Their Parents. New York: Agricultural Experiment Station, Memoir 382, May, 1963.
5. Consumer Buying Indicators. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-65, No. 17 (February 28, 1967).
6. Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966.
7. Drucker, Peter F. "Meet Tomorrow's Customer." Nation's Business, LI (June, 1963), 102-106.
8. Edwards, Kay Daun P. "Consumer Credit Knowledge and Credit Use in a Selected Group of Married Students Households at Utah State University." (unpublished Master's Thesis, Utah State University, 1964).
9. Evans, Franklin B. "Correlates of Automobile Shopping Behavior." Journal of Marketing, XXVI (October, 1962), 74-77.
10. Finance Facts Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Consumer Finance Association, 1966.
11. Ford, Roxanna R. and Lydia Inman. "Teaching of Household Equipment in High Schools." American Vocational Journal, XL (January, 1965), 22-23.
12. Gartner, Joseph, Lee Kolmer, and Ethel B. Jones. Consumer Decision Making. Iowa: Iowa State University, Consumer Marketing Bulletin I, November, 1960.

13. Gault, M. B., Jr. "A Matter of Price." Journal of Home Economics, LIV (September, 1962), 560-563.
14. Goetz, Helen M. and Alida Hotchkiss. Some Factors Influencing Decision-Making and Methods of Financing Selected Major Household Equipment by Arizona Families. Arizona: Agricultural Experiment Station, Report 228, 1965.
15. Gover, David A. "Money Management: Some Implications for Teaching." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVI (May, 1964), 231-233.
16. Guthrie, Lois Jane. "Factors Affecting the Perceived Financial Security of Twenty Urban Families, Lafayette, Indiana." (unpublished Master's Thesis, Purdue University, 1962).
17. Halliday, Jean. "A Conceptual System for Researching Decision-Making." Conceptual Frameworks: Process of Home Management. Proceedings of a Home Management Conference, Michigan State University, 1964.
18. Hillman, Christine. Factors Influencing the Lives of a Group of Young Farm Families. Ohio: Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Bulletin 750, September, 1954.
19. Home Economics New Directions. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association, 1959.
20. Katona, George. The Mass Consumption Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964.
21. Keith, Molly Jane. "Attitudes and Opinions of Selected Home Economics Majors as Related to Household Equipment." (unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1966).
22. Lamale, Helen H. "Workers' Wealth and Family Living Standards." Monthly Labor Review, LXXXVI (June, 1963), 676-686.
23. Liston, Margaret I. "Selected Interaction Processes Involved in Management by the Family Unit." Conceptual Frameworks: Process of Home Management. Proceedings of a Home Management Conference, Michigan State University, 1964.
24. Manning, Sarah L. and Mary Allen Gayle. Relationship of Family Life Cycle Definitions to Family Financial Activities. Indiana: Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Progress Report 270, October, 1966.
25. Merriam, Oreana. "How Young Families Spend Their Money." Journal of Home Economics, XLVII (May, 1955), 330-332.
26. Mueller, Eva. "A Study of Purchase Decisions." Consumer Behavior. Ed. Lincoln H. Clark. New York: New York University Press, 1955, 36-87.

27. Rose, Eithel Bray. "A Study of the Factors Influencing Selection and Satisfactions in the Use of Major Household Appliances as Indicated by Three Selected Groups of Married Women Graduates of Ohio State University." (unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1959).
28. Schlesinger, Benjamin. "Development of Interspousal Participation in Decision Making of College Educated Couples." (unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Cornell University, 1961).
29. Schubert, Genevieve Weber. "A Survey of the Problems and Needs of Young Homemakers With Implications for Home Economics at the High School Level." (unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1958).
30. Simon, Herbert A. Models of Man. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.
31. "Statistical Report." Merchandising Week, XCIX (January 30, 1967).
32. Strickling, Harry L. "Implications of the Existence of Consumers Union for Marketers of Major Appliances and Related to Consumer Durables." (unpublished Master's Thesis, New York University, 1965).
33. Udell, Jon G. "Prepurchase Behavior of Buyers of Small Electrical Appliances." Journal of Marketing, XXX (October, 1966), 50-52.
34. Van Syckle, Calla. Practices Followed by Consumers in Buying "Large-Expenditure" Items of Clothing, Furniture, and Equipment. Michigan: Agricultural Experiment Station, Technical Bulletin 224, June, 1951.
35. Wallach, Amei. "Young America is Three Markets." Merchandising Week, XCIX (March 6, 1967), 13-16.
36. Wolgast, Elizabeth H. "Do Husbands or Wives Make the Purchasing Decisions?" Journal of Marketing, XXIII (October, 1958), 151-158.

APPENDIX A

## INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. In column 1 check the items of household equipment you have acquired since marriage. In column 2 check whether you received it as a gift or purchased it new or used.

Household Equipment	Column 1 Items I Have	Column 2	
		Recd. as Gift	Purchased New    Used
Clothes Dryer			
Clothes Washer			
Range			
Refrigerator			
Room air-conditioner			
Sewing machine			
Stereo or Hi-fi			
Television set			
Vacuum cleaner			

2. Which item from the list above have you purchased most recently?
- 

QUESTIONS 3 THROUGH 23 ARE TO BE ANSWERED ABOUT THIS "MOST RECENT PURCHASE." If you have not made a recent purchase of one of the above, turn to Question 24.

3. Approximately how long ago did you make this purchase?  
Weeks \_\_\_\_\_, months \_\_\_\_\_, years \_\_\_\_\_.
4. Approximately how much did this item cost? \$ \_\_\_\_\_
5. Please check any special help you received in making this purchase choice. Check if you obtained this information before you actually began shopping or during the time you were shopping. Be sure to check all sources of information that you used to help you to decide on the item purchased.

Source of Information	Obtained	
	Before shopping	During shopping
Advertising		
Consumer publications		
Extension publications		
Friends		
Home economics classes		
Magazine or newspaper articles		
Manufacturer's handouts		
Parents		

6. How many stores did you shop in before buying? \_\_\_\_\_
7. How many different brands did you look at? \_\_\_\_\_  
How many of these did you actually consider? \_\_\_\_\_
8. What price range(s) did you consider? Low \_\_\_\_\_, Medium \_\_\_\_\_, High \_\_\_\_\_.

9. Did you shop for used models? \_\_\_\_\_ New models? \_\_\_\_\_ Both? \_\_\_\_\_
10. Did you or your husband make a written comparison of the different models and brands you had looked at? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
11. Do you believe you had sufficient information on which to make a satisfactory decision? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
12. Which of the following factors influenced you the most in selecting this item? From those listed below, indicate by number the five you think were most important in the order of importance with 1 as most important to you, 2 next in importance, etc.
- |   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. Advertising                                    | Order of Importance |
| 2. Friends' recommendation                        |                     |
| 3. Brand reputation                               | _____ 1st           |
| 4. Parents' recommendation                        |                     |
| 5. Store salesmen                                 | _____ 2nd           |
| 6. Relatives' (other than parents) recommendation |                     |
| 7. Consumers magazine ratings                     | _____ 3rd           |
| 8. Price  |                     |
| 9. Credit arrangements available                  | _____ 4th           |
| 10. Guarantee                                     |                     |
| 11. General appearance                            | _____ 5th           |
| 12. Color or finish                               |                     |
| 13. Size  |                     |
| 14. Construction                                  |                     |
| 15. Special features                              |                     |
| 16. Used appliance                                |                     |
| 17. Past experience                               |                     |
13. Did you purchase the item on your first shopping trip? \_\_\_\_\_, 2nd trip \_\_\_\_\_, 3rd trip \_\_\_\_\_, later trips \_\_\_\_\_.
14. How long do you think it was from the time you decided to buy this item until you actually did purchase it? \_\_\_\_\_
15. Did you and your husband shop together? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
16. Who do you think made the decision to purchase this particular item?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Wife only                      \_\_\_\_\_ Together but wife primarily  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Husband only                  \_\_\_\_\_ Together but husband primarily  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Together
17. Which of these statements best describes the way the decision was made?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ It seemed to fit in with the long-range plans we had made before.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ We thought it over seriously for a long time.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ We gave serious thought to it but made the decision in a hurry.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ It was not something we had planned but it seemed like the best thing to do at the time.
18. Before you shopped had you decided how you would pay for it? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 If yes: Cash \_\_\_\_\_ Credit \_\_\_\_\_  
 If you had decided to use credit, had you decided beforehand on the size of payments you could make? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

19. Money for this purchase was available because we  
 \_\_\_\_\_ had saved for this purpose.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ had money available to use, although not necessarily for this purpose.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ allocate a certain portion of our income regularly for major expenses.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ made or are making special efforts to economize and do without some things to obtain it.
20. Did any particular situation influence the time you purchased?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Gift of money  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Income tax return  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Special occasion, as birthday or Christmas  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Special sale  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Breakdown of existing equipment  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other. Specify \_\_\_\_\_
21. Why did you think it was important to have this piece of household equipment?  
 Check the most important reason.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Save money by having it  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Save time by having it  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Necessary to keep house  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Use to having it at parent's house  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Something I (or we) wanted very much
22. At the time you purchased this item, about how many of your friends had one? Few \_\_\_\_\_, About half \_\_\_\_\_, Almost all \_\_\_\_\_.
23. As you think back, are you pleased with the way you reached the decision to make this purchase? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 Would you do anything differently the next time you make a major purchase?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
24. Do you and your husband have a plan for your future major purchases?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 If yes: Do you feel the plan is definite and you will carry it out?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
25. Have you and your husband decided yet on your next major purchase?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 If yes: What will it be? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Have you decided on a definite time to purchase it? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
26. If you answered Question 24 yes, what are you doing now to obtain it?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Saving money  
 \_\_\_\_\_ "Window" shopping  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Studying pamphlets, advertisements, etc.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Hinting about it for a gift  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Entering contests  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Nothing in particular  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other. Specify \_\_\_\_\_



## DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION NEEDED FOR ANALYSIS OF DATA

1. How long have you been married?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 3-5 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 3 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 years or more
  
2. How is your husband classified in college?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Freshman	Graduate:
<input type="checkbox"/> Sophomore	<input type="checkbox"/> Masters
<input type="checkbox"/> Junior	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
<input type="checkbox"/> Senior	
  
3. Are you presently enrolled in college? Yes  No
  
4. What is the highest level of education you have obtained?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Completed High School	College:
<input type="checkbox"/> Special training other than college	<input type="checkbox"/> Freshman
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sophomore
	<input type="checkbox"/> Junior
	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior
	<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelors Degree
	<input type="checkbox"/> Graduate
	<input type="checkbox"/> Masters Degree
  
5. Is your husband employed? Yes  No   
 If yes: Part time  Full time
  
6. Are you employed? Yes  No   
 If yes: Part time  Full time
  
7. Do you and your husband receive financial assistance from parents?  
 Yes  No   
 If yes: Regularly , Tuition, fees , Gifts  As needed
  
8. Do you have any other source of income? Yes  No   
 If yes:
  - GI Bill
  - Loan
  - Savings
  - Scholarship
  - Other. Specify \_\_\_\_\_
  
9. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_ Husband's age? \_\_\_\_\_
  
10. Do you have any children? Yes  No  If yes: Number \_\_\_\_\_
  
11. Indicate the extent of your home economics training by checking one or more of the following:
  - None
  - Junior High School
  - Senior High School
  - 4-H Club
  - College or University
  - Number of home economics hours taken in college \_\_\_\_\_

Addition to Interview Schedule - Descriptive Information

Following Question 7 in regard to financial assistance received from parents, this question was added:

Approximately what per cent of your total monthly income does this represent?

An additional question was also included following Question 8:

Approximately what is the net income you and your husband receive per month?

APPENDIX B

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**

Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics  
FR 2-6211, Ext. 342

Dear Student Wife:

As a graduate student I am conducting a study in the area of Home Management. Your name has been selected as one of the persons with whom I would like to visit.

The questions asked are not personal in nature and will take only a few minutes of your time. Your answers will be considered as confidential information. The results of the study will be used as the basis for my master's thesis.

I will visit you during this next week. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

*Glenna Lackey*  
Glenna Lackey

*Florence McKinney*  
Dr. Florence McKinney  
Adviser

VITA

Glenna Durrill Lackey

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

**Thesis:** DECISION-MAKING PERCEIVED BY YOUNG HOMEMAKERS IN THEIR  
PURCHASE OF SELECTED HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

**Major Field:** Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, July 21, 1938,  
the daughter of Glenn W. and Pansy Durrill.

**Education:** Attended public schools in Bartlesville, Oklahoma,  
and graduated from College High School in May, 1956; received  
the Associate of Arts degree from Oklahoma Christian College  
in May, 1958; received the Bachelor of Science degree in  
Home Economics Education from Abilene Christian College in  
May, 1960; completed the requirements for a Master of Science  
degree in July, 1967.

**Professional Experience:** Served as Assistant and Home Demonstra-  
tion Agent in counties in the Southeastern District of  
Oklahoma, 1960 to 1965; taught Vocational Home Economics in  
Cushing High School, Cushing, Oklahoma, 1965 to 1966.

**Professional Organizations:** Omicron Nu; Kappa Delta Pi; Alpha  
Chi; Oklahoma Association of Extension Home Economics;  
Oklahoma Education Association; Business and Professional  
Women's Club.