DECISION-MAKING STYLES OF TWO SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS OF HOMEMAKERS

> Thesis for the Degree of M. A. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY M. Janice Hogan 1965

THESIS LIERARY Michiga: State University 3 1293 10211 9884

ROOM USE ONLY

DEC JU 971#274 7 .7.5 138 R58 0 1981 JUN 2 0 0

319

ABSTRACT

DECISION-MAKING STYLES OF TWO SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS OF HOMEMAKERS

by M. Janice Hogan

Decision-making styles of two socio-economic groups of homemakers were analyzed to determine if there were significant differences and similarities in the dimensions of elements used to make decisions. The model through which decision-making behavior was studied was conceptualized by Bustrillos (1).

Three elements were considered significant indicants for determining decision-making style; mode, time reference, and decision-making rule. Mode, the distinctive way of developing ideas, had three dimensions: hypothetical, factual, and action-suggestive. The dimensions of time reference were past, present and future. Decision-making rule, the method of evaluating alternatives, also had three dimensions: preference ranking, objective elimination, and immediate closure.

Data were collected through personal interviews with forty-two homemakers in two socio-economic groups. The verbal responses to three managerial problems were subjected to content analysis.

M. Janice Hogan

In comparing the two socio-economic groups, there were significant differences in their style of decision-making. The lower socio-economic group expressed an action-suggestive mode while the upper socio-economic group were factual in mode. In decision-making rule, the lower socio-economic group arrived at closure most frequently by preference ranking or immediate closure; the upper socio-economic group most often used objective elimination.

Both socio-economic groups used the past dimension of time reference most frequently. This similarity in decisionmaking style between socio-economic groups indicates that a major source of information is from past experience.

Individual homemakers in both socio-economic groups were inconsistent in their style of decision-making. Of the twenty-seven possible decision-making styles, twenty-four emerged in response to the managerial problems. Thus, the interrelationship of elements varied with homemakers and problems.

¹Bustrillos, Nena Rola. "Decision-Making Styles of Selected Mexican Homemakers." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.

DECISION-MAKING STYLES OF TWO SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUPS OF HOMEMAKERS

By

.... M. JANICE HOGAN

A THESIS

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Home Management and Child Development

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer of this thesis is indebted to Dr. Carol W. Shaffer, Dr. Beatrice Paolucci, and Dr. Mason E. Miller, members of her committee.

There is a particular debt of gratitude to Dr. Shaffer, committee chairman, for her guidance, support and generous cooperation. Dr. Paolucci, from whom much of the student's knowledge can be traced, inspired and encouraged her to undertake the present study. And, Dr. Miller furnished valuable suggestions for improving the scope and content of the research.

An acknowledgment is extended to Dr. Frances M. Magrabi for guidance in statistical analysis, and to Mrs. Edna Rogers for support and guidance in social stratification and interviewing procedures.

Appreciation is also expressed to the following fellow graduate students who served on a reliability panel: Anne Marvin, Alice Morrow, and Loretto Onorato.

Finally, the author wishes to express appreciation to the Cooperative Extension of New York State and Clinton County for granting a sabbatical leave for graduate study.

ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv

Chapter

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
III.	METHODOLOGY	21
IV.	DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE	36
V •	FINDINGS	54
VI.	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	69
LITERATUR	E CITED	76
APPENDIX	I • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	79
APPENDIX	II	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Marital Status of Homemakers by Socio-Economic Group	36
2.	Ages of Homemakers by Socio-Economic Group	37
3.	Education of Husbands by Socio-Economic Group.	38
4.	Education of Homemakers by Socio-Economic Group	39
5.	Money Income Level of Families by Socio- Economic Group	40
6.	Occupational Status of the Husbands by Socio- Economic Group	41
7.	Social Class Level as Determined by the Prestige Value of Husbands' Occupation	43
8.	Present Occupation of the Homemakers by Socio- Economic Group	45
9.	Occupation of the Homemaker Before Marriage	45
10.	Number of Children per Homemaker by Socio- Economic Group	46
11.	Age of the Youngest Child in the Family by Socio-Economic Group	47
12.	Organizational Affiliation by Socio-Economic Group	48
13.	Type of Organizational Affiliation by Socio- Economic Group	49
14.	Role of Organization-Affiliated Members by Socio-Economic Group	50

Table

•

15.	Geographic Mobility by Socio-Economic Group 1955-65	51
16.	Religious Affiliation of Homemakers by Socio- Economic Group	52
17.	Mode Dimension-Responses by Socio-Economic Group	55
18.	Mode-Response to Problem A by Socio-Economic Group	57
19.	Mode-Response to Problem B by Socio-Economic Group	58
20.	Mode-Response to Problem C by Socio-Economic Group	58
21.	Time Reference in Responses by Socio-Economic Group	59
22.	Decision-Making Rule in Responses by Socio- Economic Group	61
23.	Decision-Making Rule in Response to Problem A by Socio-Economic Group	63
24.	Decision-Making Rule in Response to Problem B by Socio-Economic Group	64
25.	Decision-Making Rule in Response to Problem C by Socio-Economic Group	64
2 6.	Decision-Making Style of Homemakers by Socio- Economic Group	66
27.	Time Reference in Response to Problem A by Socio-Economic Group	85
28.	Time Reference in Response to Problem B by Socio-Economic Group	86
29.	Time Reference in Response to Problem C by Socio-Economic Group	87
30.	Decision-Making Style in Response to Each Decision Problem and According to Socio- Economic Group	88

× .

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Home management, as a field of study, is concerned with improving managerial behavior of families. This statement of purpose implies that we need to focus attention on how managers are, in fact, behaving under stated circumstances, and rules of behavior that managers should follow if they want to make the most of their situation.

According to Nielson (14), researchers involved in both theoretical and empirical work in management have given too much attention to rules of behavior and too little attention to actual behavior. Hence, strong predications about human behavior have been made without performing the hard work of observing families in their social setting.

A model through which decision-making of the individual can be studied was conceptualized by Bustrillos (16). She hypothesized decision-making styles, or behavioral profiles, which are composed of elements of the individual's over-all decision-making behavior. By determining the styles by which decisions are made, a base is formulated from which the consequences of using a particular style can be studied. If decision-making behavior were known, home management spec-

ialists would be in a better position to prescribe change in decision-making procedure to improve managerial behavior.

Since Bustrillos' conceptualization is unique and admittedly exploratory in its approach, there is need to test the generalizations of her conclusions by further study of the population.

Objective

The objective in this study was to analyze the decision-making styles of two socio-economic groups to determine if there were significant differences in the dimensions of elements used to make decisions. Differences and similarities in the over-all decision-making style were compared in two socio-economic groups.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework in this study is replicated from Bustrillos' study (16). She viewed decision-making as a process in resolving conflict.

Three components of the decision process were identified: movement, relationship, and discrimination. Although these components cannot be directly observed, they are manifested as a working unit in an individual's verbalized behavior. Therefore, it seems possible for a person's behavior to be studied and analyzed according to verbal responses.

Style

Decision-making style is the pattern of behavior which an individual expresses. The pattern becomes a decision-maker's creative product as he attempts to recognize demands from the environment and blends these with his own needs and desires. His style may not be consistently the same, but in his day to day deciding he develops patterns which are distinctly his own.

Bustrillos conceptualized three behavioral or style elements as indicants of an individual's decision-making process. These elements are mode, time reference, and decision-making rule. According to Bustrillos (16:5), not one of these behavioral elements is altogether independent of the other components. Each style element manifests all three components in varying degrees. She cited the example that mode, as an element of style, expresses all three components of process: relationship, movement, and discrimination, but emphasizes relationship. Time reference as an element of style also expresses the three process components with a focus on movement. Likewise, decision-making rule expresses all three process components, with an emphasis on discrimination.

Therefore, to insure the sufficient inclusion of all of the components of decision-making process, Bustrillos used all three elements in determining style.

4

Elements of decision-making style

Three elements were considered significant indicants for determining decision-making style; mode, time reference, and decision-making rule. Bustrillos described the characteristics and dimensions of each element.

Mode

Mode is the distinctive way of developing ideas in a decision situation. How ideas are brought into the process and how they are structurally related to each other is indicative of how a decision proceeds. According to Bustrillos, mode is the expressive component of decisionmaking style which is not premeditated. It shows how ideas are developed, analyzed, classified, and then related to the decision-making problem. The content of ideas themselves is not of importance in determining mode; rather, it is how the ideas are stated that is important. Three modes were identified: hypothetical, factual, and actionsuggestive.

<u>Hypothetical mode</u>. - When ideas are stated conditionally, conjecturally, or doubtfully, the mode is considered hypothetical. This relationship to certain conditions makes the action hypothetical.

<u>Factual mode</u>. - When ideas about things observed, sensed, or apprehended are stated conclusively, unqualified by anything, then the mode is factual. No explicit or verbal relations between ideas or action and consequences is given in factual mode.

<u>Action-suggestive mode</u>. - When action is directly suggested in a statement, the mode is action-suggestive. These suggestions may either assert or negate action, or may take the seemingly safe road to inaction. The actions may be either manipulative or adaptive. Action verbs distinguish this type of mode.

Time Reference

No decision is independent of time. Therefore, one must be able to perceive events and phenomena in a time relationship. According to Bustrillos' conceptualization, reference to a time base gives meaning and continuity to events. This element becomes evident as a person makes decisions. Time was classified as future, past, or present.

<u>Future reference</u>. - Reference to what might come or might happen in the immediate future or in a long range view is future-based.

<u>Past reference</u>. - Reference to tradition, habitual behavior and experience by one's self or as recounted by others is considered past reference.

<u>Present reference</u>. - When behavior is based on what is on-going but not habitual, on what is felt and thought at the moment, on present needs, and on situations obtaining

at the moment decisions, it is classified as present reference.

Decision-Making Rule

The third element of decision-making style that Bustrillos proposed is decision-making rule. It consists of methods by which alternative courses of action are evaluated with the corresponding determinant or base for selecting one alternative. It, therefore, is supposed to come after a set of alternatives has been perceived.

The description of the overall procedure verbalized by the homemaker as she arrived at the "best" alternative is the decision-making rule. This procedure could have been preceded by a series of decisions and backed by certain experiences, the determination of which is beyond the scope of this research.

Through a decision-making rule, the homemaker is able to differentiate alternatives and then arrive at a decision or discriminatory point. This phase of decisionmaking style concerns the evaluation of alternatives and the method of arriving at a final choice. Three decisionmaking dimensions have been identified: preference ranking, objective elimination, and immediate closure.

<u>Preference ranking</u>. - Alternatives perceived are evaluated and placed in order from best to worst according to a subjectively defined criterion. The placement in such an order when consistent with what the homemakers would do and would not do if confronted with the same situation is defined as preference ranking. The best alternative is subjectively determined, and the base used is considered constant. There is persistency in what is considered the best choice.

Objective elimination. - Choices are immediately recognized as based on the limits imposed by the environment. No one best alternative is consistently chosen; the "best" depends on the conditions obtaining. Adapting to the changing conditions in the environment becomes the base of choice.

No personal identification is evident, only detachment. The manner of verbalizing, therefore, becomes very objective. Unless forced by the situation, closure is not readily made; rather deliberation and weighing "take time."

<u>Immediate closure</u>. - Only one action becomes the focus. The alternative is immediately grasped without explicitly going through ranking or weighing. The process is quick and analysis and reasoning come after making the choice. No other alternative is mentioned although one could have been unconsciously eliminated.

Hypotheses

1. Homemakers in the lower socio-economic group will use factual mode, present time preference, and preference ranking in over half of their responses to decision problems, and thus will have the foregoing style of decision-making.

2. Homemakers in the upper socio-economic group will use hypothetical mode, future time reference, and objective elimination in over half of their responses to decision problems, and thus will have the foregoing style of decision-making.

Assumption

The decision-making style of homemakers can be identified by verbal responses to hypothetical decision problems.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This research views the decision-making process; hence, the review of literature was limited to studies related to decision-making and focused on decision process.

Decision Studies in Home Management

Behavioral theory has received the attention of researchers in the discipline of home management. In 1963, Bustrillos (16) conceptualized a model for exploring decision-making styles. She defined a decision-making style as the behavioral profile resulting from the combination of the dimensions of three elements; mode, time reference, and decision-making rule. The dimensions of mode: hypothetical, factual, and action-suggestive; of time reference: future, past, and present; and of decision-making rule: preference ranking, objective elimination, and immediate closure, were expected to combine into a style of decision-making.

Data were collected in personal interviews with sixteen Mexican homemakers using hypothetical problems to elicit information about decision-making style. These data were subjected to content analysis using pre-established categories, and were then analyzed for decision-making styles.

It was predicted that three decision-making styles would emerge: 1) the hypothetical style, consisting of the combination of hypothetical mode, future time reference, and preference ranking; 2) the factual style, consisting of the factual mode, past reference, and objective elimination; and, 3) the action style, consisting of action-suggestive mode, present time reference, and immediate closure. The decision-making styles varied much more than those predicted. Only one of the predicted styles, the factual style, emerged.

Findings indicated that the elements of decision style were identifiable in the decision protocol. Of the three modes, the factual mode emerged most frequently, the hypothetical, least frequently. Of the three time references, the present dominated the past and the future in most responses. Of the decision-making rule, preference ranking was used most frequently.

According to Bustrillos. the decision-making styles varied with homemakers and problems, and subsequently, more than one style emerged for fifteen of the sixteen homemakers. However, the elemental dimensions factual, present, and preference ranking recurred at least twice in responses of more than half of the homemakers.

The significance of this research appears to be the recognition and attempt to study other ways of making decisions than the normative style, which assumes that the models of economic man postulated by traditional economic

theory are applicable. According to Nielson (14:1251), normative models assume an economic man who is rational, has considerable knowledge, a well organized and stable system of preferences ordered at least in ordinal terms, and chooses to maximize profits, utility, et cetera. Models based on maximization may be inappropriate for studying decision-making in families since there may be multiple and shifting goals, and multiple and shifting means for attaining goals. Bustrillos explored the idea that individuals approach decision-making uniquely, implying that there is more than one style of decision-making.

In 1964, Rivenes (20) replicated Bustrillos' study using written reports of thirty-six students enrolled in a college decision-making course. Students were assigned to reconstruct recent decision situations. Coding criteria, modified from the Bustrillos study, were used. Each response was analyzed for evidence of decision-making elemental dimensions. A frequency score was devised to tabulate the number of times each dimension appeared in the written decision situation.

Rivenes reported that the dimensions, factual mode and present time reference, dominated the two elements. These findings supported the Bustrillos study. However, in the Rivenes study, the element of decision-making rule did not appear frequently enough to be analyzed.

Another researcher, Velasco (21), investigated financial decisions in five Filipino families, attempting to analyze their decision-making style according to the behavioral model conceptualized by Bustrillos. In this exploratory study of decision-making in the use of money, responses to hypothetical problems did not elicit data necessary for analyzing process.

Velasco reported, however, that the alternatives verbalized were confined mostly to one action or inaction, and that legitimizing was not common among the lower income Filipino families that she interviewed. Thus, decisionmaking within the families studied did not fall into the highly rational normative concept of "seeking alternatives, thinking through alternatives, and choosing one alternative."

Rationality of the decision procedure was viewed by Halliday (19) in a study of a decision event. She proposes that rationality of the decision procedure and the importance of the decision as perceived by the decision-maker are related. The importance which the respondents, sixty student wives, attached to the decision appeared to be the most significant variable influencing the amount of reasoning, weighing, and information-using that decision-makers were willing to do in thinking through the decision situation.

Related Research

Decision-making research has been conducted in many of the supporting disciplines of home management. However, focus has been on normative rather than behavioral theory. Both uses of theory are relevant and important in understanding and improving managerial behavior.

Brim, Glass, Lavin, and Goodman (1:9) surveyed the literature on the phases of decision process and proposed six phases: 1) identification of the problem; 2) obtaining necessary information; 3) production of possible solutions; 4) evaluation of such solutions; 5) selection of a strategy for performance; and 6) actual performance of an action or actions, and subsequent learning and revision. They stated that every decision need not involve all of the phases; some problems may not require new information, or in others the alternatives may be given.

In a study of approximately 100 lower and middle socio-economic couples, Brim and associates found that the respondents did not reach what is commonly regarded as optimal rationality. Decision-makers may exhibit different degrees of rationality in each of the six major phases according to the way in which each operation is performed. They also cited significant individual differences in the way in which decisions were made and in the degree to which the decisions approximated the normative model.

The analyses for the differing social class and sex groups showed that the structure of the decision process was similar for all groups of subjects. The one difference reported by Brim and co-researchers was that the lower-class women differed from both their husbands and the middle-class couples in that they considered the more immediate and optimistic outcomes of their behavior, rather than the future and possibly undesirable consequences of their actions.

The researchers in the foregoing study sought for relationships among over fifty variables tested. Because their study was exploratory and included many variables, the complex conclusions provide only a guide for further research.

Variations in the normative model have been theorized by Simon (8:261). He proposes a model of decisionmaking which postulates an "approximate" rationality in which decision-makers adapt well enough to "satisfice"; they do not, in general, "optimize." He suggested that alternatives are chosen by either of two mechanisms: that of the aspiration level principle or a persistence mechanism.

According to Simon, the aspiration level which defines a satisfactory alternative, may change and thus not all alternatives will be examined. The first satisfactory alternative may be chosen. His second mechanism, that of persistence, suggests that the adjustments are made in the set of alternatives considered. When satisfactory alterna-

tives are easily discovered, the set of alternatives narrows; and if difficulty arises in finding satisfactory alternatives, then the set of alternatives broadens. This implies that the decision-maker satisfices.

Studies by Festinger (4) have focused on the behavior in the pre-decision and post-decision periods. He posed the question, "What is the person doing during the time it takes to make a decision that enables him to make the decision and determines what the decision is?"

In the pre-decision period, Festinger proposes that the decision-makers gather information and evaluate the alternatives in an impartial and objective manner. Although changes in the attractiveness of the alternatives may occur during this pre-decision period, the decision-makers do not bias their evaluations in favor of the to-be-chosen alternative. He supports the foregoing proposal by reporting several experiments.

The first experiment, by Jecker (5:65-83), supplies data showing that before the decision is made the decisionmaker spends equal amounts of time reading favorable and unfavorable information about the alternative he eventually chooses. In other experiments, Davidson and Kiesler (2:10-21) and Jecker (5:21-32) presented data which revealed that throughout the pre-decision period there is no noticeable divergence in the attractiveness of the two alternatives involved in the decision.

Even though the experiments revealed the predecision period to be a very passive and rational process, Festinger has observed that occasionally, and perhaps frequently, decisions are made on a rather impulsive basis. He suggests that such impulsive decisions may be made when the information-gathering process seems almost endless, or as a means of avoiding a situation that is viewed as difficult.

Bustrillos (16) considered the rather impulsive dimension of decision-making style and termed it immediate closure. It appeared to her that the chosen alternative is immediately grasped without going through order ranking or elimination of alternatives.

Studies comparing the pre-decision and post-decision behavior have disclosed different theoretical positions. Brehm (9), Brehm and Cohen (10), and Brock (11) have reported that the amount of conflict in choosing among alternatives before the choice is related to the dissonance experienced after the decision. Hence, the more difficulty the person had in making the decision, the greater would be his tendency to justify that decision in the post-decision period.

In Festinger's theoretical position, the implication is that the divergence of the attractiveness of the alternatives occurs only after the decision has been made, and not before. If the post-decision processes are dynamically different from the pre-decision processes, and the act of making a decision is viewed as more complex, then the theoreti-

cal framework for studying decision process is more complex. However, if the same cognitive processes occur both before and after a decision, a relatively simple theoretical framework capable of dealing with the entire process can be used for studying decision-making processes.

Regardless of the differences and similarities in decision periods or in process steps, Brim and co-researchers (1:11) state that there are certain general intellectual functions evident in the process. He identifies functions such as insight, judgment, and intelligence in each phase of the decision.

Research reports on insight present data on all phases of the decision process, including sudden identification of the problem, sudden recognition of a probable solution, and so on. Judgment, as viewed by Brim and coresearchers, could refer to how one selects sources of evidence pertinent to the problem, or the degree to which one makes logical deductions from premises in formulating hypotheses, or with how rationally one orders the alternatives.

Intelligence, the third general intellectual function inherent in decision-making process, has been defined as a measure of problem-solving capacity of a person. Brim and co-researchers proposed the possibility of a general intelligence test which deals with the use of information, the evaluation of the information received, originality, and similar components.

Measurement of Decision-Making Process

Researchers have been concerned with the technical problem of measurement in decision-making process. The question becomes one of how to combine the various aspects of the decision situation into a single measure of utility and relating the measurement to the contribution of management to the family unit.

According to Festinger (4:61-5), measurement of the details of an ongoing cognitive process is a problem for decision theorists. It would appear that if researchers want to know what is going on in the mind of a person making a decision, all they have to do is ask him the appropriate questions at the appropriate times.

Festinger cited the example of a researcher wanting to know whether a person is appraising a piece of information critically or favorably. He suggested that the researcher could interrupt the person while he is in the process of considering the information and ask him how he has been viewing it and what his thought processes were. However, data obtained in this manner are of doubtful validity.

First, Festinger stated that it is difficult to ask meaningful questions without putting thoughts into the person's mind which were not there before. And, it is probably not possible to interrupt the thinking process without interfering with it and distorting it. The very process of

questioning a person about his thought processes makes him self-conscious about them, brings to the foreground values concerning rationality and orderliness, and perhaps even changes the content of his cognition toward considerations that are more easily verbalized.

According to Festinger, until someone discovers a way to tap the cognitive process without interfering with it, we must rely mainly on observation of behavior during the process and on measurement of predicted end results of the hypothesized process.

Bustrillos (16:125-26) recognized limitations in using verbal responses to hypothetical problems in order to analyze decision-making processes. She suggested that the respondents might not have thought aloud throughout the interview, that they tended to edit what they verbalized, or that some did not know how to verbalize what they had in mind and, therefore, did not reveal all of their thought processes. Furthermore, she suggested that their own mental processes might have been too quick for them to verbalize.

The type of problem used to elicit responses was found to be very important in studying the decision-making process. According to Bustrillos, the respondent must identify with the decision problem in order to elicit data for content analysis. She interviewed the homemakers in the sample to collect background information before developing the hypothetical decision problems.

In addition, Bustrillos proposed that the nature of the problematic situations used in studying decision-making process cover a wide range and kind of situations which the respondent meets. The results of her study. as well as those of Halliday's (19), suggest that the nature of the problem might affect the use of elements and eventually the resulting style of decision-making.

Although exploratory in nature, Bustrillos' study demonstrated the feasibility and productivity of an unique approach to studying decision-making processes in home management.

On the basis of the findings in Bustrillos' study of Mexican homemakers, decision-making style for the lower socio-economic group was hypothesized - that is, factual mode, present time reference and preference ranking. It was hypothesized that the upper socio-economic group of homemakers would use normative elements because of their higher level of education. Thus, hypothetical mode, future time reference and objective elimination were predicted for this group.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This comparative and descriptive study is essentially a replicate study of Bustrillos' thesis, "Decision-Making Styles of Selected Mexican Homemakers." (16) In this chapter, the procedures for selecting the sample, collecting the data, using the instrument and making the analysis are described.

Selecting the Sample

The sample consisted of forty-two homemakers, equally divided into lower and upper socio-economic groups. According to Bustrillos (16:127), the study of decision-making style needed to be expanded to include a more heterogeneous group than she studied. She further stated that a larger sample would not only test the wider applicability of the conceptual framework, but also would allow for comparisons of decision-making styles between and among groups.

Homemakers were chosen as respondents because it was thought that common managerial problems could be provided as a stimuli to elicit responses. The sample of homemakers was chosen by the following criteria: 1) could be classified in lower and upper socio-economic strata, 2) living within one

of two geographic areas, 3) could be located and reached for interviewing by the researcher in a designated period of time, and 4) were willing to cooperate in the study.

The first criterion defines the socio-economic groups included in the study: lower and upper strata. The lower social class level was chosen in an effort to contribute to a greater understanding of this group which is of concern in America. According to Greenwood (18:1), understanding low socio-economic families is the subject of legislation at state and federal levels; focal point for editorials, stories and reports in our media of communication; and the concern of a wide array of organizations and agencies in developing programs.

The upper socio-economic stratum was selected in order to compare similarities and differences among and between social class levels.

College students were excluded from the study on the basis that their socio-economic class level would not be stable and could not be accurately assessed by occupation, the indicator for level of social class.

The second criterion specified that all of the respondents must reside within one of two geographic areas and not scattered over a large area. The residence criterion was established to aid in control of socio-economic class.

Choosing the Sample

The Institute of Community Development in Michigan State University provided a map of census tracts in Lansing, Michigan, on which were marked the areas of highest and lowest percentages of families with incomes of less than \$3,000 in 1959. Following the suggestion of a demographer at the Institute,* the researcher toured several of the census tract areas to observe housing and select a sample of streets for further population study.

A twenty-four block portion of the census tract with the highest percentage of families with incomes less than \$3,000, according to the 1960 census (15:73), was selected as a potential area for the lower socio-economic sample. Similarly, a twenty block portion of the census tract with one of the lowest percentages of families with incomes less than \$3,000 was chosen as a potential area for the upper socio-economic sample.

The occupations of residents living in the selected census tract areas were recorded as listed in the 1964 Lansing City Directory. (13) The North-Hatt Scale (17:3-21) was used to score the occupations according to prestige value and to determine the social class level. Occupational scores for the lower stratum ranged between forty and fifty-

^{*}John F. Thaden, Professor and Demographer, Institute of Community Development, Michigan State University.

nine points; the upper stratum scored above seventy points. Thus, a minimum of ten points separates the two groups on the prestige value of their occupation.

Some methods of assessing social status are involved and tedious and require more information than could be obtained through public records. There is, however, rather general agreement that social status can be approximated within relatively narrow limits of error by using occupation as the index of the family's social status.

In an article, Hyman said (12:12), "A review of literature on the measurement of social status indicated that of the many techniques for assessment of social status, the most widely accepted single criterion is occupation." According to Roe (7:9), occupation of the father is widely accepted as the most usable single index of the social and economic status of all the members of a family.

A random sample of 36 house numbers was drawn from 147 residences in the lower social class area; 36 house numbers were drawn from 157 residences in the upper socioeconomic area. A random table of numbers was used to select the sample. (3:422ff)

Names corresponding to the house numbers of the upper socio-economic sample were obtained from the City Directory and they were cross checked with the telephone directory listings. Appointments were then made by telephone contact. Of the twenty-nine homemakers in the upper socio-economic

sample that were contacted, three refused to participate because they were too busy; one was uninterested; one was moving from the area; one was on vacation and another was leaving for a vacation; and one refused because of family illness. The remaining twenty-one comprised the upper social class sample.

The homemakers in the lower stratum were contacted directly at their homes by the researcher. Of the thirtythree residents visited, one was ineligible because her husband was a graduate student; no homemaker lived at one residence; one house was vacant; three homemakers refused because they were not interested; three refused because of family illness; two refused because they were too busy; and one was unable to respond because she did not understand and speak English well enough to be interviewed. The remaining twenty-one comprised the sample.

Choosing the Instrument

Hypothetical situations, the type of instrument used by Bustrillos (16:35-39), were used for generating spontaneous responses of the homemaker. Since the hypothetical situations in Bustrillos' study were developed for an ethnic group with little or no formal education, they were not replicated in this study. The decision content of hypothetical situations developed by Halliday (19:39) in a recent study of decision-making were used in
this study. The hypothetical problems used were:

- <u>Problem A</u>. Mrs. Adams' twelve year old daughter doesn't like to help around the house. In fact, she doesn't want to do anything but play with her friends. This troubles Mrs. Adams.
- <u>Problem B</u>. Mrs. Adams has to keep food costs down and yet she wants to feed her family good, nutritious meals. This concerns Mrs. Adams.
- <u>Problem C</u>. Mrs. Adams becomes bored with cleaning and ironing and other tasks that she does over and over again. And yet, she is never caught up with her work. This disturbs Mrs. Adams.

The three hypothetical situations, which shall henceforth be referred to as decision problems, were used in the order stated.

A set of standard questions, similar to those used in Bustrillos' study (16:39), was asked in order to probe further into the decision situation. They were:

1) What could be done in this situation?

2) Do you have any strong feelings or preference about what Mrs. Adams should do? Why?

3) If you were faced with the same problem, what would you do? Why?

4) Have you ever experienced this problem? What did you do then? (If a discrepancy was observed in numbers four and three, then more probing followed.)

The second probe question was modified from that used in Bustrillos' study in order to avoid forcing the respondents to rank or objectively eliminate the alternatives. The original question was, "Which would you consider the best and the second best thing to do? Which the worst? Why?" (16:39)

As in Bustrillos' study, a hypothetical family was described to the homemaker before giving the decision problems. The hypothetical family was called the Adams family, and consisted of a couple and their three children, a girl aged twelve and two younger school-age children. The size of the hypothetical family approximated an average American family. The lack of family description was deliberate in order to avoid unnecessary socio-economic class bias. The twelve year old girl was introduced to elicit a response to the first decision problem.

The decision problems, together with the standard set of probing questions, were used to elicit decisionmaking data that could be analyzed for decision-making style. Demographic data were collected on marital status, age, education, occupation, income level, number of children, age of youngest child, geographic and residential mobility, organizational membership and leadership, and religion.

Collection of Data

The field work, conducted by the researcher, was started May 26, 1965 and completed June 25, 1965. This time range included a pre-test, preliminary contacts, and interviewing the respondents.

A pre-test was conducted with two homemakers in each of the two social class levels. They were contacted by the

researcher knocking at the door. Changes in the instrument were not deemed necessary. However, it was learned that the upper stratum should be telephoned for an appointment rather than knocking at their door. The researcher found few homemakers in the upper stratum at home, and those who were at home expressed a desire to schedule a more convenient time for the interview. Since the researcher was well received by the lower stratum without an appointment and because over half of the sample did not have telephones, it was decided to continue the door-knocking procedure with this group.

In contacting the lower stratum sample, the researcher introduced herself and said:

> "I am making an important study of three homemaking concerns that other families have, and I would very much like to include your opinion in this study. It will only take about twenty minutes."

In telephoning the upper socio-economic sample for an appointment, the researcher explained that she was conducting research concerning three homemaking situations that many families confronted, and stressed the value of their personal opinion. Appointments were scheduled at the respondent's convenience.

The interviews were conducted in the respondent's home and lasted approximately twenty minutes. Respondents were cooperative and most of them talked freely about the decision situations.

The influence of the interviewer on the data collected was minimized in several ways: 1) the same interviewer conducted all interviews: 2) the same set of stimuli was used for all respondents; and 3) the interviewer followed a set format in presenting the stimuli and in handling respondents' questions.

The interview schedule was started by introducing the hypothetical family. Then, the first decision problem, followed by the standard probing questions, was presented. The interviewer wrote the response as it was given. If the response was brief, a prompting question such as "Anything else?" elicited a little more data. Similarly, the next two decision problems were presented. The same procedure, including the order of presenting the decision problems, was followed in each interview. (See Appendix I for interview guide.)

Analysis of Data

The interview data on the decision problems were subjected to content analysis based on the categories identified in the conceptual framework in Bustrillos' study. This is a research technique whereby the content is objectively and systematically classified on the basis of explicitly formulated rules. A set of rules for coding the data into pre-established categories under mode, time reference, and rules of decision, was developed by Bustrillos (16:45-48) and further developed in this study by a panel of graduate students and the researcher. The coding rules used in analyzing the data follow.

Coding rules for mode

Mode is the distinctive way of developing ideas in a decision situation. How these ideas are brought into the process and how they are structurally related to each other is indicative of how a decision proceeds. Mode is the expressive component of decision-making style which is not premeditated. It shows how ideas are developed, analyzed, classified and then related to the decision-making problem. The ideas themselves are not of importance in determining mode; rather it is how the ideas are stated that is important.

The unit of analysis is the introduction of each new idea into the decision situation. The researcher looked for the answer to the question, "How did the respondent develop the idea?" Mode was classified according to the following categories: hypothetical (m_1) , factual (m_2) , action-suggestive (m_3) and unclassified (m_4) . Rules for each category were the following:

Categories	Code

Hypothetical

m ,

When ideas were stated conditionally, conjecturally, or doubtfully; qualified the course of action; viewed the situation objectively. This relationship makes the action hypothetical.

Criteria

Mode con't.

Categories	Code	Criteria
Hypothetical	^m ı	May be stated: That depends on If Either - or Neither - nor Maybe Perhaps
Factual	^m 2	When ideas about things observed, sensed, or apprehended were sta- ted conclusively; unqualified statements; manner of being defin- itive; more subjective. The re- spondents either stated an opin- ion, expressed an attitude, veri- fied or made comparisons on the basis of known things. For example: Of course, ais needed. You shouldn't spend time on I think The way I do is
Action-suggestive	^m 3	When action was directly suggested or commanded in a statement; may either assert or negate something or suggest inaction; action may be manipulative or adaptive; state specific course of action or steps to take; distinguished by action verbs. Just buy Look for I'd see that she (verb) She should, could, ought, must, (verb) She must not, should not (verb)
Unclassified	m4	All statements which could not be classified, such as: I don't know. I really wouldn't know what to do.

Coding rules for time reference

No decision is independent of time. One, therefore, must be able to perceive events and phenomena in a time relationship. Reference to a time base gives meaning and continuity to events. This element becomes evident as a person makes decisions. Time reference was classified according to future (t_1) , past (t_2) , present (t_3) and unclassified (t_4) . The unit of analysis was the response to the question "What could be done in this situation?" and followed by "Anything else?", "Do you have any strong feelings about what Mrs. Adams should do?", and "What would you do?"

Categories	Code	<u>Criteria</u>
Future	τı	Reference to what might happen in the immediate future or long-range consequences; predictive state- ments or explicit expectations of fulfillment of a future state of affairs; such as: If she waits awhile The next time she They will probably In the future or tomorrow
Past	t ₂	References to traditional, habit- ual behavior; experience by one's self or as recounted by others; statements about what had gone on before; such as: I used to I experiences When I was a child That's how my mother It was my (job, duty, obli- gation)

Time reference cont'd.

<u>Categories</u>	Code	<u>Criteria</u>
Present	t ₃	Present behavior based on that which is on-going but not habit- ual; on what is felt and thought at the moment; on present needs; on situations obtaining at the moment decisions; such as: I think she should I am I try My children are presently
Un cl assified	tų	Time reference not distinguish- able or no one time reference dominated the responses.

Coding rules for decision-making rule

Decision-making rule consists of the methods by which alternative courses of action are evaluated with the corresponding determinant or base for selecting one alternative. It, therefore, is supposed to come after a set of alternatives has been perceived.

Whatever the decision-maker stated as best is accepted. Through a decision-making rule, the homemaker is able to differentiate alternatives and then arrive at a decision or discriminatory point. This phase concerns the evaluation of alternatives and the method of arriving at a final choice.

Decision-making rule was classified according to preference ranking (r_1) , objective elimination (r_2) , immediate closure (r_3) , and unclassified (r_4) . The total response was the unit of analysis.

<u>Criteria</u>	Code	Criteria
Pr eference ranking	rl	When closure was reached by choos- ing one's best alternative from other alternatives; a consistency in ranking of alternatives in re- sponse to the questions; persist- ency in what was considered the best choice; subjectively deter- mined choice.
Objective elimination	r ₂	When limits to alternatives were immediately recognized; no one best alternative was stated; will- ingness to change with conditions; very objective manner; closure not readily made unless forced by the situation.
Immediate closure	r ₃	When only one action was verbal- ized; one alternative immediately grasped; process is quick and analysis and reasoning came after making the choice.
Unclassified	r ₄	No closure or decision-making rule distinguishable.

In addition to content analysis, the Chi square test was used to determine significant differences between the two socio-economic groups with regard to the dimensions used in each element. Independence was rejected at the five.percent level of significance. Thus, with two degrees of freedom, anything greater than 5.99 was granted significant.

The Chi square test was not computed for the "unclassified" category of elements.

Reliability

The reliability of content analysis was tested by a panel of three graduate students in home management. Using

the original coding rules listed in the methodology of Bustrillos' study (16:45-48), one-fourth of the responses to decision problems were analyzed by the panel and the researcher. A lack of agreement in content analysis indicated the need for greater clarification of the coding rules.

In order to clarify the categories of each decision element, two of the three panel members and the researcher studied the coding rules, probe questions and data. Coding information was added to each elemental dimension. Also, the unit of analysis was modified to include data from all pertinent probe questions.

Using the sharpened categorizations, the third panel member coded the data. Agreement in content analysis was reached between the panel members and the researcher.

Early attempts at content analysis were beneficial in training the researcher in this method of analysis.

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

The description of the forty-two homemakers in two socio-economic groups includes: marital status, age, education, husbands' education, occupation, husbands' occupation, income level, number of children, age of youngest child, geographic mobility, organizational membership and leadership, and religion.

Marital Status

Marital status	Lower N	%	Upper N	%
Single	0	0	0	0
Married	16	76.19	21	100.00
Separated	0	0	Ο	0
Divorced	2	9.52	Ο.	0
Widow	3	14.28	0	0
Totalş	21	100	21	100

TABLE 1.-Marital status of homemakers by socio-economic group

The mode for marital status in both socio-economic groups was the married state. Approximately three-fourths of the homemakers in the lower socio-economic group and all

of the homemakers in the upper socio-economic group were married. About one-fourth of the lower socio-economic group of homemakers were either divorced or widowed.

Age of Homemakers

TABLE 2.-- Ages of homemakers by socio-economic group

Age Group	Lower N	%	Upper N	%	
Under 20 years	0	0	0	0	
20-29 years	4	19.04	0	0	
30-39 years	3	14.2 8	7	33.33	
40-49 years	6	28.57	11	52. 38	
50-59 years	l	4.76	l	4.76	
60 years and over	7	33•33	2	9.52	
Totalş	21	100	21	100	

In both socio-economic groups of homemakers there was a dispersion of age. The homemakers' ages varied within about a forty year span in the lower socio-economic group and about a thirty year span of age in the upper socio-economic group. The median age was in the forty to forty-nine age category for both socio-economic groups.

Education

The sample showed a fairly wide discrepancy in the levels of education between the husbands in the two socioeconomic groups. Table 3 represents the academic achievement of husbands in the sample.

Education level	Lower N	%	Upper N	%
Below 8th grade	1	4.76	0	0
8th-11th grade	13	61.90	1	4.76
H.S. graduate	2	9.52	3	14.28
1-3 years college	0	0	3	14.28
Bachelor's degree	0	0	11	5 2. 38
Master's degree	0	0	2	9.52
Ph.D. degree	0	0	l	4.76
No res ponse ^a	5	23.80	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100 .

TABLE 3.--Education of husbands by socio-economic group

^aDeceased or divorced

In the lower socio-economic group, two-thirds of the husbands had not graduated from high school and none of the husbands had college training. In comparison, twothirds of the husbands in the higher socio-economic group had graduated from college with a minimum of a bachelor's degree. According to Kahl (6:53), there is a positive relationship between education and occupation in determining style of life.

Table 4 represents the academic achievement of homemakers in the sample.

Education level	Lower N	Ķ	Uppe r N	Ķ
Below 8th grade	4	19.04	0	0
8th-11th grade	12	57.14	1	4.76
H.S. graduate	5	23.80	8	38.09
1-3 years college	0	0	8	38.09
Bachelor's degree	0	0	3	14.28
Master's degree	0	0	l	4.76
Ph.D. degree	0	0	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 4.--Education of homemakers by socio-economic group

Approximately 24 percent of the homemakers in the lower socio-economic group had graduated from high school. In comparison, about 95 percent of the homemakers in the upper group had a minimum of a high school education and 56 percent had college training. The median level of education was eight to eleven grades for the lower group and one to three years of college for the upper stratum.

In comparing the husbands' and wives' education levels, the median education is similar in the lower socioeconomic group: eight to eleven grades completed. The median education level for the wives in the upper socioeconomic group was one to three years college compared with a bachelor's degree for their husbands.

group				
Income level	Lower N	%	Upper N	92 A
Below \$3,000	9	42.85	0	Q
\$3,000-#4,999	6	28.57	0	0
\$5,000-\$6,999	2	9.52	0	0
\$7,000-\$8,999	T	4.76	0	0
\$9 ,0 00- \$ 10,000	0	0	1	4.76
Over \$10,000	2	9.52	20	95.23
No response	1	4.76	Ο	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 5.--Money income level of families by socio-economic, group

Level of Money Income

The sample showed a wide differential between the levels of money income between the lower and upper strata. The most frequently reported income for the lower socioeconomic group was below \$3,000 annually. In the upper stratum, an annual income exceeding \$10,000 was reported most frequently. One respondent in the lower socio-economic group, whose husband was a factory night watchman, was uncertain of their family income. The five homemakers who were divorced or widowed, reported family incomes of less than \$3,000.

Occupation

The sample showed variation in the occupational status of the husbands as is shown in the following table.

TABLE 6.--Occupational status of the husbands by socioeconomic group

Occupational status	Lower N	%	Upper N	%
Gainfully employed]2	57.14	20	95.23
Unemployed	l	4.76	0	0
Retired	3	14.28	l	4.76
No response ^a	5	23.80	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

^aDeceased or divorced

The most frequently reported occupational status for both the lower and upper socio-economic group was gainful employment.

Since occupation was used as an indicator of social class level, data relative to previous occupation were collected on husbands that were unemployed or retired. An unemployed husband in the lower stratum listed occupation as construction worker. The retired husbands in the lower socio-economic group were previously employed as factory workers. In the upper socio-economic group, one husband was retired from chairmanship of a company board of directors.

The North Hatt Scale (17:3-21) was used to rate the prestige value of occupations. (See Table 7.) Prestige value scores were segmented according to Hatt's findings about the "natural segmentation" of occupations.

According to Kahl (6:53), there are several reasons why occupation and prestige are so highly related. A man's occupation is the source of his income, which in turn provides the style of life that serves as a means of evaluation for his neighbors. Occupation also indicates level of education, it suggests the type of associates he comes in contact with on the job, it tells something of the contribution he makes to the community welfare, and it hints at the degree of his authority over other people.

Two segments of social class level are present in the sample. They will be designated as "upper" and "lower" in relation to the prestige value of the husbands' occupation.

Prestige value of occupation	Lower N	%	Upper N	K
40-49 points	7	33.33	0	0
50-59 points	Э	42.85	0	0
60-69 points	0	0	0	0
70-79 points	0	0	14	66.66
80-89 points	U	0	7	33.33
No response ^a	5	23.80	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 7.--Social class level as determined by the prestige value of husbands' occupation

^aDeceased or divorced

.

The mean prestige value score for occupation in the lower socio-economic group was fifty-three points. In comparison, the mean prestige value score for the upper socioeconomic group was seventy-eight points. According to the Lansing City Directory (13), the occupations of those who refused to participate in the study were similar to the occupations of the participants.

Occupations in the lower class level were semiskilled, unskilled and service positions, e.g., janitor, construction worker, factory worker. Husbands in the upper class level had managerial and professional positions, e.g., engineer, sales manager, lawyer. Approximately one-fourth of the participants in the lower socio-economic group could not be classified according to husband's occupation because they were widowed or divorced. However, other indicants, such as education, sources of income and level of income, were substituted. The major source of income for these respondents was either from Social Security or Aid to Dependent Children and their income level was reported below \$3,000 annually. The highest academic level reported was a high school education and the mean education level for this group was eight to eleven years of school. They were similar in social class indicants to the other homemakers in the lower class level.

Occupation of homemakers

The most frequently reported present occupation for homemakers in both socio-economic groups was full-time homemaker. (See Table 8.) About 76 percent of the homemakers in the lower socio-economic group and about 90 percent of the homemakers in the upper socio-economic group were full-time homemakers. Of the five respondents in the lower socioeconomic group who were engaged in remunerative occupations, four were employed in service occupations and one homemaker was employed in a clerical position. In the upper group, one homemaker was employed as a nurse and one homemaker was employed as a sales representative; both homemakers were employed part time.

Occupational class	Lcwer "N	%	Upper N	Ķ
Professional and managerial	0	0	l	4.76
Clerical and sales	l	4.76	1	4.76
Service	4	19.04	0	0
Homemaking	16	76.19	19	90.42
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 8.--Present occupation of the homemakers by socioeconomic group

All homemakers had been gainfully employed prior to their marriage. (See Table 9.)

TABLE 9.--Occupation of the homemaker before marriage

Occupational class	Lower N	%	Upper N	%
Professional and managerial	0	0	6	28.57
Clerical and sales	4	19.04	13	61.90
Serviçe	17	80.95	2	9.52
Totalş	21	100	21	100

Data regarding the type of occupation before marriage showed differences between the two groups of homemakers. In the lower socio-economic group, the most common occupation prior to marriage was a service position. In the upper socio-economic group, the most frequently listed occupation was a clerical and sales position.

economic gr	oup			
Number of children	Lower N	%	Upper N	%
0	4	19.04	0	0
1	0	0	4	19.04
2	l	4.76	10	47.61
3	9	42.85	• 6	28.57
4	3	14.28	1	4.76
5	2	9.52	0	0
6	1	4.76	0	0
7	1	4.76	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

Number of Children

TABLE 10.--Number of children per homemaker by socio-

In the lower socio-economic families, the most common number of children was three; about 43 percent of the sample having this number of children. The higher stratum reported two children most frequently; about 48 percent of the sample. There was a greater disparity in the number of children in the lower socio-economic families than in upper socio-economic families.

	Age	of	Chi	ld	rei	ſ
--	-----	----	-----	----	-----	---

Age range	Lower N	%	Uppe r N	K
Under 2 years	2	9.52	2	9.52
2-5 years	1	4.76	3	14.28
6-10 years	4	19.04	5	23.80
11-16 years	l	4.76	6	28.57
16-21 years	3	14.28	3	14.28
Over 21 years	6	28.57	2	9.52
No children	4	19.04	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

i

TABLE 11.--Age of the youngest child in the family by socio-economic group

In both socio-economic groups there was a wide age range for the youngest child. However, the majority of homemakers in both groups had a child under twenty-one years of age. The median age of the youngest child in the lower stratum was sixteen years to twenty-one years of age. In the higher stratum, the median age of the youngest child was eleven years to sixteen years of age.

Organizations

Number of organizations	Lower N	K	Upper N	%
0	13	61.90	3	14.28
1	7	33.33	2	9.52
2	1	4.76	8	38.09
3	0	0	1	4.76
4	0	0	3	14.28
More than 4	0	0	4	19.04
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE	12Organizational	affiliation	by	socio-economic
	group			

Differences were shown in organizational affiliation between the two groups of nomemakers. Homemakers in the lower socio-economic group were non-joiners, about 62 percent. Homemakers in the upper socio-economic group most frequently belonged to more than one organization; about 76 percent belonged to multiple organizations.

Differences were also shown in the type of organization with which the two socio-economic groups of homemakers affiliated. (See Table 13.) Of the 38 percent in the lower stratum who reported affiliating with an organization, they most frequently reported affiliation with a church organization. In the upper socio-economic group, about 88 percent of the homemakers that were affiliated with an organization were members of a civic organization, and 55 percent were members of a church organization.

Type of organization	Lower N	%	Upper N	%
Civic				
Member	۷	9.52	16	76.19
Non-membe r	19	90.47	5	23.90
Totals	21	100	21	100
Church				
Member	5	23.80	10	47.61
Non-member	16	76.19	11	5 2. 38
Totals	21	100	21	100
Social				
Member	2	9.52	8	38.09
Non-member	19	90.47	13	61.90
Totals	21	100	21	100
Professional				
Member	O	0	2	9.52
Non-member	21	100.0	19	90.47
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 13.--Type of organizational affiliation by socioeconomic group

Type of organization and role	Lower _N	%	Upper N	Ķ
Civic				
Leadership role	2	100.00	9	56.25
Non-leader role	0	0	7	43.75
Totals	2	100	16	100
Church				
Leadership role	1	20.00	7	70.00
Non-leader role	4	80.00	3	30.00
Totals	5	100	10	100
Social				
Leadership role	l	50.00	2	25.00
Non-leader role	1	50.00	6	75.00
Totals	2	100	8	100
Professional				
Leadership role	0	0	0	0
Non-leader role	ა	0	2	100.00
Totals	0	0	2	100

TABLE 14.--Role of organization-affiliated members by socio-economic group

Homemakers in both socio-economic groups had leadership roles in organizations. In civic organizations, homemakers more frequently had a leadership role than a nonleadership role. However, a greater percentage of homemakers in the upper socio-economic group had leadership roles than non-leadership roles; the reverse was reported in the lower socio-economic group.

Geographic Mobility

TABLE 15.--Geographic mobility by socio-economic group: 1955-65

Number of geographic moves	Lower N	%	Upper N	%
0	17	80.95	15	71.42
l	1	4.76	4	19.04
2	1	4.76	0	0
3	0	0	l	4.76
4	0	0	1	4.76
More than 4	2	9.52	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

The two socio-economic groups were similar in geographic stability. That is, they most frequently reported life residency in the Lansing area.

Data relating to residential mobility were collected on the sample for a ten year period. However, they were not analyzed because of the difference in age of residential areas. Respondents in the upper socio-economic group lived in a residential area that was less than ten years old. The area of Lansing chosen for the lower stratum was an old, established section of the city.

Religion

Relatively little variation in religious affiliation was found between the two socio-economic groups, shown in Table 16.

Religious affiliation	Lower N	%	Upper N	%
Protestant	17	80.95	18	85.71
Roman Catholic	3	14.28	3	14.28
Jewish	0	0	0	0
None	1	4.76	Or.	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 16.--Religious affiliation of homemakers by socio-economic group

Summary

Demographic data, collected on two socio-economic groups of homemakers, were analyzed in order to ascertain points of similarity and difference.

The husband's occupation, the indicant used for determining social class level, was rated on the North-Hatt Scale for prestige value. Two social class levels, upper and lower, were designated on the basis of points on a segmented scale.

In addition to the difference in prestige value of the husbands' occupations, the two socio-economic groups lived in different census tract areas in Lansing.

Differences in the two socio-economic groups of homemakers were evident in education, income, occupation before marriage, number of children, and organizational affiliation. Most frequently, homemakers in the upper socio-economic group had college training, and their husbands were college graduates; had incomes over \$10,000 annually; were employed in a clerical or sales occupation before marriage; had two children; and belonged to two organizations. In the lower socioeconomic group, most frequently homemakers had eight to eleven years of education, as did their husbands; had incomes below \$3,000; were employed in service occupations before marriage; had three children; and did not belong to an organization.

Homemakers in both socio-economic groups were similar in marital status, present occupation, geographic mobility and religion. In addition, there was a similar disparity in ages of homemakers and in ages of the youngest child in both strata. All homemakers were living in the same city and most frequently, homemakers in both socioeconomic groups reported living in this same Midwestern city since birth.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

Introduction

The decision-making styles of two socio-economic groups were compared in relation to each of the decisionmaking elements; mode, time reference, and decision-making rule. In addition, the interrelationships of elements in decision-making style were examined for differences and similarities.

The Chi square test was the statistical procedure utilized in determining significant differences between the two socio-economic groups with regard to the dimensions used in each element. Independence was rejected at the five percent level of significance. Thus, with two degrees of freedom, anything greater than 5.99 was granted significant.

The results of the analysis follow and are first presented in relation to each element and then in relation to the composite style of decision-making.

Mode

Mode, the distinctive way of developing ideas, was analyzed according to the responses to three decision problems. The dimensions of mode are: hypothetical, factual,

and action-suggestive. A category for responses which could not be classified was also present.

Mode	Lowe r N	Respon %	ses Upper N	<i>K</i>
Hypothetical	7	11.11	7	11.11
Factual	23	36.50	39	61.90
Action-suggestive	31	49.20	17	26.98
Unclassified	2	3.17	0	0
Totals	63	100	63	100

TABLE 17.--Mode dimension in responses by socio-economic group

Degrees of freedom - 2; X^2 for table 8.47;

 X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

It was hypothesized that over half of the homemakers in the lower socio-economic group would use a factual mode. The data reveal that about one-half of the responses in that group were action-suggestive rather than factual in mode; approximately one-third were factual in mode. The third dimension, hypothetical mode, appeared in about one-tenth of the responses. Therefore, the dimension hypothesized for lower socio-economic homemakers was not supported.

In the upper socio-economic group, it was hypothesized that over one-half of the homemakers would use the hypothetical mode. Data did not support this claim. Over three-fifths of the responses, about 62 percent, were factual in mode and only ll percent hypothetical in mode. The third dimension, action-suggestive, appeared in about onefourth of the responses in the upper socio-economic group.

In comparing the two socio-economic groups, there is a significant difference in the dimensions of mode manifested. The lower socio-economic group developed ideas most frequently in an action-suggestive manner while the upper group more often used a factual manner of developing ideas.

The unclassified category, discounted in the statistical analysis, was used on coding two of the responses of lower class level homemakers. One homemaker stated three ideas about a problem situation, each idea developed with a different dimension. The second homemaker did not verbalize any ideas, but stated, "I don't know. That is a problem. I really don't know."

Mode in each decision problem

In analyzing the dimensions of mode, possible relationships were sought between the decision problem and the two socio-economic groups. Problem A concerned child discipline; problem B focused on food buying, and problem C regarded work organization. Tables 18, 19, and 20 present these comparisons.

The upper socio-economic group consistently used the factual dimension of mode in the three decision problems.

However, the lower socio-economic group was not consistent in using the action-suggestive dimension of mode.

In problem A and problem C, the lower socioeconomic group most frequently used the factual dimension of mode. Only in problem B was action-suggestive mode most frequently verbalized.

Statistically significant mode differences between the two socio-economic groups appeared only in problem B, the technical decision of food buying.

Mode	Lower N	Respon %	ses Upper N	K
Hypothetical	2	9.52	2	9.52
Factual	10	47.61	15	71.42
Action-suggestive	9	42.85	4	19.04
Unclassified	0	0	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 18.--Mode in response to problem A by socio-economic group

Degrees of freedom - 2; X^2 for table 2.96;

 X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

Mode	Lower	Respon	ses Upper	s Upper	
	Ν	%	N	%	
Hypothetical	1	4.76	2	9.52	
Factual	4	19.04	10	47.61	
Action-suggestive	15	71.42	9	42.85	
Unclassified	l	4.76	0	0	
Totals	21	100	21	100	

TABLE 19.--Mode in response to problem B by socio-economic group

 X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

TABLE 20.--Mode in response to problem C by socio-economic group

Mode	Lower N	Re s pon %	ses Upper N	%
Hypothetical	4	19.04	3	14.28
Factual	9	42.85	14	66.66
Action-suggestive	7	33.33	4	19.04
Unclassified	l	4.76	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100
Degrees of freedom - 2; X ² for table 3.82;				

 x^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

Time Reference

Time reference, the perception of time relationship to phenomena, was analyzed according to the responses to decision problems. The three dimensions were: future, past, and present. A category for responses which could not be classified was also used.

TABLE 21.--Time reference in responses by socio-economic group

Time reference	Lower N	Re sp on %	ses Upper N	<i>%</i>
Future	6	9.52	13	20.63
Past	33	5 2. 38	33	5 2. 38
Present	22	34.92	16	2 5•39
Unclassified	2	3.17	1	1.58
Totals	63	100	63	100

Degrees of freedom - 2; X^2 for table 3.56;

 X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

It was hypothesized that over half of the homemakers in the lower socio-economic group would use the present dimension of time reference. In the upper socio-economic group, the future dimension of time reference was predicted to appear in responses.

Statistical analysis of the findings reveals that there was no significant difference between the two socio-

<u>`</u>/

economic groups in their use of time reference. Over half of the responses by homemakers in both socio-economic groups were past oriented.

The unclassified category, discounted in the statistical analysis, was used in analyzing three of the responses in regard to time reference. Two respondents, one in each socio-economic group, used multiple time dimensions equally in verbalizing their ideas. One homemaker did not express any ideas in the decision problem of food buying.

Time reference in individual decision problems

Examination of the data in each of the three decision-making problems showed consistency in the use of the past dimension of time reference. Statistically, in problems A, B, and C there was no significant difference in use of time reference in the two socio-economic groups. (Refer to Appendix II for statistical analysis.)

Decision-Making Rule

Decision-making rule, the method of arriving at a closure, was the third element analyzed in decision-making style. The dimensions of decision-making rule were: preference ranking, objective elimination, and immediate closure. A category for responses which could not be classified was also present.

It was hypothesized that over half of the homemakers in the lower socio-economic group would use preference ranking in their style of decision-making. In the upper socioeconomic group, the objective elimination dimension of decision-making rule was predicted to appear in responses.

Decision-making rule	Lower N	Respon %	ses Upper N	K
Preference ranking	23	36.50	25	39.68
Objective elimination	14	22.22	27	42.85
Immediate closure	23	36.50	9	14.28
Un classified	3	4.76	2	3.17
Totals	63	100	63	100

TABLE 22.--Decision making rule in responses by socioeconomic group

Degrees of freedom - 2; X^2 for table 10.29; X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

Data revealed that responses by lower socio-economic homemakers were as frequently immediate closure as they were preference ranking in decision-making rule. Both dimensions appeared in 36.5 percent of the responses. The third dimension, objective elimination, was used in about 22 percent of the decision problems.

In the upper socio-economic group, data showed that objective elimination was the dimension of decision-making rule most frequently used. However, less than half of the responses, about 43 percent, used the predicted dimension of
decision-making rule. Preference ranking, found in about 40 percent of the responses, was used almost as frequently as objective elimination. The third dimension, immediate closure, appeared in about one-seventh of the responses.

In comparing the two socio-economic groups in use of decision-making rule, there is a significant difference in the dimensions manifested. The lower socio-economic group arrived at a closure most frequently by preference ranking or immediate closure while the upper socio-economic group most often used objective elimination.

Although discounted in the statistical analysis, five responses were unclassified. In four of the responses, alternatives were stated but neither a closure nor limits to alternatives were stated. On response was unclassified because no alternative was verbalized.

Decision-making rule in individual decision problems

In analyzing the dimensions of decision-making rule, possible relationships were sought between the decision problem and the two socio-economic groups. Tables 23, 24, and 25 present these comparisons.

In both of the socio-economic groups, consistency in the use of one predominant dimension did not appear. The responses by lower socio-economic homemakers to problem A and problem C showed immediate closure to be the dimension used most frequently. In problem B, preference ranking was the predominant dimension.

In the upper socio-economic group, respondents most frequently used objective elimination in arriving at a closure to problem A and problem B. Preference ranking was most often used as the dimension in problem C.

Statistically significant decision-making rule differences between the two socio-economic groups appeared in problem C, the work organization decision situation. In problem A, the child discipline decision situation, statistical differences were close to being significant.

Decision-making rule	Lower N	Re sp on %	ses Upper N	<i>¥</i> e
Preference ranking	8	38.09	6	28.57
Objective elimination	2	9.52	9	42.87
Immediate closure	10	47.61	6	28.57
Unclassified	1	4.76	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 23.--Decision-making rule in response to problem A by socio-economic group

Degrees of freedom - 2; X² for table 5.73;

 x^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

Decision-making rule	Lower N	Respon %	ses Uppe r N	%
Preference ranking	10	47.61	8	38.09
Objective elimination	6	28.57	10	47.61
Immediate closure	3	14.28	l	4.76
Unclassified	2	9.52	2	9.52
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 24.--Decision-making rule in response to problem B by socio-economic group

Degrees of freedom - 2; X^2 for table 2.95; X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

TABLE 25.--Decision-making rule in response to problem C by socio-economic group

Decision-making rule	Lower N	Respon %	%	
Preference ranking	5	23.80	11	52.38
Objective elimination	6	28.57	8	38.09
Immediate closure	10	47.61	2	9.52
Unclassified	0	0	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

Degrees of freedom - 2; X^2 for table 13.30;

 X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

Decision-Making Styles

The interrelationships of elements in decisionmaking style were examined for differences and similarities. Their interrelationships are referred to as decision-making styles.

With three dimensions for each of the three elements, twenty-seven possible relationships could be predicted. Of these twenty-seven relationships, it was predicted that two distinct decision-making styles would emerge in the study:

- 1. A factual mode-present reference-preference ranking style, coded as $m_2 t_3 r_1$, would be expressed by over half of the homemakers in the lower socio-economic group.
- 2. A hypothetical mode-future referenceobjective elimination, coded as $m_1 t_1 r_2$, would be expressed by over half of the homemakers in the higher socio-economic group.

The resulting styles varied as noted in Table 26. Only three out of sixty-three responses in each of the socio-economic groups were classified in the predicted manner. The hypotheses were therefore rejected.

In the upper socio-economic group, a factual modepast reference-preference ranking style appeared in onefifth of the responses. No one style predominated the lower socio-economic responses.

		_	Respon	ses	
Deci	sion-making style	Lower N	%	Upper N	%
1.	m _l tlrl	0	0	0	0
2.	m ₁ t ₂ r ₁	0	0	0	0
3.	$m_1 t_3 r_1$	0	0	1	1.58
4.	$m_1 t_1 r_2$	1	1.58	3	4.76
5.	$m_1 t_2 r_2$	1	1.58	1	1.58
6.	$m_1 t_3 r_2$	l	1.58	1	1.58
7.	$m_{1}t_{1}r_{3}$	2	.3.17	1	1.58
8.	$m_1 t_2 r_3$	1	1.58	0	0
9.	$m_1 t_3 r_3$	0	0	0	0
10.	m ₂ t ₁ r ₁	0	0	2	3.17
11.	$m_2^{t} r_1$.4	6.34	13	20.63
12.	$m_2 t_3 r_1$	3	4.76	4	6.34
13.	m ₂ t ₁ r ₂	0	0	2	3.17
14.	m ₂ t ₂ r ₂	3	4.76	8	12.69
15.	m ₂ t ₃ r ₂	2 ·	3.17	2	3.17
16.	m ^t ^r ³	1	1.58	0	0
17.	m ² t ₂ r ₃	7	11.11	4	6.34
18.	$m_2 t_3 r_3$	1	1.58	1	1.58
19.	m ₃ t ₁ r ₁	1	1.58	1	1.58
20.	^m ^{3t} ² ^r ¹	7	11.11	4	6.34
21.	$m_3 t_3 r_1$	7	11.11	0	0
22.	$m_3 t_1 r_2$	0	0	3	4.76
23.	$m_3 t_2 r_2$	3	4.76	2	3.17
24.	$m_3 t_3 r_2$	2	3.17	4	6.34
25.	m ₃ t ₁ r ₃	0	0	1	1.58
26.	m ₃ t ₂ r ₃	6	9.52	0	0
27.	$m_3 t_3 r_3$	5	7.93	2	3.17
Uncl	assified	5	7.93	3	4.76
Tota	ls	63	100	63	100

TABLE 26.--Decision-making style of homemakers by socioeconomic group

.

Decision-making style in individual decision problems

In analyzing the decision-making style, possible relationships were sought between the decision problem and the two socio-economic groups. The resulting styles varied in each of the decision-making problems and no significant relationships appeared in the findings. (See Appendix II for responses to each decision problem.)

Summary

It was hypothesized that the two socio-economic groups would differ with respect to their decision-making style in the following manner:

<u>Hypothesis I</u>. Over half of the homemakers in the lower socio-economic group will use the factual mode, present time reference, and preference ranking rule in their style of decision-making.

<u>Hypothesis II</u>. Over half of the homemakers in the higher socio-economic group will use the hypothetical mode, future time reference, and objective elimination rule in their style of decision-making.

Both hypotheses were rejected.

The responses to decision problems in the lower socio-economic group were most frequently action-suggestive in mode, past in time reference, and either preference ranking or immediate closure in decision-making rule.

The decision-making responses in the upper socio-

economic group were most frequently factual in mode; past in time reference; and objective elimination in rule.

In comparing the two socio-economic groups, there was a significant difference in the dimensions of two elements, mode and decision-making rule. The past time reference dominated the decision-making style of both social class levels.

No relationship appeared to exist from the interaction of the three elements and socio-economic group. Of the twenty-seven decision-making styles possible, twenty-four styles emerged in response to the decision problems. Individual homemakers were inconsistent in their style of decision-making from one decision situation to another. Individual styles varied among respondents in both socio-economic groups.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The previous chapter presented findings. In this chapter conclusions relevant to the findings will be drawn, limitations in the study indicated, and implications for further research suggested.

Conclusions on decision-making style

Hypothesis I, that factual mode, present time reference, and preference ranking will be used in over half of the responses by homemakers in the lower socio-economic group, was rejected.

The hypothesized elements in hypothesis I were those reported in Bustrillos' study (16:124) of sixteen Mexican homemakers in a lower socio-economic group. It was believed that the same elements would be present in this comparison study in the lower socio-economic group. This supposition was not supported.

The responses to decision problems indicated that homemakers in the lower socio-economic group most frequently use the action-suggestive mode, past time reference, and

either preference ranking or immediate closure. An equal number of responses were analyzed as preference ranking and immediate closure.

The use of preference ranking was the only similarity in comparing the decision-making style of the Mexican homemakers and the lower socio-economic group of homemakers in the present study. And, preference ranking did not appear often enough in this study to declare it the predominant dimension of decision-making rule.

Although Bustrillos' respondents were not a random sample of the population, the differences between style of decision-making in these two studies could be an indication that ethnic and non-ethnic groups use different dimensions of elements in decision-making. Also, since different decision problems were used in the two studies, this may be a variable in decision-making style.

Hypothesis II was also rejected. That is, homemakers in the upper socio-economic group will use the hypothetical mode, future time reference, and objective elimination in over half of their responses to decision problems.

The rationale underlying the second hypothesis was that the predicted elements, normative dimensions of style, are taught in management courses in school. Since homemakers in the upper socio-economic group have a higher level of education, then it was believed that they would use a normative pattern of decision-making behavior. This supposition was not supported.

Responses to the decision situations indicated that the upper class level homemakers most frequently use factual mode, past time reference, and objective elimination rule. Although the predicted decision-making rule, objective elimination, was used most frequently, it appeared in less than half of the responses; about 43 percent. The second hypothesis was not supported.

Rivenes' study (20), using written reports of thirty-six students enrolled in a college decision-making course, reported factual mode and present time reference. (Decision-making rule did not appear often enough to be analyzed.) Since the respondents in Rivenes' study and the upper group in this study are not alike in composition, a direct comparison of findings is not possible. However, if level of education were a criterion for predicting decision-making style, the behavior of the two groups studied should exhibit some similarities.

Respondents in both studies were similar in mode dimension. Factual mode was most frequently reported in the studies. However, different dimensions of time reference were reported. The most striking similarity is that neither group appeared to be normative in their style of decision-making.

In comparing the two socio-economic groups in the present study, there were significant differences in their

style of decision-making. The lower socio-economic group expressed an action-suggestive mode while the upper socioeconomic group were factual in mode. In decision-making rule, the lower socio-economic group arrived at closure most frequently by preference ranking or immediate closure; the upper socio-economic group most often used objective elimination.

Both socio-economic groups used the past dimension of time reference most frequently. This similarity in decision-making style between socio-economic groups indicates that a major source of information is from past experience. This finding emphasizes the need for behavioral models to give sufficient attention to managerial behavior as influenced by man's limited access to information and limits on human capabilities to perceive, process, and analyze information.

Individual homemakers in both socio-economic groups were inconsistent in their style of decision-making. Of the twenty-seven possible decision-making styles, twentyfour emerged in response to the decision problems. Thus, the interrelationship of elements varied with homemakers and problems.

Decision-making styles varied with problems in both socio-economic groups. The lower socio-economic group used twelve styles for problems A and B; thirteen styles emerged

for problem C. The higher socio-economic group used twelve styles for problem A; fourteen styles for problem B and eleven styles for problem C. The results suggest that the nature of the problem affects the use of elements and eventually the style.

Limitations of the study

The homemaker's ability to verbalize decisionmaking behavior is a limiting factor in classifying their decision-making process. Some homemakers talked freely about the decision problem while other homemakers were not verbal in response to the questions. It is possible that some of the respondents did not verbalize their thought processes, and therefore, did not verbalize their decisionmaking style.

The decision problems used did not include the entire range and type of problematic situations which homemakers face. Homemakers in both socio-economic groups did not identify equally with the hypothetical decision problems. The economic decision of reducing food costs was of little concern to some of the homemakers in the upper socioeconomic group. Several homemakers stated that they did not economize on their food budget, and expressed difficulty relating to the decision problem. Unless respondents relate to the problem situation, they will not verbalize ideas for solving the problem. Some responses to decision-problems could not be classified because more than one dimension of an element was present. The categories of each element need to be more mutually exclusive.

Implications for further study

The results indicate a need for further research on behavioral models used in studying decision-making process.

Variations observed among respondents in their decision-making style suggests that more needs to be known about the individual decision-maker. Personality, with its patterns, activities, orientations and motivations, gives the decision-maker certain characteristics which may be reflected in the kinds of decisions and the process by which they are made. Theories of personality could provide a general framework for studying the individual in a decisionmaking situation.

The study needs to be expanded to include a greater number of managerial problems. The question of whether the decision-maker consistently uses one style for making technical decisions, another style for economic decisions, and perhaps a third style for social decisions could be studied. This study would allow for comparisons of decision-making styles between and among types of managerial problems.

There is a need to study decision-making using par-

ticipant-observation methodology. A simulated home situation where decisions could be enacted by the respondent and observed by the researcher might give greater insight into the processes of decision-making.

The categorization of each element needs to be strengthened. Each category should be mutually exclusive.

Attention must continue to be given to how people make decisions if we are to improve quality or effectiveness of managerial behavior. Additional studies need to explore how closely family managers conform to the rational, step-like approach to decision-making that has been emphasized in home management teaching and writing. If we know how family managers behave in decision-making situations, we will then be in a better position to prescribe change in decision-making procedure to improve managerial behavior.

LITERATURE CITED

Books

- BRIM, ORVILLE G., JR., GLASS, DAVID C., LANVIN, DAVID E., and GOODMAN, NORMAN. Personality and Decision Processes: Studies in the Social Psychology of Thinking. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1962.
- 2. DAVISON, JON R., and RIESLER, SARA B. "Cognitive Behavior Before and After Decisions," in Leon Festinger. Conflict, Decision and Dissonance. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- 3. DIXON, WILFRED J., and MASSEY, FRANK J., JR. Introduction to Statistical Analysis. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 2nd ed. 1957.
- 4. FESTINGER, LEON. Conflict, Decision and Dissonance. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- 5. JECKER, JON D. "Selective Exposure to New Information," in Leon Festinger. Conflict, Decision and Dissonance. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- 6. KAHL, JOSEPH A. The American Class Structure. N.Y.: Rinehard and Company, Inc., 1957.
- 7. ROE, ANNE. The Psychology of Occupations. N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, 1956.
- 8. SIMON, HERBERT A. Models of Man: Social and Rational--Mathematical Essays on Rational Human Behavior in a Social Setting. N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.

Bulletins and Periodicals

9. BREHM, J. W. "Post-Decision Changes in the Desirability of Alternatives." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 1956, 52, 384-89.

- 10. BREHM, J. W., and COHEN, A. R. "Re-evaluation of Choice Alternatives as a Function of Their Number and Qualitative Similarity." Journal of Abnormal Psychology. 1959, 58, 373-78.
- 11. BROCK, T. C. "Effects of Prior Dishonesty on Post-Decisional Dissonance." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 1963, 66, 525-31.
- 12. HYMAN, BERNARD. "The Relationship of Social Status and Vocational Interests." Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1956, 3:12, 12-16.
- Lansing City Directory. Detroit, Michigan: R. L. Polk and Company, 1964.
- 14. NIELSON, JAMES. "Improved Management Processes for Farmers." Journal of Farm Economics. 1961, 43:5, 1250-61.
- 15. United States Census of Population and Housing: 1960 Census Tracts. United States Bureau of the Census. 1962, Final Report PHC, 1-73.

Unpublished Materials

- BUSTRILLOS, NENA ROLA. "Decision-Making Styles of Selected Mexican Homemakers." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.
- 17. DYNES, RUSSELL, SILVERMAN, L., COOK, W. R., HALLER, A. O., BUCK, R., BROWN, C. H., and LOWE, G. "The North-Hatt Scale." Mimeograph of interpolations. 1960, 3-21.
- GREENWOOD, MARY N. "Research and Experience in Working with Low Income Families." Paper read before the meeting of the Extension Section, American Home Economics Association, Detroit, Mich., June 25, 1964.
- 19. HALLIDAY, JEAN ROWAN. "Relationships Among Certain Characteristics of a Decision Event: Decision Procedure, Decision Context, and Decision-Maker." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964.

- 20. RIVENES, DANA N. "Study of Decision-Making Style." Unpublished Master Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1964.
- 21. VELASCO, ESPERANZA B. "Decision-Making in the Use of Family Money: Case Studies of Five Families." Unpublished Master Dissertation, University of the Phillippines, 1964.

.

APPENDIX I

SAMPLE PROTOCAL

Lower socio-economic interview

Wife:

- a. status: married
- b. age: 28
- c. education: 10 years
- d. occupation: homemaker
- e. occupation before marriage: nurses' aide
- f. church affiliation: stopped attending
- g. organizations: none

Husband:

- a. age: 31
- b. education: 10 years
- c. occupation: truck driver
- d. income: \$10,000

Children:

•

- a. boys: aged 8 and 11
- b. girls: aged 9

Others living in the household: none Mobility: lived in the same house lifetime

- <u>Problem A</u>: Mrs. Adams' twelve year old daughter doesn't like to help around the house. In fact, she doesn't want to do anything but play with her friends. This troubles Mrs. Adams.
- Question: What could be done in this situation?
- Answer: I have that problem with my boy. (Silence) Now my sister, she has girls. And well, she just makes her do the dishes. I think children should have an allowance for what they do; some money anyway.
- Question: Do you have any strong feelings or preference about what Mrs. Adams should do? If so, why?
- Answer: Think she should try the allowance first to coax them. If they are getting something out of it, they'll help. If they don't work, then don't pay them.
- Question: If you were faced with the same problem. what would you do?
- Answer: Now with my son, he's supposed to empty the garbage. But, he says that is not for boys to do. Now that my husband is gone all week he drives a truck and it is the first good paying job that he has had in years - the kids better get their work done before he comes home on the weekend or there is trouble. And, they know it too. We don't pay them when they don't work, and they haven't been paid for awhile now. With the children all in school and my husband gone, I really don't need them to help. My girl is retarded and can't do regular things. The problem is with my boys.
- <u>Problem B</u>: Mrs. Adams has to keep food costs down and yet she wants to feed her family good, nutritious meals. This concerns Mrs. Adams.
- Question: What could be done in this situation?
- Answer: I do baking at home rather than buying. Use leftovers too. If you cook right then you can use up the food; like stew out of meat. You can save that way. That is what I have to do and have had to do for years now.

- Question: Do you have any strong feelings or preference about what Mrs. Adams should do?
- Answer: Nothing but what I said.
- Question: If you were faced with the same problem, what would you do?
- Answer: You don't do just one thing. You have to do them all. I make bread and home made things. My family likes home made things anyway. They just love home made bread. As I told you, this is the first job that my husband has had that is steady. You don't know how much we worried about things, but everything is so much better now.
- <u>Problem C</u>: Mrs. Adams becomes bored with cleaning and ironing and other tasks that she does over and over again. And yet, she is never caught up with her work. This disturbs Mrs. Adams.
- Question: What could be done in this situation?
- Answer: I'd like a suggestion myself. (Silence) Well, we sisters get together and work at one house and then go to the other's house. We help each other and do it together. It is more fun together. Like, we do our spring house cleaning together and then if one is sick we help too.
- Question: Do you have any strong feelings or preference about what Mrs. Adams should do?
- Answer: Maybe change the routine around. Switch around from ironing to baking, and then back to ironing; same with washing. Don't get so tired of always doing the same thing all of the time.
- Question: If you were faced with the same problem, what would you do?
- Answer: I would switch around the work. That is my problem too. I just done the work until it got done.

Higher socio-economic interview

Wife:

- a. status: married
- b. age: 45
- c. education: one year college
- d. occupation: homemaker
- e. occupation before marriage: secretary
- f. church affiliation: Protestant
- g. organizations: one church, two social and one civic organization; no leadership responsibilities.

Husband:

- a. age: 45
- b. education: bachelor's degree
- c. occupation: executive director of a state department
- d. income: over \$10,000

Children:

- a. boys: none
- b. girls: aged 9, 12, and 14

Others living in the household: none

Mobility: lived in same geographic area lifetime

- <u>Problem A</u>: Mrs. Adams' twelve year old daughter doesn't like to help around the house. In fact, she doesn't want to do anything but play with her friends. This troubles Mrs. Adams.
- Question: What could be done in this situation?
- Answer: You should give children time in the morning so they won't be rushed and can get their work done. My girls get an allowance and they pay me five cents every time they don't make their bed.
- Question: Do you have any strong feelings or preference about what Mrs. Adams should do?
- Answer: At that age it doesn't matter too much. She could let her clean her own room. I don't go in my girls' room to clean because I don't dare throw anything away. They get very upset if I touch anything.
- Question: If you were faced with the same problem, what would you do?
- Answer: They know that I do things for them and they help me; like this dress that I am sewing for my youngest girl. My girls are pretty good help when we work together.
- Question: Have you ever experienced this problem?
- Answer: No, I really don't have any problem. My girls are pretty good.
- <u>Problem B</u>: Mrs. Adams has to keep food costs down and yet she wants to feed her family good, nutritious meals. This concerns Mrs. Adams.
- Question: What could be done in this situation?
- Answer: I really don't have this problem and never have had. We just buy what we need. I wouldn't know what to do. Of course we don't always have steak. I have roasts and other less expensive cuts of meat.

- Question: Do you have any strong feelings or preference about what Mrs. Adams should do?
- Answer: I don't travel around to different stores. I don't use coupons or watch for specials at different stores. I don't believe in that. Maybe she could bake more and make things from scratch.
- <u>Problem C</u>: Mrs. Adams becomes bored with cleaning and ironing and other tasks that she does over and over again. And yet, she is never caught up with her work. This disturbs Mrs. Adams.
- Question: What could be done in this situation?
- Answer: Well, she could put herself on a schedule. Can I tell you what I did today? Well, my sister called and asked me to meet her downtown for lunch. I knew that I had to finish washing the kitchen walls and wash the dishes. So, I gave myself an hour to wash the walls and I kept watching the clock to gauge myself. And, I was downtown and on time.
- Question: Do you have any strong feelings or preference about what Mrs. Adams should do?
- Answer: She needs to put herself on a schedule.
- Question: If you were faced with the same problem. what would you do?
- Answer: If you take a break, then you can work harder. After going to lunch, I came back here and hung the drapes out on the line and started washing windows. I felt like working after having a break.

APPENDIX II

Time reference	Lower N	Respon %	ses Upper N	%
Future	2	9.52	5	23.80
Past	12	57.14	10	47.61
Present	7	33.33	6	28.57
Unclassified	0	0	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 27.--Time reference in response to problem A by socio-economic group

Degrees of freedom - 2; X^2 for table 4.99; X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

Time réference	Lower N	Respon %	ses Upper N	Ķ
Future	2	9.52	6	28.57
Past	10	47.61	10	47.61
Present	8	38.09	5	23.80
Unclassified	l	4.76	0	0
Totals	21	100	21	100

TABLE 28.--Time reference in response to problem B by socio-economic group

Degrees of freedom - 2; X^2 for table 2.77; X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

Time reference	Lower N	Respon %	ses Upper N	9 6
Future	2	9.52	2	9.52
Past	11	5 2. 38	13	61.90
Present	7	33.33	5	23.80
Unclassified	l	4.76	l	4.76
Totals	21	100	21	.100

TABLE	29Time	reference	in	response	to	problem	С	by
	soci	D-economic	gro	oup				

Degrees of freedom - 2; X^2 for table 3.98; X^2 of 5.99 is significant at the 5% level.

Deei	cion molting stulo	 D	Lowe	r		Uppe	r	
Deci	sion-making style	A P	B	em C	P A	B	em C	
1.	mjtırı	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2.	$m_{1}t_{2}r_{1}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3.	$m_1 t_3 r_1$	0	0	0	l	Ö	0	
4.	$m_1 t_1 r_2$	0	0	l	1	i	l	
5.	$m_1 t_2 r_2$	1	0	0	0	1	0	
6.	$m_1 t_3 r_2$	0	0	l	0	0	l	
7.	mjt ₁ r ₃	1	1	0	0	0	l	
8.	$m_1 t_2 r_3$	0	0	1	0	0	0	
9.	$m_1 t_3 r_3$	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10.	m ₂ t ₁ r ₁	0	0	0	1	l	0	
11.	$m_2 t_2 r_1$	4	С	0	3	2	8	
12.	$m_2 t_3 r_1$	l	1	1	1	1	2	
13.	$m_2 t_1 r_2$	0	0	0	2	0	0	
14.	$m_2 t_2 r_2$	0	l	2	5	1	2	
15.	$m_2^+ r_2^-$	0	1	l	0	2	0	
16.	$m_{2}t_{1}r_{3}$	l	0	0	0	0	0	
17.	$m_{2}t_{2}r_{3}$	3	0	4	2	1	1	
18.	$m_2 t_3 r_3$	0	0	l	1	0	0	
19.	$m_3 t_1 r_1$	0	1	0	0	1	0	
20.	$m_3 t_2 r_1$	l	5	l	0	3	۰ ٦	
21.	$m_3 t_3 r_1$	2	3	2	0	0	0	
22.	$m_3 t_1 r_2$	0	0	0	0	3	0	
23.	$m_3 t_2 r_2$	1	2	0	0	1	l	
24.	$m_3 t_3 r_2$	0	2	0	l	1	2	
25.	$m_3 t_1 r_3$	0	0	0	1	0	0	
26.	^m ³ t ₂ r ³	· 2	l	3	0	O	0	
27.	m ₃ t ₃ r ₃	3	1	1	2	0	0	
Uncl	assified	·l	2	2	0	2	1	
Tota	ls	21	21	21	21	21	21	<u> </u>

TABLE 30.--Decision-making style in response to each decision problem and according to socioeconomic group

•

·

. .

· · . • • 1 . • . .

.

