



OVERDUE FINES:
25¢ per day per item

RETURNING LIBRARY MATERIALS:
Place in book return to remove
charge from circulation records

DEC 11 1985
PP 36
XXXXXXXXXX
XOX A154
OCT 12 1980
Nov 19
XXXXXXXXXX
FEB 22 1984
0 56

XXXXXXXXXX
12-
065

FAMILY WORK: THE UTILIZATION
OF TIME IN THE MAINTENANCE OF
SINGLE PARENT AND WORKING
MOTHER FAMILIES

By

Melvin Samuel Kalish

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology

1981

© Copyright by
MELVIN SAMUEL KALISH
1981

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Esther, and my children, Aaron, Naomi and Miriam, who have lived my doctoral program as much as I have, and who have been a blessing and my support at every step along the way.

[illegible]

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my advisor, Professor Fred Waisanen, for the years of guidance and support he has given me, and for our many discussions which helped to shape the present research. I am indebted as well to the other members of my dissertation committee, Professor Al Beegle, Professor Tom Conner, and Professor Bill Faunce, each of whom contributed key advice and guidance as this research progressed through design, execution and writing. I would also like to thank Professor Jim Zuiches and Professor Cy Stewart for their helpful advice and suggestions. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the friendly help and support I received over the years from Marilyn Lovall and Judy Flositz.

I will always be grateful to my staff of interviewers and screeners, who worked long and hard to finish our survey on time. I am especially grateful to Myrna Reynolds, who showed me how to adapt my instruments to the practical necessities of survey research, and helped me keep things running smoothly throughout the field work. Special thanks to Bec Crandall and Delores Wood who helped me to put my interviewing staff together. I greatly appreciate the contributions of my wife, Esther, who took part

in the

opinion

work of

and the

for the

helped

known

of the

State

Depart

Commis

inter

inter

inter

inter

in this study from the beginning, as an interviewer, coder, typist and proofreader.

I am very grateful to the many Lansing mothers who took time out from their busy and in some cases very difficult lives to share something of their experience with us.

I wish to acknowledge the contribution of The Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station, which helped to defray the cost of printing survey materials. The Automobile Club of Michigan donated Lansing maps in support of the survey. The Michigan State University Department of Sociology provided funds for the computer analysis. The Department of Computer Services, California State University Dominguez Hills kindly assisted me in completing the computer analysis.

Finally, this dissertation owes a great deal to the inspired editing of Beverly Godwin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. The Situation	2
B. Emergent Problems	5
C. The Study	8
Research Rationale and Goals	8
Description of the Study	11
Value of the Study	12
D. Definitions	14
Actors	14
Unit of Analysis	16
Acted Upon	17
Actions	17
Consequences	19
E. Limitations of the Study	20
F. Plan of the Dissertation	21
II. THEORY	23
A. Theoretical Perspectives	24
Structural Functionalism	24
Symbolic Interactionism	31
Role Theory	33
Conflict Theory	35
Systems Perspective	36
Synthesis	41
B. Research and Theory	43
Nuclear Family Maintenance	44
The Use of Time	47
Working Wives	50
Single Parents	55
Satisfaction	59
C. A Theory of Family Maintenance	62
D. Hypotheses	68
E. Variables	70
III. THE SURVEY	72
A. Methodology	72
Population	73
Study Sample	74

Sampling Method	74
Screening Method	77
Data Collection Method	77
Required Screening Sample	81
B. The Survey Instruments and Materials	82
Interviewer Questionnaire	83
Field Test Feedback Form	83
Screening Record Form	84
Screening Interview	85
Letter of Introduction	86
Informed Consent Form	86
Family Work Interview	87
Income Card	90
Performance Worksheet	90
Interview Record Form	90
Reinterview Form	91
Non-Respondent Interview	92
Non-Respondent Data Collection Forms	93
Call-Back Record Form	93
C. Measures	93
D. Procedures	96
Staffing	97
Interviewers	97
Field Supervisor	100
Telephone Screeners	100
Training	101
Field Testing	104
Sampling Procedures	104
Screening Procedures	106
Interviewing Procedures	108
Data Assessment Procedures	111
Data Handling and Preparation	113
Data Analysis	113
IV. RESULTS	115
A. The Data	115
Interviewer Data	116
Screening Data	117
Interview Data	117
Verification	119
Reliability	119
Validity	124
Screening Error Check	142
B. Background Characteristics	143
C. Task Performance	148
D. Satisfaction	159
V. CONCLUSIONS	167
A. Summary	167
Findings	171

^ B.	Discussion	177
	Relation of Findings to Prior	
	Research	177
	Conclusions	183
C.	Recommendations	189
	Research Recommendations	189
	Policy Recommendations	190
	LIST OF REFERENCES	196
	APPENDIX A	208
	APPENDIX B	233

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Interviewer Data	116
2.	Marital Status of Female Single Parent Family Heads	126
3.	Employment Status of Mothers	127
4.	Age Distribution of Married Mothers	129
5.	Age Distribution of Single Mothers	130
6.	Racial/Ethnic Distributions of Mothers	131
7.	Educational Attainment of Mothers	133
8.	Occupational Distributions of Employed Women	135
9.	Income Distributions	136
10.	Families by Number of Children Living With Them	138
11.	Background Characteristics by Marital and Employment Status	145
12.	Mean Task Performance Hours by Mother's Marital and Employment Status	149
13.	Mean Assistance Received From Businesses and Community Services by Mother's Marital and Employment Status	155
14.	Mean Satisfaction by Marital and Employment Status	160
15.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Married Mothers	209
16.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Married Mothers Working Full Time	210
17.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Married Mothers Working Part Time	211

18.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Married Mothers Not Working	212
19.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Single Mothers	213
20.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Single Mothers Working Full Time	214
21.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Single Mothers Working Part Time	215
22.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Single Mothers Not Working	216
23.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Separated Mothers	217
24.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Separated Mothers Working Full Time	218
25.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Separated Mothers Working Part Time	219
26.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Separated Mothers Not Working	220
27.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Divorced Mothers	221
28.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Divorced Mothers Working Full Time	222
29.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Divorced Mothers Working Part Time	223
30.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Divorced Mothers Not Working	224
31.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Widowed Mothers	225
32.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Widowed Mothers Working Full Time	226
33.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Widowed Mothers Working Part Time	227
34.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Widowed Mothers Not Working	228
35.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Never Married Mothers	229

36.

37.

38.

36.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Never Married Mothers Working Full Time	230
37.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Never Married Mothers Working Part Time	231
38.	Mean Task Performance Hours For Never Married Mothers Not Working	232

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

ABSTRACT

FAMILY WORK: THE UTILIZATION OF TIME IN THE MAINTENANCE OF SINGLE PARENT AND WORKING MOTHER FAMILIES

By

Melvin Samuel Kalish

The number of single parents and working mothers has greatly increased in recent years. These statuses pose special problems for their occupants in the area of family maintenance, and in particular, in their use of time. The problems are societal as well as individual, concerning as they do the well-being and employment of tens of millions of people, and the upbringing of tens of millions more.

The family was conceptualized as a social system with the positions of child and mother and/or father. Family maintenance is the most basic family process. The family maintenance tasks are allocated to 3 roles: provider, housekeeper, and child care agent. Although the provider role is traditionally assigned to fathers, and the housekeeper and child care roles to mothers, performance is often shared. Single parents and working wives, in particular, find themselves performing all 3 family maintenance roles.

Prior theory and research suggest that nuclear families tend to be largely, but not entirely, independent of others in meeting their basic needs. Parents perform most family maintenance, but they receive some help from their children, kin, friends and neighbors. A theory was developed relating family type, the utilization of time in family maintenance and satisfaction. Hypotheses were derived concerning these issues.

A comparative cross-sectional survey was conducted in Lansing, Michigan to obtain the data to test these hypotheses. Representative samples of married and single mothers were obtained by random digit dialing and telephone screening. A total of 128 married mothers and 102 single mothers were interviewed face-to-face utilizing a structured interview with largely closed-ended questions.

It was found that single mothers perform few, if any, more hours of family maintenance than married mothers. They do tend to spend more time earning a living and less time at housekeeping. Single mothers receive considerable help from their children, but no more than married mothers.

Both nuclear and mother-child families derive support from persons outside the immediate family. Kin provide some assistance, but not more for single mothers than married. Friends give considerably more help to single mothers than married. Neighbors help out a little in both cases.

Melvin Samuel Kalish

Ex-husbands contribute a few hours a week to their former familys' maintenance efforts. As a result of the absence of a second parent in the family, however, the mother-child family makes do with far fewer maintenance hours than the nuclear family.

The employed single mother does less housekeeping and child care and keeps her total family maintenance hours from rising very much, if at all. Her children support her employment by spending more time at family maintenance. If she is employed fulltime she receives less support from relatives and friends than otherwise.

Married mothers who are employed do less housekeeping and child care and more family maintenance overall than married mothers who are not employed. Their children and relatives support their employment with additional family maintenance help. Families of married mothers employed full-time total the most maintenance hours of all family types.

Single mothers are somewhat less satisfied with their lives than married mothers. The life satisfaction of married mothers varies inversely with the number of hours they spend at family maintenance.

The "no
Western
decades
working
nature
differe

to soci
been de
family,
incorpor
family s
States t
in which

and soc
economic
is to or
process
family.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The family is undergoing rapid change worldwide. The "normal" nuclear family of the United States and other Western societies has become the exception in the last three decades, while single parent families and families with working mothers have proliferated at a rapid rate. The nature of the family, its workings and its needs are vastly different today from what they were not very many years ago.

This situation poses a challenge and an opportunity to sociologists. On the one hand, family theory, which has been developing in parallel with the recent changes in the family, is challenged to keep up with these changes and to incorporate them. On the other hand, the diversity of family structures and functional arrangements in the United States today presents us with an unusual natural laboratory in which to study the nature of the family.

The challenge is social as well, demanding significant social change, as the changing family impacts the economic and other major institutions. The opportunity here is to create a more equitable and flexible society in the process of accommodating to the changes and diversity of the family.

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

2100

This volume reports the results of a study of family maintenance, that process which is directed toward the continued survival of individual families. A theory of family maintenance is developed, which incorporates single parent as well as nuclear families. This theory is productive of testable hypotheses. A sample survey was conducted to obtain the data to test these hypotheses. The results are examined, and the implications for family theory and policy are discussed.

A. The Situation

Alternatives to the one-income nuclear family are rapidly growing in numbers and importance. The number of women in the United States living as single parent family heads has risen steadily from 1.3 million in 1950 to 5.3 million in 1979, an increase of 308%. During the same time period the number of nuclear families increased by only 31%. From 1970 to 1979 alone the number of female headed single parent families has increased 81%, while the number of nuclear families has decreased by 3.5% (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1950, 1971, 1980a).

As a result of these trends, female single parents, who headed 6% of all families with dependent children in 1950, headed 17% of such families in 1979. Female single parents are concentrated in the central cities, where they headed 28% of all families with dependent children in 1979 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1950, 1980a).

31
since 1965
center for
contributed
female fam
in 1973
nately for
mats are
the second
of single
married wo
children.
parent fam
disabled fr
1975.

As
were living
this const
United Sta
institute
United Sta

Ma
in poverty
winger the
and presen
husband-wa
threshold

Divorce, the rate of which has more than doubled since 1965 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979, U.S. National Center For Health Statistics, 1980), has been the major contributor to this rise. Divorced women comprised 12% of female family heads in 1950 and 33% of female family heads in 1979 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1951, 1980a). Approximately forty-two percent of female single parent family heads are divorced (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980b). The second major contributor to the increase in the number of single parents is the rapidly growing trend for never-married women who become pregnant to bear and raise these children. From 1970 to 1979 the percentage of female single parent family heads who have never been married more than doubled from 8 to 17 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980b).

As of March 1979, 9,828,000 children under eighteen were living with their mothers in single parent families. This constituted 16% of all children growing up in the United States. Of these, 3,649,000 were Black children, constituting 39% of all Black children growing up in the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980c).

Many female single parents and their children live in poverty. The median income of families with own children younger than 18 years old maintained by women with no husband present was \$7,035 in 1978, compared with \$20,410 for husband-wife families with dependent children. The poverty threshold in that year was \$6,662 for a nonfarm family of

four.

below

to 5.

family

total

three

husband

lies,

person.

in fact

of Max

when

strong-

when

force

to start

than 7

of 65

with 60

steadily

with 60

force,

of 65

person,

clear 6

four. While the number of United States families living below the poverty level declined from 8.0 million in 1959 to 5.3 million in 1978, the number of female-headed families in poverty rose from 1.6 million (20% of the total) in 1959 to 2.7 million (50% of the total) in 1978. Thirty-one percent of women maintaining families with no husband present, and 51% of related children in such families, lived in poverty in 1978, compared with 9% of all persons maintaining families and 16% of related children in families (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978a, 1980b).

Most female single parents work for a living. As of March 1978, 55% of separated women and 67% of divorced women with preschool children were in the labor force. Sixty-two percent of separated women and 81% of divorced women with school-aged children only were in the labor force (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979).

The trend toward mothers working is not confined to single parents. In 1950, 3.6 million wives with children younger than 18 years old were in the labor force, 28% of those with school-aged children, and 12% of those with preschool children. These numbers have increased steadily and rapidly, so that by 1978 12.5 million wives with children younger than 18 years old were in the labor force, 57% of those with school-aged children only, and 42% of those with preschool children (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979). In 1979, 24 million children lived in nuclear families in which their mother worked (Johnson, 1980).

Th
to live as
moved as
members, a

Fa
parent hav
not as sev
individual
lies is a
status inc
enough tim
flicking o

Th
adequately
tain itself
the family
accomplish
even though
of having t
of her home
ing female
these diff

A 6
to contribu
higher inco
the househo

B. Emergent Problems

The problems arising out of the attempts of people to live as single parents and as working wives may be viewed as being on two levels, that of the family and its members, and that of the society and its institutions.

Families containing a working wife or a single parent have problems which are either not present in or not as severe in one-income nuclear families. The primary individual and family level problem in both types of families is a shortage of time. Single parent or working wife status increases one's risk of having too much to do, not enough time to do it in, not enough assistance, and conflicting demands on one's time and energy.

The family with a single parent must find a way to adequately accomplish all of the tasks necessary to maintain itself without the contribution of a second parent. The family with a working wife must find a way to adequately accomplish all of the tasks necessary to maintain itself even though the female parent is generally in the position of having taken on a provider function without having given up her homemaker and child care responsibilities. The working female single parent, of course, is faced with both of these difficulties.

A few husbands are not employed and so may be able to contribute more to the other family maintenance tasks. Higher income families can hire others to perform some of the household tasks. The family blessed with a large

support network may be able to make arrangements with relatives, friends or neighbors. In any case, careful time-scheduling and time-budgeting and increased efficiency may go far to make up the lost time. The least tractable problem in this area, and the one most discussed in applied and lay publications, is that of providing adequate, affordable day care so that the female parent can go to work.

The efforts of working wives and single parents to earn an income are often hampered by a lack of appropriate education or work experience, or by an inability to surmount age, sex and/or racial barriers to better jobs and better pay. The working wife is often at work out of necessity to increase the family's income, or at least in order to contribute to important practical family goals. Her needs and problems are real. Nevertheless, the two-income family has the highest median income of all major categories of family, and can often afford to purchase some of the services it requires to maintain itself.

The female single parent is generally in a far more difficult situation. She provides all or most of her family's income, but has access to, if anything, less support than the working wife. Thus, only 67% of female heads of families with related children under eighteen worked in 1978, and, of these, only 52% worked full-time year-round. Twenty-eight percent of female-headed families relied on public assistance for all or part of their income in that

year

of t

sing

aris

The

con

also

sing

have

idol

one

or o

on r

sex.

and

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

year, compared to 2% of male-headed families (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980d). The net result is that the female single parent often lacks money as well as time.

Single parenthood produces, as well, problems that arise out of the unique characteristics of the situation. The number of parents in the single parent family is, of course, half of that in a nuclear family, but there is almost as much work to be done. The presence of only a single parent in the family makes it likely that she will have to go outside the immediate family for child care, adult companionship and support. Generally there is no other adult in the family to "step in" in case of illness or other emergency.

It is also necessary for the single parent to take on roles generally performed by persons of the opposite sex. She may be unfamiliar, inexperienced and perhaps uncomfortable with these roles. They may be structurally difficult for her to perform, or culturally disapproved of (Glasser and Navarre, 1965; Nye and Berardo, 1973).

The personal consequences of the combination of circumstances confronting the single parent often include fatigue, loneliness, anxiety and depression, and an increased likelihood of physical illness (Ferri and Robinson, 1976; Weiss, 1979).

Taken in the aggregate, the problems of working wives and single parents constitute a growing social problem. Rapid social change in the family institution is

1923

and 1924

1925

1926

1927

1928

1929

1930

1931

1932

1933

1934

1935

1936

1937

1938

1939

1940

1941

1942

1943

1944

1945

1946

1947

1948

1949

1950

1951

1952

creating difficulties and demands for compensating cultural and structural changes. As the United States Bureau of the Census (1977a) put it:

Families headed by women who have no husband present represent a growing proportion of all families in this country. For many women, being a female family head is a transitional status which often subsequently changes by entry into first marriage for never-married women, reconciliation for separated women, and remarriage for divorced or widowed women. Nevertheless, many more women are passing through this increasingly common life cycle stage than in the past. Effective response to the needs of these women and their family members (particularly their children) relative to employment, welfare, education, child care arrangements, and a variety of related social and economic requirements constitutes a major challenge to governmental and private agency planners and service personnel. (p. 5)

The consequences of these problems are not limited to the parents and their families. The welfare of a large and growing number of citizens cannot help but affect the general welfare. Then again, the ability of millions of parents to work and support their families must have an effect on the national economy.

C. The Study

This section discusses the need for family research, describes the present study, and defines its contribution to theory and practice.

Research Rationale and Goals

The discussion so far has described a situation of rapid social change in our society, the development and proliferation of new family forms, and the problems

experienced
the personal
also been ex
social scien
is now known
family forms

Here

there is a r
States as a
well as weak
differences
to see resea
single paren
receive from

The

changes tak
that part of
should be ba
in turn, sho
phenomena in
the need for
provision of

A gr

single paren
reports and
the situatio
describing t

experienced by people who are participating in this change. The personal and social consequences of this situation have also been explored. As stated in the introduction, the social scientist will want to know a great deal more than is now known about the structure and function of the new family forms.

Herzog and Sudia (1968), for example, state that there is a need to study the fatherless family in the United States as a family form in its own right, its strengths as well as weaknesses, and its similarities to, as well as differences from, the two-parent family. They would like to see research concerning the coping behavior of female single parents and their families, and the support they receive from relatives, friends and the community.

The need for social and cultural adjustment to the changes taking place in the family has also been discussed. That part of the adjustment which is designed and guided should be based upon well-reasoned social policy, which, in turn, should be grounded in a solid understanding of the phenomena involved. Cogswell and Sussman (1972) emphasize the need for research on variant family forms to guide the provision of services and the modification of practices.

A great deal has been written in recent years about single parents and working wives. There are statistical reports and analyses, policy studies, articles interpreting the situation and trends for the general public, and books describing the experiences of one or a small number of

individuals.

in print, so

new lifestyle

and skills to

live better

Cons

the lives of

families, ge

Their sample

populations

designs gene

Then

area, but it

research. T

search to su

a comparative

The

1.

concerning t

two-income a

and outcomes

2.

state effect

make socia

income and s

individuals. A lot of persuasive material has appeared in print, supportive of one perspective or another on the new lifestyles. How-to books attempt to impart knowledge and skills that the authors feel will enable people to live better lives as single parents.

Considerable exploratory research has been done on the lives of single parents and working wives and their families, generating a great deal of descriptive detail. Their samples have usually been drawn from special problem populations or have otherwise been non-random. Study designs generally have not been comparative.

There has been some theoretical writing in this area, but it has not usually been tied to the empirical research. There has now been sufficient exploratory research to support the statement and empirical testing of a comparative model of family survival behavior.

The goals of the present study are, then:

1. The further development of explanatory theory concerning the survival behaviors of traditional nuclear, two-income and single parent families, their determinants and outcomes, and
2. The development of a body of knowledge to facilitate effective intervention and the making of rational and humane social policies toward meeting the needs of two-income and single parent families in our society.

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

Description of the Study

The present study investigates the family maintenance process. Particular attention is paid to this process in two-income families and single parent families, types of family which have special problems in this regard. Within the general area of family maintenance the focus is on the utilization of time in the performance of those tasks required to maintain a viable family. A theory of family maintenance is developed within a sociological framework which combines elements of the structural-functional, symbolic interactionist, conflict and systems perspectives. Hypotheses are derived concerning family type differences in family maintenance behavior and outcomes.

The hypotheses are tested utilizing data obtained by empirical research. The research design is that of a cross-sectional survey, utilizing a sample of City of Lansing, Michigan mothers, stratified so as to obtain approximately equal subsamples of single parents and married mothers. Respondents were acquired by a two-stage sampling process, utilizing random digit dialing and telephone screening. Each respondent was interviewed face-to-face, utilizing a structured interview averaging one hour in duration.

Information was acquired in three general areas: background data, task performance and satisfactions. The basic background data obtained were the respondent's marital status, employment status, age and education, as

well as her
performance fact
in family man
riding the
maintenance
the maintenanc
purchasing,
the risk per
parent, child
wives, in-law
my utilization
a performing
also contained
and her home
and financial
happiness.

Anal
and comparison
of the hypoth

Title of the

this
addresses an
developed or
and directed
some of the
this area of

well as her family's size and income. The key task performance data consisted of an accounting of the time spent in family maintenance activities during the seven days preceding the interview, broken down into five categories of maintenance tasks and seven categories of task performers. The maintenance task categories were: income acquisition, purchasing, physical maintenance, feeding, and child care. The task performer categories were: respondent (female parent), children at home, husband or ex-husband, relatives, in-laws, friends, and neighbors. Information regarding utilization of business and community services for help in performing these tasks was also obtained. The survey also obtained data regarding the respondent's satisfaction with her home, meals, family life, social life, free time, and financial situation, plus general life satisfaction and happiness.

Analysis of these data was by means of examination and comparison of the resultant statistics and the testing of the hypotheses.

Value of the Study

This study is significant in a number of ways. It addresses an area of theory much mentioned but little developed or investigated. It bases research on theory and directs the results of the research toward the development of theory and practice. The survey was unusual in this area of research in being based on a representative

random sample and being of a comparative nature. The research is also more quantitative than has generally been the case in single parent or two-income family research.

This study serves both theoretical and instrumental purposes. To understand the family today it is necessary to understand the nature and functioning of single parent and two-income families and their relationships with their social environment. This study produces a relevant body of knowledge and contributes to the development of explanatory theory in the area.

In order to respond appropriately to the needs of single parent and two-income families it is necessary to know a great deal about their needs, resources and family maintenance behavior. This study produces a data base descriptive of the resources and efforts of such families which can support, with greater clarity than has previously been available, policy decision-making and planning toward helping them meet their needs.

The information produced by this study serves as a baseline against which the results of further studies may be compared. Studies of urban/rural, ethnic and national differences would serve to further enrich family theory and assist human service providers. Replication of this study would provide very useful longitudinal data concerning the rapid social changes taking place in the family institution and the position of women in American society.

More generally, it is hoped that this dissertation may serve to stimulate more professional interest in family maintenance and that the theoretical synthesis will prove useful to others. Finally, it is hoped that the survey methodology will serve as an example of what may be accomplished with the use of random-digit dialing.

D. Definitions

This section discusses the meanings of a number of key terms used in this dissertation.

Actors

One of the central impediments to the development of family theory has been the lack of an agreement as to what constitutes a family (Bell and Vogel, 1960). For the purposes of this research, the Census Bureau definition is the most appropriate:

The term "family" refers to a group of two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption and residing together in the same household. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976:3.)

Several additional distinctions made by the Census Bureau will also be helpful:

A primary family consists of the head of a household and all other persons in the household related to the head.

A secondary family comprises two or more persons such as guests, lodgers or resident employees and their relatives, living in a household and related to each other but not to the household head.

A "subfamily" is a married couple with or without children, or one parent with one or more unmarried

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

children under 18 years old, living in a household and related to, but not including, the head of the household or his wife. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976:3.)

It is implicit in the definitions of "primary family" and "subfamily" that subfamilies are part of primary families, and not "families" in their own right.

A "household" comprises all persons who occupy a "housing unit", that is, a house or apartment or other group of rooms, or a room that constitutes "separate living quarters." (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976:3.)

The Census Bureau defines the head of a household or family as "the person 'maintaining' the household or family" (1977b:2). In this study, husband and wife are considered joint heads. It is also perceived that household and family maintenance are, in general, shared by the head(s) and others, a "head" being distinguished as a person who is responsible for the maintenance.

A "nuclear family" consists of a husband, wife and children (Christensen, 1964). A "single parent family" consists of a mother or father and her or his children. The "immediate family" is the single parent family or nuclear family. An extended family member is any relative of a member of a nuclear or single parent family. Thus a relative of a female single parent's ex-husband, her child's paternal grandmother for example, would be considered an extended family member. The families with whom this study is concerned all contain at least one dependent child (i.e., a child less than 18 years of age).

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

A parent is usually defined as the natural or adoptive mother or father, or the stepmother or stepfather of a dependent child. For the purposes of this study, this definition is extended to include foster parents and extended family members who are responsible for and caring for (i.e., parenting) a dependent child. The definitions of the various kinds of family, above, are also extended to accommodate these kinds of parents.

The number of parents in a family determines whether it is a "single parent family" or a "nuclear family", regardless of other adults who may reside in the household with the family. Such individuals, and others who may be of assistance, are considered part of the family's social environment and constitute family resources.

Unit of Analysis

This study focuses on individuals as actors. In particular, the female family head or husband and wife working together are seen as acting to maintain the family by acting themselves and also by organizing the actions of others within and outside of the family. They are acting for and within the context of the family. The primary unit of analysis of this study is the female family head, but an important secondary unit of analysis is the family as a whole. Similarly, although the focus is on the outcomes for the female family head, the wider concern is for the consequences for other family members and for the family

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

as a whole. Thus, the analysis may be said to be primarily at the individual level, but also importantly at the family unit level.

Acted Upon

The efforts of the actors act upon the basic life necessities and resources convertible into them. The basic life necessities are here taken to comprise food, clothing, shelter, medical care and child care. Money is the primary convertible resource, but others may include any goods or services exchangeable for food, clothing, shelter, medical care or child care.

Actions

The actions of interest comprise the behaviors of family members and others in seeking to acquire the basic life necessities for a family and provide them to its members, and so maintain the survival of the members of the family and the family unit. These behaviors include those aimed at the acquisition and utilization of convertible resources and of the required goods and services, physical maintenance of belongings and care of dependent children. These actions are referred to as the performance of maintenance tasks. Taken together they comprise the family maintenance process.

Five categories of family maintenance tasks have been distinguished: income acquisition, purchasing, physical maintenance, feeding and child care (see Chapter I,

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

Section C). Income acquisition consists of all activities involved in performing a job, maintaining a business, or receiving financial assistance. Applying for a job or for financial assistance is included in this category. Help provided to someone in performing income acquisition which does not come under the definition of another category is also included in this category. Commuting and attending school are not considered income acquisition activities.

Purchasing, or shopping, is the trading of convertible goods for goods and services. It includes shopping for such goods as groceries, clothes, furnishings and appliances, as well as for such services as repairs and haircuts. Physical maintenance comprises all activities directed toward the maintenance of the family's durable goods and property. As such, it includes such tasks as doing laundry, mending, housecleaning and straightening, yard and car care, pet care, and repairs. Feeding consists of the preparation of meals and snacks and cleaning up afterwards. Robinson (1977b) calls physical maintenance and feeding, taken together, housework.

A primary activity is the main thing one is doing at any given time. A secondary activity is one engaged in while also performing a primary activity. Primary child care consists of such activities as washing and dressing children, reading to them, helping them with their homework, playing and talking with them, and providing baby care and medical care. Primary child care requires direct interaction

2874

2875

2876

2877

2878

2879

2880

2881

2882

2883

2884

2885

2886

2887

2888

2889

2890

2891

2892

2893

2894

2895

2896

2897

between the caring person and the child. Supervising, minding, watching or baby-sitting a child is considered secondary child care, as it is often done passively while also performing a primary activity. Only primary activities are considered to contribute to the time spent in family maintenance task performance.

Time spent at the tasks mentioned above must be directed toward family maintenance to be counted as family maintenance task performance (see Chapter III, Section B and the Family Work Interview in Appendix B). The definitions of the family maintenance task categories was suggested by Robinson (1977b).

Consequences

The consequences of family maintenance task performance may be viewed in terms of function and process. If the task performance serves its function the family and its members survive. This outcome is called "success." If the task performance does not serve its function the family and/or one or more of its members do(es) not survive. This outcome is called "failure." A family may survive more or less well, with consequences for its members' satisfactions.

The family maintenance process has its consequences as well. The manner in which this process is carried out may have an effect upon family members' workloads, and so their satisfactions. The satisfactions of concern in this study are those of the female family head with regard to

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

her home, meals, family life, social life, free time and financial situation, as well as her general life satisfaction and happiness.

E. Limitations of the Study

In order to complete a useful and meaningful piece of work with limited time and money, limits have been placed on the scope of this work. Despite the fact that approximately one in ten single parents is a man, the very different circumstances and problems of single fathers are not addressed in this research. The focus is entirely on mothers.

One very appropriate coping response to single parenthood, for those who have this option, is for the single parent to move in with her parents. Again, these single parent subfamilies live under very different circumstances than single parent families headed by a woman who is also the head of her own household. The decision was made early-on to focus on those families in which a single parent is living independently and determining her own family maintenance strategy.

The present research is concerned strictly with urban mothers. The urban and rural situations are felt to be too different to utilize a joint sample, and there were not the resources to study both environments. The urban environment was selected because single parents are concentrated in the cities.

Opri

7821

1071

3000

13 1

1000

3000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

Field work was conducted during a single season, Spring, in a single city, Lansing, Michigan. Only school-year observations were made. What family maintenance activity arrangements are during the Summer or major school vacations is an important question, but one which is felt to be secondary to the present question, given the current state of knowledge in this area.

A major methodological limitation was to a cross sectional design. Dynamics can only be inferred. While this design is appropriate to the goals of the present research, a more ambitious research program would be enriched by a longitudinal approach.

F. Plan of the Dissertation

Chapter One has described the socio-economic situation to which this study is addressed, the problems emergent from that situation, and the nature, value and limitations of the present study. The following chapters will describe the research in detail.

Chapter Two reviews the theoretical and research literatures bearing on the subject. These are broken down into theoretical frames of reference and theory and research concerning nuclear family maintenance, the use of time, working wives, single parents and satisfaction. It then lays out the author's theoretical synthesis and hypotheses.

Chapter Three describes the methodology, materials and procedures utilized in the empirical research. Chapter Four defines and assesses the data set. It also describes

and

task

four

draw

tion

and compares the survey samples in terms of demographic, task performance and satisfaction data obtained. Chapter Four reports the results of the hypothesis tests.

Chapter Five reviews the study and its findings, draws some conclusions, and makes a number of recommendations.

2000

2000

2000

the

in

has

the

in

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

CHAPTER II

THEORY

Reviewers of family theory generally remark about how sparse it is (Hill and Hansen, 1960; Nye and Berardo, 1966; Burr, 1973; Morgan, 1975; Burr, Hill, Nye and Reiss, 1979). The consensus is that the development of family theory is a huge, complex undertaking, only recently begun in earnest. Progress has been very slow, despite a great deal of effort on the part of many scholars, and what theory there is is considered preliminary and tentative. On the other hand, the effort is accelerating, and there appears to be a strong commitment to achieving real progress.

The status of family maintenance theory is particularly rudimentary. Despite the frequent mention of family maintenance and survival in family literature there has been little interest in theory development or research on this subject. Only with the rapid and large scale development of variations on the family, in particular single parent and two-income families, has an interest in family maintenance appeared. Even so, almost all of the available literature to date has been prescriptive, descriptive or policy oriented.

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

This chapter discusses the key sociological perspectives bearing on family maintenance, reviews some recent theory and research, and states a theory of family maintenance. Testable hypotheses are then derived from the theory, and the key variables are listed.

A. Theoretical Perspectives

Social theory has tended to develop within general frames of reference or perspectives. Several of the most important of these bear on family maintenance. Structural-functionalism and the systems perspective utilize the concepts of system maintenance and survival. Symbolic interaction, role theory and conflict theory concern themselves with aspects of human behavior which are useful in understanding the family maintenance process.

This section briefly introduces these perspectives and discusses those of their aspects which are relevant to family maintenance. It concludes with a theoretical synthesis incorporating these relevant aspects.

Structural Functionalism

A major organizing paradigm in sociology for the last thirty years has been structural-functionalism. Over the years a number of different formulations have developed within this general frame of reference. What follows is an outline of those aspects of the common core which pertain to family maintenance.

Structural-functionalism focuses on the relationships and integration of parts with each other and within a whole (Pitts, 1964). The whole is a social entity, a society or a family for example. The parts are either smaller social entities or individuals. The relationships, taken together, constitute the structure of the whole. Often, the structure is said to relate positions rather than smaller social entities or individuals. The latter are then said to occupy the positions in the social structure. Thus we have the positions of child, mother and/or father in the family.

Associated with each position is a set of roles (Merton, 1957). Each role defines the normative behavioral expectations for the occupant of that position in his or her interaction with the occupant of some other position.

Structural-functionalism sees the whole and other social entities as social systems (Hill and Hansen, 1960). McIntyre (1966) defines a social system as "two or more interdependent units which are at the same time actors and social objects to each other" (p. 58). She characterizes social systems as possessing the distinguishing attributes of differentiation, organization, boundary maintenance, and equilibrium tendency.

That is, the actors occupy differentiated statuses or positions and perform differentiated roles; there is some organized pattern governing the relationships of the members and describing their rights and obligations with respect to one another, and some set of common norms and values, together with various types of shared cultural

500

Mar

Apr

May

Jun

Jul

Aug

Sep

Oct

Nov

Dec

Jan

Feb

Mar

Apr

May

Jun

Jul

Aug

Sep

Oct

Nov

Dec

Jan

objects and symbols. A system is boundary-maintaining in that there tends to be a tighter, more integrated organization among its components than there is between components and elements outside the system. A social system is characterized by an equilibrium tendency in that the system has built-in mechanisms which operate to hold it in some sort of steady state, either a static or a moving stability, over a period of time. (pp. 58, 59)

The definition of the meaning of "function" in structural-functionalism has been problematical (see e.g., Merton, 1968; Hill and Hansen, 1960). Merton defines functions as "those observed consequences which make for the adaptation or adjustment of a given system" (1968: 105). McIntyre reports that "function" may refer to "the contribution that an activity or an item makes to the whole; the consequences of the activity or item for the system being considered" or "the activity by which the consequences referred to are attained" (1966:61).

Dysfunctions are "those observed consequences which lessen the adaptation or adjustment of the system" (Merton, 1968:105), "the negative consequences of an activity for a given system" (McIntyre, 1966:61). It may be useful to conceptualize a contribution as a variable running from positive values through zero to negative values. A positive contribution is functional, a negative contribution is dysfunctional and a zero contribution is non-functional (Merton, 1968:105). Finally, "the same activity may have utterly different consequences for the

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

individual, his family, and for society as a whole or for some subsystem of the society" (McIntyre, 1966:61).

Merton (1968) writes that

Embedded in every functional analysis is some conception, tacit or expressed, of the functional requirements of the system under observation.
 . . . this remains one of the cloudiest and empirically most debatable concepts in functional theory.
 . . . the concept tends to be confined to the conditions of "survival" of a given system; it tends . . . to include biological as well as social "needs." (p. 106)

McIntyre defines functional prerequisites as "the problems which must be solved or the activities which must be performed to insure the survival of a social system on a given level" (1966:61). One way of looking at functional prerequisites is then as "a list of activities which must be performed if the society is to survive" (McIntyre, 1966:67).

Morgan (1975) states that Parsonian functionalism dominates the sociology of the family. Hill and Hansen (1960), while emphasizing the influence of the interactional approach over the previous twenty years, acknowledge the contribution of Parsons and find the structural-functional approach to have been growing in influence at that time.

In this framework, then, the family is conceived of as a component of society, a large social system. The family itself is a social system, composed of individuals who occupy positions within the family structure and who interact according to the expectations of other family members as institutionalized in the roles associated with

2

5

11

21

2

2

11

30

21

21

11

21

21

21

21

21

21

30

21

21

21

21

21

21

those positions. Families may be thought of as containing subsystems, for example the conjugal pair of husband and wife in a nuclear family, or a mother-daughter dyad (Bell and Vogel, 1960).

Family members perform functions for each other, for the family and for society. The family as a whole performs functions for its members and for society. Society, in turn, performs functions for the family and its members.

Thus, the family as a whole has functions for society. For example, it is said to be the primary socialization agent by which its society's basic values are transmitted to the next generation. Thus also the individuals within a family have functions for the family. For example, at least one member of the family must do something to acquire an adequate income for the family.

Family members are significant from the structural-functional perspective, according to Hill and Hansen "for their functions in the maintenance of the family system and, ultimately, of the social system" (1960:303). The importance of the maintenance process in the family is underscored by the fact that "The family structure . . . is oriented toward boundary maintenance of the system" (Hill and Hansen, 1960:303). The centrality of the maintenance process in the structural-functional framework is indicated by the fact that "Behavior . . . is studied in the context of its contribution to the maintenance of the structure" (Hill and Hansen, 1960:303).

Hill and Hansen (1960) characterize structural-functionalism as seeing "the family as open to outside influences and transactions" (p. 303), while also maintaining its boundaries. Bell and Vogel (1960) discuss the key activities family members engage in in order to maintain their families. In interaction with its social environment, the family trades its labor for rewards. These may be the ultimate goods and services the family requires. In the industrialized societies the rewards are more likely to be in the form of money. The family then exchanges these assets for the goods and services it requires. Internal to the family additional tasks must be performed to maintain the family. These may be categorized as the final preparation of goods, for example food, for family use, the maintenance of physical possessions, and caring for dependent family members.

Two controversial issues within structural-functionalism bear directly on the present study. Parsons (1955) defines the basic role structure of the nuclear family in terms of higher versus lower power and instrumental versus expressive functions. These latter he defines thusly:

The area of instrumental function concerns relations of the system to its situation outside the system, to meeting the adaptive conditions of its maintenance of equilibrium, and "instrumentally" establishing the desired relations to *external* goal-objects. The expressive area concerns the "internal" affairs of the system, the maintenance of integrative relations between the

members, and regulation of the patterns and tension levels of its component units. (Parsons, 1955:47)

The father/husband is allocated high power and specializes in the instrumental function, the mother/wife high power and the expressive function, the son/brother low power and the instrumental function, and the daughter/sister low power and the expressive function.

Pitts (1964) and Broderick (1971) discuss the controversy concerning the allocation of the instrumental and expressive family functions by sex. The implications of this allocation in the present context would be a lack of socialization of the female to the instrumental function, and a lack of legitimacy of the female in performing the instrumental function.

The expressive and instrumental functions are conceptualized as "mutually exclusive categories of behavior" (Broderick, 1971:4). Clearly, no matter how this aspect of the perspective is interpreted, there is the strong implication that it would be very difficult for a single person to successfully perform major instrumental and expressive tasks. Thus, it would be very difficult to be a married working mother. It would be even more difficult to maintain a family as a single parent. Indeed, Zelditch (1955) asks rhetorically, "Why after all, are *two* parents necessary?" (p. 312)

The other controversial area in Parsonian functional analysis of interest here is that of the isolation of the

American nuclear family. Pitts (1964) and Broderick (1971) discuss this issue as well. The Parsonian argument is that the isolation of the nuclear family developed out of the functional requirement of industrial society for a mobile work force. Extended family relations are perceived as restrictive, and the isolated nuclear family as mobile (Pitts, 1964). The isolated nuclear family is economically independent of related nuclear families (Lee, 1979). Gibson (1972) maintains that:

Parsons posits the isolated nuclear family because it is the normal household unit where neither household arrangements nor source of income bears any specific relation to either family of orientation, and because its social status and economic support depend on the husband's occupation which is held independently of any particularistic relation to kinsmen. (p. 14)

The implication for the present study is that the family would be expected to have little or no support from kin.

Symbolic Interactionism

Another major conceptual framework of sociology, and perhaps the major paradigm in American family sociology (Hill and Hansen, 1960) is symbolic interactionism. It has been productive of a great deal of research (Broderick, 1971).

Symbolic interactionism conceptualizes the interaction of human beings as taking place largely through significant symbols, the meanings of which are more or less consensual. A language is a system of significant symbols. People interact in accordance with how they understand or

define the situation (Stryker, 1959). That is, human interaction proceeds on the basis of participating individuals' unique subjective realities, constructed on the basis of information received through imperfect senses and largely mediated or modified by symbols.

Symbolic interactionism shares with structural-functionalism the concept of a social "position". From this perspective, however, a position is viewed as a socially recognized category of actors. The concept of role is also very important in symbolic interactionism.

Stryker (1964) relates position and role in the following way:

In attaching a position designation to a person, we are led to expect certain behaviors from him and we behave toward him on the basis of these expectations. To the expectations with regard to behavior attached to a position the term role is given. (p. 137)

A person's behavior is influenced by his or her self definition, which is developed in interaction with others, and reflects how they have acted toward the person. It is also shaped by one's reference group of the moment; "that group, real or imaginary, whose standpoint is being used as the frame of reference by the actor" (Shibutani, 1961:257).

The interactionist concept of the family is succinctly outlined by Hill and Hansen (1960):

The family is a unity of interacting persons, each occupying a position(s) within the family to which a number of roles are assigned, i.e., the individual perceives norms or role expectations

held individually or collectively by other family members for his attributes and behavior. In a given situation, an individual defines these role expectations primarily in view of their source (reference group) and of his own self-conception. Then he role-plays. (pp. 302, 303)

Interactionist studies have generally focused on the family and its members, and neglected the family's relationships with its social environment, thus studying it as a "comparatively closed unity" (Hill and Hansen, 1960:303). Nevertheless, the framework contains the concept of adaptation, "family and individual survival or integration in a given cultural milieu" (Schvaneveldt, 1966:108).

Role Theory

Standing between structural-functionalism and symbolic interactionism, is a perspective referred to as role theory. Thomas and Biddle (1966) outline this perspective as follows:

Individuals in society occupy positions, and their role performance in these positions is determined by social norms, demands, and rules; by the role performances of others in their respective positions; by those who observe and react to the performance; and by the individual's particular capabilities and personality. (p. 4)

Morgan (1975) states that, as with functional theory, there are many versions of role theory. He finds the more systems oriented approach to role theory to be "clearly congruent with and often part of a wider functional theory" (p. 55). Note also the striking congruence between Thomas and Biddle's (1966) formulation and Hill

and Hansen's (1960) interactionist conceptualization of the family in the previous subsection. Nye and Gekas (1976) review the controversy between the structural and interactionist positions on role and suggest a possible integration.

Broderick (1971) believes that the family developmental framework "demonstrates once again how well the units and constructs of the interactional and structural-functional frameworks can be made to articulate with each other" (p. 6). Broderick also feels that Parsons, "as much as any other theorist," has "integrated interaction theory with structure-functional theory through the simple expedient of specifying roles as the chief structured elements of social systems" (Broderick, 1971:4).

Several role variables are relevant to the subject of working mothers and single parents. Role conflict is the presence of incompatible expectations for a role. Role incompatibility is the degree to which the demands of a set of roles are incompatible with each other. Role clarity is the degree to which the behaviors associated with a role are explicitly defined. Role strain is the stress felt by a person when he or she cannot comply with or has difficulty complying with role expectations (Burr, 1973).

Role strain has been primarily thought of "as a dependent variable, indicative of problems in role enactment" (Nye, 1976:23). Nye (1976) believes that role strain could also be used as a predictor of marital

dissatisfaction, marital dissolution and mental illness.

Nye and Gekas (1976) identify eight family roles: provider, housekeeper, child care, child socialization, sexual, recreational, therapeutic, and kinship associated with the husband/father and wife/mother positions.

Conflict Theory

The frameworks discussed so far do not incorporate interpersonal conflict as an important factor in ongoing human interaction. Conflict is, however, a ubiquitous fact of life in society and in the family. Deutsch (1969) defines interpersonal conflict "as existing whenever incompatible activities occur . . . between two or more persons" (Barry, 1970:47). "Conflict, says Deutsch, may arise from differences in information or belief, from differences in interests, desires, or values, or from the scarcity of some resource, or from a rivalry in which one person tries to outdo or undo the other" (Barry, 1970:47, from Deutsch, 1969). Barry (1970) adds that conflicts arise from perceptions of reality, and not strictly from objective circumstances, a symbolic interactionist perspective.

Sprey (1969, 1979) proposes a model of the family as a system living with conflict within itself and in its transactions with its environment. He rejects any implication of other perspectives "that stability, the fact of family continuity, is somehow normal and incompatible with the presence of conflict and disorder" (1969:699). Clearly,

many families persist for years in the presence of a great deal of conflict. Virtually all families experience some. Indeed, family counselors are concerned if there is the appearance or claim of a total absence of conflict in a family.

The emphasis is then on the achievement of ongoing family functioning through the management of conflict. Sprey (1969) makes cooperation the key concept. He defines cooperation with Horowitz (1967) as a process by which problems are settled in a manner permitting the existence of ongoing differences and disagreements.

Sprey's model links the conflict and systems perspectives. He says that the systems approach is a basic premise of conflict theory, that the systems perspective is assumed. Working from this perspective Sprey finds that the "family system places a premium on survival as a group" (1979:153) and the "Living, open systems depend for their survival on exchanges with their environment" (1979:143). Sprey (1979) discusses family system maintenance, a process to which he finds the family's children contribute.

Systems Perspective

The classic definition of system, stated by von Bertalanffy in 1956, is "a set of units with relationships among them" (Stein, 1974:3). Many would elaborate on this rather spare statement. Brock, Chesebro, Cragan and Klumpp (1973), for example, state that

A system is an assembly of objects all of which are related to one another by some form of regular interaction or interdependence so that the assembly can be viewed as an organic or organized whole (p. 27),

thus specifying the nature of the relationships among the units, introducing a dynamic element, and enlarging upon the concept of the set.

Kantor and Lehr (1975) add further ramifications to the concept of a system by defining it as:

. . . a set of different things or parts . . . that meet two requirements: first, these parts are directly or indirectly related to one another in a network of reciprocal causal effects, and second, each component part is related to one or more of the other parts of the set in a reasonably stable way during any particular period of time. (p. 10)

This definition further details the nature of the relationships among units, introducing the concepts of indirectness, network, and stability.

A system may be characterized in a number of ways. It may be said to have a given number of components or to be of a certain size or extent. It may be described in terms of its structure or organization. The network of relationships among components may be more or less complex. The components may be specialized, and may be differentiated in terms of access to energy or resources and power or control. They may also be of differential primacy in their functioning. The pattern of communication among components of information processing systems may be more or less complex (Anderson and Carter, 1974).

The definition or specification of a system also defines its boundary, that which separates or distinguishes it and its parts from its environment (Speer, 1970). Systems may be characterized as to the location and nature of their boundaries (Anderson and Carter, 1974). An "open" system is a system which interacts with its environment, exchanging energy or information (Kantor and Lehr, 1975). Buckley (1967) requires that a system's interchange with its environment be an essential factor underlying its viability and continuity if it is to be considered an open system. Open systems may be said to have permeable boundaries (Brock, Chesebro, Cragan and Klumpp, 1973). Such systems may be thought of as having linkage with other systems in their environment.

Systems may be overlapping or interrelated, and they may be components of other systems. Thus, there are "sub-systems" and "suprasystems" (Anderson and Carter, 1974). To the degree that a system is open, it is subject to environmental influences.

Systems may be adaptive, that is, "capable of making changes, and of responding productively to stress whether it is internally or externally stimulated" (Kantor and Lehr, 1975:11). An information processing system may, for example, receive information which stimulates it to make an adaptive response. Kantor and Lehr (1975) maintain that "Systems theory asserts that complexly organized, open, and adaptive

information processing systems are purposive and goal seeking" (p. 11).

A system may be characterized, largely in terms of its components, as abstract, physical, organic or social. A set of interrelated mathematical functions or a model of a human personality would be an abstract system. Machines are physical systems. A living creature may be considered an organic system. A human being is an organic system. It is also a complexly organized, open, adaptive information processing system. Social systems are "composed of persons or groups of persons who interact and influence the behavior of each other." (Anderson and Carter, 1974:8). Groups, organizations, communities and societies are examples of social systems.

A family is a social system. It is a recognizable entity made up of several regularly interacting and interdependent people related to one another by a framework of positions and corresponding role sets (Anderson and Carter, 1974), and sharing a common family culture: norms, rules, expectations, rituals, etc. (Wertheim, 1975). Families may be characterized in terms of their power, authority and influence structures and their patterns of communication. The nuclear family and the single parent family and their members are subsystems in extended families, the community and society. The family and/or its members may also belong to such overlapping social systems as school classes, work

groups, voluntary organizations and formal and informal social groups.

The family is an open system, as it and its components are in important and ongoing interaction with its physical and social environment. The family is an information processing system, utilizing information from its environment. It is dependent on its environment. Families are adaptive systems, endeavoring to respond appropriately to protect and further their interests. They and their component individuals are "responsive, purposeful systems" (Wertheim, 1975).

At any given time a system is in a state defined by all of its characteristics at that time. In actual practice, the state of a system is specified by a "state vector," consisting of the values of a number of system parameters at the given time (Bellman and Smith, 1973). The set of parameters selected is a function of the interests of the observer. The state of a system may be different at different times. It may change in response to the aging or growth or development of its components, or in response to external influences. It may develop, grow or evolve.

An adaptive system which is open to a changing environment, and/or which contains components whose states may change with time, is said to be "stable", or in a "steady state" if it is "maintaining a viable relationship with its environment and its components, and its functions are being performed in such fashion as to ensure its

continued existence" (Anderson and Carter, 1974:18). It may maintain its stability through "self-corrective" processes. It may adapt to changes through change-promoting "self-directive" processes (Wertheim, 1975). "Steady state is characteristic of the family system" (Anderson and Carter, 1974:112), which needs to "endure as a system but to undergo successive transformations in response to changes in its micro- and/or macro- environment." The same may be said of human beings (Wertheim, 1975:286). Self preservation as an identifiable entity, through maintenance of a steady state, is one of the most important goals of a purposeful system.

"Process" is "the actions and interactions of the various component parts of a system both within and across its environmental borders" (Kantor and Lehr, 1975:10). "A process" is generally referred to in terms of the function performed by or consequences of the particular set of activities it comprises. A process may or may not result in significant or enduring change in the system's state. It also may or may not affect the stability of the system.

Synthesis

The eclectic approach to sociological frames of reference comes well recommended. According to Broderick (1971), "Parsons set an important example for other theorists in not feeling the need to work exclusively within any one of the traditional conceptual frameworks" (p. 4).

Broderick (1971) suggests what he calls the strategy of multiple perspectives. This strategy:

. . . takes advantage of the existence of established conceptual frameworks, but instead of attempting to integrate them systematically and across the board, it attempts only to integrate them around more narrowly defined particular social processes such as courtship or marital decision making. (p. 17)

The frames of reference briefly described above are often referred to as being in competition (see e.g., Hill and Hansen, 1960:309). In a sense they are, focusing on different aspects of human interaction and organization, and sometimes contradicting each other on specifics. A more promising perspective, however, looks to the overlaps among the frameworks, which are not inconsiderable, and to their congruencies, in a spirit of synthesis and development. Ritzer (1975), for example, takes this approach.

Stryker (1959) gives a substantive example of this approach:

One final remark: symbolic interaction is not a general theory of human behavior. That is, it does not incorporate all the variables presumably important in accounting for human behavior, but rather selects from these a few for concentrated attention. Thus it would not do to deny the contributions of alternative theoretical views from which human behavior can be approached. It is contended, however, that alternative views can be enriched by taking into account the set of ideas which have been developed. (p. 119)

The following argument seeks to develop a frame of reference for the study of family maintenance by indicating how each of the perspectives discussed above contributes to the synthesis. Although the present concerns are most closely

related to those of structural-functionalism, it will be seen that each perspective serves to enrich the whole. Structural-functionalism defines the entities and makes of system maintenance a basic if not focal process. Symbolic interactionism addresses the interaction process, by which the family system is actually maintained, and explains why maintenance efforts may be ineffective or dysfunctional. Role theory focuses on a key concept of structural-functionalism and symbolic interactionism, and provides the formal framework for interaction. Conflict theory addresses the individualistic efforts of family members in their own behalf, providing additional detail at the interaction level, and additional explanation for maintenance inefficiencies. Finally, systems theory provides a detailed extension of structural-functionalism in the area of system maintenance, which provides the necessary framework for the development of a family maintenance theory.

B. Research and Theory

The preceding section has outlined the core concepts of several key theoretical frameworks of sociology and attempted to indicate how they might be integrated to apply to the issues at hand. This section discusses the theory and research bearing on the subject matter of this study. In contrast to the state of family theory, family research comprises a huge and rapidly growing literature (Hill and Hansen, 1960; Burr, Hill, Nye and Reiss, 1979). Even so,

single parent research has lagged, as has the organization of findings and the derivation of theory from them.

The relevant literature may be broken down into that addressing issues of nuclear family maintenance, the use of time, the working wife and mother, the single parent family, and satisfaction. Each of these areas is taken up in turn.

Nuclear Family Maintenance

The fact of the division of labor within the family by sex is supported by many studies (Hesselbart, 1976). We have distinguished five general family maintenance tasks, the external tasks of income acquisition and the purchasing of goods, and the internal tasks of physical maintenance, meal preparation and cleanup, and child care (see Chapter II, Section A). The acquisition of income is the key task of the provider role, the child care task is the function of the child care role, and the remaining tasks are generally assigned to the housekeeper role. The husband/father position traditionally has a provider role. The housekeeper and child care roles are traditionally attached to the wife/mother position (Nye and Gekas, 1976).

The division of labor by sex has been the case in the United States, as elsewhere. The sex-typing of family maintenance roles is even supported by law (Slocum and Nye, 1976). The American family as a whole has a more flexible role structure than most, with the majority of married

mothers in the labor force and husbands often contributing to the housekeeping and child care tasks. The wife's income is, however, usually far less than her husband's, and is regarded as supplemental. The husband's housekeeping and child care efforts are regarded as "help." Finally, the responsibility for family maintenance task performance is still sex-typed even when the performance itself is not (Zelditch, 1955; Slocum and Nye, 1976). The relationship between sex-role attitudes and the family division of labor is, in fact, complex (see Hesselbart, 1976; Bowling, 1977).

There is much, however, that mothers do in their traditional roles that is, in fact, instrumental. Women do much of the interacting with the family's social environment to obtain the needed goods and services, and perform much instrumental work in the home. In recent years, recognition has also been given to important expressive functions performed by the husband/father. (Pitts, 1964; Slocum and Nye, 1976)

The contributions of children to family maintenance are sometimes ignored. Children do in fact contribute to, as well as derive support from, the family (Cogswell and Sussman, 1972). This contribution, of course, varies with age. Walker and Gauger (1973) found in a study of 1,378 upstate New York families that children 12 to 17 years of age averaged 1 hour per day per child, and children 6 to 11 half of that.

The question of the isolation of the nuclear family has been mentioned above, in Chapter II, Section A. Despite the arguments of the Parsonian functionalists, kin have been found to be an important source of aid to nuclear and single parent families. Adams (1968) reports that research by Sussman, Sharp and Axelrod, and himself demonstrates the existence of considerable aid, mostly from parents to adult children, mostly in the form of money and child care, and some shopping companionship as well. Adams (1968) found less, but still significant, aid from adult children to parents.

Walker and Gauger (1973) report finding babysitters, grandparents, neighbors and others providing family maintenance help. Litwak (1960) and Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) present evidence for assistance from relatives, friends and neighbors in the United States and Hungary. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) also indicate the primacy of kin as a source of aid if they are geographically close.

Lee (1979) discusses the isolated nuclear family issue and extensively reviews the kinship aid research. He concludes that there is substantial assistance among kin within a framework in which the nuclear family "is largely responsible for its own economic fortunes" (p. 50). He also suggests that service assistance from kin increases, and service assistance from neighbors decreases, with the proximity of kin.

The family may, of course, have recourse to assistance from businesses or agencies. Depending upon the family's financial resources, household help may be hired, child care paid for, meals eaten out, and a variety of other services purchased. The use of hired help has decreased greatly in this century, while eating out has greatly gained in favor (Bose, 1978). Those able to demonstrate need also have access to free school lunches, free child care and other services at reduced or no cost.

The Use of Time

There are a considerable number of studies concerning the use of time by Americans (e.g., Robinson, 1977a) and in twelve countries (Szalai, 1972). There is also a sizable research literature concerning the temporal aspects of household work (e.g., Walker, 1969, 1970; Walker and Gauger, 1973; Vanek, 1974). While the figures vary, certain general findings appear time and again.

The hours expended by wives in housework are equivalent to their husband's fulltime jobs. A study of 2214 American families by Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966) found that wives averaged 40 hours a week of regular housework in 1964. Regular housework was defined as "meal preparation, regular cleaning, child care, straightening up, and other time spent working around the house" (Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt, 1966:102, 526). Walker (1969, 1970) reports that 1296 married Syracuse, New York, homemakers

averaged 7.3 hours a day of household work, 7 days a week, in 1967-1968. These hours varied directly with number of children and inversely with age of youngest child. Household work was defined as "the many activities performed to produce goods and services used by the family" (Walker, 1970: 8). These activities comprised food preparation and cleanup, house care, clothing care, family care, marketing, management and record keeping. Walker (1970) specifically excluded work to provide money to buy goods and services.

Robinson (1977a) reports the finding of the Study of Americans' Use of Time that urban American housewives averaged 53.2 hours of housework per week in 1965 and 1966. Housework included cooking, laundry, housecleaning, shopping, repairs, care of pets or plants, child care, and all related travel. Oakley (1974), in a study of forty London housewives, found that they averaged 77 hours a week "in housework, including shopping, and in child care or supervision" in 1971 (p. 92). Child supervision is a problematical variable, as it is often carried out as a secondary activity together with something else, and it is something that one can be said to be doing whenever one is in the company of one's dependent children, which for a non-employed mother may be most of the time.

The Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966) study found that male family heads working for money averaged about 47 hours a week at this activity. Husbands also contributed an average of 4 hours a week to regular housework. The Study

of Americans' Use of Time found that employed men averaged 44.8 hours a week on their jobs and 11.3 hours a week on housework (Robinson, 1977a). Walker (1970) reports that husbands spent an average of 1.6 hours a day doing household work. Walker and Gauger (1973) found that husbands contributed an average of 1.5 hours a day to household work. This contribution varied inversely with his employment hours. Walker and Gauger's (1973) work was an extension of Walker's (1969, 1970), utilizing a slightly augmented 1967-68 sample plus 60 rural upstate New York families surveyed in 1971.

Taking husbands and wives together, Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966) report that they averaged 43 hours of regular housework a week. In families with children under 18 at home they averaged 48 hours of regular housework a week. If the youngest child was under 4 they averaged 55 hours a week, and if there were also 4 or more people in their family their total household work averaged 58 hours a week. In addition to regular housework, Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966) found that married couples spent an average of 5 hours a week on home production in 1964. Home production included such activities as painting, redecorating, repairing, major housecleaning, sewing, mending, gardening, canning and freezing.

The contributions of individual children to housework tend to be less than that of either parent, but may be substantial in the aggregate. The findings of Walker and

Gauger (1973) were reported above. The contributions of others to family maintenance is not so well detailed as that of husbands and wives. Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966) found that family members other than husbands and wives, meaning children and others, contributed an average of 7 hours a week to regular housework. They also found that outside help of all kinds, free and paid for, averaged about 5 hours a week.

Working Wives

The situation changes when the wife goes to work. American norms have become somewhat more accepting of this, now common, practice (Hesselbart, 1976; Iglehart, 1979). Employed women averaged 38.8 hours a week at work in Robinson's (1977a) study. Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966) found that working wives averaged 27 hours a week at work, after eliminating the 9% who worked less than 121 hours in the year. Women with preschool children in the family averaged 20 hours a week.

In general, the data show that the family's adjustment of its housework to a wife's employment is primarily for the wife to reduce the hours she spends at housework (Walker and Gauger, 1973; Vanek, 1974). Robinson (1977a) reports that employed women spent an average of 28.1 hours a week doing housework, compared to the 53.2 hours spent by housewives. Bose (1978) reports that working women average 3 to 4 hours a day less housework than housewives,

but may spend more time at employment and housework taken together. Walker and Gauger (1973) found that "On the average, wives used 2 hours less time per day in household activities if employed than if not employed" (p. 9). Walker (1970) reports that wives employed 15 or more hours a week nevertheless averaged 70 hours a week at paid employment, household work plus volunteer work, compared to 61 hours for wives employed 0 to 14 hours a week.

Husbands of employed women have usually, but not always, been found to contribute somewhat more to household work than husbands of housewives. Berk and Berk (1979), however, find it "still probably fair to say the employed wives hold down two fulltime jobs: one in the market and one in the household" (p. 231). Walker (1969, 1970), Walker and Gauger (1973) and Vanek (1974) found that, while the wife's time at household work of all kinds goes down with increasing hours of paid employment, her husband's contribution remains essentially unchanged. Walker (1970) also found that husbands of wives who were employed 15 or more hours a week averaged 63 hours a week at paid employment, household work and volunteer work, compared to 65 hours for husbands of wives employed 0 to 14 hours a week.

Blood and Wolfe (1960) and Blood (1963), however, report evidence that husbands tend to contribute more to household task performance if their wives work, the contribution varying inversely with their own work time. Hood (1977) reports a "one-hour, eighteen-minute per week

increase [in child care] for fathers of pre-school children, and a three hour increase for fathers of school-aged children when wives work" (p. 1) in a 1971 national probability sample. Robinson (1977a) found that husbands of employed women recorded 10% more time spent at housework than husbands of housewives. This additional contribution made up only a small part of the housework time sacrificed by the working wife, however. Taking working wives and their husbands together, the more hours they spend working for money the fewer hours they spend doing regular housework (Morgan, 1966).

Layne and Lowe (1977) report finding that child care and household task performance by husbands and other household members are much more likely in families with a working wife than in those with a housewife. Walker and Gauger (1973) report that the contribution of children 12 to 17 years old to household work varied very little with mother's employment. No change is discernable in their data regarding the contributions of children 6 to 11 years old. Douvan (1963), however, found that the proportion of adolescent girls having major household responsibilities and working parttime varies directly with the degree of maternal employment. Roy (1963) found that high school children of working mothers do slightly more housework than children of not-employed mothers, girls more than boys. Boys worked for pay slightly less, and girls significantly more, if their mother worked. Rallings and Nye (1979) review the literature and

propose that higher levels of employment of a wife/mother are directly productive of lower amounts of household labor performed by her, greater enactment of traditionally feminine roles by her husband, and a greater number of household tasks performed by her child(ren).

Exploring in detail the help received from others outside the immediate family, Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966) found that the most such help was received by families with wives under 35 working more than half time who have children under 6 to care for. This help amounted to an average of 19 hours a week. If there were children under 18 but not under 6, an average of only 5 hours of help a week was received. Help received by families varied directly with the hours the wife spent working for money. Vanek (1974) found that employed and non-employed women did not differ in their use of paid help. Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport (1971), however, found that a variety of domestic help arrangements were used by dual-career families in Great Britain to cope with the demands on their time.

Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) suggest that the family with a working wife must either redistribute the maintenance task load, neglect some of it, or else suffer overload. Robinson (1977a) summarizes the typical effects of employment on a woman's time:

While an employed woman may have reduced both housework and child-care time by 50 percent when taking on an outside job, these savings in time came nowhere close to the 30 or 40 hours she had to devote to that job. The overall result . . .

was that employed women had over 10 hours less free time per week to enjoy than women not in the paid labor force. (p. 148)

Employment was the major cause of reduced free time found by Robinson (1977a), far exceeding all other factors, including marriage, the arrival of children, additional children, and preschool children (see also Rice, 1979).

To the extent that a working wife works longer hours to meet the demands of her family roles she takes away from her free time, family life and/or social life (Robinson, 1977a). Nye (1963) reports that "Both observers and employed women themselves have indicated that the combined duties of housewife and employee were burdensome and produced some feelings of anxiety, frustration and fatigue" (p. 323). The task/role situation of a working wife as described above has the potential for role conflict, role incompatibility, and a lack of role clarity. The role of wife/mother as a provider is developing, and is not entirely clear or consensual. It is thus susceptible to role conflict. Incompatibility between the provider and the housekeeper and child care roles is a major problem for many working mothers (Lobodzinska, 1977). There is the reality of being committed to a great many normatively prescribed task hours, perhaps with little freedom to change the situation. This would be the case, for example, if the wife's income was necessary rather than discretionary. Burr (1973) and Rice (1979) predict that the wife/mother will experience role strain in this situation.

Single Parents

Families headed by never-married mothers are social systems without a husband/father, but with the same maintenance roles and tasks as nuclear families. Separation, divorce, and the death of a spouse also produce one-parent families, necessitating the redistribution of family maintenance task performance. If one conceptualizes the family as an isolated system, all of the maintenance tasks of which are performed by its adult members, then one might reasonably question the ability of a single parent to maintain a family. Zelditch (1955) finds two parents to be a necessity (see Chapter II, Section A). Glasser and Navarre (1965) doubt the long-term viability of the isolated single-parent family. The same logic can, however, be used to question the viability of the isolated nuclear family. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969:469) discuss the "lack of human resources" of the nuclear family, which "has only two adult members", and its consequent inadequacies and problems.

Litwak and Szelenyi (1969), however, go on to discuss the contributions made to family task performance by others outside the family. In fact, it is hard to imagine any social system surviving entirely on its own efforts. Fortunately, this is unnecessary. Virtually all social systems are multiply connected in a complex web of dependencies. Families are open systems deriving support from kin, friends and neighbors, businesses and agencies. The question then, is not whether a given family form is viable or not on

its own, but rather, how family maintenance task performance may be distributed among actors within and outside of the family.

The absence or near-absence of any contribution to family maintenance by a husband necessitates most importantly that someone else, almost always the mother, take up the role of primary provider. She may, through choice or an inability to arrange a job, not be employed, living on support payments, welfare and/or other forms of assistance. The income obtained in this way is very likely to be quite low and the lifestyle is not generally a very pleasant one (see e.g., Weiss, 1979). Although the family maintenance task load is reduced somewhat by the absence of a husband, there are fewer family members and in particular, only one parent to cope with it. On balance, the non-employed female single parent is likely to spend somewhat more time doing household work than the housewife (see above and Weiss, 1979).

Most often, however, the female single parent is employed, at least parttime, although she is likely to be low paid and may still be dependent in part on financial assistance (see Chapter I, Section B). She has a more demanding family maintenance situation than the working wife, but she has less in the way of resources with which to cope. Being responsible for what amounts to two full-time jobs (Weiss, 1979), she is likely to work long and hard to keep up with all the family maintenance tasks.

As with the working wife, if the single parent is not to be overloaded, she must either reduce her family maintenance efforts or obtain additional assistance (Weiss, 1979; Glasser and Navarre, 1965; Blood, 1972). The single parent may attempt to reduce her maintenance task load by sacrificing task performance in one area or another. Children may be left alone more, or meal preparation may be simplified. Standards for housekeeping and/or meals may be reduced. Some time may be saved by more efficient management of time (Weiss, 1979).

The single parent may also attempt to hand off to others part of her maintenance task load. Children typically take up some of the load (Weiss, 1979; Blood, 1972). A former mate does not simply disappear upon separation or divorce. (S)he remains one of the two parents of any children of the marriage and often sees them regularly. Ex-husbands may provide some money for child support, and may be available to perform major repairs, emergency child care and other supportive services (Hetherington, Cox and Cox, 1976; Goetting, 1978).

Relatives may be helpful. Adams (1968) reports help received from grown children by a widowed or divorced parent. Lopata (1978) reports some extended family support to a sample of 1169 Chicago area widows, none of which was significant except that from grown children. Weiss (1979) found evidence that single parents in general receive some help from relatives, especially if they live nearby, as well as

from friends and neighbors. He also found that single parent organizations may serve as sources of information and emotional support.

Financial resources may permit the buying of time--eating out, using a professional cleaner more often, or paying for child care, for example. Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976), however, report that only 4% of their 1971 national probability subsample of 128 divorced and separated women hired a person outside their family to help with housework, despite the fact that 71% of them worked outside the home and 84% had children. Community agencies provide child care and other services as well as financial aid to qualifying parents.

The overload a single parent is likely to experience despite her efforts to cope, coupled with her often low income, tends to isolate her from adult companionship and a social life, a situation typically productive of loneliness, anxiety and despair (see e.g., Ferri and Robinson, 1976; Weiss, 1979). The ability of the single parent to give up roles and change the situation is even less than that of the working wife. Burr's (1973) analysis implies that she is therefore likely to experience greater role strain than the working wife. Incompatibility between her roles, their ambiguity and potential for role conflict may also contribute to role strain. Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) found that divorced and separated women

reported far more stress than any other subgroup of American women.

Satisfaction

It seems likely from the discussion so far that a mother's life satisfaction would be related to family maintenance task performance. The sort of lifestyles reported in the studies of single parents and working wives imply the likelihood of a reduced level of general satisfaction and happiness, and reduced satisfaction with a number of specific aspects of life as well. This may come about through overwork, a reduced quality of life, and/or through protracted and/or severe role strain.

Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) constructed an Index of Well-Being composed of one overall life satisfaction item and an Index of General Affect made up of 8 semantic differential scales. They report that the lowest levels on the Index of Well-Being were attained by the unemployed, those separated or divorced, and those who never married. The general sense of well-being also varies directly with income and inversely with population of place of residence, being well below the mean for those with low incomes (below \$7000 a year in 1970) and those living in cities of over 100,000. The female single parent is at risk of being in more than one of these categories.

Nye (1963), Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) and Burt, Wiley, Minor and Murray (1978) discuss specific,

or domain, satisfactions as well. Nye (1963) devised 7 questionnaire items to determine a mother's satisfaction "in the principal relationships in which [she] is a participant" (p. 321): family income, house and furniture, recreation, children, husband, community and daily work. In a study of 1991 married mothers in 3 Washington towns, he found that those employed fulltime were more satisfied with their work than were those employed parttime. They were also more satisfied with their work than the non-employed mothers were with their housework.

Nye (1963) constructed a general life satisfaction index by counting the number of specific satisfaction items answered "generally" or "entirely satisfied", and found that employment, especially parttime, was productive of a higher general satisfaction with life. Robinson (1977a) also found that employment is a more satisfying activity than housework. He found, however, that employed married mothers felt somewhat more rushed and less satisfied with their free time and life in general than married mothers who were not employed.

Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) investigated satisfaction with regard to 18 domains of life experience chosen in a "somewhat arbitrary" (p. 62) fashion to broadly cover the lives of their respondents. Their domains comprised marriage, family life, health, neighborhood, friendships, housework, job, life in the United States, city or county, nonwork, housing, usefulness of education, standard

of living, amount of education, savings, religion, organizations, and the national government. They found that divorced and separated women were less satisfied than women in general with regard to a number of domains, in particular their family life, standard of living and savings. This is in marked contrast to the responses of widows, who, despite their rather low general sense of well-being, were well satisfied in regard to the specific domains in their lives, excepting only health. They were particularly well satisfied with their standard of living, savings and housing. Very few of the widowed respondents were responsible for young children.

Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) also compared the domain satisfactions of housewives, employed wives and employed single (i.e., separated, divorced, widowed and never married) women. A large majority of the wives and about half of the employed single women had children. The only significant differences found were that the employed single women were less satisfied with their family life and standard of living than either married group.

As an alternative to their Index of Well-Being, Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) constructed a satisfaction index by summing their domain satisfactions. They conclude that "global reports of a sense of well-being can be meaningfully seen as a composite of feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a variety of more specific domains of life" (p. 95).

Burt, Wiley, Minor and Murray (1978) investigated the underlying structure of well-being, utilizing 12 measures of perceived quality of life and pooled data from 12 independent national probability samples. Their measures comprised one of positive and one of negative affect, overall life satisfaction and overall happiness, plus 8 domain satisfaction measures "spanning the range of basic life activities" (p. 376): housing, neighborhood, finances, work, leisure, local store, local health center, and police service. They conclude that the "structure most likely to be latent in patterns of individuals' manifest satisfaction with their consumption of goods in the United States" is "four-dimensional . . . consisting of positive affect, negative affect, satisfaction with domains, and general satisfaction" (p. 393). Positive and negative affect each influence the corresponding measure. General satisfaction underlies the measures of overall life satisfaction and happiness. All four dimensions influence the domain satisfaction measures.

C. A Theory of Family Maintenance

The family is a social system which is a component of a larger social system, the national society. As such, it interacts with the national society as a whole and other of its components. The family is made up of members who may occupy the positions of mother, father and child, depending upon the family type. Family members are also

members of the national society, and, in general, of other units of that society.

The most basic function of the family is to maintain its continuing survival and that of its members. Family maintenance requires the acquisition of necessary goods and services. Convertible resources are generally acquired first and traded for these goods and services. Certain of the goods require preparation before consumption. The property and belongings of the family must be maintained. Finally, its dependent members must be cared for.

Members of the family seek to accomplish these tasks. Maintenance task activity goes on within a structure of roles which relate the positions of family members and define to a degree the reciprocal behaviors expected of them. In particular, the parent or parents are considered responsible for family maintenance. A person occupying a father position is expected to perform a provider role, acquiring resources for the family. A mother is expected to perform a housekeeper and child care role, doing shopping, maintaining the home and belongings, preparing meals, and caring for the child(ren). This is true no matter what other activities, including family maintenance activities, the parent may be involved in. Single parents are considered responsible for all aspects of family maintenance. The parents may help each other in the accomplishment of these maintenance tasks. They may also be assisted by their children, and by kin, friends, and neighbors. They

may obtain assistance from businesses and community agencies as well.

Each individual performing family maintenance tasks does so within the context of his or her own personal needs and interests, which may, from time to time, be in conflict with those of others or the family as a whole. Furthermore, each individual acts in accordance with his or her own definition of self and situation, which in turn are based upon an imperfect and mediated perception of reality.

The female single parent is responsible for all 3 family maintenance roles. She spends more time at family maintenance than the married mother, and so she has less free time. She receives more help from her children, kin, friends, neighbors, businesses and agencies than the married mother. Lacking most or all of a husband's contribution, however, her family averages fewer total maintenance hours than a married mother's.

If the female single parent is not employed she spends all but a small part of her family maintenance time doing almost all of the household work of a married mother plus some of what a husband would have done. The rest of her family maintenance time is spent in activities relating to beginning or continuing to receive an income from some source other than employment. The primary deficit in family maintenance relative to a nuclear family is in the area of income production, resulting in a very low income.

The employed female single parent spends more time acquiring an income, less time doing household work, and more time at family maintenance overall than the non-employed female single parent. The size of the latter differences is proportional to the former difference. She also receives more help than the non-employed female single parent, also in proportion to her hours of employment, and so her family averages more total maintenance hours. Due to difficulties relating to the performance of all 3 family maintenance roles in addition to the sex differentials in pay and opportunity in the marketplace, the employed female single parent does not average as many employment hours as a husband, and earns a much lower income. The primary family maintenance deficit in this kind of family, however, is in the area of household work.

The working wife performs 3 family maintenance roles to the housewife's 2. She spends less time at household work but more time at family maintenance overall, and so she too has less free time. She receives more help from her children, husband, kin, friends, neighbors, businesses and agencies than the housewife, and so her family averages more total maintenance hours than a housewife's. All of these differences are proportional to her hours of employment.

Having the most employment hours of all the family forms considered here, the two-income family has the highest average income as well. Since the husband's contribution to family maintenance is largely in the form of employment

hours, however, the two-income family still makes do with fewer hours of household work than the nuclear family in which the wife is not employed.

To the extent that a mother spends more time at normatively prescribed family maintenance tasks she will experience role strain. To the extent that she performs more roles the possibility of role incompatibility, which is also productive of role strain, increases. If she is performing roles which lack role clarity there is the chance of role conflict, which again is productive of role strain. Her continuing experience of role strain is related to the degree to which she is not free to leave her roles. This felt stress, in proportion to its severity and duration, exerts a negative effect on the mother's life satisfaction and happiness.

Greater times spent in family maintenance means less free time, and a diminished family life and social life as well. With less free time there is more of a sense of being rushed or burdened. Fatigue, anxiety and despair are likely further consequences. Less family and/or social life is likely to result in a feeling of loneliness and depression. These conditions imply a reduced level of satisfaction with free time, family life and social life, as well as happiness and life in general.

The standard of living or quality of life of a family is directly affected by the amount of effort expended toward its maintenance. The more time spent earning money the

higher the family income is likely to be, on the average, enabling the purchase of more free time and opening up more options for the enjoyment of that time. The more time expended in household work, the better the family's meals are likely to be and/or the better kept the home and possessions. A higher quality of life will generally produce a higher perceived quality of life, and so a higher life satisfaction for family members. The higher the income, the more satisfied family members are likely to be with their financial situation. The better the family's meals and the condition of their home, the more satisfied they are likely to be with these aspects of their lives.

The female single parent, working more hours to maintain her family, but accumulating fewer total family maintenance hours overall, would thus be expected to be less satisfied with the specific domains of her life discussed above, and so less satisfied with her life and less happy than a married mother. If she was not employed she would be particularly dissatisfied with her financial situation. If she was employed, she would be particularly dissatisfied with her free time, family and social life, meals and home. The working wife, working more hours to maintain her family and accumulating more total family maintenance hours overall but fewer hours of household work, is likely to be less satisfied with her free time, social life and family life, meals and home than a housewife, but more satisfied with her family's financial situation. Her general satisfaction

would be negatively affected by the consequences of her greater family maintenance hours but positively affected by the consequences of her family's greater total number of maintenance hours.

It is clear from the above that family system maintenance is a multi-faceted process influenced by many variables and productive of a variety of consequences. Given the present state of knowledge and the resources of this study, it is desired to focus on only a few basic relationships. Thus, only the use of time in family maintenance is considered. The two key family maintenance task performance variables are the time spent by the mother and the total time spent by all actors in family maintenance.

Two key causal variables are considered: family type and mother's employment status. Family type is more or less equivalent to mother's marital status and the number of parents in the family. One outcome variable is considered, the mother's life satisfaction. Of course, as we have shown, there are numerous other variables at each level and numerous intervening variables as well.

D. Hypotheses

The preceding discussion suggests the following hypotheses:

- H.1 Nuclear and mother-child families derive support from others outside the family.
- H.2 (Ex-)husbands of separated and divorced mothers work fewer family maintenance task

hours for them than husbands in nuclear families, but more than zero hours.

H.3 Female single parents work more family maintenance task hours than married mothers living with their husbands.

H.4 Children of female single parents work more family maintenance task hours than children in nuclear families.

H.5 Kin of female single parents work more family maintenance task hours for them than kin of married mothers living with their husbands.

H.6 Friends and neighbors of female single parents work more family maintenance task hours for them than friends and neighbors of married mothers living with their husbands.

H.7 Fewer total family maintenance task hours are worked for families of female single parents than nuclear families.

H.8 Female single parents have more recourse to businesses and community services than married mothers living with their husbands.

Within the married and single parent populations:

H.9 Employed mothers work more family maintenance task hours than non-employed mothers.

H.10 More total family maintenance task hours are worked by and for families of employed mothers than families of non-employed mothers.

Regarding satisfaction:

H.11 The life satisfaction of a mother varies inversely with her family maintenance task hours.

H.12 The life satisfaction of a mother varies directly with her family's total maintenance task hours.

E. Variables

The variables which must be measured to test these hypotheses are:

A. Demographic Variables:

1. The mother's marital status, which also indicates the family type and number of parents in the family.
2. The mother's employment status.

B. Task Performance Variables:

1. The number of family maintenance task hours worked by the mother during some time period.
2. The number of family maintenance task hours worked by her husband or ex-husband, children at home, kin, friends, and neighbors for her family during the same time period.
3. The total family maintenance task hours worked by her and all other members of her immediate family during the same time period.
4. The total family maintenance task hours worked for her family during the same period.

5. Recourse to businesses and community services.

C. Outcome Variables:

1. Mother's life satisfaction.

CHAPTER III

THE SURVEY

This chapter is concerned with the research conducted to obtain the empirical data for this study. It begins with a discussion of the methodology. A description of the research instruments and materials follows. The measures of the variables are defined next. The chapter ends with a discussion of the research procedures.

A. Methodology

This study is based upon original empirical research. The data were collected by means of a cross-sectional sample survey. The sample is a disproportionate stratified sample, so as to obtain approximately equal numbers of married and single mothers for the purpose of statistical comparison.

The sampling procedure was a two-staged design. The initial screening sample was obtained by the process of random digit dialing. Telephone screening then produced the survey interview sample. The survey data were then obtained by face-to-face interview.

Population

The survey universe or hypothetical population that it was desired to represent was urban women heads of household, with or without a husband, with one or more children less than 18 years old.

The population from which the study sample was drawn was the population of City of Lansing, Michigan, women who were female heads of household (alone or with a husband) with one or more children less than 18 years old between March 24 and April 15, 1979. Persons living in the area called Waverly, extending Northwest from the city limits, were also included, as this area is, in fact, an integral part of Lansing. Excluded from the study were persons residing in East Lansing, an adjoining city containing a major university and the homes of many of its faculty, staff and students. Also excluded were other smaller and more distant suburbs, and the surrounding rural area.

This population was operationally defined by the 13 telephone exchanges containing City of Lansing and Waverly residential lines. As a result, a very small percentage of non-city but nearby residents were included. No telephones in the target area were excluded. Persons not having residential telephones were, of course, excluded as well by this approach. The percentage of such persons is approximately 6% in Lansing. The telephone company representatives believe most of these persons to be single--

often students or transients. They did not believe that families of any kind would be overrepresented among those without telephones.

Study Sample

In order to make the desired comparisons it was necessary to obtain an adequate sized representative sample of married and unmarried female heads of households with dependent children, residing in Lansing. It was further required that there be approximately equal numbers of married and unmarried respondents. Of course, many variables might have been considered, which would have required a huge sample and analysis. Limiting this study to the key variables produced a manageable analysis requiring approximately 100 married and 100 single-parent respondents.

Sampling Method

The key sampling problem was to obtain an adequate sample of female single parent heads of household. Although an important and rapidly growing segment of the population, they make up only a small fraction of all households. In 1970, for example, they added up to 2,551 out of 42,643, or 6%, of Lansing households (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973).

It was decided early on to obtain a random sample. Prior research has relied on nonprobabilistic sampling or on special populations. Since this was to be a study of a representative sample of Lansing mothers, an area probability sample was inappropriate. There was neither time

nor money to do the necessary door-to-door screening in pursuit of the single-parent stratum. Furthermore, better procedures were available.

Telephone screening was selected early in the survey design to permit the screening of large numbers of persons quickly. Sampling from the latest Lansing telephone book was considered but rejected, primarily because it omits approximately 13% of leased lines as unpublished/unlisted numbers. It was also, of necessity, somewhat out of date.

The use of the latest Polk City Directory for Lansing (Polk, 1977) was considered. Investigation of this source turned up a number of omissions and obsolete and incorrect items in the name list. This finding was in agreement with Kish (1965). There existed no adequate list from which to obtain a representative sample of Lansing mothers to screen.

The remaining option was to sample by random digit dialing, a method discussed by Dillman (1978) and Sudman (1976).

Random digit dialing requires the production of a random list of artificially constructed telephone numbers with exchanges covering the survey area. First a list of all such exchanges is obtained. The telephone numbers are then produced one at a time by selecting an exchange at random, with replacement, and then appending a four digit random number to it. Since different exchanges may have widely different numbers of lines in residential use at any

given time, the selection of an exchange should be weighted by the number of residential lines to produce a random sample of residential lines (i.e., one in which each residential line had an equal probability of being selected). An adjustment may be made for multiple line residences.

This process is repeated until an adequate sized list of artificial telephone numbers has been prepared. Any duplicate numbers are screened out and the list is then printed. The estimation of what constitutes an adequate number of artificial telephone numbers requires a knowledge of the number of respondents desired, the percentage of possible telephone numbers which are actual current residential numbers, the percentage of residences which contain a person who qualifies as a respondent, the expected cooperation rate, and a contingency allowance.

In the case of disproportionate stratified sampling where one stratum is several times as well represented in the general population and screening sample as the other, the number of artificial telephone numbers required is determined by the desired size of the sample of the scarcer stratum. The present survey therefore screened for both strata until the more common subsample was obtained, then screened for the less common subsample only. It was possible to do this because the field work period was short, and because the date of the interview was not a critical variable.

The method of random digit dialing produces a random sample of residences which is current, not out of date as any printed list would be, and which gives equal probability of selection to all residential telephone numbers, including unlisted and unpublished numbers. On the other hand, its use requires a great deal of screening of non-working and non-residential telephone numbers.

Screening Method

The screening of the artificially constructed telephone numbers for persons eligible to participate in the survey was conducted by short structured telephone interviews with closed-ended questions. Since any part of the random list of artificial telephone numbers is also random, sections of the list could be distributed to the interviewers for parallel screening, and screening could terminate at whatever point had been reached when the required samples had been obtained.

Data Collection Method

The data collection constraints of this study were a very limited field work period in which to collect a substantial amount of data from a moderate sized sample, a firm deadline of April 15, 1979, and very limited financial resources.

Robinson (1977a) and Butz and Greenberg (1975) discuss the measurement of time spent in different activities. They both reject direct observation as expensive and

intrusive. Robinson (1977a) favors the use of a single-day diary. At the same time, he reports that this method is also expensive, the time period is too short to accurately capture some important activities, and analysis is laborious.

Butz and Greenberg (1975) agree that the diary or time budget would produce the most precise data, they consider the one-week time budget, which would reflect an individual's typical time allocation much more accurately than the single-day diary. They also, however, mention the high cost of this data collection methodology.

Moser and Kalton (1972) discuss the usefulness of the diary method as well. They suggest that this approach may suffer from high refusal rates and low data quality, while requiring much work on the part of the interviewing staff.

It is felt that the present study requires a one-week family maintenance task performance time period. There are not enough respondents to smooth out the fluctuations in a daily study, nor to fairly represent infrequently performed tasks. The expected response to a one-week diary was judged inadequate in quality and quantity for this survey. These considerations plus time and cost constraints dictated the rejection of the diary method.

Butz and Greenberg (1975) suggest the use of retrospective questioning as a source of "reasonably

accurate information on time spent in major household production activities" (p. 21). The choice between the diary and retrospective questioning depends on the subject matter of the survey and the ability of respondents to recall the necessary information (Moser and Kalton, 1972). The activities in question being basic in the lives of the respondents and retrospectivity being minimal, it was expected that recall would be at least adequate. On balance, it was felt that the resources of this survey would be best utilized, and reasonably accurate data representative of people's time allocation would be obtained, through the use of retrospective family task performance questions regarding the seven-day period immediately prior to the interview.

The female head of household was relied upon to provide the task performance data for all task performers. The impracticality of attempting to obtain these data directly is obvious. Fortunately, agreement between spouses, at least, has been found to be high (Berk, Shih and Berheide, 1978). In any case, the female head of household is the best single source for this information.

The choice still remained as to whether to utilize a questionnaire or an interview. The data collection constraints made a mailed questionnaire with follow-ups an undesirable choice. It was also felt that the questionnaire required the guidance of an interviewer to assure proper completion. A questionnaire of this difficulty and size is

sometimes left with the respondent and picked up or mailed in later. There may be some associated face-to-face interviewing as well. It was not desirable to require the interviewers to make two trips to each respondent (or more if difficulties arose). It was also felt that, in view of the schedule, respondents should not be relied on to complete the key instrument by themselves and return it to the investigator.

The decision to utilize interviewing as the sole data collection method still allowed a number of options. The interviews might have been by telephone, even in the same call as the screening, if convenient to the respondent. It was felt that this interview was better suited to a face-to-face situation. It was also felt that better quality responses might be obtained face-to-face, with less missing data.

A final choice was to adopt a structured format with closed-ended questions. The required data lent themselves well to this approach. Nothing would be gained by allowing an unstructured format and/or open-ended questions, and much work would have been created in utilizing the resulting protocols. Only a very limited amount of probing was permitted.

The selected data collection method, then, was face-to-face interviewing using a structured format and closed-ended questions, including retrospective task performance questions.

Required Screening Sample

The methodology described above was calculated to require the screening of approximately 9000 artificially constructed telephone numbers to obtain 100 married mothers and 100 female single parents, heads of household, with one or more dependent children. The expected cooperation rate was set at 67%, a typical figure for various kinds of surveys over the last 10-20 years. An additional 20% allowance was made for unforeseen losses.

Thirteen telephone exchanges service City of Lansing residential numbers. There are 10,000 possible telephone numbers in each exchange (nnn-0000 through nnn-9999), and so 130,000 possible telephone numbers in the set of 13 exchanges which define the population. There are approximately 50,000 residential City of Lansing telephone numbers, somewhat more than one out of every three of the possible numbers. Assuming that every residence has a single telephone number, approximately 36% will be held by nuclear families with dependent children, and approximately 6% are held by female headed families with dependent children.

The number of artificial telephone numbers which must be screened to obtain the single parent subsample is then computed by:

$$N_{sp} \text{ (Allow.)} = \frac{(\text{Res. Nos.})}{(\text{Poss. Nos.})} \frac{(\text{Fem-Head Fams.})}{(\text{Total Res's.})} \frac{(\text{Coop. Rate})}{1} T_{sp}$$

where N_{sp} is the number of female single parent respondents

desired, and T_{sp} is the number of artificial telephone numbers which must be screened to obtain that subsample.

Substituting the estimates of these quantities:

$$(100)(1.2) = (1/3)(6/100)(2/3) T_{sp}$$

so $T_{sp} = 9000$.

The number of artificial telephone numbers to be screened to obtain the married subsample is on the order of 1500, or 1/6 as many as for the single parents. As stated above, this screening is accomplished together with the earlier single parent screening.

B. The Survey Instruments and Materials

The Family Work Survey required a variety of instruments and materials during its various stages. The first instrument utilized was the Interviewer Questionnaire, during the interviewer hiring process.

The Field Test Feedback Form was used in evaluating and finalizing the Screening Interview and Family Work Interview.

During the field work, the Screening Record Form and Screening Interview were used in the screening process, and the Letter of Introduction, Informed Consent Form, Family Work Interview, Income Card and Performance Worksheet were utilized in the parallel study interview process. The Interview Record Form served as a record of field work status.

Subsequent to the completion of the primary data collection phase, a Reinterview was employed to measure reliability, a Non-Respondent Interview and Data Collection forms to examine validity, and call-back record forms to investigate a possible screening error.

Interviewer Questionnaire

The Interviewer Questionnaire (Appendix B) served two purposes. During the effort to set up the survey, it was utilized as an application form, a tool for evaluating possible interviewers. In the analysis, it is a source of interviewer background data.

In the hiring process it also served to inform the potential interviewer of the nature and requirements of the interviewing effort, in particular, the amount of time and scheduling required. The potential interviewer was asked if she had sufficient free time and whether she could work evenings and weekends as well as weekdays. She was also asked whether she had the free use of a telephone and an automobile.

The background data included age, marital status, householder status, ethnic status, and responsibility for dependent children.

Field Test Feedback Form

The Field Test Feedback Form (Appendix B) required the interviewer's name and whether it was a Screening Interview or Family Work Interview being field tested.

The first of three parts of the form was feedback from the respondent regarding her reactions to the interview procedures and questions, specific items which she might have felt were confusing, difficult, too personal or unfair, or upsetting, and suggestions for improvements.

The second part asked for the interviewer's perceptions of the respondent's reactions to the interview. The third part asked the interviewer's assessment and recommendations regarding the procedures and questionnaire.

Screening Record Form

The list of artificial telephone numbers was produced in the form of the Screening Record Form (Appendix B). This was the primary instrument by which survey respondents were obtained. This form was produced at the Michigan State University Computer Laboratory. Programming and production were performed by the Applications Programming Office. The form consisted of 260 pages of standard computer printer paper, each containing 54 artificial telephone numbers, 27 down the left side of the page and 27 down the middle of the page, and a double set of column headings to aid the interviewer in recording the results of attempted contacts and make the required additional tries if there was a busy signal or no answer. If the number was found to be a business number, this was also recorded on this form.

Screening Interview

Each time a person telephoning for respondents reached her party, not a business, she conducted a screening interview (Appendix B), recording the respondent's answer on a copy of the one sheet interview form.

The screening interview consisted of two pages reduced to one on the front of the sheet and another two pages reduced onto the back of the sheet. Page 1 was a record of the interviewer, the telephone number, date and time of the initial call involving speaking with anyone at that number and any call back to complete the screening. It also had a place for recording the sample into which the eligible household member fit, if any. Page 1 also contained the introductory text.

Page 2 contained the questions and text for reaching and screening the female head of the household. Page 3 contained additional explanatory text for persons eligible for the survey, a request to arrange a Family Work Interview, and interview arrangements and directions. It also recorded, for the first time, the name of a willing respondent.

The top half of Page 4 contained end of interview remarks and post-interview instructions. The bottom half of Page 4 contained text for cases where it was necessary to call back and cases where the household contains no person eligible for the survey. There was also room for interviewer comments.

A second, slightly different screening interview form was produced at the point in the field work when only single parents were being accepted for interviewing. Questions 4 and 5 on page 2, and question 7 on page 3 were revised, and instructions were added on page 3 for telephone screeners. These changes simplified screening for single parents only, allowed the screener to obtain information from persons other than the female head of household herself, and allowed for telephone screening by persons who would not be conducting the Family Work Interview themselves.

Letter of Introduction

A Letter of Introduction (Appendix B) was provided to each Family Work interviewer. It identified the interviewer by name and certified her employment as an interviewer for the Family Work Survey. It was signed by the author, the field supervisor and the Chairman of the author's dissertation committee and listed their telephone numbers. It was also notarized and enclosed in a plastic protective cover.

Informed Consent Form

The Informed Consent Form (Appendix B) was required by the Michigan State University committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS). It listed six points to be read and agreed to in advance of the Family Work Interview by the respondent.

Point one stated that the respondent had willingly agreed to participate in this survey. Point two set down in writing the fact that the respondent had received and understood an explanation of the survey and the nature of her participation in it. Points three to six stated that the respondent understood that she was free to end her participation in the survey at any time without penalty, that the information she provided would be held confidential and her anonymity would be protected, that the results of the survey would be made available to her at her request, and that her participation did not guarantee any beneficial results to her.

A place was marked at the bottom of the form for the respondent's signature and the date of signature.

Family Work Interview

The Family Work Interview (Appendix B) consisted of a Cover Sheet, a 26-page Interview Form, and a final sheet for interviewer comments.

The Cover Sheet noted the sample to which the respondent belonged, the interviewer's name and/or number, the respondent's first, last or whole name (and, later, number), the respondent's telephone number, and the date, time, place and length of the interview. A place was provided at the bottom of the Cover Sheet for interviewer comments.

The Family Work Interview was organized into several parts. Following a brief introduction, a household census was obtained, including all persons resident or visiting overnight during the previous seven days, their relationship to the respondent, sex, age, educational and employment status, health, and days present.

An enumeration of other relatives, in-laws, friends and neighbors who might be available to contribute to the respondent's family maintenance was obtained next. A single question explored the respondent's knowledge of community services available to assist her in taking care of her family and home.

The next three pages explored the respondent's willingness to ask for assistance of various kinds from possible providers, including relatives, friends, neighbors and agencies. The following two pages explored the same issues with regard to the husbands of married respondents.

The family maintenance task performance hours were recorded next. This consisted of five questions, one for each category of family maintenance task, each asked with regard to the respondent, children at home, (ex-)husband, relatives, in-laws, friends and neighbors. Income acquisition/producing activities were asked first, then shopping, home and possession maintenance, meal preparation and cleanup, and primary child care. A question was then asked in the same way about child minding time. It was noted if any task performance by others was paid for.

The next set of four questions inquired into the respondent's formal and informal utilization of mutual assistance from others in performing family maintenance tasks. Following this were questions concerning the degree to which the respondent utilized agencies and businesses, free or paid, to help in getting family maintenance tasks done.

A question was asked at this point as to whether the previous week had been unusual in a way which might have affected the family maintenance task hours. Current sources of financial assistance were recorded. The degree to which the respondent would voluntarily do family maintenance tasks if equal cost alternatives existed was explored next, then the child care alternatives utilized in a number of special circumstances.

A short section recorded the degree to which the respondent organized her family task performance. The next five pages were devoted to obtaining 4 point and 100 point scale ratings of respondent satisfaction with home, meals, family life, social life, free time and financial situation. Corresponding aspirations in each area were obtained, as well as general life satisfaction and happiness ratings.

A final section served to record a variety of background details: marital status, months in that status, religion, ethnic category, education and employment, number of rooms in home, and income.

Space was left for interviewee comments and questions at the end of the interview form. The interviewer's comments requested on the back sheet comprised the nature of the interview setting, others present, interruptions, respondent's reactions, attitudes and behavior, and anything else the interviewer felt may be helpful in the interpretation of the data.

Income Card

As an aid in asking the income questions, an Income Card (Appendix B) was provided to each interviewer. It had a heading describing in detail the income desired, and listed nine annual income ranges, identified by letter, from "under \$3,000 a year" to "\$25,000 and over a year."

Performance Worksheet

As an aid to the respondent in figuring out her task performance hours, each interviewer was given a number of worksheets (Appendix B) divided into Sunday to Saturday columns and Morning, Afternoon and Evening rows.

Interview Record Form

For the purpose of maintaining a current status record of the field work an Interview Record Form (Appendix B) was constructed. This form was originally a single page, but a second page was added to keep track of the telephone screeners when they were added to the staff.

A total of nine columns of information were maintained. The first was the interviewer or telephone screener's employee identification number. The second column was the number of screening interviews attempted and the third was the number of these persons refusing screening.

The fourth column was the total number of persons screened into the married sample, the fifth the number of these refusing to be interviewed, and the sixth the number who agreed to be interviewed but subsequently cancelled.

Similarly, the last three columns recorded the number of persons screened into the single parent sample, the number of these who refused to be interviewed, and the number who agreed but subsequently cancelled.

Reinterview Form

The one-page Reinterview Form (Appendix B) was utilized to record post-test data on representative Family Work Interview questions, to be used in the estimation of their reliability. A total of seven questions and four probes were asked.

Question 1 asked for the respondent's hours of house and possession maintenance during the same seven day period she reported in the Family Work Interview. Question 2 asked for the same information for the most recent seven days. Question 3 asked for the hours the respondent's children at home spent preparing meals and snacks and cleaning up afterward during the period reported in the Family

Work Interview. Question 4 asked for the same information for the most recent seven days.

Question 5 asked for the number of parents the respondent had living in Lansing and its suburbs. Question 6 requested the number of adult siblings the respondent had in the same area. Probes asked whether these numbers were the same as on the date of the original interview and what the difference was, if any.

Question 7 reiterated the general life satisfaction question of the original interview. Probes asked if this answer was different from the earlier answer given and what the difference, if any, was.

The respondent number, interview date and reinterview date were recorded at the top of the Reinterview Form.

Non-Respondent Interview

The Non-Respondent Interview (Appendix B) consisted of a brief introduction and eleven questions selected to provide background data comparable to information obtained from survey respondents. In the order in which asked, these questions were the survey non-respondent's marital status, age (on April 5, the mid-point of the survey), employment status, education attained, minority group membership, number of children under 18 living with her, number of them under 6, approximate geographical location and 1978 income. The survey non-respondent was also asked whether she was receiving any financial assistance from any public agency

at the time of the survey, and whether or not her telephone number was listed.

Non-Respondent Data Collection Forms

Non-Respondent Interview data for married and single parent non-respondents were collected on separate forms (Appendix B) which provided a column for the answers to each question and for notes.

Call-Back Record Form

Data concerning the accuracy with which persons were screened out as married after that stratum was closed were recorded on a Call-Back Record Form (Appendix B). This form provided columns for the telephone numbers of screening respondents, their marital statuses at screening, any children and notes.

C. Measures

What it is necessary to find out about each respondent has been listed in Chapter II, Section E. In what form is this information obtained? The respondent's marital and employment statuses are closed-ended questions. The categories of marital status are MARRIED, SEPARATED, DIVORCED, WIDOWED and NEVER MARRIED. The employment status categories are NOT EMPLOYED, PART TIME, FULL TIME and MORE THAN FULL TIME. The latter two categories were combined as FULL TIME for the purposes of the present analysis. The dividing line between categories of employment was left to the

definition of the respondent. Long term leave without regular pay was not, however, considered employment.

Data for the computation of the task performance measures was obtained as answers to the detailed family maintenance task performance questions described in Chapter III, Section B. The data for each family then consists of a 5x7 table of category of task by category of performer, as described in Chapter I, Section C. The cells of the table contain the number of family maintenance task hours worked by members of each performer category at activities in each task category in the seven days prior to the interview. The total number of hours spent by the mother (respondent) doing family maintenance work is the sum of the hours she spent at each of the five categories of tasks. The total number of family maintenance task hours worked by her husband or ex-husband, children at home, relatives, in-laws, friends and neighbors is computed in the same way.

The number of family maintenance task hours performed by kin is the sum of the hours performed by relatives and in-laws. The number of family maintenance task hours performed by nuclear family members is the sum of the hours of the parents and their children. The corresponding figure for female-headed single parent families consists of the contributions of the mother and her children living with her. The total family maintenance task hours

performed for the family is the sum of the hours contributed by all performers over all family maintenance tasks.

Recourse to businesses and community services is categorized into services in support of shopping (purchasing and delivery), physical maintenance, feeding (individual meals eaten out, picked up and delivered), and child care. Each category of support is further divided into services provided free and services the respondent had to pay for. Thus, there are eight questions in the interview relating to this area. With regard to shopping, physical maintenance and feeding it was useful to take Butz and Greenberg's (1975) advice to use the frequency of occurrence during the preceding seven days as a proxy for time spent. The respondents were asked the number of times a purchasing or delivery service or a physical maintenance service was provided. They were also asked the number of individual meals eaten out by family members, picked up by them or delivered to them. They were asked, however, the number of child care hours provided.

The mother's (respondent's) life satisfaction is an index made up of eight items, six of which relate to specific satisfactions, plus general life satisfaction and happiness (see Chapter III, Section B). Each item is a 4 point scale, from 1 for NOT SATISFIED AT ALL to 4 for VERY SATISFIED. Thus, the index ranges from 8 for entirely NOT SATISFIED to 32 for completely VERY SATISFIED. This approach was suggested by discussions in Campbell, Converse

and Rogers (1976), Nye (1963) and Burt, Wiley, Minor and Murray (1978). (See Family Work Interview, Appendix B.)

D. Procedures

This section describes the manner in which the methods were implemented in the actual survey. To obtain the desired number of interviews in the time available it was necessary to hire, train and equip a substantial staff of interviewers. It became evident during the staffing process that a field supervisor would be needed to share the effort of supervising the staff, collecting completed interviews from them and supplying them with fresh materials. Additional telephone screening support also was required and obtained.

The instruments were field tested, revised and printed in parallel with staffing and training. At the same time the list of artificial telephone numbers was obtained. Staff then proceeded to screen and interview respondents during an intensive three week field program.

After all materials had been completed and staff paid, a period of data assessment commenced. Data were then prepared for the computer and analyzed.

Care was taken throughout the survey to respect the rights of the persons contacted, their anonymity and the confidentiality of their responses.

Staffing

This section describes the process by which the survey staff was assembled and the rationale for choices among options. The completed staff consisted of the researcher, a field supervisor, twelve interviewers and five telephone screeners.

Interviewers

The survey methodology required a staff of interviewers. The size of this staff was determined by the number of interviews required and the screening effort required to obtain them, the time allowed for field work, and the availability of capable personnel.

It was decided in advance that all of the interviewers would be female. This eliminates sex of interviewer as a possible causal variable systematically affecting the data and potentially the findings. It was also felt that it would be productive of a more comfortable, less anxious situation for the respondents, benefiting both them and the survey. It seemed reasonable that they would be more likely to invite a woman than a man to interview them in their homes, and that they would be more likely to be open and frank with them.

The options were to hire student personnel (graduate and/or undergraduate) or temporary agency personnel, or to select from among those persons who might be known by or referred to the researcher. Students were felt to be unable

to offer the intensive participation and dedication this survey required, given their other commitments. Temporary agency personnel were also felt to be unlikely to have the personal involvement required, and to live at somewhat greater distances from the base of operations as well. On the other hand, personnel acquired from the general population might be very diverse in background and ability.

The use of student personnel as the sole source of survey staff was rejected. Detailed discussions were held with two temporary personnel agencies, resulting in concerns about the inability to pay interviewers in a manner which would motivate the desired performance in one case, and about the survey-agency relationship in the other. The last option was thus chosen, with the stipulation that all potential interviewers would be carefully interviewed before being selected.

It was decided that interviewers would be paid solely for usable completed interviews. This was done to motivate the production of interviews, given the short time available for field work. The maintenance of interview quality was a function of interviewer selection and training, close supervision and verification. The amount paid, \$10.00 per interview, was based on a rough estimate of total time invested in screening, traveling and interviewing to produce a usable interview, at about \$3.33 per hour. This amount was acceptable to all the prospective interviewers.

The researcher had tentatively discussed the possibility of interviewing with his wife and several acquaintances. Several more prospective interviewers were contacted through an acquaintance who was developing a job placement agency at the time. Other interviewers were referred by friends, by interviewers hired earlier and by the field supervisor. The final interviewing staff consisted of twelve women.

Each prospective interviewer was told in an initial telephone discussion about the survey and about the demands it would place on staff. There was some initial discussion about her background, but most of that was covered in a subsequent face-to-face interview. At that interview, the survey and the interviewer's job were reviewed. The Interviewer Questionnaire was completed, and served as a basis for further discussion. Care was taken to answer any interviewer questions and concerns.

Criteria for selection included Lansing area residence, free use of an automobile and telephone during the field work period, availability and adequate free time, prior experience, evidence of ability and motivation, and an absence of biases.

Each applicant was called back and offered a position as an interviewer. All those interviewed were felt to be satisfactory for the job. One person was hired and participated in the training program, but subsequently was

unable to participate. She was replaced by an experienced survey interviewer who received a briefing.

Field Supervisor

At the point where the number of interviewers reached about ten, it became obvious that it would be very difficult for a single person to supervise this staff alone and handle all routine and problematical matters during this short, intense survey. The researcher was fortunate to be referred to an experienced survey supervisor who agreed to share the effort. Specifically, it was agreed that she would review the draft survey instruments with the author and make recommendations concerning possible improvements, share routine supervision of the interviewers and verify a sample of completed interviews.

Telephone Screeners

At the midpoint in the field work, after the married stratum had been filled, it became obvious that the screening for single parents was not going to provide the required sample before the field work must end. There being no other experienced interviewers who could be recruited in time, the researcher contacted one of the temporary personnel agencies with which he had spoken earlier, and obtained the services of a total of five telephone screeners, all women, who would obtain willing respondents for the interviewers. These personnel were paid an hourly wage by their agency and the researcher was billed for their services. An

additional incentive was offered to them in the form of a \$2.00 bonus for each referral resulting in a usable completed interview.

Training

Arrangements were made to bring all of the interviewers together for a full day training program, covering interviewing in general and the specific procedures and requirements of this survey. The program was held on a Saturday in a conference room at Michigan State University. Arrangements were made for child care and refreshments.

Training was conducted by the researcher and the field supervisor. Time was allowed at the beginning for informal interaction, to encourage the interviewers to get acquainted with each other, and hopefully to begin to build a team spirit and joint commitment to the project. The morning session began with introductions and orientation by the field supervisor. The researcher then reviewed the nature and purpose of the study, and discussed pay and other administrative details. After a break, the field supervisor instructed the interviewers in effective interviewing techniques and discussed the needs of the present survey and her expectations. The remainder of the morning was taken up reviewing and discussing the screening record form, interview, and procedures.

The afternoon was devoted to a detailed review and discussion of the primary survey interview procedures,

instruments and materials. Throughout, a high level of interaction was maintained, with the emphasis on a thorough discussion of the interviewers' questions and concerns until everyone understood what was going to be done and was comfortable with it. At this session, the interviewers were equipped with letters of introduction and ID pins, clip folders, Lansing street maps, calendars, a draft Family Work Interview, and an initial supply of screening record forms and other survey materials.

An important part of the interviewers' training was their participation in pretesting the instruments and procedures. During staffing three interviewers were enlisted in an internal review and simulated use of the draft screening interviews and procedures. Immediately after the training program each interviewer was required to conduct a survey interview utilizing the draft instrument she had received. Each interviewer found a person whose marital and family status would have qualified her for the study sample and interviewed her, using all the appropriate materials. At the conclusion of this field test interview she completed the attached Field Test Feedback Form and returned the completed interview and feedback to the researcher in the next day or two. In doing this two additional interviewers practiced the screening procedures.

This process served to introduce the interviewer to the survey and permit her to adjust her performance

before conducting a study survey. It also served as a field test for the Family Work Interview and materials.

As mentioned above, one experienced interviewer was hired after field work had started to replace a trained interviewer who withdrew from the study. The new interviewer was thoroughly briefed by the field supervisor.

The researcher discussed any problems, questions or concerns with each interviewer after their practice interview, and on an ongoing basis throughout the field work. The usual occasions for these discussions were when the interviewers delivered completed forms and/or picked up blank forms, and during daily status checks. Information of general value that came out of conferences with individual interviewers was passed on to the others. Interviewers were also encouraged to call the researcher to discuss any problems, questions or concerns as they arose.

The field supervisor was thoroughly informed as to the nature and purposes of the study and survey during discussions regarding her employment, and in subsequent discussions in which she, in fact, contributed to the final versions of the procedures and instruments.

The initial three telephone screeners were thoroughly briefed in a joint meeting with the researcher and survey supervisor. The two screeners hired later were also thoroughly briefed individually. Like the interviewers, they also discussed any problems, questions or

concerns with the researcher during status checks or when being resupplied throughout the remaining field work.

Field Testing

Drafts of the survey instruments, materials and procedures were reviewed and tested in several ways. Drafts of all instruments and materials were reviewed by the researcher's dissertation committee. They were also reviewed by the University Committee for Research Involving Human Subjects for their potential impact on survey respondents. The field supervisor reviewed them as well for ease of use and response.

Subsequently, they were field tested by the interviewing staff, as described under Training, above. The information on the feedback forms and the interviewers' comments were considered in finalizing the survey instruments, materials and procedures. A total of four practice screening interviews and eleven practice survey interviews were conducted. Ten of the latter were returned with feedback forms.

Sampling Procedures

Sampling was conducted by the method of random digit dialing, as described in Chapter III, Section A. With the assistance of Michigan Bell Telephone Company personnel a list was compiled of the thirteen telephone exchanges servicing City of Lansing and Waverly residences. Current information was obtained regarding the number of working

business and residential lines on each exchange. Information was also obtained as to the number of multiple- (almost always two-) line residences in each of the three offices among which the thirteen exchanges were apportioned. As these numbers averaged only approximately 2.9% of residences with telephones, the percentage varied little from office to office, and there were no data which would allow a meaningful correction by exchange, the uncorrected number of residential lines in each exchange was utilized as the exchange weight in constructing the artificial telephone numbers.

The sampling frame for this survey was then all possible telephone numbers within the thirteen exchanges. The Waverly district and perhaps another 500 residences outside of the boundaries of the City of Lansing but ecologically a part of it were captured by this choice. On the one hand, there was no way to exclude these households except by complicating the screening. On the other hand, the sample obtained by not excluding these households is, in fact, more representative of Lansing than would have been one strictly restricted to residents of the City of Lansing.

Utilizing these figures, then, the Michigan State University Applications Programming Office created a random list of 14,032 unique artificial Lansing telephone numbers on the Screening Record Form. The surplus over the 9000 telephone numbers calculated to be needed for

screening in Chapter III, Section A was obtained at negligible cost as prior insurance against any conceivable error or problem, given the brief and unrepeatable nature of the survey.

Screening Procedures

Ten consecutive pages of the Screening Record Form were distributed to each of the twelve interviewers at the training program. They immediately began screening telephone numbers and making appointments for face-to-face interviews, allowing several days for the completion, reproduction and distribution of copies of the Family Work Interview.

The interviewers telephoned the numbers on their sheets sequentially. If a number was a non-working number of any kind they received a recorded message to that effect and noted this outcome on the Screening Record Form. If they spoke with someone who indicated that the number was a business or other non-residential number, they noted that on the record form. If there was no answer after the five rings they were required to wait, or if they heard a busy signal, they recorded that fact. In each case they continued on to the next number.

In the case of a busy signal or no answer, the interviewers were required to call back until they had tried at least once each during a weekday, an evening, and a weekend day. In fact, the completed record forms indicate

that this procedure was generally followed and an average of at least two calls were made to any number not reached.

When a residence was reached, the interviewer attempted to complete a screening interview. If it was ascertained that a potential respondent resided in that household but was unavailable to complete the screening interview at that time, she attempted to ascertain when to call back. In any case, she attempted to reach this person on at least two additional occasions, noting the outcomes of these calls on a Screening Interview Form.

When the interviewer reached a female head of household who was willing to be screened, she completed the screening interview. If the woman fit the sample, she was read a short description of the study and asked to participate in the face-to-face Family Work Interview. If the woman was willing to be a survey respondent, the interviewer made an appointment to interview her as soon as possible at a mutually convenient time and place, generally the respondent's home.

The interviewer was free to respond briefly to any questions or concerns expressed by the person to whom she was talking. If further cooperation was refused at any point she marked this fact in the appropriate place on the form, and politely terminated the conversation.

During the first half of the field work the interviewer was filling both the married and single parent strata of the sample. During the second half of the field

work married mothers were screened out, the stratum having been filled. This was accomplished by notifying each interviewer a day in advance to utilize the single-parents-only procedure, which appeared on the Screening Interview Form.

When it became necessary to hire additional staff to do telephone screening only, the Screening Interview Form was modified to allow for screening by either interviewers or screeners and to simplify and expedite the screening for single parents. The interviewers continued to work as before, concentrating more than ever on the Family Work Interview. The screeners referred the telephone numbers of persons eligible and willing to be respondents to the researcher or field supervisor. The latter then assigned that telephone number to an interviewer to follow up.

Interviewing Procedures

Interviewing commenced approximately two days after screening began. The two activities then proceeded in parallel throughout the field work period, the screening tapering off in the last few days.

The Lansing Police Department was notified in advance by letter that the survey would field a team of women interviewers. This was done for the protection of the interviewers and to facilitate the resolution of any misunderstandings. Interviewers could refer concerned persons

to the police department as well as to the field supervisor, the researcher and the dissertation director for verification. A very few such calls were received and easily handled.

All survey data were obtained from each respondent in the course of a single face-to-face interview. Interviewers called respondents within a day of their appointment to confirm the interview arrangements. If the respondent was not available upon arrival, the interviewer attempted to rearrange the interview or find out when to call back. If no one was home, she telephoned later to attempt to reschedule the interview. A small number of such cases was encountered, some of which ultimately produced completed interviews.

Upon meeting the respondent the interviewer identified herself by her ID badge and by showing the respondent her notarized Letter of Introduction. She then gave the Informed Consent Form to the respondent to read and went over it with her, responding to any questions or concerns. The respondent signed the Informed Consent Form and returned it to the interviewer, who returned it to the researcher or field supervisor along with the completed interview.

The interviewer attempted to arrange to interview the respondent alone. Less than complete privacy or lack of interruption was often the case, but the social environment was rarely very intrusive. In the few cases where others commented on answers to survey questions at least

some of this intrusion served to facilitate accurate reporting.

The interviewer proceeded through the Family Work Interview form from front to back, following the instructions on the form. She offered a task performance worksheet to the respondent for her use in any way she found helpful. A considerable number of respondents made some use of the worksheet, but the majority did not. The worksheet, if used, was returned to the researcher or field supervisor with the completed interview.

To encourage the respondent to report her family income the interviewer utilized an income card, as recommended by Van Dusen and Zill (1975) and Moser and Kalton (1972). The respondent had only to indicate which letter of the alphabet, corresponding to an income range, represented her family's income.

All but one interview was completed in a single visit. The interviews averaged one hour in length, ranging from one-half to two hours. Despite the size of the form and the amount of information requested, the structured nature of the interview and the closed-ended nature of the questions kept the interviewing time down.

Interviewers did what post-interview checking of the completed forms they had time for. Typically, they accumulated completed interviews until they found the time to exchange them for more blank interviews with the researcher or field supervisor. At the end of the field

work all materials were returned. After some preliminary checking of the completed interviews the interviewers and field supervisor were paid what was due them, the screeners were paid their bonuses, and the temporary personnel agency was paid.

Data Assessment Procedures

Immediately after the field work ended, the completed materials were organized. The numbers of screening interviews resulting in refusals, screen-outs, and face-to-face interviews were counted. The numbers of face-to-face interviews obtained with married and with single parents were counted, as well. Five interviews were found which were not usable due to the ineligibility of the respondent. Response rates were computed at this time.

Also immediately following the completion of the field work the field supervisor called an arbitrary sample of about 10% of each interviewer's respondents. She verified that the interview had taken place and checked the answers to several basic questions.

After the elapse of approximately three weeks time from the end of the field work a 10% simple random sample of respondents was drawn to test the stability of several key items. Respondents were contacted by telephone by the researcher's wife, a member of the interviewing team. She explained the need for additional information and then asked two background questions, two task performance

questions and a satisfaction question. A brief interview script and the Reinterview Form were used, each respondent's answers being entered on a Reinterview Form.

When the reinterviews had been completed, two simple random samples of non-respondents who were eligible to have been married or single parent respondents were drawn. This was done to support an assessment of the external validity of the findings. The researcher contacted each selected non-respondent by telephone. Approximately 20% of the married non-respondents and 25% of the single parent non-respondents were interviewed, using a single Non-Respondent Interview sheet and married and single non-respondent data collection forms. Eleven demographic questions were asked.

Kish (1965:407) suggests that a sample check of screening exclusions be made. In the process of conducting the non-respondent interviews it appeared that a few screening errors had indeed occurred during the field work. An arbitrary sample was drawn of those women who were screened out as married by each interviewer after the married stratum was filled. Contacts were made by the researcher and his wife, asking only marital status and dependent children at the time of screening. Answers were recorded on a call-back record form. In all, 101 persons were spoken with, about a 10% sample of all those screened out as married.

Data Handling and Preparation

All survey materials were promptly collected from the interviewers, screeners and field supervisor by the researcher. They were quickly transferred to bank safe-deposit boxes, where all but those in current use were stored. No one but the researcher and his wife, acting as a staff member, have had access to any of the materials since.

After the data assessment call-backs had been completed, the researcher designed a data record layout and constructed a code-book. The researcher and his wife then proceeded to code the data onto standard coding forms. Only numeric codes were used and all identifying information was omitted.

The coding forms were submitted for keypunching and verifying to the Michigan State University Data Preparation Service.

Data Analysis

The data were copied from the punched cards onto two magnetic tapes at the Michigan State University Computer Laboratory. One tape was written in the form of raw data card images. The other was constructed as an SPSS system file, containing all the data plus SPSS control information in binary form.

The data cards were reproduced, one copy going to a safe-deposit box, the other residing, unidentified, in

the researcher's home. Statistical analysis was performed at Michigan State University and at California State University Dominguez Hills, using SPSS Version 8, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et al., 1975).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter is concerned with the information obtained by means of the Family Work Survey. It begins with a description and assessment of the data. The subsamples are then described and compared with regard to their demographic characteristics, family maintenance task performance, and respondents' satisfactions. The results of the hypothesis tests are reported and discussed.

A. The Data

The data generated by this study comprise the following:

1. interviewer data
2. screening data
3. interview data
4. reinterview data
5. non-respondent interview data
6. screening error check data

Each of these data sets will be discussed or utilized in the above order in the following subsections.

Interviewer Data

A team of 12 women conducted the Family Work interviews. Although these women were unusual in their availability for intensive employment on short notice, they represented a wide range of ages and marital status, as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
INTERVIEWER DATA

Marital Status	Number	Percent	Age (Years)	Number	Percent
married*	5	42	20-29	5	42
separated	2	17	30-39	4	33
divorced	1	8	40-49	2	17
widowed	1	8	50-59	1	8
never married	3	25			

*living with husband

The interviewers ranged in age from 27 to 56, averaging 35. All 5 married interviewers had dependent children, as did all but 2 of the single interviewers. These latter 2 women had never been married. One of them was the only interviewer who was not the female head of her household. One of the interviewers was Black.

The 5 telephone screeners comprised 3 young single women and 2 housewives who were somewhat older. One of the single women was Black.

Screening Data

Two thousand seven hundred thirty-eight screening interview forms were returned. Of these, 267, or 9.8%, indicated that a possible respondent or someone else in the household had refused to permit a screening interview. An additional 102 failures to screen were recorded, including 88 cases where the possible respondent was never reached. The remaining loss includes 3 cases marked "unavailable", 2 who said they had already been contacted, 7 who spoke no English and 2 who could not understand the interviewer. Thus 2,369 screening interviews were completed, for an overall response rate of 87%.

Interview Data

Two hundred fifty-six married mothers were reached and screened during the first half of the field work, when married mothers were being sought for interviews. One hundred five refused to be interviewed, and 18 more subsequently cancelled interview appointments. Two additional eligible marrieds were unavailable during the field work period and 3 interviews were missed. One hundred twenty-eight interviews were obtained with married mothers, for an overall response rate of 50%.

One hundred ninety-one female single parent households were reached and screened. In 4 cases, the head of the household was never reached. In 68 cases the eligible respondent refused to be interviewed, and in another 9 cases

she cancelled the interview appointment. Five eligible respondents were unavailable during the field work period and 3 interviews were missed. One hundred two interviews were obtained with female single parents, for an overall response rate of 53%.

Moser and Kalton (1972) estimate that a typical non-response rate for an ordinary random sample interview would be around 20%. Longer and more complex interviews would tend to achieve lower response rates. Zuiches, Morrison and Gladhart (1976) report a 61.5% overall response rate in a complex survey of families residing in the Lansing, Michigan Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

The present survey was also complex, involving a minimum of 2 contacts with each respondent, including a lengthy survey interview. The use of the telephone and the anonymity of screening contacts made it easy to refuse. Prior telephone appointments have been found to significantly reduce the response rate. Inexperienced interviewers have also been found to achieve lower response rates than professional interviewers (Moser and Kalton, 1972). Furthermore, it was not possible to offer respondents a financial incentive for participating, as was done in the Zuiches, Morrison and Gladhart (1976) study.

Given these considerations, the achieved response rates were about what was expected. Furthermore, they were adequate. The desired sample was obtained, and, as will be

seen, it is likely that the sample adequately represents the population.

The interviews obtained were extremely complete. For most questions there were no missing data at all. Where there were missing data, it was usually a single case that was missing. The worst item lacked 3½%, or 8 cases. Income, for example, lacked 3 cases, 2 who did not know and 1 who refused.

By far, the most frequent reason for the absence of an answer was "don't know." The worst case, for example, was the understandable lack of knowledge single parents had concerning their ex-husbands' use of time to provide financial support to their ex-wives and/or children. Refusals were almost nonexistent.

Verification

A verification check of about 10% of the interviews was conducted immediately after the field work was completed. It confirmed that all checked interviews had been conducted as reported. No errors were found in the data.

Reliability

Discussions by Selltitz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook (1959), Moser and Kalton (1972) and Wright (1979) make it clear that there is no perfect approach to measuring reliability. Nevertheless, it is necessary to have some idea about the reliability of the measures utilized in this survey. The test-retest procedure is most appropriate to the

present study. Selltitz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook (1959) discuss the difficulties of implementing this procedure in survey research. As they suggest, it was thought best to repeat only representative questions, and then, only to a sample of the respondents.

A 10% sample of respondents was reinterviewed to measure the stability of response to representative interview items. The 24 respondents were selected at random by the method described by Moser and Kalton (1972:152-4), utilizing Babbie's (1973) table of random numbers. The reinterview sample comprised 13 married and 11 single mothers, closely reflecting the study sample proportions. The reinterviews were conducted between 23 and 37 days after the original interview with each respondent, about the time interval suggested by Selltitz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook (1959) and Nunnally (1964).

One interviewer from the survey staff conducted all of the reinterviews. She interviewed by telephone rather than face-to-face. The reinterview she used differed greatly in length, contents, organization and presentation from the Family Work Interview (see Chapter III, Section B and Appendix B). There was no attempt made to match the time of day or day of the week of the reinterview with that of the original interview.

Five items were selected from the Family Work Interview to represent the 3 main kinds of information being obtained. Two task performance items were selected, the

respondent's physical maintenance time and the meal preparation and cleanup time of her children living at home. These items were chosen because they tested the respondent's reliability as a reporter of her own and others' efforts and because they are common activities for the actors in question and are likely to produce few zero answers. Two items of background information were selected, the number of parents and adult siblings the respondent had in the Lansing area. The general life satisfaction item was chosen to represent the satisfaction data, as the single most representative item.

Pearson product-moment correlations were utilized as the measure of stability of the ratio level task performance and background items. Two comparisons were made for each task performance item, one with regard to the same actual week, and the other with regard to the 7 days prior to each interview. The correlation between interview and reinterview responses to the items regarding the respondent's physical maintenance time during the same week was .65. One respondent refused to answer this question in the reinterview. The correlation between responses to the item regarding her children's meal preparation and cleanup time during the same week was .70. The same respondent refused to answer this question in the reinterview, another didn't know, and a third respondent terminated the reinterview prior to this question. Between responses concerning the 7 days prior to each interview, the correlations for these

two items were both equal to .73, omitting 2 cases of reported real change affecting the mother's hours and 1 case of real change in the children's hours.

The correlations between interview and reinterview responses to the items regarding parents and adult siblings in the Lansing area were .93 and .97, respectively. There was some evidence that the definition of the geographical area may have been confusing in at least one case.

The choice of a reliability coefficient for the satisfaction item was less straightforward. If the responses are assumed to be interval level data the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is warranted, and is calculated to be equal to .51. If only ordinal level data is assumed, Kendall's tau is the most appropriate measure (Nie et al., 1975), and it is equal to .54. Hays (1963) suggests the use of the gamma statistic, the coefficient of predictive association between sets of ordered classes, on the grounds that it has a simpler interpretation than tau when ties are present. Gamma is .83 for the general life satisfaction item. This is the difference between the probability that two respondents' scores will have the same rank order on test and retest and the probability that their scores will be in a different order for all pairs of respondents whose scores are united in either test.

In fact, from inspection alone, the reliability of this item looks very good. Sixteen of the 23 pairs of

responses, or 70%, were tied at 2, 3 or 4. Six responses changed by 1, 3 up and 3 down. The single case of a change by 2 was the only case in which the original survey response was a 1, completely dissatisfied. This and 1 case in which a change of -1 was recorded were interviews in which poor recall was made note of. Another case of a change by -1 was noted to be real change. Three additional respondents stated in the reinterview that their life satisfaction was different from what it was at the time of the Family Work Interview, when in fact it was reported the same.

By comparison, Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) obtained a correlation (r) of .428 for the test-retest stability of their overall life satisfaction item over an 8 month interval. Converse and Robinson obtained a Kendall's tau of .59 between life satisfactions reported 4 to 6 months apart (Robinson and Shaver, 1973). Robinson and Shaver (1973) review this and other data regarding the reliabilities of satisfaction and happiness items and find their stability "impressive" (p. 17).

In any case, the foregoing relates to the reliability of a single item in the satisfaction index. Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) found that their composite satisfaction index showed a much higher stability, at .758, than any individual item, and in particular the overall life satisfaction and happiness items.

In their extensive discussion of reliability, Selltitz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook (1959) state that "there is

no simple answer to the question of satisfactory reliability" (p. 178). (See also Carmines and Zeller (1979), who suggest that a reliability of .80 is appropriate for widely used scales.) The test-retest reliabilities of the representative demographic items were, as expected, very high. The representative task performance items, with correlation coefficients between .65 and .73, were felt to be of satisfactory reliability. The representative satisfaction item was as stable as comparable items in published surveys which were judged to be reliable in a major methodological review (Robinson and Shaver, 1973). The composite index is likely to be considerably more reliable. Comparing the Family Work Survey and the small reinterview program, the former is likely to have produced the higher quality data. Thus, the Family Work Survey measures are judged to be reliable.

Validity

The generalizability of the findings to the intended population depends in large part on the degree to which the survey sample is similar to the population. An empirical approach was taken to this question of external validity. Sample characteristics were compared with corresponding population figures. A small follow-up non-respondent interview program was also conducted.

Twenty-five married and 25 single survey non-respondents were selected at random and briefly interviewed by telephone by this researcher. An additional 4 married

non-respondents were unreachable and 2 refused. Statements made at this time indicated that another 4 non-respondents screened as eligible marrieds might in fact not have been. A check of 24 more married non-respondents turned up no other possible screening errors, however. An additional 2 single non-respondents were unreachable and 3 refused.

The non-respondent interviews were carried out over a 2 week period beginning approximately 3½ months after the Family Work Survey. Several attempts were made to reach each selected non-respondent if necessary. The Non-Respondent Interview forms and procedures are described in Chapter 3, Sections B and D, respectively. The following discussion presents the results of the population and non-respondent comparisons.

The marital status distribution of respondent single mothers is very similar to the corresponding national distribution (Table 2). The study sample is somewhat higher in the percentage divorced and lower in the percentage widowed. The respondent distribution is also broadly consistent with the distribution of non-respondents. It is, however, closer to the national figures, generally speaking, falling between the two.

The employment status distributions of married and single respondents are quite similar to those of non-respondents and the corresponding United States distributions (Table 3). In general, a higher percentage of survey respondents and non-respondents were employed than was true of

TABLE 2

MARITAL STATUS OF FEMALE SINGLE PARENT FAMILY HEADS

Marital Status	Respondents		Non-Respondents		U.S. * percentage
	number	percentage	number	percentage	
Married, husband absent	22	21.6	2	8.0	27.9
--separated	22	21.6	2	8.0	23.8
--other	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.1
Divorced	57	55.9	18	72.0	42.2
Widowed	5	4.9	1	4.0	12.8
Never married	18	17.6	4	16.0	17.1
Total	102	100.0	25	100.0	100.0

* Female householders with no husband present, with own children under 18, as of March 1979.
Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 107, Table 9, p. 16.

TABLE 3
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF MOTHERS
percentage (number)

Employment Status Marital Status	Respondents			Non-Respondents			U.S. *		
	full- time	part- time	not em- ployed	full- time	part- time	not em- ployed	full- time	part- time	not em- ployed
Married	32 (41)	28 (36)	40 (51)	60 (15)	20 (5)	20 (5)	32.5	16.2	51.3
Single **	61 (62)	16 (16)	24 (24)	64 (16)	8 (2)	28 (7)	49.3	9.3	41.4

* Employment status of mothers 16 years old and over computed from information contained in U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Special Labor Force Report 219, Table F, p. A-23 and Johnson, Beverly L., "Marital and Family Characteristics of the Labor Force, March 1979", Monthly Labor Review 103, 4, Table 4 (p. 50).

** Separated, divorced, widowed and never married.

the nation as a whole. Study respondents were also more likely than non-respondents or American mothers to be employed parttime. It is felt that the present survey recorded more employment, especially parttime, at least in part because it went beyond the Census Bureau's definition of employment (see U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1980a) to include any activity at all, however casual, engaged in to produce income during the task performance week of record.

The age distribution of married respondents very closely parallels the national distribution. It is also similar to that of non-respondents (Table 4). This latter finding is most evident if age categories are collapsed to 16-34, 35-44, and 45 and over. The median ages of all three samples are almost identical.

The age distribution of single respondents is close to the national distribution as well (Table 5). There is some tendency toward larger proportions at younger ages. This is somewhat more true of non-respondents, so that the age distribution and median age of single respondents lie generally between the national and non-respondent figures, and close to both.

The proportions of married respondents who are Caucasian, Black or of Spanish origin are each slightly less than corresponding national population figures (Table 6). Taking account of the difference in the definitions of the categories (see Table 6), the proportions of Blacks and

TABLE 4

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF MARRIED MOTHERS

Age * Years	Respondents		Non-Respondents		U.S. **	
	number	percentage	number	percentage	number (thousands)	percentage
16 to 24	16	12.5	0	0.0	2,883	11.5
25 to 34	50	39.1	13	52.0	9,962	39.7
35 to 44	39	30.5	9	36.0	7,892	31.4
45 to 54	23	18.0	2	8.0	3,830	15.3
55 and over	0	0.0	1	4.0	531	2.1
Total	128	100.0	25	100.0	25,098	100.0
Median Age	34.5		34.8		34.7	

* Age at last birthday.

** Wives 16 years old and over with own children under 18 years as of March 1977.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports Series P-23, No. 77, Table 20, p. 26.

TABLE 5

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE* MOTHERS

Age ** Years	Respondents		Non-Respondents		U.S. ***	
	number	percentage	number	percentage	number (thousands)	percentage
14 to 24	17	16.7	3	12.0	709	13.4
25 to 29	20	19.6	7	28.0	946	17.9
30 to 34	21	20.6	6	24.0	1,068	20.2
35 to 44	31	30.4	7	28.0	1,616	30.6
45 to 54	9	8.8	2	8.0	786	14.9
55 to 64	3	2.9	0	0.0	151	2.9
65 and over	1	1.0	0	0.0	12	0.2
Total	102	100.0	25	100.0	5,288	100.0
Median Age	32.6		31.3		34.6	

130

* Separated, divorced, widowed and never married.

** Age at last birthday.

*** Female householders 14 years and over with no husband present, with own children under 18, as of March 1979.

Source: United States Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports Series P-23, No. 107, Table 8, p. 14.

TABLE 6
RACIAL/ETHNIC DISTRIBUTIONS OF MOTHERS
percentage (number)

Racial/Ethnic Category	Respondents *		Non-Respondents *		U.S. **	
	married	single	married	single	married	single
Caucasian	88.3 (113)	74.5 (76)	92.0 (23)	76.0 (19)	90.2 (22,101)	66.4 (3,511)
Black	6.3 (8)	22.5 (23)	4.0 (1)	16.0 (4)	7.7 (1,890)	31.8 (1,684)
Spanish Origin	4.7 (6)	2.9 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1,456)	7.8 (410)
Other	0.8 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.0 (1)	8.0 (2)	---	---
Total	100.0 (128)	100.0 (102)	100.0 (25)	100.0 (25)	100.0 (24,514)	100.0 (5,288)

131

* Racial/Ethnic categories are mutually exclusive.

** Families with own children under 18 by racial/ethnic category of householder as of March 1979.
Caucasian and Black categories include persons of Spanish origin. Numbers, therefore, do not sum
to totals or percentages to 100 percent. Numbers in thousands.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports Series P-23, No. 107, Table 4, p. 7.

Caucasians in the 2 samples are likely very close. One of the married respondents was a Native American.

The sample of female single parents contained a higher proportion of Caucasians, but smaller proportions of Blacks and persons of Spanish origin, than did the national sample (Table 6).

The racial/ethnic distribution of the non-respondents roughly paralleled the respondent and national distributions. The respondent figures tended to fall between or close to those of the other two.

The married and single respondent and non-respondent samples were roughly similar to each other in educational attainment (Table 7). The respondent samples, however, had a smaller proportion of individuals not completing high school and a larger proportion going beyond high school than the corresponding national samples. The non-respondent samples were also relatively low in individuals who didn't complete high school. Married non-respondents were much more likely to have had some college than members of the national sample, but were about as likely to have finished or gone beyond college. The proportion of single non-respondents completing high school was high, but the proportion going beyond high school was similar to the national proportion.

In the case of the married respondents, at least part of the higher educational level may be attributed to the fact that they were compared with a national sample which included wives who were not mothers. Non-mothers

TABLE 7
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF MOTHERS
percentage (number)

Years of School Completed	Respondents		Non-Respondents		U.S.	
	married	single	married	single	married*	single**
Elementary School 1 to 7 years 8 years	1.6 (2) 1.6 (2)	2.0 (2) 0.0 (0)	4.0 (1) 0.0 (0)	0.0 (0) 4.0 (1)	6.0 (2,887) 6.4 (3,084)	{ 12.4 {
High School 1 to 3 years 4 years	9.3 (12) 47.7 (61)	15.6 (16) 40.2 (41)	4.0 (1) 48.0 (12)	16.0 (4) 60.0 (15)	14.7 (7,081) 45.6 (22,000)	24.5 13 40.1 33
College 1 to 3 years 4 years more than 4 years	22.7 (29) 10.2 (13) 7.0 (9)	32.4 (33) 4.9 (5) 4.9 (5)	32.0 (8) 4.0 (1) 8.0 (2)	12.0 (3) 4.0 (1) 4.0 (1)	14.8 (7,155) 8.5 (4,087) 4.1 (1,964)	16.7 { 6.4 {
Total	100.0 (128)	100.0 (102)	100.0 (25)	100.0 (25)	100.0 (48,258)	100.0
Mean	12.87	12.60	12.84	12.24		

* Wives of husbands aged 14 and over, as of March 1979. Numbers in thousands.
Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports Series P-20, No. 356, Table 4, pp. 34-35.

** Female householders with no husband present, with own children under 18.
Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports Series P-23, No. 107, Table 10, p. 18.

c

T

no

ma

in

of

ef

an

th

em

re

co

ca

ope

tha

gra

or

res

hol

of

and

prop

The

tend to be older and less well educated than mothers (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1980b). The single respondents were compared with a national sample of female single parents. The previous effect is therefore not a factor, but urban/non-urban differences probably are, as they are in the married sample as well. The educational status of persons in urban areas tends to be higher on the average than that of persons residing in non-urban areas. Support for this effect may be found in the U. S. Bureau of the Census (1973) and in Zuiches, Morrison and Gladhart (1976).

The proportions of married and single respondents in the broad occupational groupings is similar to those for employed wives and female householders (Table 8). Married respondents were somewhat more likely than members of the corresponding national sample to be professional or technical workers, crafts or service workers and less likely to be operatives or laborers. Single respondents were more likely than members of the corresponding national sample to be crafts or service workers, less likely to be sales workers or operatives. These data were not obtained for non-respondents.

Compared to a national sample of husband-wife households containing related children under 18, the proportion of married respondents' families with incomes below \$10,000 and between \$12,000 and \$15,000 in 1978 was low, and the proportion between \$20,000 and \$25,000 was high (Table 9). The mean family income of married respondents was slightly

TABLE 8
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF EMPLOYED WOMEN
percentage (number)

Occupational Category	Respondents		U.S.	
	married	single	married*	single**
Professional and Technical	21.1 (16)	14.1 (11)	17.0	13.1
Managerial and Administrative	5.3 (4)	6.4 (5)	7.1	6.6
Sales	5.3 (4)	1.3 (1)	7.0	4.6
Clerical	36.8 (28)	34.6 (27)	34.9	34.0
Crafts	3.9 (3)	5.1 (4)	1.8	2.1
Operatives	7.9 (6)	9.0 (7)	12.5	14.7
Laborers	0.0 (0)	1.3 (1)	2.0	1.5
Service	19.7 (15)	28.2 (22)	17.6	23.4
Total	100.0 (76)	100.0 (78)	100.0	100.0

* Employed married women, husband present, as of March 1978.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1979, Table 663, p. 401.

** Female householders with no husband present, as of March 1979.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 107, Table 16, p. 32.

TABLE 9

INCOME DISTRIBUTIONS
percentage (number)

Total Money Income in 1978 (dollars)	Respondents ¹		Non-Respondents ¹		U.S. ⁴	
	married	single	married	single	married ²	single ³
Less than 7,000	4.8 (6)	32.4 (33)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (7)	5.9 (1,484)	46.7 (2,621)
7,000 to 9,999	2.4 (3)	16.7 (17)	10.5 (2)	23.8 (5)	6.4 (1,603)	16.8 (943)
10,000 to 11,999	6.4 (8)	12.7 (13)	0.0 (0)	4.8 (1)	5.9 (1,483)	8.5 (479)
12,000 to 14,999	6.4 (8)	14.7 (15)	0.0 (0)	14.3 (3)	9.8 (2,460)	9.2 (515)
15,000 to 19,999	19.2 (24)	14.7 (15)	15.8 (3)	19.0 (4)	20.1 (5,064)	9.7 (547)
20,000 to 24,999	27.2 (34)	6.9 (7)	15.8 (3)	4.8 (1)	18.2 (4,595)	4.7 (266)
25,000 and over	33.6 (42)	2.0 (2)	57.9 (11)	0.0 (0)	33.7 (8,500)	4.4 (247)
Total	100.0 (125)	100.0 (102)	100.0 (19)	100.0 (21)	100.0 (25,189)	100.0 (5,617)
Mean	\$21,568	\$11,118	\$26,579	\$10,011	\$22,702	\$9,532

¹Families of respondents and non-respondents.

²Households headed by married male, wife present, containing related children under 18.

³Households headed by female, containing related children under 18.

⁴Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports Series P-60, No. 121, Table 18, p. 56.
Numbers in thousands.

lower than that of those in the national sample. This may have been due to the selection of too low an income to represent the highest income category, which was open ended and which contained a third of the cases, in computing the mean. The income distribution of married non-respondents was quite coarse, as most of the cases fell into the top category. The distribution is roughly comparable to that of the married respondents, but disproportionally favors the highest incomes.

Compared to a national sample of female-headed households containing related children under 18, the proportion of single respondents with family incomes less than \$7,000 and \$25,000 and over was low, and the proportion between \$10,000 and \$25,000 high (Table 9). The mean family income of female single parents is higher than the corresponding national figure. The proportions of single respondents and non-respondents by income category are quite similar if the categories between \$7,000 and \$11,999 are collapsed. This is appropriate given the small sample size and consequent coarseness of the data.

The distributions of married and single respondents' families by number of children are generally similar to those of non-respondents and national distributions (Table 10). The families of married respondents are slightly more likely to have 1 child than those of non-respondents, but are considerably less likely to do so than members of the national sample. They are, however, slightly less likely to have 2

TABLE 10

FAMILIES BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN LIVING WITH THEM

percent (number)

Number of Children ¹	Respondents		Non-Respondents		U.S. ²	
	married	single	married	single	married ³	single ⁴
1	28.1 (36)	45.1 (46)	24.0 (6)	40.0 (10)	37.5 (9,204)	44.6 (2,360)
2	45.3 (58)	26.5 (27)	48.0 (12)	28.0 (7)	37.3 (9,136)	32.2 (1,701)
3	14.8 (19)	17.6 (18)	20.0 (5)	24.0 (6)	16.6 (4,067)	14.8 (782)
4	2.3 (3)	7.8 (8)	8.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1,437)	5.5 (293)
5	4.7 (6)	2.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	4.0 (1)	1.8 (448)	1.8 (97)
6 or more	4.7 (6)	1.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.0 (1)	0.9 (222)	1.0 (55)
Total	100.0 (128)	100.0 (102)	100.0 (25)	100.0 (25)	100.0 (24,514)	100.0 (5,288)
Mean	2.29	1.97	2.12	2.12	1.95	1.86

¹For respondents: own children only; for non-respondents: children under 18 only; for U.S.: own children under 18 only.

²Numbers in thousands. Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 352, Table 1, p. 7.

³Husband-wife families with own children under 18.

⁴Families with female head, no husband present, with own children under 18.

s

c

t

n

e

r

e

s

re

to

th

li

ha

na

the

chi

and

fig

chil

the

chil

the

children than families of non-respondents, but are more likely to do so than families in the national sample. A smaller proportion of married respondents' families have 3 or 4 children and a larger proportion have 5 or 6 children than either of the other two corresponding samples. The mean number of children in the families of married respondents is slightly higher than the figure for married non-respondents and somewhat more than the national figure.

The proportions of mother-child families of respondents and nationally having 1 child are almost identical, and somewhat more than the figure for non-respondents. Both respondents' and non-respondents' families were less likely to have 2 children and more likely to have 3 children than the national sample. The respondent families were more likely than non-respondents and national sample families to have 4 children. Respondent families were very close to the national proportions for 5 and 6 or more children, but less than those figures for non-respondents. The mean number of children in respondent mother-child families lies between and close to the corresponding national and non-respondent figures.

Differences in the definitions of the number of children, as noted in Table 10, account for at least part of the differences between the distributions and means. "Own children" also includes foster children (in 2 families) in the respondent but not the U.S. samples.

Overall, the survey sample is very similar to both the national and non-respondent samples on the basic demographic variables. Members of the survey sample are a bit younger and better educated, are more likely to be employed and tend to have higher incomes than members of the national samples. This is particularly true of the single respondents, who were also less likely to belong to a racial or ethnic minority. By and large these differences are confirmed by the sample of non-respondents, pointing to probable real differences between Lansing and the United States as a whole.

If the samples are representative, can we then assume that the findings will be representative? Two issues bearing on this question must be examined. It is necessary to consider whether the findings might have been different in a different climate and/or at another time of year. The weather during the data collection phase of the study comprised temperatures and precipitation common to Spring and Fall in most temperate regions, including most of the United States. It was also not atypical of Winter weather in the warmer parts of the nation. The temperatures were mid-range, neither as hot nor as cold as it can get in almost any part of the United States.

The effects of weather and climatic differences or changes on the family maintenance process are minimal as well. By the nature of the process, it will go on under any conditions in which families are found. The basic tasks

must still be performed. Even the time devoted to each task will not vary greatly, although it is to be expected that the most severe weather and climates will make some activities somewhat more burdensome and time-consuming and limit or preclude the performance of others. The weather conditions under which respondents were performing family maintenance at the time of the survey are therefore felt to be adequately representative.

Given that the climate and season were not such as to greatly restrict the representativeness of the findings, is it possible that the characteristics of the specific community studied might have been such as to produce findings ungeneralizable to larger populations? Lansing, Michigan and the adjoining Waverly area make up a city with a population of approximately 150,000. It is neither very small nor very large as urban places go. It is a state capital, and contains a variety of government offices at several levels. It contains both light and heavy industry. It has several institutions of higher education, including a community college, a business college and a law school. It is the urban center of a standard metropolitan statistical area containing a diversified agricultural sector and a major university (Zuiches, Morrison and Gladhart, 1976). It is felt that the routines, activities and conditions of life in Lansing, and the manner in which family maintenance is conducted, will not differ greatly from those in most other urban places.

It is concluded, therefore, that the sample is successful in representing Lansing women in the desired categories, and women in the same categories living in similar sized cities. It is also concluded that, with due allowance for the vast range of urban experiences, the present findings reflect the lives of the women of the hypothetical population as well.

Screening Error Check

During the course of the married non-respondent interviewing, several persons originally recorded as married mothers reported that they were separated at the time of the survey field work. To check the possibility of screening errors causing a loss of eligible single parents, 101 persons screened out as married mothers were recontacted and asked for their marital status and whether they had any children at the time of the screening interview. Ninety-one cases were as originally recorded. In 8 cases there was a difference in reported statuses, but the person was ineligible in either status. In 2 cases it appeared that a single parent might have been screened out in error. In 1 of these cases, as in several of the 8 other cases, there was sufficient uncertainty that one could only say that a screening error might well have occurred.

Both possible screening losses were of separated mothers. The overrepresentation of separated mothers among single parents screened out in error might logically derive

from the ambiguity inherent in the married but separated marital status, if the screening interview was not followed carefully enough by the screener and/or the respondent.

Random single parent sample loss would have had no meaningful effect on any part of the analysis. Its only effect would have been to diminish the single parent sample, which would have only slightly reduced the significance of some findings. Only in testing Hypotheses 11 and 12 were the married and single mother strata combined, and in that case their responses were weighted so as to, in effect, convert the sample proportions to approximate population proportions. The actual degree to which the proportions of single parents by marital status may have been distorted in the sample by differential screening error is undetermined. The figures in Table 2, however, indicate that the separated mothers of Lansing, in particular, were not likely to have been much underrepresented in the sample, if at all, and the single parent sample was quite close to the national proportions as to marital status.

B. Background Characteristics

Fifty-six percent of the single respondents were divorced, 21½% separated, 18% never married and 5% widowed (Table 2). Sixty percent of married respondents were employed, 53% of them fulltime. Seventy-six percent of single respondents were employed, 79% of them fulltime (Table 3).

Married respondents ranged in age from 19 to 54, with a median age of 34½ (Table 4). Single respondents ranged from 18 to 65 years old, with a median age of 32½ (Table 5). Respondents employed fulltime tended to be older than those employed parttime or not employed. Among single parents they also tended to have completed more years of school, averaging more than one full year beyond high school. The youngest respondents by marital status were those never married, the oldest the widows. The youngest subgroup was that of never married mothers who were also not employed (Table 11).

About 9 out of every 10 married respondents were Caucasian. Blacks were slightly predominant over persons of Spanish origin among the remainder. Three out of every 4 single respondents were Caucasian. Blacks comprised almost all of the rest of the singles (Table 6). Caucasians predominated among the separated and divorced, Blacks among the never-marrieds, mirroring their respective contributions to the growth in the number of single parent families (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1980b).

It appeared that single respondents were somewhat more likely than married respondents to have ended their formal education without completing high school. Better than 2 out of 5 of each sample did complete high school, however, and about another 2 out of 5 went on to at least begin college or equivalent higher education. Married respondents

TABLE 11
BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS BY MARITAL AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Marital Status	Employment Status	Characteristic								
		Number in Sample	Mean Age	Mean Years Educ.	Race/Ethnic Number			Mean 1978 Family Income	Mean Own Children	
					Wh.	Bl.	Span. Am.			
Married:	Total	128	34.84	12.87	113	8		6*	\$21,568	2.3
	Fulltime	41	36.32	12.71	35	2		4	22,854	2.3
	Parttime	36	35.22	12.92	33	2		1	21,618	2.1
	Not employed	51	33.39	12.96	45	4		1*	20,480	2.4
Single:	Total	102	33.80	12.60	76	23		3	11,118	2.0
	Fulltime	62	35.13	13.18	46	14		2	13,258	2.0
	Parttime	16	29.31	11.69	12	4		0	6,594	1.9
	Not employed	24	33.38	11.71	18	5		1	8,188	1.8
Separated:	Total	22	30.50	12.96	18	3		1	13,682	2.1
	Fulltime	12	32.00	13.42	9	2		1	15,750	2.6
	Parttime	4	24.00	11.50	3	1		0	10,375	1.0
	Not employed	6	31.83	13.00	6	0		0	10,917	1.8

TABLE 11--Continued

Divorced:	Total	57	36.07	12.65	48	9	0	\$10,807	2.1
	Fulltime	39	37.23	13.26	33	6	0	13,090	2.1
	Parttime	7	33.43	11.71	7	0	0	5,786	2.3
	Not employed	11	33.64	11.09	8	3	0	5,909	1.8
Widowed:	Total	5	45.60	11.40	5	0	0	11,800	2.2
	Fulltime	1	43.00	12.00	1	0	0	13,500	1.0
	Parttime	1	35.00	10.00	1	0	0	6,000	3.0
	Not employed	3	50.00	11.67	3	0	0	13,167	2.3
Never married:	Total	18	27.39	12.33	5	11	2	8,778	1.5
	Fulltime	10	29.90	12.70	3	6	1	10,900	1.4
	Parttime	4	26.00	12.25	1	3	0	5,625	2.0
	Not employed	4	22.50	11.50	1	2	1*	6,625	1.3

146

* Plus one American Indian.

seemed more likely than the singles to have completed college and to have gone on to graduate study (Table 7).

Employed married respondents were half again as likely as employed single respondents to be employed in a professional or technical occupation (Table 8). They were also much more likely to be sales workers. Employed single respondents were considerably more likely than employed married respondents to be service workers. Both were more likely to be clerical workers than anything else.

The mean 1978 family incomes were approximated from grouped figures on an open-ended scale. Means also overstate group incomes due to the weight they give exceptional cases. The findings are, however, another confirmation of the general poverty of single mothers. The mean family income of single mothers barely exceeded half of the over \$20,000 a year income of nuclear families. Families in which the single mother was not employed or was employed parttime did even much worse than that (Table 11). The income distribution of nuclear and mother-child families are almost the reverse of each other (Table 9).

Single mothers employed parttime seemed to attain mean family incomes not even equal to those of single mothers who were not employed. This difference was not, however, found to be significant by a t-test. The never married respondents were the poorest by marital status, but the divorced, widowed and never married respondents who were employed parttime and the divorced respondents who were not

employed were the poorest groups, averaging \$6,000 or less in 1978 (Table 11).

Married respondents averaged 2.3 own children living with them to 2.0 for the single parents. The single mothers were most likely to have 1 child, the married mothers 2. The married mothers were much more likely than the singles to have 5 or more children (Table 10). The separated, divorced and widowed single parents averaged slightly above 2 children each, but the younger never-marrieds averaged only 1.5 children (Table 11).

C. Task Performance

Married mothers averaged 78 hours a week of family maintenance work (Tables 12, 15). Of this time, 17 hours were spent in the acquisition of income, 42 hours in housekeeping, and 19 hours in primary child care. Families of married mothers averaged a total of 168 hours of family maintenance work a week. Seventy-one of these hours were spent in income acquisition, 59 in housekeeping and 38 in primary child care. The children at home contributed 22 hours to this total, primarily in income acquisition and child care. Husbands contributed 62 hours toward family maintenance, most importantly 45 in income acquisition and 9 in child care. Kin contributed 4 hours, primarily in child care. Friends and neighbors added little, again mostly in the area of child care.

TABLE 12

MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS BY MOTHER'S MARITAL AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(per week)

Marital Status	Employment Status	Mother	Children at Home	(Ex-) Husband	Kin	Friends	Neighbors	Total for Family
Married:	Total	77.9	22.1	61.8	4.0	0.9	1.2	167.9
	Fulltime	88.0	30.2	61.3	5.2	1.1	1.4	187.2
	Parttime	75.3	18.9	59.7	3.1	0.7	0.7	158.5
	Not employed	71.7	17.8	63.7	3.6	0.9	1.3	159.0
Single:	Total	81.0	19.5	2.0	3.3	4.2	0.6	110.6
	Fulltime	84.1	21.6	2.2	2.7	2.6	0.6	113.8
	Parttime	74.9	19.6	0.7	4.1	6.9	0.0	106.3
	Not employed	76.7	13.9	2.5	4.0	6.6	1.0	104.8

Single mothers averaged 81 hours a week of family maintenance work (Tables 12, 19). Of this time, 28½ hours were spent in income acquisition, 31 hours in housekeeping, and 21½ hours in primary child care. Families of single mothers averaged a total of 111 hours of family maintenance work a week. Thirty-five of those hours were spent in income acquisition, 42 in housekeeping and 34 in primary child care. The children at home contributed 19½ hours to this total, primarily in child care, income acquisition and physical maintenance. Assistance from separated and ex-husbands averaged 2 hours a week over the entire single parent sample, 3 hours a week over the separated and divorced groups only. Most of this assistance was in the form of child care, then in the provision of income. Kin contributed a little over 3 hours, primarily in child care. Friends contributed about 4 hours, also primarily in child care but secondarily in income acquisition. Neighbors contributed little.

Within the single parent sample, the separated mothers averaged 73 hours of family maintenance a week (Table 23), divorced mothers 82 (Table 27), widowed mothers 81 (Table 31) and never-married mothers 87 (Table 35). Widows averaged only 12 hours of income acquisition a week, compared to 22 for separateds, 30 for never-marrieds and 32 for divorcees. Widows, however, spent much more time on housekeeping than did persons in other marital statuses.

It was hypothesized that nuclear and mother-child families derive support from others outside the family (H.1).

To test whether this hypothesis holds for nuclear families, the sum of the family maintenance hours performed by the mother, her husband and the children at home was compared with the total family maintenance hours. For mother-child families, the sum of the family maintenance hours performed by the mother and her children at home was compared with the total family maintenance hours. Utilizing correlated one-tailed Student's t-tests (paired samples) it was found that total family maintenance hours significantly exceeded the maintenance hours of members of both nuclear and mother-child families (beyond .001). The approximately 6 hour contribution to the maintenance of sample nuclear families by persons outside the family, while small in comparison to the efforts of the family members themselves, is almost certainly a reality of life in American families. The same may be said of the approximately 10-hour contribution of others to the maintenance of sample mother-child families.

Hypothesis 2 stated that husbands of separated mothers and ex-husbands of divorced mothers work fewer family maintenance task hours for them than husbands in nuclear families, but more than zero hours. It was found that separated and ex-husbands contribute an average of about 59 hours a week less to their (ex-)wives' single parent families than husbands did to their nuclear families (Table 12). This difference was found to be significant beyond the .001 level by a one-tailed t-test. The separated mothers did, however, receive an average of about 3 hours a week from

their husbands, and the divorced mothers $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours from their ex-husbands (Tables 23, 27).

Hypothesis 3 stated that female single parents work more family maintenance task hours than married mothers living with their husbands. It was found that the single parents did average about 3 more family maintenance task hours a week than the married mothers (Table 12). This difference was not found to be significant by Student's *t*, however.

It was hypothesized that children of female single parents work more family maintenance task hours than children in nuclear families (H.4). In fact, a difference of about $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours a week was found in the opposite direction (Table 12). This difference was not, however, found to be significant using Student's *t*-test.

Hypothesis 5 stated that kin of female single parents work more family maintenance task hours for them than kin of married mothers living with their husbands. It was found to the contrary that kin contributed slightly, but insignificantly, more to nuclear families than to mother-child families (Table 12). Decomposing the contribution of kin into that of relatives and in-laws clarifies this finding. Relatives of married and single mothers contributed almost identically to family maintenance, a little over 3 hours a week (Tables 15, 19). In-laws of all kinds, however, contributed almost an hour a week to nuclear families, almost nothing to mother-child families (Tables 15, 19).

This difference was significant at the .001 level using a one-tailed t-test.

It was hypothesized (H.6) that friends and neighbors of female single parents work more family maintenance task hours for them than friends and neighbors of married mothers living with their husbands. Friends did, in fact, contribute over 3 hours more to the maintenance of mother-child families than they did to nuclear families (Table 12). This difference was significant beyond the .01 level in a one-tailed t-test. Neighbors averaged about half an hour a week more help to nuclear families than to mother-child families (Table 12). This difference was not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 7 stated that fewer total family maintenance task hours are worked by and for families of female single parents than nuclear families. Mother-child families did average 57 fewer family maintenance hours a week than nuclear families (Table 12). This difference was found to be significant beyond the .001 level by Student's t (one-tailed). Although the time spent in the performance of every category of family tasks was less for the mother-child family than the nuclear family, the greatest deficit, 35 hours a week, was in income acquisition (Tables 15, 19).

It was hypothesized that female single parents have more recourse to businesses and community services than married mothers living with their husbands (H.8). The services received from these providers were categorized as

shopping (purchasing and delivery), physical maintenance, meals eaten out or picked up or delivered, and child care. They were further categorized as services paid for or received free of charge. It was found that female single parents receive an average of 7 hours a week of paid child care and about another hour free from businesses and community services, compared with about 2½ hours and almost nothing, respectively, for married mothers (Table 13). The difference of about 4½ hours a week of paid child care was significant beyond the .01 level by a one-tailed t-test. The difference of almost an hour a week of free child care was significant beyond the .05 level by a one-tailed t-test. Mothers employed fulltime utilized by far the most paid child care, 5½ hours a week for those married, 10½ hours a week for those single. Not-employed single parents were the only mothers to receive much free child care, 3½ hours a week.

Female single parents also reported slightly more free physical maintenance and meals than married mothers, but the differences were not significant. Married mothers reported somewhat more paid physical maintenance help. This difference was statistically significant beyond the .01 level (2-tailed). Married mothers also reported more paid meals and free and paid purchasing and delivery. None of these differences were significant (Table 13).

Respondents were asked about their participation in mutual-help organizations. Eleven of the 102 single mothers

TABLE 13

MEAN ASSISTANCE RECEIVED FROM BUSINESSES AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

BY MOTHER'S MARITAL AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(per week)

Marital Status	Employment Status	Shopping (times)		Physical Maintenance (times)		Meals (number)		Child Care (hours)	
		paid	free	paid	free	paid	free	paid	free
Married:	Total	.09	.13	.26	.02	5.97	.61	2.42	.02
	Fulltime	.08	.13	.32	.00	9.00	.78	5.46	.00
	Parttime	.08	.08	.25	.03	4.72	.44	1.67	.08
	Not employed	.12	.16	.22	.02	4.41	.59	0.51	.00
Single:	Total	.05	.06	.10	.06	5.41	.88	7.00	.89
	Fulltime	.08	.07	.13	.05	5.98	.53	10.52	.07
	Parttime	.00	.06	.06	.00	4.38	.88	2.00	.00
	Not employed	.00	.04	.04	.13	4.57	1.83	1.21	3.58

indicated that they did belong to such an organization. They stated that they received between "little" and "some" family maintenance help from them. By comparison, 16 of the 127 married respondents who answered these questions said that they belonged to a mutual-help organization. They reported receiving "some" help with family maintenance from them.

Housewives with children averaged about 72 hours of family maintenance work a week. Married mothers working parttime averaged about 75 hours. Those working fulltime averaged 88 hours (Table 12). As employment time increased, shopping, physical maintenance and meal preparation and cleanup time decreased. Housewives also spent more time caring for their children than married mothers employed fulltime or parttime (Tables 16, 17, 18).

The contributions to family maintenance of the children and relatives increase with the mother's increasing employment hours. Husbands contribute about 2 hours more to family maintenance if their wives are not employed than if they are employed fulltime, 4 hours more than if they are employed parttime. The small contribution of in-laws follows the same pattern. Friends and neighbors contribute most to nuclear family maintenance when the wife works fulltime, slightly less if she is not employed, and least if she is employed parttime (Table 12).

Total family maintenance time for families of housewives with children averaged 159 hours a week, for married

mothers working parttime also 159 hours a week, and for married mothers working fulltime 187 hours a week (Table 12).

Female single parents who were not employed averaged about 77 hours of family maintenance work a week. Those employed parttime averaged 75 hours, those employed fulltime 84 hours (Table 12). As employment time increased, physical maintenance, meal preparation and cleanup, and child care time decreased. Time spent shopping was greatest for those employed parttime, least for those employed fulltime (Tables 20, 21, 22).

Children of female single parents contribute more to family maintenance the more hours their mother spends at income acquisition. Friends of parttime employed single mothers contribute the most to their family maintenance, almost 7 hours a week. Friends of non-employed single mothers contribute slightly less, friends of single mothers employed fulltime only about 2½ hours. Kin follow the same pattern. Ex-husbands and neighbors contribute most to non-employed single mothers, less to those employed fulltime, and least to those employed parttime (Table 12). Only in the case of single mothers employed fulltime did in-laws make a small contribution to the kin total.

Total maintenance time for families of female single parents who were not employed averaged about 105 hours a week. The corresponding figures for those employed

parttime and fulltime were 106 and 114 hours a week, respectively (Table 12).

It was hypothesized that, for married and single mothers taken separately, employed mothers work more family maintenance task hours than non-employed mothers (H.9). It was found that the single mothers working parttime actually averaged 2 hours less family maintenance time than the single mothers who were not employed. Married mothers working parttime reported an average of $3\frac{1}{2}$ more family maintenance hours than did non-employed married mothers, but this difference proved not to be statistically significant. The same is true of the single mothers working fulltime, despite the $7\frac{1}{2}$ hour difference. The married mothers working fulltime, however, did put in significantly more family maintenance hours than the housewives with children. The 16 hours difference is statistically significant beyond the .01 level by a one-tailed t-test.

It was also hypothesized that, for nuclear and mother-child families taken separately, more total family maintenance task hours are worked by and for families of employed mothers than families of non-employed mothers (H.10). In fact, the nuclear families with a mother employed parttime averaged very slightly less time spent in family maintenance than nuclear families with a mother who was not employed. The $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours a week more time spent at family maintenance in the mother-child families with a mother employed parttime than in those in which the mother was not

employed proved not to be statistically significant. The 9 hours more a week spent at family maintenance in the mother-child families with a mother employed fulltime than in those in which the mother was not employed also proved not to be significant. The 28 more hours a week spent in the nuclear families with a fulltime employed mother than in those with a non-employed mother, however, was significant beyond the .05 level by a one-tailed t-test.

D. Satisfaction

Looking at the mean life satisfaction index scores by marital status (Table 14), it appears that married respondents were somewhat more satisfied than single respondents overall. The married mothers averaged slightly better than "pretty satisfied" while the single parents averaged slightly below "pretty satisfied." The small sample of widows was most satisfied overall among the single parents but not as satisfied as the married mothers. The never-married respondents were the least satisfied of the marital status groups.

The married respondents also exceeded the single respondents in every specific satisfaction, general satisfaction and happiness (Table 14). The difference was especially great with regard to financial situation and happiness. Other larger differences were with regard to condition of home, free time and general satisfaction.

TABLE 14
MEAN SATISFACTIONS BY MARITAL AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Marital Status	Employment Status	Mean Satisfaction								
		Home ¹	Meals ¹	Family Life ¹	Social Life ¹	Free Time ¹	Financial Situation ¹	Gen. Sat. ¹	Happiness ²	Life Sat. Index ³
Married:	Total	3.070	3.258	3.098	2.828	2.819	2.906	3.188	3.331	24.498
	Fulltime	2.927	3.024	2.780	2.780	2.525	2.732	3.024	3.300	23.092
	Parttime	3.139	3.333	3.208	2.806	2.833	2.917	3.194	3.278	24.708
	Not employed	3.137	3.392	3.275	2.882	3.039	3.039	3.314	3.392	25.470
Single:	Total	2.765	3.167	2.971	2.627	2.569	2.196	2.873	2.892	22.060
	Fulltime	2.758	3.226	2.919	2.742	2.516	2.355	2.935	2.919	22.370
	Parttime	2.563	2.938	2.813	2.250	2.250	1.750	2.375	2.563	19.502
	Not employed	2.917	3.167	3.208	2.583	2.917	2.083	3.042	3.042	22.959
Separated:	Total	2.818	3.227	2.909	2.318	2.864	2.364	2.773	2.727	22.000
	Fulltime	2.917	3.250	3.000	2.333	2.833	2.583	3.000	2.833	22.749
	Parttime	2.000	3.000	2.250	2.000	2.000	1.750	2.000	2.000	17.000
	Not employed	3.167	3.333	3.167	2.500	3.500	2.333	2.833	3.000	23.833

TABLE 14--Continued

Divorced:	Total	2.719	3.158	2.930	2.789	2.579	2.193	2.965	3.018	22.351
	Fulltime	2.692	3.179	2.897	2.872	2.487	2.282	2.897	2.923	22.229
	Parttime	2.857	3.143	2.714	2.429	2.714	2.143	2.714	3.143	21.857
	Not employed	2.727	3.091	3.182	2.727	2.818	1.909	3.364	3.273	23.091
Widowed:	Total	3.400	3.400	3.300	2.600	2.600	2.400	3.000	2.600	23.300
	Fulltime	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	2.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	23.000
	Parttime	3.000	3.000	2.500	1.000	2.000	1.000	2.000	1.000	15.500
	Not employed	3.667	3.667	3.667	3.000	3.000	2.667	3.333	3.000	26.001
Never Married:	Total	2.667	3.056	2.944	2.500	2.167	1.944	2.667	2.778	20.723
	Fulltime	2.800	3.400	2.900	2.700	2.300	2.300	3.000	3.000	22.400
	Parttime	2.500	2.500	3.000	2.500	1.750	1.250	2.250	2.500	18.250
	Not employed	2.500	2.750	3.000	2.000	2.250	1.750	2.250	2.500	19.000

¹ 4=very satisfied; 3=pretty satisfied; 2=not too satisfied; 1=not satisfied at all.

² 4=very happy; 3=pretty happy; 2=not too happy; 1=not happy at all.

³ 32=very satisfied; 24=pretty satisfied; 16=not too satisfied; 8=not satisfied at all.

Among single parents the widows were the most satisfied with the condition of their home, their meals, family life, and financial situation, and expressed the highest general satisfaction. They exceeded the married respondents as well in the first three items, averaging well above "pretty satisfied." They were, however, the least happy of marital status groups, averaging just above the midpoint of "not too happy" and "pretty happy." On other items the never-married respondents tended to be the lowest. This was the case for home, meals, free time, financial situation and general satisfaction. The lowest item score for any marital status group was never-marrieds with regard to their financial situation, just below "not too satisfied." Separated respondents reported the least satisfaction with their family life and social life of all marital status groups.

Among the married mothers, respondents seemed to be more satisfied in inverse proportion to their employment (Table 14). This was the case for the life satisfaction index, as well as for all its items, excepting only home and happiness. Housewives and married mothers employed parttime reported essentially the same satisfaction with regard to the condition of their homes, which was higher than that reported by those employed fulltime. Housewives reported the highest level of happiness, but married mothers employed fulltime reported themselves slightly happier than those employed parttime. The differences between satisfactions reported by housewives and married mothers employed parttime

tended to be much less than those between the parttime and fulltime employed. This was especially true of family life, and very noticeable with regard to home and meals. It was not true of social life or happiness. On the life satisfaction index the magnitude of the fulltime-parttime difference was about twice that of the housewife-parttime difference.

Among the single mothers, those not employed tended to be slightly more satisfied than those employed fulltime (Table 14). This was true with regard to the satisfaction index, the home, family life, free time, general satisfaction and happiness. Single parents working fulltime reported greater satisfaction with meals, social life and finances than those not employed.

Single mothers employed parttime were much less satisfied overall than those employed fulltime and those not employed. They were also less happy and less satisfied with regard to every specific domain and in general. This was especially true of general satisfaction and happiness. The lowest satisfaction reported by married or single mothers of any employment status was that of single mothers working parttime in regard to their financial situations, below "not too satisfied."

Among single mothers broken down by marital and employment status (Table 14), the lowest mean life satisfaction index score was achieved by the widowed mother employed parttime, just below "not too satisfied", followed

by parttime employed separated mothers, then never-married mothers employed parttime and not employed. The widow was "not happy at all", and "not satisfied at all" in general and with her social life and financial situation. Other marital/employment status group means below "not too satisfied" were: never-married mothers with regard to their financial situations and free time and separated mothers working parttime with regard to their financial situations.

The highest mean satisfaction index score was computed for the widowed mothers who were not employed, slightly higher even than that of the housewives. Both were above "pretty satisfied", as was that of married mothers employed parttime. Non-employed separated mothers averaged almost "pretty satisfied." The highest item scores were recorded by the non-employed widows with regard to home, meals and family life, closer to "very satisfied" than "pretty satisfied." Not much lower were the satisfactions of non-employed separated mothers with their free time and fulltime employed never-marrieds with their meals.

Overall, married respondents reported the highest scores for happiness, meals, general satisfaction and family life, in that order. The highest scores for single respondents were the same, but in the order: meals, family life, happiness and general satisfaction. Married respondents were least satisfied with their free time and social lives. Single parents were much less satisfied with their financial

situations than anything else, followed by their free time and social lives.

It was hypothesized that the life satisfaction of a mother varies inversely with her family maintenance task hours (H.11). A representative sample of Lansing mothers was constructed by weighting the responses of married mothers by $3.694/2.499$ and those of single mothers by $1/2.499$ to compensate for the purposive oversampling of single mothers in the Family Work Survey. Multiplying the responses of married mothers by 3.694 adjusted the sample married/single ratio to correspond to that of the United States in March 1979 (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1980a). Dividing both weights by 2.499 preserved the sample size so as not to distort the tests of significance (Nie et al., 1975).

The satisfaction index scores of the respondents in this sample were found to correlate $-.20$ (Kendall's tau) or $-.28$ (Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient) with their family maintenance task hours. Both correlations, while weak, are significant at the .001 level. Weaker, but still significant, negative correlations were found between these 2 variables in the unweighted sample.

Within the married sample the 2 variables were found to correlate $-.24$ (Kendall's tau), $-.34$ (Spearman's rank-order coefficient) and $-.33$ (Pearson's product-moment coefficient). All 3 measures were significant at or beyond .001.

There was no significant correlation between the 2 variables within the single parent sample, however.

It was hypothesized that the life satisfaction of a mother varies directly with her family's total maintenance task hours (H.12). In the weighted sample it was found that there was no such relationship. A very weak (.11 to .16) but significant (.01 to .05) correlation was found in the unweighted sample, depending on the measure used.

Very weak and non-significant negative correlations were computed between these 2 variables in the married sample. An almost significant (.067) Pearson product-moment correlation of .165 was found between these 2 variables in the single parent sample. Smaller and non-significant positive Kendall and Spearman coefficients were computed.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter begins with a review of the situation which motivated this study. There follows a discussion of the study and its methodology. The survey findings are then reviewed and compared with those of others. Conclusions are drawn and the theory of family maintenance is revised in light of the findings. The chapter concludes with some recommendations regarding future research and policy.

A. Summary

Women have been working for a living and raising children alone for a long time. In 1950 many women were engaged in each of these activities, some in both. Family sociology was just beginning to develop systematic theory, and what theory there was related primarily to the extended family systems of the developing nations and the isolated nuclear family in the industrialized societies. Working mothers and single parents were considered deviants, while the focus was on the "normal" family. A single parent family was referred to as partial or broken in comparison to "normal" nuclear families. To be sure, the deviants represented only a small proportion of all families.

The situation has changed dramatically, however. Working mothers are now in the majority. This is the demographic fact, even if our cultural norms have lagged somewhat behind. Economic necessity and the increasing importance given a woman's equal right to find meaning in her life and power in her relationships through employment now counterbalance to a degree her homemaking and child care responsibilities.

The increasing ease and acceptability of divorce and of mothers working has sparked a major increase in single parenthood as well. With its increasing visibility and familiarity single parenthood has also become more acceptable in recent years, further intensifying the increase.

Families with a working mother and mother-child families have special needs as a result of their particular structures. The two-income family has a surplus of tasks and the mother-child family has a deficit of parents relative to the one-income nuclear family. Thus both are liable to suffer a shortage of time. The mother-child family is also very likely to suffer a shortage of money, since men tend to earn more than women and provide the bulk of a family's income. It is usually left largely to the mother to cope with the special demands of the two-income and mother-child family. The working single mother, in particular, has to cope with the extra tasks of the working mother and the paucity of support of the single mother.

The consequences of these problems to the mother often include a degree of role strain, anxiety, fatigue, and, in the case of the single parent, loneliness and despair. The consequences to two-income and mother-child families and their members may include a diminished quality of life through reduced housekeeping, child care, free time and/or income. The consequences to society include the existence of large numbers of mothers experiencing difficulties in their attempts to earn a living and maintain their families, the cost of supporting many dependent families, and the uncertain effects of these conditions on the millions of children growing up in these families.

The societal response to this situation has been inadequate to date. Although attitudes and norms are beginning to catch up with demographic reality, the life situation of working mothers and female single parents is still made unnecessarily difficult by a variety of structural problems. Among the most important of these are a lack of equal pay and job opportunities for women, the absence of generally available and affordable quality child care, and a variety of scheduling problems and other role incompatibilities.

A great deal of effort has been put into the construction of family theory over the past two decades. Much has also been written about single parent families and working mothers. Unfortunately, the two literatures have until now said little to each other. There is almost nothing written about the newly common family forms which could be called

theory, and there is little of family theory that bears any relevance to the new family forms, and in particular to the single parent family.

The present study is a small attempt to contribute to the development of a broader family theory which incorporates family type and mother's employment as variables, and to develop a body of knowledge which could be useful in responding to the needs of working and single mothers. In particular, this study focuses on the most basic of subjects, family survival.

Families are conceptualized as social systems made up of members who occupy at least the positions of child and mother and/or father. The most basic function of the family is to preserve itself and its members. This is accomplished by the performance of family maintenance tasks by family members and others. These tasks can be categorized as income acquisition, shopping, maintenance of home and possessions, meal preparation and cleanup, and child care. This activity goes on within a structure of roles and in accordance with the individuals' own perceptions and needs.

Family type and mother's employment status influence the manner in which the family maintenance tasks are accomplished. A theory of family maintenance was proposed and specific hypotheses were stated regarding the use of time in the accomplishment of the family maintenance tasks for mother-child, working mother and one-income nuclear families.

A comparative cross-sectional survey was conducted in Lansing, Michigan in the Spring of 1979 to obtain data with which to test these hypotheses. A disproportionate stratified random sample of 102 female single parents and 128 married mothers was obtained by random digit dialing and telephone screening and interviewed face-to-face by a staff of 12 women interviewers. Information was obtained regarding background characteristics of respondents and their families, family maintenance task performance and satisfaction.

Findings

Fifty-six percent of the single mothers were divorced, 21½% separated, 18% never married and 5% widowed. Sixty percent of the married mothers were employed, 53% of them fulltime. Seventy-six percent of the single mothers were employed, 79% of them fulltime.

The married mothers averaged 34½ years of age, 2 years older than the average single mother. The married mothers tended to be slightly better educated than the single mothers, but both groups averaged more than half a year beyond high school. The mothers overall tended to be employed in clerical work. They were next most likely to be in service work and in professional and technical work. Employed single mothers were much more likely than marrieds to be service workers. Married mothers were much more likely than single mothers to be professional and technical workers.

The mean income of mother-child families barely exceeded half of the over \$20,000 mean income of nuclear families in 1978. Mother-child families in which the mother was not employed or was employed parttime did much worse than even that. Nuclear families averaged 2.3 own children living at home to 2.0 for the mother-child families.

The single mothers averaged 81 hours a week of family maintenance work, compared to 78 hours for the married mothers. This 3 hour difference was not found to be statistically significant. The allocation of time among the 5 task categories was, however, markedly different for the single and married mothers. The single mothers averaged 28½ hours a week acquiring an income, over 11½ hours more than the married mothers, and 21½ hours a week at child care, 2½ more than the married mothers. Shopping times were about equal at 4½ hours a week. The single mothers, however, spent less than 15½ hours a week at physical maintenance, over 7 hours less than the married mothers, and 11 hours a week at meal preparation and cleanup, almost 4 fewer than the married mothers.

Contrary to expectations, the children of the single mothers contributed less time to family maintenance than the children in nuclear families, 19½ versus 21 hours a week. This difference was also not statistically significant. The children of single mothers tended, however, to spend less time at the "external" activities of income acquisition and shopping and more time at the "internal" family activities of physical

maintenance, meal preparation and cleanup, and child care, than did children in nuclear families.

Both the nuclear and mother-child families received some support, an average of 6 and 10 hours a week respectively, from persons outside the immediate family. Ex-husbands and husbands of separated mothers contributed $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 hours a week to their (ex-)wives' family maintenance efforts, far less than the 62 hours a week of nuclear family husbands. Relatives provided just over 3 hours of help a week, regardless of whether the mother was married or single. In-laws provided less than an hour a week of help to the married mothers, almost nothing to the female single parents. Friends contributed a little under an hour a week to the married mothers, and over 4 hours a week to the single mothers. Neighbors contributed a little over an hour a week to the nuclear families, half of that to the mother-child families. This last difference was not statistically significant.

A total of 168 hours a week were spent in the maintenance of the nuclear families, and 111 hours a week to maintain the mother-child families. Less time was spent in the performance of every category of family maintenance tasks for the mother-child families than for the nuclear families. This difference represents the effect of the absence of a second parent in the family. The few additional hours reportedly contributed by single mothers and their friends made up very little for the lack of a husband's contribution.

The largest part of the difference was over 35 hours a week of income acquisition time, reflecting the husband's provider role, despite the single mothers' additional efforts in this regard. The mother-child families also received over 10 hours less a week of physical maintenance, more than 4½ less of child care and meal preparation and cleanup, and over 2½ less of shopping.

Neither the single nor the married mothers had much recourse to businesses or community services for family maintenance support except in the area of child care. The single mothers paid for an average of 7 hours of child care a week, significantly more than the 2½ hours a week paid for by the married mothers. The married mothers, on the other hand, paid for more physical maintenance help than the single mothers, although neither group received much such help. Only 11 to 12 percent of the respondents reported belonging to a mutual help organization, and even they reported receiving a modest amount of help with family maintenance in this way.

The married mothers' family maintenance hours rose as their employment increased, from about 72 hours a week for housewives to 75 hours a week for those employed parttime and 84 for those employed fulltime. Their total family maintenance hours did not increase as much as their time spent in income acquisition, however, because as their employment increased they spent less time at the other family tasks.

The single mothers who were not employed averaged about 77 hours a week of family maintenance. Those employed

parttime put in 75 hours a week, while those employed fulltime spent 81 hours a week at family maintenance. As with the married mothers, time spent at the other family maintenance tasks decreased as the time spent acquiring an income increased. The findings for mothers' family maintenance hours must be regarded as indicative only, as only the difference between married mothers employed fulltime and those not employed was statistically significant.

The contributions of the children living at home to the maintenance of nuclear and mother-child families rose substantially as their mothers' employment increased. Kin also appeared to contribute somewhat more to nuclear families if the mother was employed fulltime. On the other hand, kin and friends contributed less to mother-child families if the mother was employed fulltime than if she was employed parttime or not employed. Total nuclear family maintenance hours rose from 159 a week for families with mothers who were not employed or who were employed parttime to 187 a week for those in which the mother was employed fulltime. Total mother-child family maintenance hours rose from 105 for those with mothers who were not employed to 106 for those with mothers employed parttime and 114 if the mother was employed fulltime. The findings for total family maintenance hours should also be taken to be only indicative, as only the difference between nuclear families in which the mother was employed fulltime and those in which she was not employed proved to be statistically significant.

Both the married and single mothers who were employed reported several times as many hours of paid child care as did others of the same marital status, $5\frac{1}{2}$ hours a week for marrieds, $10\frac{1}{2}$ hours a week for singles. The non-employed single parents were the only marital/employment status to report significant free child care, $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours a week.

The single respondents were somewhat less satisfied with their lives than the married respondents. Both tended to characterize themselves as more or less "pretty satisfied." The single mothers were considerably less happy than the married mothers and less satisfied with their financial situations. They were also less satisfied with the condition of their homes, with their meals, family lives, social lives, and free time. Among single mothers the widowed mothers were most satisfied with their lives, the never-married mothers the least. The widowed mothers reported, however, the lowest level of happiness of all marital statuses. Married mothers, but not single mothers, reported decreasing levels of satisfaction with increasing employment.

The life satisfactions of the respondents were found to have a weak but statistically significant negative correlation with the number of hours they spent at family maintenance. This was true of the mothers overall and of the married mothers, but not of the single mothers taken alone. There did not seem to be a relationship between the life satisfactions of the respondents and the total maintenance hours for their families in the overall sample or the sample

of single mothers. There was some indication of a possible positive relationship between the 2 variables in the married sample.

B. Discussion

Relation of Findings to Prior Research

The traditional division of family maintenance tasks and roles by sex, discussed by Hesselbart, 1976 and Slocum and Nye, 1967, is reconfirmed. Married mothers spend far more time doing housekeeping (shopping, physical maintenance and meal preparation and cleanup) and child care than anyone else, regardless of their employment status. Husbands spend more time at income acquisition than their wives do, even if the wife works fulltime. Nevertheless, most wives make a contribution to income acquisition, an instrumental function, and husbands contribute to such internal family tasks as physical maintenance and child care. Thus the evidence requires that the instrumental function of the father and the expressive function of the mother be considered relative rather than absolute, as, in fact, Parsons (1955) had suggested.

Research by Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966), Walker (1970), Robinson (1977a), and Oakley (1974) indicates that the housekeeping and child care efforts of wives totaled an average of around 55 hours a week. The first 3 studies, however, included women without dependent children. The authors indicate that upward adjustments of 3½ to 11 hours a

week would be required to reflect the lives of married mothers. The Oakley (1974) study utilized a sample of young married mothers "with at least one child under 5" (p. 198), and also included child supervision time. Data from Walker (1969) and Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966) indicate that Oakley's (1974) findings would thus require a downward adjustment to be comparable with their findings, Robinson's (1977a) and those of the present study. Given these considerations, the 61 hours of housekeeping and child care averaged by the married mothers in the present study would appear to be in good agreement with the findings of prior research.

Robinson (1977a) and Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966) found that husbands average about 46 hours of employment a week. The present study found a comparable figure of 44.7 hours a week. Husbands have previously been found to average between 4 and 11.3 hours a week of housekeeping and child care (Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt, 1966; Walker, 1970; Walker and Gauger, 1973; and Robinson, 1977a). The lower figure, of Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966), included "regular housework" only. Information in Walker and Gauger (1973) also indicates that married fathers contribute slightly more time to household work than husbands without children. Since the samples utilized to obtain prior findings included families without children, they would require an upward adjustment to be compared with the finding of the present survey of families with children, which was that married fathers averaged about 8 hours of housekeeping and 9 hours of

child care a week. Considering the time that has elapsed since the prior surveys, perhaps the difference is also an indication of increasing participation by husbands in internal family maintenance tasks.

Walker (1970) found that wives employed zero to 14 hours a week spent a total of 61 hours a week, and their husbands 65 hours a week, at family maintenance. If the wives were employed 15 or more hours a week they averaged 70 hours a week at family maintenance, their husbands 63. The present study found that non-employed married mothers spent 71.7 hours a week at family maintenance, their husbands 63.7. Married mothers employed parttime spent 75.3 hours a week at family maintenance, their husbands 59.7. Married mothers working fulltime devoted 88 hours a week to family maintenance, and their husbands 61.3. Again, the earlier findings would require some upward adjustment to represent the hours of fathers and especially of mothers.

The contribution of children to family maintenance reported by Walker and Gauger (1973) is also confirmed. There are roughly 2 children per family in the present sample and they make a combined contribution of about 20 hours a week to both nuclear and mother-child families. It then appears that each child, of any age, would spend about $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours a week at family maintenance, somewhat more than the $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 hour a week that Walker and Gauger (1973) reported.

The findings of this study are also in agreement with research indicating some, but limited, assistance to

nuclear families by kin (see e.g., Adams, 1968 and Lee, 1979). While the nuclear family is largely dependent on its own efforts for its maintenance, it still receives about 3 hours a week of assistance from relatives of the wife and almost another hour from her in-laws. Interestingly, the same level of assistance was found from relatives to single mothers, except in the case of the small sample of widowed mothers, who received no help from kin at all. This tends to support Lopata's (1978) finding that kin support of widows may have been exaggerated, but suggests that neither the nuclear family nor the mother-child family is, in general, so isolated.

The present study found that employed married mothers averaged 27.9 hours a week of income acquisition, very close to Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt's (1966) 27 hours a week. It should be noted that the latter omitted those cases with the lowest 9% and the highest 1% of employment hours. Robinson (1977a) reported considerably more hours for employed women, but noted that those with young or many children "reported considerably shorter work hours" (p. 50).

The effects of married mothers' employment on their housekeeping and child care efforts is as reported by Walker (1969, 1970), Walker and Gauger (1973), Robinson (1977a) and Bose (1978). Time spent in housekeeping and child care declined as the level of employment rose from not employed through employed parttime to employed fulltime. Also in accordance with Walker (1970), the total time devoted to family

maintenance by married mothers increased with increasing employment.

In agreement with Walker (1969, 1970), Walker and Gauger (1973) and Vanek (1974), but contrary to Blood and Wolfe (1960), Blood (1963), Hood (1977) and Robinson (1977a), no increase in husbands' housework, child care or total family maintenance time was found if their wives were employed. In fact, the numbers show a slight decline of about 2 hours in all three variables from husbands of mothers who are not employed to husbands of mothers working fulltime.

Walker and Gauger (1973) found no increase in the contribution of children to family maintenance with their mother's employment. Douvan (1963), Roy (1963) and Rallings and Nye (1979), however, point to the likelihood of such an increase. The present research did, in fact, find a marked increase in the amount of housekeeping and child care performed by children with increasing level of mother's employment.

The evidence regarding changes in help received from others outside the family with mother's employment is mixed. Nuclear families with mothers employed fulltime received about 7.7 hours of such help a week to 5.8 for nuclear families with non-employed mothers. These findings agree well with those of Morgan, Sirageldin and Baerwaldt (1966). Unlike Vanek's (1974) finding, however, mothers employed fulltime were found to make greater use than others of paid child care. Their families also tended to eat more meals out and to have somewhat more

recourse to paid physical maintenance, along the lines suggested by Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport (1971).

Comparable numbers regarding single parents are not easy to come by. Weiss (1979) estimates that the non-employed female single parent spends about 9 hours a day at family maintenance. The present study found an average of just under 11 hours a day. Children were not found to contribute more to maintaining mother-child families than nuclear families, as was suggested by Blood (1972) and Weiss (1979).

As reported by Hetherington, Cox and Cox (1976) and Goetting (1978), however, ex-husbands and separated husbands were found to contribute a few hours a week to maintaining their former families. Adams (1968) and Lopata (1978) report help received from grown children by widows and divorcees. Such help was reported by the divorced mothers, but not by the widowed mothers in the present study. No more help was received from relatives by single mothers than married mothers in the present study except for divorced mothers who were not employed.

This study did find that friends tended to offer more help to single mothers than to married mothers, in agreement with Weiss (1979). It did not, however, support Weiss' (1979) findings for additional help to single parents from relatives or neighbors. In agreement with Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) levels of hired household help found in this study were very low for mother-child families.

Nye (1963) states that working wives have been found to feel burdened, anxious, frustrated and fatigued. Nonetheless, he found that the life satisfaction of employed married mothers, especially those employed parttime, was greater than that of married mothers who were not employed. Robinson (1977a) found that employed married mothers felt more rushed and less satisfied with their lives in general. The present study found that married mothers at increasing levels of employment reported decreasing levels of life satisfaction.

Ferri and Robinson (1976) and Weiss (1979) reported feelings of loneliness, anxiety and despair among single parents. The present study found lower levels of life satisfaction and happiness among single mothers than among married mothers. This is also in accordance with the findings of Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976). The widowed mothers' high satisfactions and low happiness are in agreement with findings of Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976).

Conclusions

The theory of family maintenance proposed in Chapter II is supported in general, but with some modifications. The immediate family, nuclear or single parent, does receive support from a wide variety of non-family members. The time contributed is not large, however, although it is probably important in individual cases. The nuclear family is not isolated from kin or others in its social environment, but

it may be said to be largely dependent on its own resources. The same may now be said, with somewhat more emphasis on the dependence, of the female-headed single parent family.

While their total contribution of time to family maintenance is less than that of married mothers, husbands do contribute significantly to housekeeping and child care, and perform the bulk of the income acquisition. Thus, the absence of a husband represents a loss of many hours spent maintaining the family. Even though separated and ex-husbands contribute a few hours a week to family maintenance, and friends contribute a few hours more a week to mother-child families than they do to nuclear families, the primary family response to the absence of a husband is to make do with much less family maintenance.

The female single parent may or may not spend a few more hours at family maintenance than the married mother. What she does primarily, however, is trade housekeeping time for more employment and child care hours. Neither her efforts, nor those of others make up the differences. The shortage of income acquisition hours, in particular, together with relatively low pay, result in generally low mother-child family incomes. Single mothers have recourse to more paid child care than married mothers, largely in support of fulltime employment.

The female single parent who is not employed spends, as predicted, slightly more time doing family maintenance than the housewife. She gets by with somewhat less shopping

and physical maintenance and about the same time devoted to meals and income-related activities. She spends half again as much time as the housewife on child care, however, making up, with some added help from friends, for the lower contributions of the father, other children, in-laws and neighbors. The mother-child family in which the mother is not employed primarily sacrifices in the area of income production, and subsists on a generally very low income.

Also as predicted, the employed female single parent spends more time acquiring an income, less time at household work, and perhaps more time at family maintenance overall than the female single parent who is not employed. Except for shopping, which those employed parttime do slightly more of than the others, time spent at housekeeping and child care decreases as employment increases. Child care performed by other children at home increases as the mothers' child care decreases, reducing the overall loss.

Other than increased help from their children proportional to level of employment, single mothers who are employed do not receive more help with family maintenance. In fact, those employed fulltime appear to lose support from friends and relatives, as if they had lost their dependent status and were seen as being "on their own two feet." Despite their efforts to earn a living, even the single mothers employed fulltime average a few less employment hours and much lower incomes than husbands with children. The greatest deficit in total family maintenance hours for families

of single mothers working fulltime is in the area of household work. Total family maintenance hours may increase with the single mothers' level of employment.

Married mothers do less child care if employed than if not employed. They also spend less time at each category of housekeeping task with increasing employment. Nevertheless, their total family maintenance hours increase with increasing employment, as predicted. Generally speaking, only the married mothers' children, and relatives support their fulltime employment with increased family maintenance time.

Nuclear families with mothers employed fulltime total about the same amount of child care time as nuclear families with non-working mothers, but somewhat less housekeeping, especially physical maintenance. They spend the most hours at income acquisition and at family maintenance overall, and have the highest incomes of all categories of nuclear or mother-child families. They also make some additional use of paid child care.

Couched in dynamic terms, what seems to happen is that, as the mothers' family maintenance load increases through single parenthood or employment, it is easier for her and her family to sacrifice the maintenance of home and belongings and the preparation and cleaning up of meals than it is to add family maintenance hours at the sacrifice of free time or to obtain assistance from others. Child care is more resistant to reduction, but mother-child

families unlike nuclear families, having fewer resources, sacrifice here also. The actual degree to which an individual mother or family will sacrifice family maintenance, work longer hours or enlist the aid of others is, of course, a matter of individual preference and opportunity.

The utilization of time in family maintenance is a very elastic process (Weiss, 1979). Much time can be done without if necessary. Tasks performed by two or more family members together can often be done alone. The social and personal value of such companionable redundancy is lost, but time is freed for other uses. That which is not strictly necessary can be put off or left undone. Standards for performance can be lowered, but standards of quality may be slow to change. It is often possible to work more steadily, more rapidly or more efficiently. Overdone, the first two of these strategies may be productive of fatigue and stress.

Thus, single parent families can and do maintain themselves with far less time than nuclear families devote to family maintenance. Nuclear families with employed mothers make do with less housekeeping than those in which the mother is not employed. There is often a very real sacrifice in the level at which the family is maintained, however, and in the quality of life experienced by its members. It should be noted that, in this process, many individuals successfully perform both instrumental and expressive functions.

As predicted, single mothers are less happy and less satisfied with their lives than married mothers. This

relative dissatisfaction and unhappiness derives from relative dissatisfaction with their financial situation, free time, social life, family life, meals and home. These specific dissatisfactions arise out of life situations which include low income, possibly a little less free time, less time and money for a social life and more child care and other problems in having one, no spouse companionship or support, less time to prepare meals and maintain the home and possessions, and sole responsibility for the maintenance of the family.

Single mothers who are not employed or who are employed parttime tend to have especially low incomes and are therefore inclined to be especially dissatisfied with their financial situation. Single mothers who are employed, while still relatively dissatisfied with their financial situation, also tend to be particularly dissatisfied with their free time, their family life, and the condition of their home. This arises out of reduced housekeeping and possibly less free time. Their generally higher income and more time spent away from the family and in the company of adults presumably contribute to more satisfactory social lives than experienced by those not employed. It appears that single mothers working parttime may suffer from the disadvantages of both the lower income of those not employed fulltime and the diminished housekeeping time of those employed.

Married mothers do not share the low income and dissatisfaction with the financial situation experienced by

single mothers. Married mothers who are employed, however, do share the relative lack of, and dissatisfaction with free time. They are consequentially relatively dissatisfied with their social and family life. Less time spent at housekeeping is productive of lower satisfaction with meals and home. This is especially true of those employed full-time. Apparently any additional satisfaction because of the increase in the family income resulting from the wife's employment is not generally adequate to compensate for other financial dissatisfactions arising out of the 2-income situation.

C. Recommendations

Research Recommendations

The study reported in this document was a modest and preliminary attempt to explore in some detail the use of time in family maintenance by several now-common types of families. Replication would be a useful test of the findings. Such research could be improved by attention to the experiences of this study. A larger survey could achieve a greater degree of confidence in its findings, particularly with respect to the smaller subsamples.

Similar studies in other locales would serve to establish the limits of applicability of the present findings. As suggested in Chapter I, comparative studies of urban/rural, ethnic and national differences would further enrich family theory and knowledge. Replication of this study from

time to time, or some other longitudinal approach to this subject, would provide useful data concerning changes in family maintenance over time. Longitudinal studies of changes in family maintenance in individual families experiencing marital and employment status and life cycle changes would support the development of a dynamic model of family maintenance.

Some specific variables which could not be addressed within the limits of the present research require special attention. The relationships of efficiency and personal standards to family maintenance performance need to be investigated. A richer model of the relationships between family maintenance, role strain and satisfaction also needs to be developed and tested.

Policy Recommendations

Simply put, the mother-child family lacks both time and money. Given the negative effects of this situation, what can be done to improve upon it? The biggest problem is in providing an adequate income for the family in the absence of the traditional provider. The lack of equal pay and job opportunities together with a lack of training for the higher-paid occupations and a variety of structural problems inherent in being a single parent prevents most single mothers from working as many hours a week as a father or earning as high an income.

The issues of equal pay and job opportunities for women have become matters of legislative, administrative and judicial action. The lives of some individuals are improved by such efforts, but a general movement in the direction of equality goes forward slowly, if at all, against the inertia of norms and attitudes and a reluctance to accept the costs of social change. (See, e.g., Beller, 1977.)

Job training would seem to hold promise for those lacking job skills. Again, there are government programs, but these have been subject to changes in economic conditions and political philosophy. A helpful development is the facilitation of job training for single mothers in schools and colleges and on the job. Readily available child care during classes, low-cost education loans and company-sponsored training might allow many otherwise dependent mothers to develop skills which would enable them to support their families and make an economic contribution to society.

Adequate day care also makes it possible for those with job skills to go to work and to work fulltime. Improvements and expansion in the day care delivery system are already underway. Private companies have begun developing chains of day care centers and a few employers are experimenting with on-site day care facilities as a service to employees. The supply is still far from adequate, however, and the cost is a problem for low-income families. Day care for children who are ill, but not seriously so, remains a problem for employed mothers.

As was found in the present study, a few mothers largely avoid these problems by being self-employed, usually working at home, most often providing child care themselves. Mothers also cope by obtaining school-hour jobs, leaving children alone part of the day, and/or obtaining needed child care on the basis of individual opportunity. These practices meet the needs of some mothers, but they clearly do not meet the national need by themselves. The growing number of "latch-key" children, for example, is considered a social problem.

Policy should be directed toward supporting the promising developments mentioned above and others, to facilitate the growth of an extensive, high quality, multi-option, affordable child care system. Government can provide incentives to development along with standards and regulation. Provision for supervised play, homework and other activities at school, before and after the regular sessions, would greatly improve the situation, at no sacrifice to parent-child interaction. A comprehensive child care system would incidentally take on some of the burden of sole responsibility that single parents often report, leaving them feeling less stress, and allowing them the time and money to do more than just cope with their survival needs. (See Angrist and Lave, 1973, and Auerbach, 1979, for more about child care.)

For many single mothers being employed and/or solely responsible for a family is either a novel or an ancient

experience. Readily available services such as those to "displaced homemakers", providing guidance and assistance in obtaining employment and running a household, would greatly encourage and facilitate single parent coping. Many single mothers would also benefit from stricter enforcement of child support, as in Michigan, as described by Chambers (1979). Sussman (1977) and Cogswell and Sussman (1972) suggest additional policy issues.

The working married mother tends not to have the financial problems of the single parent, but she does share the problems of job discrimination, time scheduling and budgeting. The same day care system would help meet her needs as well. It would be very helpful if the trend toward life education in the public schools continued. Courses concerned with coping with the basic adult life concerns, marriage and family realities, and handling time and money would be useful. Concepts could, of course, be worked into existing courses. More responsive to people's immediate needs would be similar courses and workshops at community colleges and night schools, and perhaps individual or group counseling.

Although the parent or parents are largely on their own in maintaining their families, the findings suggest some other possibilities for increased support. The trend toward increased two-parent responsibility for children after separation and divorce should be encouraged to allow a higher quality of life for both parents and children as well.

Divorce arbitration and counseling rather than adversary proceedings would be likely to facilitate this trend. For the working wife, one can hope that the trend toward increasing involvement of husbands in family maintenance will continue.

Friends appear to be a meaningful source of family maintenance support to single mothers. Although few respondents reported any help from organizations, many were involved in mutual aid with friends and acquaintances. The development of mutual-help groups and organizations focused on practical issues in family maintenance, such as child care networks, could be of great assistance to single parents and working mothers.

Given the limit on mothers' family maintenance time and their inability to hand off to others much of the work they do not do, single parent families and nuclear families with working mothers often sacrifice in the performance of maintenance tasks. It will be helpful for the single parent or working mother to carefully consider what tasks can be adequately performed more easily or in less time. Family members should examine their standards and priorities for family maintenance to determine whether less effort in some areas might be acceptable. Consideration may also usefully be given to how kin, friends, neighbors and other acquaintances might contribute to family maintenance, in however minor a way.

A few suggestions have been made for how parents, various levels of government and private industry might respond to improve the situation for single parents and working wives. No short-term solutions are apparent. It seems likely that large numbers of single parents and working mothers will continue to have much to accomplish in limited time in order to maintain their families. Individual mothers will continue to find individualistic solutions for themselves, and perhaps develop increasing levels and modes of cooperation with others to their mutual benefit, while the society slowly develops in the direction of meeting their needs, as best it can.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adams, Bert N.
1968 Kinship In An Urban Setting. Chicago: Markham.
- Anderson, Ralph E. and Irl E. Carter
1974 Human Behavior In The Social Environment: A Social Systems Approach. Chicago: Aldine.
- Angrist, Shirley S. and Judith R. Lave
1973 "Issues surrounding day care." The Family Coordinator. October:457-64.
- Auerbach, Stevanne
1979 Confronting the Child Care Crisis. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Babbie, Earl R.
1973 Survey Research Methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Barry, William A.
1970 "Marriage research and conflict: an integrative review." Psychological Bulletin 73, 1:41-54.
- Bell, Norman W. and Ezra F. Vogel
1960 "Toward a framework for functional analysis of family behavior." Introductory Essay in Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel (eds.), A Modern Introduction To The Family. New York: Free Press.
- Beller, Andrea H.
1977 "The effect on women's earnings of enforcement in title VII cases." Monthly Labor Review 100, 3:56-7.
- Bellman, Richard Ernest and Charlene Paule Smith
1973 Simulation In Human Systems: Decision-Making In Psychotherapy. New York: Wiley.
- Berk, Richard A. and Sarah Fenstermaker Berk
1979 Labor And Leisure At Home; Content And Organization of the Household Day. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Berk, Sarah Fenstermaker, Anthony Shih and Catherine White Berheide
 1978 "The 'Rashomon' of household labor: a comparison of wives' and husbands' accounts of household task contribution." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Sociologists For Women In Society, San Francisco, September.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr.
 1963 "The husband-wife relationship." Chapter 20 in F. Ivan Nye and Lois Wladis Hoffman (eds.), The Employed Mother In America. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr.
 1972 The Family. New York: Free Press.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr. and Donald M. Wolfe
 1960 Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics Of Married Living. New York: Free Press.
- Bose, Christine
 1978 "Technology and changes in the division of labor in the American home." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, September.
- Bowling, Michael
 1977 "Sex-role attitudes and the division of household labor." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, September.
- Brock, Bernard L., James W. Chesebro, John F. Cragan and James F. Klumpp
 1973 Public Policy Decision-Making: Systems Analysis and Comparative Advantages Debate. New York: Harper and Row.
- Broderick, Carlfred B.
 1971 "Beyond the five conceptual frameworks: a decade of development in family theory." Chapter 1 in Carlfred B. Broderick (ed.), A Decade of Family Research and Action. Washington, D.C.: National Council on Family Relations.
- Buckley, Walter
 1967 Sociology and Modern Systems Theory. Englewood Cliffs: N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Burr, Wesley R.
 1973 Theory Construction And The Sociology of the Family. New York: Wiley.

- Burr, Wesley R., Reuben Hill, F. Ivan Nye and Ira L. Reiss
1979 "Introduction", in Wesley R. Burr, Reuben Hill,
F. Ivan Nye and Ira L. Reiss (eds.), *Contemporary Theories About The Family. Volume I.*
New York: Free Press.
- Burt, Ronald S., James A. Wiley, Michael J. Minor and James
R. Murray
1978 "Structure of well-being; form, content, and
stability over time." *Sociological Methods and
Research* 6, 3:365-407.
- Butz, William P., David H. Greenberg
1975 *An Economic Methodology For Measuring the Bene-
fits From Children.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse and Willard L. Rodgers
1976 *The Quality of American Life; Perceptions,
Evaluations, and Satisfactions.* New York: Rus-
sell Sage.
- Carmines, Edward G. and Richard A. Zeller
1979 *Reliability and Validity Assessment.* Beverly
Hills, CA: Sage.
- Chambers, David L.
1979 *Making Fathers Pay; The Enforcement of Child
Support.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Christensen, Harold T.
1964 "Development of the family field of study."
Chapter 1 in Harold T. Christensen (ed.), *Hand-
book of Marriage and the Family.* Chicago: Rand
McNally.
- Cogswell, Betty E. and Marvin B. Sussman
1972 "Changing family and marriage forms: complica-
tions for human service systems." *The Family
Coordinator* 21 Oct.: 505-16.
- Deutsch, Morton
1969 "Conflicts: productive and destructive." *Jour-
nal of Social Issues* 25:7-41.
- Dillman, Don A.
1978 *Mail And Telephone Surveys; The Total Design
Method.* New York: Wiley.
- Douvan, Elizabeth
1963 "Employment and the adolescent." Chapter II in
F. Ivan Nye and Lois Wladis Hoffman (eds.),
The Employed Mother in America. Chicago: Rand
McNally.

- Ferri, Elsa and Hilary Robinson
1976 Coping Alone. Slough, Berkshire, England: NFER.
- Fogarty, Michael P., Rhona Rapoport and Robert N. Rapoport
1971 Sex, Career and Family: Including an International Review of Women's Roles. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gibson, Geoffrey
1972 "Kin family network: overheralded structure in past conceptualizations of family functioning." Journal of Marriage and the Family 34:13-23.
- Glasser, Paul and Elizabeth Navarre
1965 "Structural problems of the one-parent family." Journal of Social Issues 21, 1:98-109.
- Goetting, Ann
1978 "The normative integration of the former spouse relationship." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, September.
- Hays, William L.
1963 Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Herzog, Elizabeth and Cecelia E. Sudia
1968 "Fatherless homes; a review of research." Children 15, 5:177-82.
- Hesselbart, Susan
1976 "Does charity begin at home? Attitudes toward women, household tasks, and household decision-making." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, August-September.
- Hetherington, E. Mavis, Martha Cox and Roger Cox
1976 "Divorced fathers." The Family Coordinator 25, 4:417-28.
- Hill, Reuben and Donald A. Hansen
1960 "The identification of conceptual frameworks utilized in family study." Marriage and Family Living 22:299-311.
- Holmstrom, Lynda Lytle
1972 The Two-Career Family. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.

- Hood, Jane C.
1977 "Work-scheduling, work-involvement and parental role-sharing in sixteen two-job families." Unpublished abstract, University of Michigan.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis
1967 "Consensus, conflict and co-operation." In N. J. Demerath III and Richard A. Peterson (eds.), *System, Change, and Conflict*. New York: Free Press.
- Iglehart, Alfreda P.
1979 *Married Women and Work: 1957 and 1976*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Johnson, Beverly L.
1980 "Marital and family characteristics of the labor force, March 1979." *Monthly Labor Review* 103, 4:48-52.
- Kantor, David and William Lehr
1975 *Inside the Family: Toward a Theory of Family Process*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kish, Leslie
1965 *Survey Sampling*. New York: Wiley.
- Layne, Norman R., Jr. and Jay Lowe
1977 "The effects of the timing of successive births upon the social organization of American families." *Sociological Focus* 10, 1:89-96.
- Lee, Gary R.
1979 "Effects of social networks on the family." Chapter 3 in Wesley R. Burr, Reuben Hill, F. Ivan Nye and Ira L. Reiss (eds.), *Contemporary Theories About The Family. Volume I*. New York: Free Press.
- Litwak, Eugene
1960 "Geographic mobility and extended family cohesion." *American Sociological Review* 25:385-94.
- Litwak, Eugene and Ivan Szelenyi
1969 "Primary group structures and their functions: kin, neighbors, and friends." *American Sociological Review* 34:465-81.
- Lobodzinska, Barbara
1977 "Married women's gainful employment and housework in contemporary Poland." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 39(May):405-15

- Lopata, Helena Znaniecki
 1978 "Contributions of extended families to the support systems of metropolitan area widows: limitations of the modified kin network." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 40, 2:355-64.
- McIntyre, Jennie
 1966 "The structure-functional approach to family study." Chapter 3 in F. Ivan Nye and Felix M. Berardo (eds.), *Emerging Conceptual Frameworks in Family Analysis*. New York: Macmillan.
- Merton, Robert K.
 1957 "The role-set: problems in sociological theory." *The British Journal of Sociology* 8(June):106-20.
- Merton, Robert K.
 1968 *Social Theory and Social Structure*. 1968 Enlarged edition. New York: Free Press.
- Morgan, D. H. J.
 1975 *Social Theory and the Family*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Morgan, James N., Ismail Sirageldin, Nancy Baerwaldt
 1966 *Productive Americans: A Study of How Individuals Contribute to Economic Progress*. Survey Research Center Monograph 43. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute For Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Moser, C. A. and G. Kalton
 1972 *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*. Second edition. New York: Basic Books.
- Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner and Dale H. Bent
 1975 *SPSS; Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nunnally, Jum C.
 1964 *Educational Measurement and Evaluation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nye, F. Ivan
 1963 "Personal satisfactions." Chapter 22 in F. Ivan Nye and Lois Wladis Hoffman (eds.), *The Employed Mother in America*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Nye, F. Ivan
1976 "Role constructs: measurement." Chapter 2 in F. Ivan Nye, Role Structure and Analysis of the Family. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Nye, F. Ivan and Felix M. Berardo
1966 "Introduction." Chapter 1 in F. Ivan Nye and Felix M. Berardo (eds.), Emerging Conceptual Frameworks in Family Analysis. New York: Macmillan.
- Nye, F. Ivan and Felix M. Barardo
1973 The Family: Its Structure and Interaction. New York: Macmillan.
- Nye, F. Ivan and Viktor Gekas
1976 "The role concept: review and delineation." Chapter 1 in F. Ivan Nye, Role Structure and Analysis of the Family. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Oakley, Ann
1974 The Sociology of Housework. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Parsons, Talcott
1955 "Family structure and the socialization of the child." Chapter II in Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales, Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Pitts, Jesse R.
1964 "The structural-functional approach." Chapter 3 (pp. 51-124) in Harold T. Christensen (ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Polk, R. L. and Company
1977 Polk's Lansing City Directory. Detroit: R. L. Polk.
- Rallings, E. M. and F. Ivan Nye
1979 "Wife-mother employment, family, and society." Chapter 9 in Wesley R. Burr, Reuben Hill, F. Ivan Nye and Ira L. Reiss (eds.), Contemporary Theories About The Family. Volume 1, New York: Free Press.
- Rapoport, Rhona and Robert N. Rapoport
1971 Dual-Career Families. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin.
- Rice, David G.
1979 Dual-Career Marriage; Conflict and Treatment. New York: Free Press.

- Ritzer, George
1975 Sociology; A Multiple Paradigm Science. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Robinson, John P.
1977a How Americans Use Time: A Social-Psychological Analysis of Everyday Behavior. New York: Praeger.
- Robinson, John P.
1977b How Americans Used Time in 1965. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Robinson, John P. and Phillip R. Shaver
1973 Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Revised Edition. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Roy, Prodipto
1963 "Adolescent roles: rural-urban differentials." Chapter 12 in F. Ivan Nye and Lois Wladis Hoffman (eds.), The Employed Mother in America. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Schvaneveldt, Jay D.
1966 "The interactional framework in the study of the family." Chapter 5 in F. Ivan Nye and Felix M. Berardo (eds.), Emerging Conceptual Frameworks in Family Analysis, New York: MacMillan.
- Selltiz, Claire, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch and Stuart W. Cook
1959 Research Methods in Social Relations. Revised One-Volume Edition. New York: Henry Holt.
- Shibutani, Tamotsu
1961 Society and Personality: An Interactionist Approach to Social Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Slocum, Walter L. and F. Ivan Nye
1976 "Provider and housekeeper roles." Chapter 5 in F. Ivan Nye, Role Structure and Analysis of the Family. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Speer, David C.
1970 "Family systems: morphostasis and morphogenesis, or 'is homeostasis enough?'" Family Process 9, 3:259-78.

- Sprey, Jetse
1969 "The family as a system in conflict." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 31(November):699-706.
- Sprey, Jetse
1979 "Conflict theory and the study of marriage and the family." Chapter 4 in Wesley R. Burr, Reuben Hill, F. Ivan Nye and Ira L. Reiss (eds.) *Contemporary Theories About the Family. Volume II.* New York: Free Press.
- Stein, Irma
1974 *Systems Theory: Science and Social Work.* Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Stryker, Sheldon
1959 "Symbolic interaction as an approach to family research." *Marriage and Family Living* 21(May): 111-9.
- Stryker, Sheldon
1964 "The interactional and situational approaches." Chapter 4 in Harold T. Christensen (ed.), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family.* Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Sudman, Seymour
1976 *Applied Sampling.* New York: Academic Press.
- Sussman, Marvin B.
1977 "The female-headed household: new directions for public policy." Paper presented at the twenty-first annual Merrill-Palmer Conference, Detroit, April.
- Szalai, Alexander (ed.)
1972 *The Use of Time: Daily Activities of Urban and Suburban Populations in Twelve Countries.* The Hague: Mouton.
- Thomas, Edwin J. and Bruce J. Biddle
1966 "The nature and history of role theory." Chapter 1 in Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas (eds.), *Role Theory: Concepts and Research.* New York: Wiley.
- U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
1979 *Special Labor Force Reports. No. 219. "Marital and family characteristics of workers, 1970 to 1978."* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1950 Current Population Reports. Series P-20, No. 32. "Children and youth: 1950." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1951 Current Population Reports. Series P-20, No. 33. "Marital status and household characteristics: March 1950." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1971 Current Population Reports. Series P-20, No. 218. "Household and family characteristics: March 1970." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1973 U. S. Census of Population: 1970. Volume 1: "Characteristics of the population, part 24: Michigan." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1976 Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1976. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1977a Current Population Reports. Series P-20, No. 306. "Marital status and living arrangements: March 1976." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1977b Current Population Reports. Series P-20, No. 313. "Households and families by type: March 1977 (advance report)." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1978a Current Population Reports. Series P-60, No. 115. "Characteristics of the population below the poverty level: 1976." Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1978b Current Population Reports. Series P-23, No. 77. "Perspectives on American husbands and wives." Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1979 Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1979. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1980a Current Population Reports. Series P-20, No. 352. "Household and family characteristics: March 1979." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1980b Current Population Reports. Series P-23, No. 107. "Families maintained by female house-holders 1970-79." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1980c Current Population Reports. Series P-20, No. 349. "Marital status and living arrangements: March 1979." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1980d Current Population Reports. Series P-60, No. 124. "Characteristics of the population below the poverty level: 1978." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census
1980e Current Population Reports. Series P-60, No. 121. "Money income in 1978 of households in the United States." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. National Center For Health Statistics
1980 Monthly Vital Statistics Report. Volume 29, No. 8. "Births, marriages, divorces, and deaths for August 1980." DHHS Publication No. (PHS) 81-1120; November 10, 1980.
- Vanek, Joann
1974 "Time spent in housework." Scientific American. November: 116-20.
- Walker, Kathryn E.
1969 "Time spent in household work by homemakers." Family Economics Review. September: 5-6.
- Walker, Kathryn E.
1970 "Time used by husbands for household work." Family Economics Review. June:8-11.

- Walker, Kathryn E. and William H. Gauger
 1973 "Time and its dollar value in household work."
 Family Economics Review. Fall: 8-13.
- Van Dusen, Roxann A. and Nicholas Zill (eds.)
 1975 Basic Background Items for U.S. Household Surveys. Washington, D.C.: Social Science Research Council, Center For Coordination of Research on Social Indicators.
- Weiss, Robert S.
 1979 Going It Alone; The Family Life and Social Situation of the Single Parent. New York: Basic Books.
- Wertheim, Eleanor S.
 1975 "The science and typology of family systems II. Further theoretical and practical considerations." Family Process 14, 3:285-309.
- Wright, Sonia R.
 1979 Quantitative Methods and Statistics; A Guide to Social Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Zelditch, Morris, Jr.
 1955 "Role differentiation in the nuclear family: a comparative study." Chapter VI in Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales, Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Zuiches, James J., Bonnie Maas Morrison and Peter Michael Gladhart
 1976 "Interviewing families: methodology and evaluation of 'energy and the family' survey." Research Report 311. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
DETAILED TASK PERFORMANCE TABLES

This Appendix contains the detailed tables of family maintenance task performance time by category of performer and category of task for subgroups of respondents by marital status and employment status. The tables for the married respondents are first, followed by the tables for all single (i.e., non-married) respondents, then tables for separated, divorced, widowed and never-married respondents separately, in that order. There are 4 tables for each marital status. The first is for all respondents in that marital status. The following 3 tables are for those working fulltime, working parttime and not working, in that order.

TABLE 15
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR MARRIED MOTHERS
PER WEEK

		TASK PERFORMER							N = 128	
Task	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	16.932	8.820	44.658	0.094	0.063	0.016	0.000	70.583		
Shopping	4.590	1.701	1.832	0.104	0.012	0.023	0.001	8.263		
Physical Maintenance	22.488	3.572	4.656	0.789	0.008	0.039	0.125	31.677		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	14.913	2.333	1.385	0.449	0.027	0.059	0.010	19.176		
Primary Child Care	18.980	5.655	9.289	1.738	0.695	0.789	1.027	38.173		
Total	77.903	22.081	61.820	3.174	0.805	0.926	1.163	167.872		

TABLE 16
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR MARRIED MOTHERS WORKING FULL TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 41		
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	39.171	12.049	45.402	0.000	0.000	0.049	0.000	96.671		
Shopping	4.049	1.750	1.726	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.525		
Physical Maintenance	15.659	4.602	4.793	1.195	0.000	0.000	0.000	26.249		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	10.510	3.750	1.713	0.854	0.000	0.171	0.000	16.998		
Primary Child Care	18.590	8.024	7.671	2.415	0.756	0.902	1.366	39.724		
Total	87.979	30.175	61.305	4.464	0.756	1.122	1.366	187.167		

TABLE 17
 MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR MARRIED MOTHERS WORKING PART TIME
 PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 36		
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	15.104	6.319	42.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	63.673		
Shopping	4.097	2.375	1.847	0.012	0.000	0.000	0.005	8.336		
Physical Maintenance	23.708	3.838	3.958	0.861	0.000	0.111	0.000	32.476		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	15.875	1.810	1.449	0.417	0.000	0.000	0.028	19.579		
Primary Child Care	16.549	4.552	10.208	1.306	0.514	0.611	0.708	34.448		
Total	75.333	18.894	59.712	2.596	0.514	0.722	0.741	158.512		

TABLE 18
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR MARRIED MOTHERS NOT WORKING
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total
Income Acquisition	0.343	7.990	45.760	0.235	0.157	0.000	0.000	54.485
Shopping	5.373	1.186	1.907	0.253	0.029	0.059	0.000	8.807
Physical Maintenance	27.118	2.555	5.039	0.412	0.020	0.020	0.314	35.478
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	17.775	1.562	1.077	0.147	0.069	0.010	0.005	20.645
Primary Child Care	21.050	4.529	9.941	1.500	0.775	0.824	0.980	39.599
Total	71.659	17.822	63.724	2.547	1.050	0.913	1.299	159.014

TABLE 19
 MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR SINGLE MOTHERS
 PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total
Income Acquisition	28.535	5.245	0.500	0.392	0.000	0.676	0.000	35.348
Shopping	4.505	0.735	0.054	0.093	0.000	0.147	0.029	5.563
Physical Maintenance	15.324	4.537	0.098	0.417	0.000	0.870	0.284	21.530
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	11.074	2.669	0.049	0.279	0.005	0.346	0.176	14.598
Primary Child Care	21.574	6.314	1.337	2.042	0.030	2.166	0.104	33.567
Total	81.012	19.500	2.038	3.223	0.035	4.205	0.593	110.606

TABLE 20
 MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR SINGLE MOTHERS WORKING FULL TIME
 PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 62		
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	41.883	4.484	0.519	0.000	0.000	0.194	0.000	47.080		
Shopping	4.161	0.855	0.065	0.081	0.000	0.089	0.000	5.251		
Physical Maintenance	12.113	4.907	0.161	0.266	0.000	0.431	0.226	18.104		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	8.895	2.988	0.016	0.282	0.008	0.133	0.258	12.580		
Primary Child Care	17.081	8.364	1.443	2.062	0.048	1.738	0.090	30.826		
Total	84.133	21.598	2.204	2.691	0.056	2.585	0.574	113.841		

TABLE 21
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR SINGLE MOTHERS WORKING PART TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER								N = 16	
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	18.067	7.563	0.188	0.000	0.000	1.063	0.000	26.881		
Shopping	5.438	0.891	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.188	0.000	6.517		
Physical Maintenance	17.563	5.188	0.000	1.063	0.000	1.875	0.000	25.689		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	10.188	1.938	0.000	0.063	0.000	0.750	0.000	12.939		
Primary Child Care	23.667	4.063	0.500	2.969	0.000	3.000	0.031	34.230		
Total	74.923	19.643	0.688	4.095	0.000	6.876	0.031	106.256		

TABLE 22
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR SINGLE MOTHERS NOT WORKING
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total
Income Acquisition	0.594	5.667	0.667	1.667	0.000	1.667	0.000	10.262
Shopping	4.771	0.320	0.063	0.188	0.000	0.271	0.125	5.738
Physical Maintenance	22.125	3.146	0.000	0.375	0.000	1.333	0.625	27.604
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	17.292	2.333	0.167	0.417	0.000	0.625	0.083	20.917
Primary Child Care	31.875	2.455	1.625	1.375	0.000	2.739	0.188	40.257
Total	76.657	13.921	2.522	4.022	0.000	6.635	1.021	104.778

TABLE 23
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR SEPARATED MOTHERS
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 22	
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total	
Income Acquisition	22.322	2.500	0.762	0.000	0.000	0.045	0.000	25.629	
Shopping	3.750	0.318	0.114	0.159	0.000	0.068	0.068	4.477	
Physical Maintenance	15.523	3.909	0.045	0.591	0.000	0.614	0.682	21.364	
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	9.114	2.182	0.023	0.284	0.000	0.159	0.273	12.035	
Primary Child Care	22.523	8.368	2.095	2.250	0.000	2.409	0.318	37.963	
Total	73.232	17.277	3.039	3.284	0.000	3.295	1.341	101.468	

TABLE 24
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR SEPARATED MOTHERS WORKING FULL TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 12		
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	34.750	0.417	0.545	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	35.712		
Shopping	4.083	0.542	0.167	0.000	0.000	0.125	0.000	4.917		
Physical Maintenance	10.042	6.208	0.083	0.000	0.000	1.125	0.000	17.458		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	8.000	1.875	0.042	0.313	0.000	0.208	0.333	10.771		
Primary Child Care	20.542	15.900	2.091	1.625	0.000	3.667	0.250	44.075		
Total	77.417	24.942	2.928	1.938	0.000	5.125	0.583	112.933		

TABLE 25
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR SEPARATED MOTHERS WORKING PART TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total
Income Acquisition	16.000	0.000	0.500	0.000	0.000	0.250	0.000	16.750
Shopping	5.625	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.625
Physical Maintenance	12.500	1.625	0.000	1.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	15.625
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	7.750	0.375	0.000	0.125	0.000	0.250	0.000	8.500
Primary Child Care	19.250	0.000	1.250	7.000	0.000	2.250	0.000	29.750
Total	61.125	2.000	1.750	8.625	0.000	2.750	0.000	76.250

TABLE 26
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR SEPARATED MOTHERS NOT WORKING
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 6	
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total	
Income Acquisition	1.680	8.333	1.333	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	11.346	
Shopping	1.833	0.083	0.083	0.583	0.000	0.000	0.250	2.832	
Physical Maintenance	28.500	0.833	0.000	1.167	0.000	0.000	2.500	33.000	
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	12.250	4.000	0.000	0.333	0.000	0.000	0.333	16.916	
Primary Child Care	28.667	0.000	2.667	0.333	0.000	0.000	0.667	32.334	
Total	72.930	13.249	4.083	2.416	0.000	0.000	3.750	96.428	

TABLE 27
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR DIVORCED MOTHERS
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER								N = 57	
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	32.103	6.316	0.620	0.702	0.000	0.281	0.000	40.022		
Shopping	4.658	0.946	0.053	0.088	0.000	0.079	0.000	5.824		
Physical Maintenance	14.921	4.842	0.158	0.342	0.000	0.702	0.035	21.000		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	10.965	2.996	0.079	0.219	0.000	0.268	0.000	14.527		
Primary Child Care	19.667	7.027	1.596	1.693	0.053	1.353	0.053	31.442		
Total	82.314	22.127	2.506	3.044	0.053	2.683	0.088	112.815		

TABLE 28
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR DIVORCED MOTHERS WORKING FULL TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 39	
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total	
Income Acquisition	43.506	6.385	0.688	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	50.579	
Shopping	4.346	1.115	0.051	0.128	0.000	0.064	0.000	5.704	
Physical Maintenance	12.564	5.359	0.231	0.372	0.000	0.282	0.051	18.859	
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	9.013	3.596	0.013	0.103	0.000	0.135	0.000	12.860	
Primary Child Care	16.128	8.218	1.667	1.718	0.077	1.096	0.064	28.968	
Total	85.557	24.673	2.650	2.321	0.077	1.577	0.115	116.970	

TABLE 29
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR DIVORCED MOTHERS WORKING PART TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total
Income Acquisition	16.833	9.286	0.143	0.000	0.000	2.286	0.000	28.548
Shopping	6.000	0.464	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.286	0.000	6.750
Physical Maintenance	14.714	3.500	0.000	0.429	0.000	4.143	0.000	22.786
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	12.714	1.786	0.000	0.071	0.000	1.429	0.000	16.000
Primary Child Care	25.286	5.714	0.429	1.071	0.000	4.714	0.071	37.285
Total	75.547	20.750	0.572	1.571	0.000	12.858	0.071	111.369

TABLE 30
 MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR DIVORCED MOTHERS NOT WORKING
 PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 11		
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	0.000	4.182	0.727	3.636	0.000	0.000	0.000	8.545		
Shopping	4.909	0.652	0.091	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.652		
Physical Maintenance	23.409	3.864	0.000	0.182	0.000	0.000	0.000	27.455		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	16.773	1.636	0.364	0.727	0.000	0.000	0.000	19.500		
Primary Child Care	28.636	3.300	2.091	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	36.027		
Total	73.727	13.634	3.273	6.545	0.000	0.000	0.000	97.179		

TABLE 31
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR WIDOWED MOTHERS
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 5		
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	12.000	8.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	20.000		
Shopping	8.200	2.600	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	11.800		
Physical Maintenance	23.000	7.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.000	2.000	37.000		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	17.000	4.100	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	22.100		
Primary Child Care	20.600	4.200	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.000	0.100	31.900		
Total	80.800	25.900	0.000	0.000	0.000	14.000	2.100	122.800		

TABLE 32
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR WIDOWED MOTHERS WORKING FULL TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total
Income Acquisition	40.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	40.000
Shopping	10.000	3.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	13.000
Physical Maintenance	32.000	4.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.000	46.000
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	7.000	3.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.500
Primary Child Care	7.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.000
Total	96.000	10.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.000	116.500

TABLE 33
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR WIDOWED MOTHERS WORKING PART TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total
Income Acquisition	20.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	20.000
Shopping	15.000	10.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	25.000
Physical Maintenance	35.000	3.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	38.000
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	14.000	3.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	17.000
Primary Child Care	7.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.000
Total	91.000	16.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	107.000

TABLE 34
 MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR WIDOWED MOTHERS NOT WORKING
 PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER								N = 3	
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	0.000	13.333	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	13.333		
Shopping	5.333	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.667	0.000	7.000		
Physical Maintenance	16.000	9.333	0.000	0.000	0.000	8.333	0.000	33.666		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	21.333	4.667	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.667	0.000	27.667		
Primary Child Care	29.667	7.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	11.667	0.167	48.501		
Total	72.333	34.333	0.000	0.000	0.000	23.334	0.167	130.167		

TABLE 35
 MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR NEVER MARRIED MOTHERS
 PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 18	
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total	
Income Acquisition	29.621	4.444	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.889	0.000	36.954	
Shopping	3.917	0.056	0.000	0.056	0.000	0.222	0.083	4.334	
Physical Maintenance	14.222	3.653	0.000	0.556	0.000	0.569	0.111	19.111	
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	12.167	1.833	0.000	0.542	0.028	0.639	0.667	15.876	
Primary Child Care	27.029	2.294	0.000	3.463	0.000	3.056	0.000	35.842	
Total	86.956	12.280	0.000	4.617	0.028	7.375	0.861	112.117	

TABLE 36
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR NEVER MARRIED MOTHERS WORKING FULL TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 10	
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total	
Income Acquisition	44.300	2.400	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.200	0.000	47.900	
Shopping	2.950	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.150	0.000	3.100	
Physical Maintenance	10.850	1.675	0.000	0.200	0.000	0.225	0.200	13.150	
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	9.700	1.900	0.000	0.975	0.050	0.050	1.200	13.875	
Primary Child Care	17.650	1.556	0.000	4.133	0.000	2.100	0.000	25.439	
Total	85.450	7.531	0.000	5.308	0.050	3.725	1.400	103.464	

TABLE 37
MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR NEVER MARRIED MOTHERS WORKING PART TIME
PER WEEK

Task	TASK PERFORMER							N = 4		
	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	21.500	14.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	35.500		
Shopping	1.875	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.250	0.000	2.375		
Physical Maintenance	23.250	12.250	0.000	2.000	0.000	0.250	0.000	37.750		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	7.250	3.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.250	0.000	11.000		
Primary Child Care	31.333	6.250	0.000	3.000	0.000	1.500	0.000	42.083		
Total	85.208	36.250	0.000	5.000	0.000	2.250	0.000	128.708		

TABLE 38
 MEAN TASK PERFORMANCE HOURS FOR NEVER MARRIED MOTHERS NOT WORKING
 PER WEEK

TASK PERFORMER									N = 4	
Task	Mother	Children	(Ex-) Husband	Relatives	In-Laws	Friends	Neighbors	Total		
Income Acquisition	1.042	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.000	0.000	11.042		
Shopping	8.375	0.000	0.000	0.250	0.000	0.375	0.375	9.375		
Physical Maintenance	13.625	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.750	0.000	15.375		
Meal Preparation and Cleanup	23.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.500	0.000	25.750		
Primary Child Care	47.250	0.000	0.000	2.250	0.000	7.000	0.000	56.500		
Total	93.542	0.000	0.000	2.500	0.000	21.625	0.375	118.042		

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND MATERIALS

This appendix contains the Family Work Survey instruments and materials in the following order:

1. Interviewer Questionnaire
2. Field Test Feedback Form
3. Screening Record Form
4. Screening Interview
 - a. For married and single respondents
 - b. For single respondents only
5. Letter of Introduction
6. Informed Consent Form
7. Family Work Interview
 - a. Cover sheet
 - b. Interview
8. Income Card
9. Performance Worksheet
10. Interview Record Form
11. Reinterview Form
12. Non-Respondent Interview
13. Non-Respondent Data Collection Forms
14. Call-Back Record Form

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

FAMILY WORK STUDYINTERVIEWER QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

I estimate that each interviewer will work about one-hundred hours. The work will be very intensive at times.

Can you work at least forty hours a week during all of April and May, 1979?

____ Yes
____ No

Much of the work will be done evenings and weekends.

Can you work weekdays, weekday evenings and weekends?

____ Yes
____ No

This study will require about sixty hours of telephone screening by each interviewer.

Do you have a telephone in a quiet place, which you can use for eight hours a day?

____ Yes
____ No

Each interviewer will conduct about forty face-to-face interviews, at a time and place convenient to the respondent.

Do you have an automobile you can use when you want to, as much as thirty hours a week?

____ Yes
____ No

Please describe any interviewing or survey research experience you may have:

Additional information?

Please answer a few questions for use in the preliminary statistical data analysis:

What was your age on your last birthday? _____

What is your present marital status?

- _____ married, husband present
- _____ married, husband absent
- _____ separated
- _____ divorced
- _____ widowed
- _____ never married

Are you a Black person? _____ Yes
_____ No

Are you a member of any other minority group? _____ Yes
_____ No

If yes, which? _____

Are you the female head of your household? _____ Yes
_____ No

Do you have any children under 18 living with you for whom you are responsible? _____ Yes
_____ No

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

FAMILY WORK STUDYFIELD TEST FEEDBACK

INTERVIEWER _____

____ SCREENING INTERVIEW ____ FAMILY WORK INTERVIEW

PLEASE ASK THE RESPONDENT TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING
QUESTIONS AFTER EACH FIELD TEST OR PILOT STUDY
INTERVIEW.

SAY:

1. We are currently evaluating our procedures and questionnaires.
Would you please take two more minutes to tell us what you thought
of them?

____ YES ____ NO

IF NO: SAY:

Thank you for taking part in our study, then. Goodbye.

IF YES, ASK:

2. Did you find this interview very interesting, interesting,
uninteresting, very uninteresting or neither interesting nor
uninteresting?

VERY INTERESTING I I I I I I VERY UNINTERESTING
VI I N CI VII

3. Did you find any of the questions confusing?

____ YES ____ NO

IF YES, ASK:

4. Which? Why? _____

5. Did you have any trouble answering any questions?

____YES ____NO

IF YES, ASK:

6. Which? Why? _____

7. Did you feel that any questions were (ASK WITH PAUSE)
unfair? or too personal?

____UNFAIR ____TOO PERSONAL

IF YES, ASK:

8. Which questions were (ASK WITH PAUSE) unfair? too personal?
Why?

9. Did any questions make you feel angry or sad?

____YES ____NO

IF YES, ASK:

10. Which? Why? _____

11. Do you have any suggestions about how we could improve
or interview procedures or questionnaire?

SAY:

Thank you very much for your help. Goodbye.

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS YOURSELF AFTER
EACH FIELD TEST OR PILOT STUDY INTERVIEW:

12. How much trouble did the respondent have in satisfactorily
completing this interview?

COULDN'T
___ COMPLETE ___ A LOT ___ SOME ___ LITTLE ___ NONE

13. What questions, if any, seemed to cause the respondent
trouble?

14. What questions, if any, was the respondent unwilling to
answer?

15. What questions, if any, angered or saddened the respondent?

16. What questions, if any, did the respondent find silly or
ridiculous?

PLEASE ANSWER AS MANY OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AS APPLY
FOR YOURSELF:

17. How easy or difficult was the screening record form to use?

VERY EASY I I I I I I VERY DIFFICULT
VE E N D VD

18. How could the screening record form be improved to correct it or make it easier to use?

19. How easy or difficult was the screening interview to use?

VERY EASY I I I I I I VERY DIFFICULT
VE E N D VD

20. Which questions, if any, did you find awkward or difficult to ask? Why?

21. How could the screening interview be improved to correct it or make it easier to use?

22. How easy or difficult were the screening procedures to use?

VERY EASY I I I I I I VERY DIFFICULT
VE E N D VD

23. What procedures, if any, were awkward or difficult to perform? Why?

24. How could the screening procedures be improved upon?

25. How long did the screening interview take?

_____ MINUTES

26. How easy or difficult was the Family Work Interview to use?

VERY EASY I I I I I I VERY DIFFICULT
VE E M D VD

27. Which questions, if any, did you find awkward or difficult to ask? Why?

28. How could the Family Work Interview be improved to correct it or make it easier to use?

29. How easy or difficult were the face-to-face interview procedures to use?

VERY EASY I I I I I I VERY DIFFICULT
VE E M D VD

30. What procedures, if any, were awkward or difficult to perform? Why?

31. How could the face-to-face interview procedures be improved upon?

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

PAGE nnn

INTERVIEWER xxxxxx x. xxxxxxxxxxxx

[illegible]

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

DATE: LANSING, MICHIGAN, 1961

FAMILY HOME STUDY

SCREENING INTERVIEW

SAMPLE

INTERVIEWER _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

DATE _____ TIME _____

CALL BACK _____

IF THE PERSON WHO ANSWERS THE TELEPHONE IDENTIFIES

THIS NUMBER AS A BUSINESS NUMBER, SAY:

I'm sorry! I have the wrong number.

HANG UP, AND MAKE "X" IN THE "NOT IN SERVICE" COLUMN
ON THE SCREENING RECORD FORM.

OTHERWISE, SAY:

Hello. This is _____

I'm calling for Michigan State University. We're
conducting a survey of women in Lansing, and talking
with them about how they get their everyday tasks done.

IF YOU ARE ASKED HOW YOU GOT THEIR NUMBER, SAY:

We're dialing numbers at random.

1. May I speak with the female head of your household?

___ YES ; CONTINUE

___ YES, HE ; GO TO 3.

___ NOT HOME ; GO TO 13.

___ NONE ; GO TO 14.

___ NO ; GO TO 14.

2. WHEN POTENTIAL RESPONDENT COMES TO TELEPHONE, SAY:

Hello. This is _____

I'm calling for Michigan State University. We're
conducting a survey of women in Lansing, and talking
with them about how they get their everyday tasks done.3. May I ask you a couple of questions to find out if you
fit into our survey sample?

___ YES ; CONTINUE

___ NO ; GO TO 14.

4. Are you married and living with your husband?

___ NO ; CONTINUE

___ YES; IF THE MARRIED FEMALE

IS COMPLETE GO TO 15;

OTHERWISE CONTINUE

5. Do you have any children living with you for whom you
are responsible?

___ YES ; CONTINUE

___ NO ; GO TO 15.

6. Your household fits into our survey sample. Let me tell you about the survey. We're interviewing women like yourself about their housework, child care and employment. We also need to know something about their family, friends and acquaintances, and about how satisfied they are with some aspects of their lives.

7. Would it be possible for me to interview you at your convenience?

...YES I CONTINUE
...NO I GO TO 14.

8. What would be the earliest convenient date and time for you?

DATE _____
TIME _____

9. And where would you like me to meet you?

PLACE _____
(address)

DIRECTOR _____

10. May I have your name?

NAME _____

11. If something should come up and you have to change our appointment, you can call me at _____ (phone number)

The best time to reach me is _____

My home again is _____

12. Thank you very much. I'll look forward to seeing you at _____ (date, time, place)

Goodbye.

TRANSFER RESPONDENT'S NAME AND INTERVIEW DATE, TIME AND PLACE TO STUDY INTERVIEW COVER SHEET. ALSO NOTE WHICH SAMPLE SHE'S IN.

END

13. When would be a good time to call back to talk with her?

CALL BACK _____

14. Thank you very much. Goodbye.

RECORD TIME TO CALL BACK, IF ANY, ON FIRST PAGE.

END

15. Your household doesn't fit into our study sample.

Thank you very much for your help. Goodbye.

END

INTERVIEW COMPLETE

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

DATE: _____ TIME: _____

FAMILY HOME STUDY

SCREENING INTERVIEW

SP
SAMPLE

INTERVIEWER / SCHEDULE

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

DATE _____

CALL BACK _____

IF THE PERSON WHO ANSWERS THE TELEPHONE IDENTIFIES THIS NUMBER AS A BUSINESS NUMBER, SAY:

I'm sorry! I have the wrong number.

HANG UP, AND NAME "P" IN THE "NOT IN SERVICE" COLUMN ON THE SCREENING RECORD FORM.

OTHERWISE, SAY:

Hello. This is _____.

I'm calling for Michigan State University. We're conducting a survey of women in Lansing, and talking with them about how they get their everyday tasks done.

IF YOU ARE ASKED HOW YOU GOT THEIR NUMBER, SAY:

We're dialing numbers at random.

1. May I speak with the female head of your household?

- ___ YES ; CONTINUE
- ___ YES, EA ; GO TO 3.
- ___ NOT HOME ; GO TO 4.
- ___ HOME ; GO TO 14.
- ___ NO ; GO TO 14.

2. WHEN POTENTIAL RESPONDENT COMES TO TELEPHONE, SAY:

Hello. This is _____.
I'm calling for Michigan State University. We're conducting a survey of women in Lansing, and talking with them about how they get their everyday tasks done.

3. May I ask you a couple of questions to find out if you fit into our survey sample?

- ___ YES ; CONTINUE
- ___ NO ; GO TO 14.

4. Are you (is she) married and living with your (her) husband?

- ___ NO ; CONTINUE
- ___ YES ; GO TO 15.

5. Do you (does she) have any children under 18 living with you (her) for whom you (she) are (is) responsible?

- ___ YES ; IF THE FEMALE HEAD OF THE HOUSEHOLD IS HOME, CONTINUE:
OTHERWISE GO TO 13.
- ___ NO ; GO TO 15.

3

6. Your household fits into our survey sample. Let me tell you about the survey. We're interviewing women like yourself about their housework, child care and employment. We also need to know something about their family, friends and acquaintances, and about how satisfied they are with some aspects of their lives.

7. Would it be possible for me to interview you at your convenience? (one of our women interviewers)

—YES I CONTINUE (SCREENERS GO TO 10)
—NO I GO TO 14.

8. What would be the earliest convenient date and time for you?

DATE _____
TIME _____

9. And where would you like me to meet you?

PLACE _____
(address)

DIRECTIONS _____

10. May I have your name?

NAME _____

SCREENERS SAY:

One of our interviewers will call you in the next couple of days to set up an appointment. SCHEDULE THEM JO TO 14.

11. If something should come up and you have to change our appointment, you can call me at _____ (phone number)

The best time to reach me is _____

My name again is _____

12. Thank you very much. I'll look forward to seeing you at _____ (date, time, place)
Goodbye.

TRANSFER RESPONDENT'S NAME AND INTERVIEW DATE, TIME AND PLACE TO STUDY INTERVIEW COVER SHEET. ALSO NOTE WHICH SAMPLE LINE'S IN.

END

13. When would be a good time to call back to talk with her?
CALL BACK _____

14. Thank you very much. Goodbye.

RECORD TIME TO CALL BACK, IF ANY, ON FIRST PAGE.

END

15. Your household doesn't fit into our study sample.
Thank you very much for your help. Goodbye.

END

INTERVIEWER COMMENTS



MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
Family Work Survey

This Is To Certify That

is employed as an interviewer by the Family Work Survey, Michigan State University, during March, April, May and June, 1979.

She is authorized to conduct personal interviews, using the Family Work forms, during that time. If you have any questions concerning these matters, please call me at the number below.

Sincerely,

Melvin S. Kalish
Melvin S. Kalish
Survey Director
353-6879

Myrna Reynolds
Myrna Reynolds
Survey Associate
669-5313

Frederick B. Waisanen
Frederick B. Waisanen
Professor
355-6647

Rose M. Calabrese
3/23/79

ROSE M. CALABRESE
Notary Public, Ingham County, Mich.
My Commission Expires on August 24, 1982

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

FAMILY WORK SURVEY

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1. I have freely agreed to participate in a scientific survey being conducted by Melvin S. Kalish, M. S., under the supervision of Professor Frederick B. Waisanen, Michigan State University.
2. The survey has been explained to me, and I understand the explanation that has been given and what my participation will involve.
3. I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation in the survey at any time without cost to me.
4. I understand that the information I provide will be treated in strict confidence and that I will remain anonymous.
5. I understand that the results of the survey will be made available to me at my request.
6. I understand that my participation in this survey does not guarantee any beneficial results to me.

Signed

Date

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

FAMILY WORK INTERVIEWCOVER SHEET

SAMPLE

INTERVIEWER _____

RESPONDENT _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

INTERVIEW DATE _____

TIME _____

PLACE _____

LENGTH _____ (MINUTES)

COMMENTS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

FAMILY WORK INTERVIEW

INTERVIEWER NUMBER _____

RESPONDENT NUMBER _____

AFTER THE RESPONDENT HAS SIGNED THE INFORMED CONSENT FORM,
AND YOU HAVE PUT IT BACK IN YOUR FOLDER, MAKE THE FOLLOWING
OPENING REMARKS:

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. As I've
said, we're studying how household tasks are done in different
families. I'll be asking you questions about your family and
friends, and about your everyday tasks.
I'd like to start by asking you some questions about yourself,
your family and household.

HOUSEHOLD LISTING

ENTER RESPONDENT'S FIRST NAME ON FIRST LINE OF HOUSEHOLD LIST.

1. First, would you help me list all the people who live in your
household? What are their first names and their relationship
to you?

LIST ALL PERSONS LIVING IN THIS HOUSEHOLD, AND THEIR
RELATIONSHIP TO THE RESPONDENT, IN THE HOUSEHOLD LIST.

HOUSEHOLD LIST

NO.	FIRST NAME	RELATIONSHIP	SEX	AGE	EDUC. STATUS	EMPLOY. STATUS	HEALTH	RESIDENCY STATUS
					F P N	F+ F P N	D S	SES. VIS.
1		RESPONDENT	M (F)					
2			M F					
3			M F					
4			M F					
5			M F					
6			M F					
7			M F					
8			M F					
9			M F					
10			M F					
11			M F					
12			M F					

2. Does anyone else live in your household now, such as
(READ WITH PAUSES) another family? roomers or boarders?
domestic help? visitors or guests? Other friends or
relatives? Any infants or children we missed?

IF YES, ASK.

What are their first names and their relationship to you?

3. Are there any other persons who stayed over in your home
during the last seven days?

IF YES, ASK:

What are their first names and their relationship to you?

How many days were they staying with you?

RECORD THE NUMBER OF DAYS STAYED OVER IN THE HOUSEHOLD LIST.

4. Are there any persons who usually live here, but who were away during the last seven days?

IF YES, ASK:

What are their first names and their relationship to you?

How many of the last seven days were they away?

RECORD THE NUMBER OF DAYS AWAY IN THE HOUSEHOLD LIST.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the members of your household.

FOR EACH PERSON LISTED IN THE HOUSEHOLD LIST ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, AND RECORD THE ANSWERS IN THE HOUSEHOLD LIST.

MARK THE SEX OF EACH PERSON IN THE HOUSEHOLD LIST. IF IT IS NOT OBVIOUS FROM THEIR NAME AND RELATIONSHIP TO THE RESPONDENT, ASK:

5. Is (...) male or female?
6. What was your (...)'s age on your (his/her) last birthday?
7. Are you (Is ...) now attending or enrolled in school?
IF NOT, RECORD "N" (NOT IN SCHOOL) FOR EDUCATIONAL STATUS AND SKIP TO 10.

3. Is that full-time or part-time?

9. In the last seven days how many days did you (...) attend school?

RECORD "F" (FULL-TIME) OR "P" (PART-TIME) FOR EDUCATIONAL STATUS, AND NOTE THE NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDING.

10. Are you (Is ...) presently employed? (PAUSE) Self-employed? IF NOT, RECORD "N" (NOT EMPLOYED) FOR EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND SKIP TO 13.

11. Is that more than full-time, full-time or part time?

12. In the last seven days how many days did you (...) work?

RECORD "F+" (MORE THAN FULL-TIME), "F" (FULL-TIME) OR "P" (PART-TIME) FOR EMPLOYMENT STATUS, AND NOTE THE NUMBER OF DAYS AT WORK.

13. Do you (Does ...) have any condition which limits the amount or kind of work you can do?

IF YES, RECORD "D" (DISABILITY/HANDICAP) FOR HEALTH.

14. Were you (Was ...) too sick at any time during the last seven days to do the things (he/she) usually do(es)?

IF NOT, SKIP TO 16.

15. How many of the last seven days were you (was ...) that sick?

RECORD "S" (SICK) FOR HEALTH, AND NOTE THE NUMBER OF DAYS SICK.

POTENTIAL SUPPORT

Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about people
outside of your household.

16. First, how many of your parents are living in Lansing
and its suburbs? NONE 0
ONE 1
TWO 2
OTHER _

17. How many brothers and sisters over 18 do you have living
within the same area? NUMBER _

18. How many grown children do you have living away from
home within the same area? NUMBER _

19. How many grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins over
18 do you have living within the same area? NUMBER _

IF RESPONDENT IS SEPARATED, ASK:

20. Does your husband live within the same area? YES 1
NO 0

IF RESPONDENT IS DIVORCED, ASK:

21. Does your ex-husband live within the same area? YES 1
NO 0

IF RESPONDENT IS NEVER-MARRIED, SKIP TO 23.

22. How many (ex)parents-in-law do you have living within
the same area? NUMBER _

23. How many (ex-)brothers and sisters-in-law over 18
do you have living within the same area? NUMBER _

24. How many other in-laws over 18 do you have living
within the same area? NUMBER _

25. How many people living in Lansing and its suburbs
do you consider your friends? NUMBER _

26. How many ^{of your} neighbors do you consider friendly acquaintances?

NUMBER _____

27. What public and private community services do you know
of which could help you to support and take care of your family
and home?

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

If you needed help, and were eligible:

28a. Would you be willing to ask for financial help from:

(IF SEPARATED)	your husband	YES 1
		NO 2
(IF DIVORCED)	your ex-husband	YES 1
		NO 2
	a relative	YES 1
		NO 2
	an in-law	YES 1
		NO 2
	a friend	YES 1
		NO 2
	a neighbor	YES 1
		NO 2
	a public agency	YES 1
		NO 2
	a private agency	YES 1
		NO 2

IF ANSWER IS NO TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, ASK:

Why not?

WHICH? WHY NOT? _____

28b. Would you be willing to ask for other kinds of help from:

(IF SEPARATED)	your husband	YES 1
		NO 2
(IF DIVORCED)	your ex-husband	YES 1
		NO 2
	a relative	YES 1
		NO 2
	an in-law	YES 1
		NO 2
	a friend	YES 1
		NO 2
	a neighbor	YES 1
		NO 2
	a public agency	YES 1
		NO 2
	a private agency	YES 1
		NO 2

IF ANSWER IS NO TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, ASK:

Why not?

WHICH? WHY NOT? _____

29a. Would you be willing to go to MESC (Unemployment) for benefits? YES 1
NO 2

IF NOT, ASK:

Why not? _____

29b. Would you be willing to ask for free job or other services from MESC (Unemployment)? YES 1
NO 2

IF NOT, ASK:

Why not? _____

30a. Would you be willing to go to the Department of Social Services for:

food stamps	YES 1
	NO 2
medicaid	YES 1
	NO 2
aid to dependent children (ADC)	YES 1
	NO 2
paid day care	YES 1
	NO 2
other <u>financial aid</u>	YES 1
	NO 2

IF ANSWER IS NO TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, ASK:

Why not?

WHICH? WHY NOT? _____

30b. Would you be willing to ask for free services such as
homemaking services from the Department of Social Services? YES 1
NO 2

IF NOT, ASK:

Why not? _____

IF THE RESPONDENT IS NOT "MARRIED AND LIVING WITH HER
HUSBAND," SKIP TO 34.

31a. Would your husband be willing to ask for financial
help from:

a relative	YES 1
	NO 2
an in-law	YES 1
	NO 2
a friend	YES 1
	NO 2
a neighbor	YES 1
	NO 2
a public agency	YES 1
	NO 2
a private agency	YES 1
	NO 2

31b. Would your husband be willing to ask for other kinds
of help from:

a relative	YES 1
	NO 2
an in-law	YES 1
	NO 2
a friend	YES 1
	NO 2
a neighbor	YES 1
	NO 2
a public agency	YES 1
	NO 2
a private agency	YES 1
	NO 2

IF ANSWER IS NO TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, ASK:

Why not?

WHICH? WHY NOT? _____

32a. Would your husband be willing to go to MESC (Unemployment)
for benefits?

YES 1
NO 2

IF NOT, ASK:

Why not? _____

32b. Would your husband be willing to ask for free job or
other services from MESC (Unemployment)?

YES 1
NO 2

IF NOT, ASK:

Why not? _____

33a. Would your husband be willing to go to the Department
of Social Services for?

food stamps

YES 1
NO 2

medicaid

YES 1
NO 2

aid to dependent children (ADC)

YES 1
NO 2

paid day care

YES 1
NO 2

other financial aid

YES 1
NO 2

IF ANY ANSWER IS NO, ASK:

Why not?

WHICH? WHY NOT? _____

33b. Would your husband be willing to ask for free services
such as homemaking services from the Department of Social
Services ?

YES 1
NO 2

IF NOT, ASK:

Why not? _____

TASK PERFORMANCE DATA

Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the time that you and other people spent doing things for your family during the last seven days.

Here's a pencil and a worksheet which may help you answer these questions.

HAND WORKSHEET TO RESPONDENT. IF NECESSARY, EXPLAIN FURTHER, USING A SAMPLE WORKSHEET.

Please try to answer these questions as accurately as you can.

REPEAT EACH TASK PERFORMANCE QUESTION FOR THE RESPONDENT, HER CHILDREN, HER (EX-)HUSBAND, RELATIVES, IN-LAWS, FRIENDS, AND NEIGHBORS.

34. How many hours, if any, did you (...) spend during the last seven days earning money, going to an agency or elsewhere for money, filling out applications and forms for financial aid, or doing anything else to provide money for your family?

RESPONDENT / CHILDREN / (EX-)HUSBAND / RELATIVES / IN-LAWS / FRIENDS / NEIGHBORS
AT HOME

35. How many hours, if any, did you (...) spend shopping for anything: groceries, clothes, furnishings, appliances, repairs, haircuts or any other goods or services for your family and home?

RESPONDENT / CHILDREN / (EX-)HUSBAND / RELATIVES / IN-LAWS / FRIENDS / NEIGHBORS
AT HOME

36. How many hours, if any, did you (...) spend doing laundry, mending, housecleaning, straightening, yard, car and pet care, and any repairs for your family?

~~RESPONDENT / CHILDREN / (EX-)HUSBAND / RELATIVES / IN-LAWS / FRIENDS / NEIGHBORS~~
~~AT HOME~~

37. How many hours, if any, did you (...) spend preparing meals and snacks for your family and cleaning up afterward?

~~RESPONDENT / CHILDREN / (EX-)HUSBAND / RELATIVES / IN-LAWS / FRIENDS / NEIGHBORS~~
~~AT HOME~~

38. How many hours, if any, did you (...) spend washing and dressing your children, reading to them, helping them with their and talking homework, playing with them, and providing baby care and medical care?

~~RESPONDENT / CHILDREN / (EX-)HUSBAND / RELATIVES / IN-LAWS / FRIENDS / NEIGHBORS~~
~~AT HOME~~

39. How many hours, if any, did you (...) spend supervising, watching or baby-sitting your children?

~~RESPONDENT / CHILDREN / (EX-)HUSBAND / RELATIVES / IN-LAWS / FRIENDS / NEIGHBORS~~
~~AT HOME~~

40. Did you have to pay any of these people to do any of these things for you and your family during the last seven days?

IF YES, ASK:

Who? To do what? _____

13

41. Do you cooperate with any people in the same situation as yourself to help each other out? IF NO, SKIP TO 43. YES 1
NO 2

42. How much help would you say you get from these people in doing the kinds of things we've been talking about? A lot of help, some help, little help or no help at all? A LOT OF HELP 4
SOME HELP 3
LITTLE HELP 2
NO HELP AT ALL 1

43. Do you belong to an organization or group of persons in your situation which exists for the purpose of mutual assistance? IF NO, SKIP TO 45. YES 1
NO 2

IF YES, ASK FOR THE GROUP'S NAME, IF ANY.

NAME _____

44. How much help would you say you get from this organization or group in doing the kinds of things we've been talking about? A lot of help, some help, little help, or no help at all? A LOT OF HELP 4
SOME HELP 3
LITTLE HELP 2
NO HELP AT ALL 1

The next series of questions concerns your family's use of various services during the last seven days.

45. How many times during the last seven days did you have a store, business or agency purchase or deliver something to you for an extra charge? (PAUSE) free of charge?

CHARGE: TIMES ____

FREE: TIMES ____

46. How many times did you arrange with a company, business person or agency to do laundry, mending, housecleaning or straightening, yard, car or pet care, or any repairs, for a fee? (PAUSE) free of charge?

CHARGE: TIMES ____

FREE: TIMES ____

47. How many meals and snacks did you and any other member of your family eat out at a restaurant, organization or agency, pick up or have delivered, that you paid for? (PAUSE) or at no cost to you?

RECORD THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL MEALS

PAID: MEALS ____

FREE: MEALS ____

48. How many hours of day care, child care or baby-sitting were performed for you by a hired business person, a day care center, a business or agency for a charge? (PAUSE) or free of charge?

CHARGE: HOURS ____

FREE: HOURS ____

COLLECT PERFORMANCE WORKSHEET

49. Did anything at all happen last week that might have affected the hours you or anyone else spent doing the things we've been talking about?

YES 1
NO 2

IF YES, ASK:

What? _____

50. Do you receive financial assistance from:

(IF SEPARATED)	your husband	YES 1
		NO 2
(IF DIVORCED)	your ex-husband	YES 1
		NO 2
	a relative	YES 1
		NO 2
	an in-law	YES 1
		NO 2
	a friend	YES 1
		NO 2
	a neighbor	YES 1
		NO 2
Which: _____	a public agency	YES 1
		NO 2
Which: _____	a private agency	YES 1
		NO 2

51. If you didn't have to earn any money, if somehow you could have enough money to live on without making any more, how many hours a week, if any, would you want to work at a job anyway?

HOURS ____

52. If you didn't have to go shopping for anything, if everything you needed could be delivered, and if doctors and hairdressers, for example, made housecalls at no extra cost, how many hours a week, if any, would you want to spend shopping anyway?

HOURS ____

53. If you didn't have to do any maintenance work in or around your home, that is, if all your laundry, mending, housecleaning, straightening, yard, car and pet care, and any repairs could be taken care of at the same cost as if you did it yourself, how many hours a week, if any, would you want to spend doing these things anyway?

HOURS ____

54. If you didn't have to prepare meals or snacks or clean up after meals, if this could be taken care of at the same cost as if you had done it yourself, how many hours a week, if any, would you want to spend preparing meals and cleaning up after meals anyway? HOURS _____

55. If you didn't have to do any child care, if your children could be washed, dressed, read to, helped with homework, and played with, and if baby care and medical care could be taken care of for you at no extra cost, how many hours a week, if any, would you want to spend doing these things anyway? HOURS _____

56. If you didn't have to supervise or watch your children, if someone could watch them for you free of charge, how many hours a week, if any, would you want to watch them anyway? HOURS _____

We've been talking about how you got your housework done and supported yourself last week. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about what you've done at special times of the year.

IF NO CHILD IN SCHOOL, SKIP TO 60.

57. First of all, please tell me what arrangements, if any, you made for child care during the school's summer vacation last year? CIRCLE AS MANY ANSWERS AS APPLY.

CHILD TO FATHER
RELATIVE CARED FOR
NEIGHBOR CARED FOR
FRIEND CARED FOR
SUMMER SCHOOL
SUMMER CAMP
PAID DAY CARE
CHILD STAYED ALONE
OTHER

(specify)

100-40000-100

58. What arrangements, if any, did you make for child care during the last school vacation? CIRCLE AS MANY ANSWERS AS APPLY.

CHILD TO FATHER	1
RELATIVE CARED FOR	2
NEIGHBOR CARED FOR	3
FRIEND CARED FOR	4
PAID DAY CARE	5
CHILD STAYED ALONE	6
OTHER	7

(specify)

59. What arrangements, if any, did you make for child care last time there was no school on a weekday? CIRCLE AS MANY ANSWERS AS APPLY.

RELATIVE CARED FOR	1
NEIGHBOR CARED FOR	2
FRIEND CARED FOR	3
PAID DAY CARE	4
CHILD STAYED ALONE	5
STAYED HOME FROM WORK	6
OTHER	7

(specify)

60. What did you do about child care last time (one of) your child(ren) was sick. CIRCLE AS MANY ANSWERS AS APPLY.

RELATIVE CARED FOR	1
STAYED HOME FROM WORK	2
OTHER	3

(specify)

61. What did you do about child care last time you were sick?

CIRCLE AS MANY ANSWERS AS APPLY.

CHILD TO FATHER	1
RELATIVE CARED FOR	2
NEIGHBOR CARED FOR	3
FRIEND CARED FOR	4
OTHER	5

(specify)

62. What did you do about child care last time someone who regularly watches your child(ren) wasn't able to, for any reason?

CIRCLE AS MANY ANSWERS AS APPLY.

CHILD TO FATHER	1
RELATIVE CARED FOR	2
NEIGHBOR CARED FOR	3
FRIEND CARED FOR	4
CHILD STAYED ALONE	5
OTHER	6

(specify)

Here now are a few questions about how you might manage your time and money.

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| 63. Do you use an appointment book or a calendar to schedule your time in advance? | YES 1
NO 2 |
| 64. Do you plan your day in advance? | OFTEN, YES 1
RARELY, NO 2 |
| 65. Do you make up a shopping list before you go grocery shopping? | YES 1
NO 2 |
| 66. Do you make up a budget to manage your finances? | YES 1
NO 2 |
| 67. Do you have a plan about how much time you will spend on each of your major activities each week? | YES 1
NO 2 |
| 68. Do you schedule your errands so that you can do them together when possible? | YES 1
NO 2 |

SATISFACTIONS

Now I would like to ask you some questions about how satisfied you are with some aspects of your life.

69. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the state or condition of your home? Very satisfied, pretty satisfied, not too satisfied, not satisfied at all?

VERY SATISFIED	4
PRETTY SATISFIED	3
NOT TOO SATISFIED	2
NOT SATISFIED AT ALL	1

Imagine a scale running from zero to one hundred. Suppose one hundred represents the perfect state or condition your home could be in, and zero represents the worst possible state or condition you can imagine your home being in.

70. How would you rate the present state or condition of your home? RATING _____

71. How would you rate the best state or condition you could ever hope your home would be in? RATING _____

72. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the quality, appearance and taste of your family's meals? Very satisfied, pretty satisfied, not too satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

VERY SATISFIED	4
PRETTY SATISFIED	3
NOT TOO SATISFIED	2
NOT SATISFIED AT ALL	1

Using the scale again, suppose one hundred represents the perfect meal, and zero represents the worst possible meal you can imagine.

73. How would you rate the typical meals your family eats these days. RATING _____

74. How would you rate the best meal you could ever hope your family would eat? RATING _____

75. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your family life - the amount of time you spend and the things you do with your family? Very satisfied, pretty satisfied, not too satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

VERY SATISFIED	4
PRETTY SATISFIED	3
NOT TOO SATISFIED	2
NOT SATISFIED AT ALL	1

Let's say that your family life is the amount of time you spend and the things you do with your family. Let's use the zero to one hundred scale again. Suppose one hundred represents the perfect family life - the ideal family life for you, and zero represents the worst possible family life that you can imagine.

76. How would you rate your present family life? RATING_____

77. How would you rate the best family life you could ever hope for? RATING_____

78. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your social life - the amount of time you spend and the things you do with your friends? Very satisfied, pretty satisfied, not too satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

VERY SATISFIED	4
PRETTY SATISFIED	3
NOT TOO SATISFIED	2
NOT SATISFIED AT ALL	1

Let's say that your social life is the amount of time you spend and the things you do with your friends. Using the scale again, suppose one hundred represents the perfect social life - the ideal social life for you, and zero represents the worst possible social life that you can imagine.

79. How would you rate your present social life? RATING_____

80. How would you rate the best social life you could ever hope for? RATING_____

81. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the amount of free time you have? Very satisfied, pretty satisfied, not too satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

VERY SATISFIED	4
PRETTY SATISFIED	3
NOT TOO SATISFIED	2
NOT SATISFIED AT ALL	1

Imagine the zero to one hundred scale again. Suppose one hundred represents the perfect amount of free time - the ideal amount of free time for you, and zero represents the worst possible amount of freetime that you can imagine.

82. How would you rate the amount of free time you have at present? RATING_____

83. How would you rate the best amount of free time you could ever hope for? RATING_____

34. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your family's financial situation? Very satisfied, pretty satisfied, not too satisfied, not satisfied at all?

VERY SATISFIED	4
PRETTY SATISFIED	3
NOT TOO SATISFIED	2
NOT SATISFIED AT ALL	1

Using the scale one more time, suppose one hundred represents the perfect financial situation, your ideal financial situation, and zero represents the worst possible financial situation that you can imagine.

35. How would you rate your family's present financial situation?

RATING _____

36. How would you rate the best family financial situation that you could ever hope for?

RATING _____

We've talked about various aspects of your life; now I want to ask you about your life as a whole.

37. How satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days? Very satisfied, pretty satisfied, not too satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

VERY SATISFIED	4
PRETTY SATISFIED	3
NOT TOO SATISFIED	2
NOT SATISFIED AT ALL	1

88. How happy would you say you are these days? Very happy,
pretty happy, not too happy, or not happy at all.

VERY HAPPY	4
PRETTY HAPPY	3
NOT TOO HAPPY	2
NOT HAPPY AT ALL	1

89. What single change do you think would make the greatest
improvement in your life?

BACKGROUND DATA

Now just a few last questions for the purposes of
classification:

90. Are you now: married, widowed, divorced, separated, or
have you never been married?

MARRIED	1
SEPARATED	2
DIVORCED	3
WIDOWED	4
NEVER MARRIED	5

IF RESPONDENT IS MARRIED, ASK:

91. How many years have you been married?

YEARS__

IF THE RESPONDENT IS SEPARATED OR DIVORCED, ASK:

92. How long have you been separated? MONTHS _____
YEARS _____

IF THE RESPONDENT IS DIVORCED, ASK:

93. How long has it been since your divorce became final? MONTHS _____
YEARS _____

IF THE RESPONDENT IS A WIDOW, ASK:

94. How long have you been a widow? MONTHS _____
YEARS _____

95. What is your religion, if any? Is it Protestant,
Catholic, Jewish, some other religion (which?) or no religion?

PROTESTANT 1
CATHOLIC 2
JEWISH 3
OTHER 4

(specify)
NONE 5

RECORD BY OBSERVATION ONLY IF POSSIBLE:

96. Are you (READ WITH PAUSES) a White or Caucasian person?
a black person? Chicano, Spanish-American or Mexican-American?
or a member of any other ethnic or racial minority group (which?)?

WHITE 1
BLACK 2
CHICANO 3
OTHER 4

(specify)

97. What is the highest grade or year you finished and got credit for in regular school, college or vocational school?

GRADE/YEAR _____

IF EMPLOYED, ASK:

98. What kind of work do you do? What is your main occupation called? OCCUPATION: _____

IF THE RESPONDENT IS NOT MARRIED AND LIVING WITH HER HUSBAND SKIP TO 103.

99. What is your husband's religion, if any? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion (which?), or no religion?

PROTESTANT	1
CATHOLIC	2
JEWISH	3
OTHER	4
NONE	5

(specify)

RECORD BY OBSERVATION ONLY, IF POSSIBLE:

100. Is your husband (READ WITH PAUSES) a White or Caucasian person? a Black person? Chicano, Spanish-American, or Mexican-American? or a member of any other ethnic or racial minority group (which)?

WHITE	1
BLACK	2
CHICANO	3
OTHER	4

(specify)

101. What is the highest grade or year your husband finished and got credit for in regular school, college or vocational school?

GRADE/YEAR _____

IF EMPLOYED ASK:

102. What kind of work does your husband do? What is his main occupation called? OCCUPATION: _____

RECORD BY OBSERVATION, IF POSSIBLE:

103. How many rooms do you have in your home, not counting hallways and bathrooms? (COUNT ROOMS IN BASEMENT OR ATTIC ONLY IF FINISHED AND FURNISHED.)

ROOMS _____

HAND FLASHCARD TO RESPONDENT AND ASK:

104. For statistical purposes only, will you please look at this card and tell me which letter best represents your total family income in 1978 before taxes? This should include all the money earned by yourself and all the members of your family living with you, any public assistance or other financial aid, net income from any business, dividends, interest, pensions, gifts, rent you receive, and any other income.

IF UNCERTAIN, ASK:

What would be your best guess?

LETTER _____

This concludes the interview. Thank you very much for your cooperation. Are there any questions or comments you would like me to communicate to the project director?

RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS/QUESTIONS:

INTERVIEWER'S COMMENTS

Where did you take this interview? (Respondent's home,
place of work, etc.)

Was anyone else present during the interview? _____

Who? (Respondent's husband, children, etc.) _____

Were there any interruptions during the interview? _____

Describe _____

Did the respondent appear to react emotionally or stressfully
to any part of the interview? _____

Describe (Give question numbers if relevant) _____

What was the respondent's attitude to you? _____

To the interview? _____

How careful did the respondent appear to be in giving her
answers? _____

Is there anything else about the respondent or the interview that
we should know in interpreting this interview?

Additional Comments:

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME IN 1978 - BEFORE TAXES
ALL MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY LIVING IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD

- A. UNDER \$3,000 A YEAR
- B. \$3,000 TO \$4,999 A YEAR
- C. \$5,000 TO \$6,999 A YEAR
- D. \$7,000 TO \$9,999 A YEAR
- E. \$10,000 TO \$11,999 A YEAR
- F. \$12,000 TO \$14,999 A YEAR
- G. \$15,000 TO \$19,999 A YEAR
- H. \$20,000 TO \$24,999 A YEAR
- I. \$25,000 AND OVER A YEAR

PERFORMANCE WORKSHEET

	SUNDAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
MORNING							
AFTERNOON							
EVENING							

INTERVIEW RECORD FORM

[illegible]

REINTERVIEW

RESPONDENT NUMBER _____

INTERVIEW DATE _____

REINTERVIEW DATE _____

1. How many hours, if any, did you spend during the seven days from _____ to _____ doing laundry, mending, housecleaning, straightening, yard, car and pet care, and any repairs for your family? HOURS _____
2. How many hours did you spend doing these things during the last seven days? HOURS _____
3. How many hours, if any, did your children at home spend during the seven days from _____ to _____ preparing meals and snacks for your family and cleaning up afterward? HOURS _____
4. How many hours did they spend doing these things during the last seven days? HOURS _____
5. How many of your parents are living in Lansing and its suburbs? NUMBER _____
6. How many brothers and sisters over 18 do you have living within the same area? NUMBER _____
Are these numbers the same as they were on _____
____YES ____NO
(difference? _____)
7. How satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?
Very satisfied, pretty satisfied, not too satisfied, or not satisfied at all? _____VS _____NVS
____PS _____NSN
Is this any different than you felt on _____
____YES ____NO
(difference? _____)

Non-Respondent Interview

Hello. This is _____ from the Family Work Survey at Michigan State University. Could I ask you a few questions?

(EXPLAIN AS NECESSARY)

1. On April 5 were you married, separated, divorced, widowed, or never married?

IF MARRIED: and were you living with your husband?

<u>MR</u> MARRIED, WITH HUSBAND	<u>D</u> DIVORCED
<u>MA</u> MARRIED, HUSBAND ABSENT	<u>W</u> WIDOWED
<u>S</u> SEPARATED	<u>NN</u> NEVER MARRIED

2. What was your age on April fifth?
3. Were you employed or self-employed at that time?
- IF YES: Full-time or part time?
4. What is the highest grade or year you finished and got credit for in public school, college or vocational school?

<u>8</u> ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GRADUATE	<u>16</u> COLLEGE GRADUATE
<u>12</u> HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	(BACHELORS DEGREE)

5. Are you a member of any minority group?

IF YES: Which?

2 BLACK 3 SPANISH-SPEAKING, etc.

6. How many children under 18 did you have living with you around April 5?
7. How many of them were under 6 years old?
8. What is the nearest street intersection to your home?
- _____ STREET 1 _____ STREET 2
9. Could you give me an idea of your approximate total income last year counting everything?
10. Were you receiving any financial assistance from any public agency in March or April this year?
11. Is your telephone number unlisted?

Thank you.

MN- RESPONSE No.	TEL. MNR. STRT. NO.	2. AGE	3. EMPLOYED, P/N	4. EDUC.	5. MINOR HY	6. CH. Z/B	7. C.H. A/C	8. LOCATION ST. 1 ST. 2	9. MTR INCOME	10. PUBLIC ASSIST.	11. TEL. LISTED	TRY TRY TRY 1 2 3	NOTES
		Years		GRADE	B.S.E.	No.	No.		\$	Y/N	L/U	DIRECTIONS OUTLINE	

CALL-BACK RECORD FORM

SCREENED OUT AS HIV	MARITAL STATUS AT SCREENING	ANY CHILDREN ?	SCREENER	NOTES
TELEPHONE NUMBER	1st, M.A.S. 2nd, N.A.A.	Y/N	NUMBER	