

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

---

5-1979

## Factors Affecting the Amount of Leisure Time of Utah Adults

Sherry Ann Swapp  
*Utah State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Swapp, Sherry Ann, "Factors Affecting the Amount of Leisure Time of Utah Adults" (1979). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2275.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2275>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



FACTORS AFFECTING THE AMOUNT  
OF LEISURE TIME OF

UTAH ADULTS

by

Sherry Ann Swapp

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Home Economics and Consumer Education

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Jane McCullough for her thoughtful direction, criticisms and suggestions which proved to be so helpful in writing my thesis. I found her to be a very concerned, as well as efficient and conscientious, major professor.

I would also like to thank Dr. Janice Pearce and Dr. Alison Thorne for serving as members of my committee. I appreciate their time, interest, and careful review of my thesis.

I also wish to thank my fellow graduate students in the HECE department for their encouragement and friendship. They have contributed to making my graduate work an enjoyable experience.

Most of all, I wish to thank my wonderful family for their constant love and support during this endeavor. Their confidence in me has been a great source of motivation.

Sherry Ann Swapp

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
ABSTRACT . . . . .	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purpose . . . . .	2
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	3
Concept of Leisure . . . . .	3
Amount of Leisure Time Available . . . . .	6
Factors Related to Amount of Leisure . . . . .	13
Summary . . . . .	18
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURE . . . . .	19
NE 113 Family Time Study . . . . .	19
Sample . . . . .	19
The Data Collection Instrument . . . . .	20
Administration of the Instrument . . . . .	21
Hypotheses . . . . .	22
Definitions . . . . .	23
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	26
Description of Sample . . . . .	26
Amount of Leisure Time Reported . . . . .	33
Factors Related to Amount of Leisure Time . . . . .	33
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	43
Limitations . . . . .	45
Recommendations . . . . .	46
LITERATURE CITED. . . . .	47
APPENDIX . . . . .	51
VITA. . . . .	53

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Income of the Household . . . . .	27
2. Employment Status of the Homemaker . . . . .	28
3. Occupation of the Homemaker . . . . .	29
4. Occupation of the Spouse . . . . .	30
5. Educational Level of Homemaker . . . . .	30
6. Educational Level of Spouse . . . . .	31
7. Age of Homemaker . . . . .	32
8. Age of Spouse . . . . .	32
9. Leisure Time According to Sex . . . . .	34
10. Leisure Time of Employed vs. Non-employed Women . . . . .	35
11. Homemaker's Leisure Time According to Age of Youngest Child . . . . .	36
12. Spouse's Leisure Time According to Age of Youngest Child . . . . .	37
13. Homemaker's Leisure Time According to Residence . . . . .	38
14. Spouse's Leisure Time According to Residence . . . . .	38
15. Homemaker's Leisure Time According to Family Income . . . . .	39
16. Spouse's Leisure Time According to Family Income . . . . .	40
17. Homemaker's Leisure Time According to Educational Level . . . . .	41
18. Spouse's Leisure Time According to Educational Level . . . . .	41
19. Participation in the Most Common Leisure Activities . . . . .	42

## ABSTRACT

Factors Affecting the Amount of  
Leisure Time of Utah Adults

by

Sherry Ann Swapp, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1979

Major Professor: Jane McCullough  
Department: Home Economics and Consumer Education

The amount of leisure time available to Utah adults and its relationship to the factors of sex, employment, age of children, place of residence, income, and education was investigated. A time diary was kept for two days recording the time use allocation of each respondent. Data were gathered from May 1977 to August 1978. The sample consisted of 210 men and 210 women from Iron, Washington, and Salt Lake counties in Utah.

The adults reported an average of 4.6 hours of leisure time per day. Employment and educational level were related to the amount of leisure time reported by women. Leisure time reported by men was related to age of children and place of residence. Income and sex had no significant relationship to amount of leisure time.

(58 pages)

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Leisure is a concept that has fascinated people since civilization began. It has been thought about, written about, and studied for centuries. Today it is of interest to researchers in sociology, family relations, physical education, recreation, and home management. Although there is no consensus on how to define or measure leisure, there has been and is great interest in attempting to do so (Kreps & Clark, 1975).

"Classical theory (economics) posited leisure and labor as the two uses of time, the first producing pleasure or utility and the second pain or disutility" (Bell, 1975, p. 558). Everyday activities, however, do not all fit neatly into these two categories. There is some ambiguity and overlapping. Nevertheless, time research requires some categorization for the data to be meaningful. Paid work, household work, and child care are usually classified under the heading of obligatory time--things we usually do because of necessity (Robinson, 1977b). Time left over from these activities, excluding maintenance or personal care, is considered by most researchers to be leisure time.

As technological advances brought mechanization to many industries and businesses, as modern labor-saving devices found a place in most American homes, and as the four-day work week was expected to become more common in the United States, it was predicted that Americans

would enjoy an increase in the amount of leisure time available to them (Changing Times, 1958). Supposedly this would raise the quality of life and be a symbol of the high standard of living enjoyed by many people in the United States. There is disagreement as to whether or not this prediction has been fulfilled. This is an area in which the "experts" do not agree.

Many professionals and laypersons are concerned that people have too much leisure time and don't know what to do with it (Wall Street Journal, 1978). Others are concerned that we have very little leisure (Linder, 1970). Research which provides data concerning the amount of leisure time available and factors related to the amount could be useful to many groups and organizations. Public and private agencies who provide leisure facilities, tools, and activities, as well as volunteer agencies, could gain practical import from leisure studies.

Efforts have been made to determine the amount of some kinds of leisure in Utah. Two recent studies were primarily concerned with outdoor recreation and tourism travel (Becker & Hunt, 1977; Hunt et al, 1978). Both studies employed two common methods of time measurement--time diary and estimation. No one, as far as could be determined, had determined the total amount of time Utahns devote to leisure.

#### Purpose

The purpose of this research project was to determine how much leisure time is available to adults in Utah, and how some factors such as sex, employment, age of children, location of residence, income, and education relate to the amount.



## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature, ranging from popular periodicals to professional research journals, is filled with information concerning leisure and its related topics. The subjects usually covered include leisure time in relation to the length of the work week, money expenditures for leisure, social class differences in leisure activities, allocation of leisure time among various activities, and definitions of leisure. The scope of this research project is the amount of leisure time available. The review of literature will cover definitions of leisure, amounts of leisure time, and factors affecting the amount of leisure time.

Concept of Leisure

In past literature, leisure has been assigned several definitions varying with the authors who addressed themselves to the concept. Godbey (1968) quoted Meyersohn as classifying the definitions of leisure into three conceptualizations: time, activity, or state of mind. There is, of course, some overlapping in the definitions.

Leisure defined as time

Murphy (1974) divided time into three classes: existence time (meeting biological needs), subsistence time (working at one's job), and leisure. Leisure can be obtained by subtracting existence and

subsistence time from 24 hours and labeling the remainder as leisure time. This is the basis for the Dictionary of Sociology describing its definition of leisure as "an arithmetic one" (Godbey, 1968, p. 11). Parker (1971) called this type of definition a residual definition.

Some authors define leisure as surplus time, "the time surplus remaining after the practical necessities of life have been attended to" (May and Petgen, 1928, p. 3). According to Gross (1961, p. 2), "Leisure refers to free time, free, that is, from the need to be concerned about maintenance. . ." Larrabee and Meyersohn (1958, p. 3) quoted the Oxford English Dictionary's definition of leisure as "the state of having time at one's own disposal; time which one can spend as he pleases; free or unoccupied time." Murphy (1974) referred to this as discretionary or non-obligatory time. DeGrazia (1964, p. 12) spoke of this time as "freedom from the necessity of being occupied . . . time in which a person can do as he pleases; time, perhaps, for amusement or recreation." He added, "The word leisure has turned into the phrase free time, and the two are now almost interchangeable" (DeGrazia, 1964, p. 12).

Wilensky (1961, p. 46) stated, "The notion of free time, time set aside and unconstrained, is a peculiarly modern idea; in the primitive tribe or peasant village, work is hardly distinguished from the rest of life--from one's duties and rights as husband, son, father, clansman."

According to one author, "the goal of a modern society is the creation of greater amounts of free time", and "since free time implies periods which allow individuals maximum choice over their

activities, it has by definition been valued positively" (Robinson, 1977b, p. 161).

#### Leisure Defined as Activity

In describing leisure as activity, Robinson (1977b) included three main categories: (1) organizational activity, (2) mass media, and (3) socializing and recreation.

An interesting thought about leisure was supplied by Gross (1961, p. 2), "If work is what a man does when he would rather be doing something else, then leisure is what he does when he does not have to work." Perhaps this describes what it isn't, as opposed to what it is. This could include a multitude of activities, each set unique to the individual.

Willmott raised a question about terminology:

In all classes most "non-work" time is spent at home and with the family. The most common activities are jobs like gardening, home decorating, repairing or cleaning the car. But it may be stretching the meaning of "leisure" to use it for such tasks. In large part they are not "chosen" activities at all, but necessary duties" (Willmott, 1971, p. 582).

This is one problem of categorizing all activities that are not work as leisure. Another problem is that work and leisure are not mutually exclusive. Some activities may possess elements of both. Individuals may also attach different meanings to the same activities, making it leisure to one and work to the other, or leisure at one time and work at another.

### Leisure Defined as State of Mind

DeGrazia is a staunch advocate of defining leisure as a state of mind. He stated, "The word leisure has always referred to something personal, a state of mind or quality of feeling" (DeGrazia, 1964, p. 312). Pieper (1964) apparently agreed. He defined leisure as "an attitude of mind, a condition of the soul. . ." (Pieper, 1964, preface). These definitions stress the quality of leisure rather than time or activity.

### Amount of Leisure Time Available

There have been and are conflicting ideas over the amount of leisure time that is available to Americans today. One school of thought is that technological developments have freed and will continue to free people from work, and consequently increase the leisure time available (Kreps, 1968). There has even been discussion of too much leisure time becoming a problem. A second school of thought sees the problem as not increasing, but decreasing time available for leisure. Perhaps advanced technology does not always result in increased leisure, but could lead, instead, to a decrease (Robinson, 1977a).

### Increase in Leisure

In anticipation of a shortened work week and longer vacations, a Changing Times writer 20 years ago predicted that by 1975, Americans would enjoy a significant increase in leisure time available to them

(Changing Times, 1958). Arthur Schlesinger was quoted as saying, "The most dangerous threat hanging over American Society is the threat of leisure. . . and those who have the least preparation for leisure will have the most of it" (Swados, 1958, p. 56). A professor of psychiatry at the University of Southern California expressed concern that the traditional work-oriented American would be unable to handle the increased amount of leisure available to him. He suggested an alteration of the work ethic that would allow acceptance of increased leisure and prevent guilt and depression (San Francisco Examiner & Chronical, 1971).

Some Americans are positive that there has been an increase in leisure time. According to Donald and Havighurst (1959, p. 355), "With modern social trends, the time which people have for leisure activities is tending to increase." As seeming evidence for this idea, Americans recently spent a record \$180 billion on leisure activities (U.S. News and World Report, 1979). Moore and Hedges (1971) reported that American workers in 1970 had 50 more hours free from work per year than they had in 1960. Several other authors supported the idea that leisure time has increased in American over the past several decades (Faunce, 1963; Brightbill, 1966; Kreps, 1969; Parker, 1971; Szalai et al., 1972). Parker (1971) believed that the increase has been slight and far less than some people would have us think.

As leisure is often considered to be the opposite of work, a reason given for the assumed increase in leisure is the reduction in labor market activity or paid work. This reduction has been affected by: (1) improvement in technology, (2) decrease in hours spent in the

labor market, and (3) changes in how the work hours are arranged.

Technology. Many people think that technological advances in the form of automation and increased use of machines have increased our leisure time (Faunce, 1963; Brightbill, 1966; Weiss & Riesman, 1961). Faunce (1963, p. 85) wrote, "This new leisure, as well as our economic abundance, is machine-made, the product of the increasing mechanization of production technology." As technology expanded and productivity increased, the result was a reduction in working hours. "The increasing productivity of our economy is what made this reduction in working hours possible" (Faunce, 1968, p. 73).

Labor market time. According to Carter (1970, p. 54), the length of the workweek "declined from an average of 70 hours in 1850 to approximately 40 hours in 1969." The average has remained fairly constant since then (Moore & Hedges, 1971; Meyersohn, 1974; Owens, 1976). Carter (1970) cited three reasons for the decreased work week: (1) public concern for women and children during the early periods of urban industrialization, (2) increased productivity per worker in manufacturing industries which didn't require a reduction in wages, and (3) a share-the-work program introduced after the depression to help relieve some of the unemployment.

An example of a work-sharing program was the one introduced by a rubber plant in Akron, Ohio, in the late 1930's (Swados, 1958). A six-hour six-day work week was instituted for a portion of their plant which allocated the work among four six-hour shifts rather than three

eight-hour shifts in a 24-hour period. The slight reduction in the work week became so popular that it was written into their union's constitution, although it represented only a small percentage of the total employees in the rubber industry.

Some individuals saw the Akron experiment as a possible forecast of what American's future shortened work week would be like. Others felt it would more likely assume a different form, perhaps a seven-hour five-day week, or an eight-hour four-day week. None of the predicted changes have affected more than a very small segment of the American labor force.

Arrangement of hours. Arrangement of work hours has changed over the past several years. The four-day work schedule is a relatively new practice that represents one of these changes (Maklan, 1977). Although it may not necessarily result in decreased weekly work hours, it appeals to workers because of their increase in "usable leisure", a description of the extended weekend (Hedges, 1971). A decrease in the commuting time required for the four-day, as compared to the five-day work week, might also increase leisure time (Hedges, 1971).

Meyersohn (1974) suggested that the increased length of paid vacations and Monday holidays, as well as three-day weekends resulting from four-day work weeks, are measures of increased leisure. He suggested that changes in the life cycle may affect the amount of leisure time an individual possesses over a lifetime and result in increased leisure. Preparation time to gain necessary skills to enter the labor force has expanded and more years are spent in school, life

expectancy has increased, and more Americans are retiring at an earlier age (Meyersohn, 1974). All of these factors may contribute to increased leisure time, or at least the time not spent in the labor market.

Many feel that time spent in housework has decreased (Gittelson, 1977; Nye, 1974, Boulding, 1972), or should have decreased (Changing Times, 1973). "Advances in technology and small family size are widely assumed to have reduced the working hours of housewives . . ." (Moore and Hedges, 1971, p. 8). If this is true, it would seem that housewives could have experienced a gain in leisure time.

Does a decrease in time spent in the labor market necessarily lead to an increase in leisure? Linder (1970) didn't think so. He saw the average earner in a rich country like America as a member of the "harried leisure class" (Linder, 1970, p. 12). The work week may have decreased, but the worker is scurrying to and fro in his hectic attempt to do a myriad of things at once or in quick succession. With increased income has also come increased goods which take time to consume or maintain (Linder, 1970). A decrease in time spent on the job may not be directly translated into increased leisure. Other aspects of life which have the characteristics of work may claim that time (Zuzanek, 1974).

#### No Increase in Leisure

Wilensky (1961) believes that increased leisure is a myth. He stated, "The average man's gain in leisure with economic growth has been exaggerated" (Wilensky, 1961, p. 55). According to Owen (1976)



and Meyersohn (1974), there has been no significant increase in leisure time since World War II. This is the result of a fairly constant average work week of approximately 40 hours (Meyersohn, 1974; Moore and Hedges, 1971). Owen (1976) attributed the slight decrease that has occurred in the average hours worked per week to a shift in the composition of the labor force rather than an actual decrease in time spent working. This shift included an increase in women and students, two groups who are likely to work part time (Owen, 1976).

Wilensky (1967, p. 21) said, "The most striking thing about work in modern society is that it is unevenly distributed." Because the work week is not evenly distributed among all workers, we may be led to believe it has decreased. However, many Americans are working longer than 40 hours each week. "Almost 16.7 million wage and salary workers were working longer than the standard 40 hour week in May 1976, up 1.2 million from the revised figure for the previous year" (Gallogly, 1977, p. 42). A year later, Mellor (1978) reported that the number had increased an additional 1.5 million, to a total of almost 18.2 million who were working more than 40 hours a week. Although the work week may have decreased for some individuals, this cannot be generalized to the total working population.

Some of those who work long hours are workers who hold more than one job. "In May 1969 about four million persons, more than 5% of all workers, held two jobs or more at the same time" (Moore and Hedges, 1971, p. 7). In industries where the work week had declined, moonlighting increased to result in an average of approximately 40 hours

or more per week for the individual worker, if not for the industry as a whole (Meyersohn, 1974).

Increased income is often the incentive for the practice of dual job holding. Many employees opt for the additional income rather than an increase in leisure time (Moore & Hedges, 1971). According to Carter, Ziesel said:

. . . It is not at all clear that, for all individuals, rising incomes and the ability to afford more leisure will necessarily be translated into demand for more leisure. The recent rapid increase in dual job holding has occurred during a period of new full employment and a rapid rise in real wages. Moreover, dual job holding is by no means concentrated among lower income persons alone (Carter, 1970, p. 62).

Some authors believe that part of our increased leisure is forced leisure, and as such should not be referred to as an increase in leisure time. Wilensky (1961, p. 51) stated that "much of the modern gain in 'free time' is illusory." Brightbill (1966) described enforced leisure as the kind of leisure we do not want. Three main groups fall victim to this: "(1) the involuntarily retired, (2) the intermittently unemployed, and (3) the chronically unemployed--all growing categories of the population" (Smigel, 1963, p. 126). Carter (1970) saw those experiencing forced leisure as those who can realistically expect an increase in future leisure.

A fallacious assumption in the past has been that time spent in housework would decrease as a result of technology and labor-saving devices, and would consequently result in more leisure time for the American homemaker. Szalai et al. (1972), p. 125) found little

evidence "that gains from an abundant labor-saving technology receive much translation into leisure." Several writers were of the opinion that, in fact, time spent in housework had increased, not decreased, for the full-time homemaker (Walker, 1969; Hall & Schroeder, 1970; Vanek, 1974). The time spent on particular tasks may have decreased, but new tasks have been introduced and some original tasks now take longer to perform because of higher standards (Cowan, 1976). Studies of housework time offer little support for an increase in leisure resulting from a decrease in housework.

An increasing percentage of women entering the labor force (Wilensky, 1967; Owen, 1976, Peterson, 1979) also contributes to a lack of leisure (Moore and Hedges, 1971). Employed women not only spend time in the labor market, but they continue to have the "work of home and family" (Wilensky, 1967, p. 21). This allows them less leisure time than either employed men or full-time homemakers (Szalai et al., 1972; Social Indicators 1976, 1977).

#### Factors Related to Amount of Leisure

The amount of leisure time available to individuals varies considerably. Groups such as business executives and farmers work long hours and have little time left over for leisure, while retired persons often have a surplus of leisure time. Of course there are differences in amount of leisure time within groups as well as between groups. The relationship between factors such as sex, employment,

age of children, place of residence, income, education, and the amount of leisure time individuals report has received some attention from researchers.

### Sex

Robinson (1977b, p. 148) said that "Time use patterns do demarcate a strong and persistent sexual division of labor and leisure in our society." Kreps and Clark (1975) felt that there had been an increase in leisure during this century, but that it had not been equally distributed; men had had a larger increase than women. Using time free from work as a measure of leisure, they cited shortened work weeks, longer vacations, more holidays, and "a score of non-working years in youth and old age" as reasons for this increase for men (Kreps & Clark, 1975, p. 54). In contrast, the working hours of employed women, including family care, had changed very little during the 1900's.

Using data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the 1975 Statistical Abstract of the United States, Owen (1976) compared employed men and women and stated that women had approximately six hours less time per week to use in pursuit of leisure activities than men. These figures included 33 hours per week which had been estimated as the time employed women spend in commuting, housework, and other unpaid work (Owen, 1976). Robinson (1977b) and Szalai et al. (1972) also found that employed women have less leisure time than employed men, and even less than full-time homemakers. However, "Combining

the data for housewives and employed women produced almost exactly the same amounts of free time available to women as men" (Robinson, 1977b, p. 89). Thus, "the overall result was practically no difference in free time by sex" (Robinson, 1977b, p. 91).

Gallogly (1977, p. 42) and Mellor (1978, p. 46) found that male full-time workers were "more than twice as likely as their female counterparts to work 41 hours or more" per week. This could suggest that women are likely to have more leisure time than men, but it excludes the time women spend in housework (Walker, 1969). Owen (1976) suggested that the male's longer work week is offset by the smaller amount of time he devotes to housework compared to women.

#### Employment of Women

According to Robinson (1977b), total leisure time for men compared to total leisure time for women when employed women and housewives are combined may not seem to differ, but there is a significant difference between housewives and employed women. Wilensky (1967, p. 22) explained why: "If a woman takes on a job today, she has to figure on adding her work week to a 40 or 50-hour homemaking minimum, unless she can afford and obtain a maid." Robinson (1977b) and Szalai et al. (1972) both found that American housewives had approximately two more hours of free time per day than employed women.

Owen (1976) and Hogan (Journal of Home Economics, 1977) felt that a decline in leisure time was associated with the employment of women. Findings from Robinson seemed to support this thought:

Employment's role as the major thief of a woman's free time is confirmed, the loss of 139 minutes per day on the average being greater than the combined effects of marriage (37 minutes) arrival of children (40 minutes), additional children (28 minutes), and even preschool children (24 minutes) (Robinson, 1977b, p. 156).

Although leisure time may vary with people, the group having the least free time per day "was within a very substantial and familiar segment of the sample, namely employed women" (Robinson, 1977b, p. 96).

#### Age of Children

Age of children usually affects the amount of leisure time available to parents (Szalai, et al., 1972). Robinson (1977b, p. 96) found that "the age of children had more effect on women's free time than number of children." As expected, younger children required more time than older children, consequently leaving their mothers with less leisure time (Robinson, 1977b, p. 75). According to Owen (1976, p. 4), employed women with children under 15 spent less time in the labor market, "about 1.4 fewer hours a week for every child under 15 at home." This probably indicates the greater amount of time needed for the care of younger children.

Robinson (1977b, p. 96) found that men's free time did not "vary systematically as a function of age . . . of children as it did for women." Though not using age of children as a factor, the mere presence of children in the family decreased men's leisure time by only half as much as it did housewives' leisure, and even less than half as much as it did employed women's leisure in Szalai et al. (1972) study.

### Rural/Urban

Little literature could be found which had examined the relation of rural or urban living to the amount of leisure time available. Vanek (1974) found that there was little difference in the amount of time urban and rural wives spent in housework. Mellor (1978) and Moore and Hedges (1971) described farmers and agricultural workers as one of the groups who experienced a long work week often in excess of 40 hours. Some groups of urban workers may also work long hours, which makes it difficult to attribute rural/urban status as a general factor affecting leisure time.

### Income

Income has rarely been studied in relation to amount of leisure by researchers. Robinson (1977b, p. 96) found little important correlation between income and amount of leisure time, "outside of the slightly higher free time reported by the most affluent group (over \$15,000) in the sample."

### Education

One important study revealed that "the amount of free time increases together with the advance of educational levels" (Szalai et al., 1972, p. 394). Robinson (1977b, p. 86) found slightly more free time among the better educated, but not enough to "support descriptions of 'harried leisure classes' or leisure-deprived underclasses."

Although income and education were not commonly used as factors related to amount of leisure, several authors described differences in use of leisure time between social classes or occupational levels which may be related to education and income (Robinson, 1977b; Willmott, 1971; White, 1955; Clarke, 1965).

#### Summary

Leisure has several connotations, but most definitions suggest freedom and pleasure. There are those who say that leisure time is increasing, while others contend that this is not the case. Individuals have different amounts of leisure time available to them which may be related to variables such as sex, employment of women, age of children, and place of residence. This study focused on how much leisure time is available to Utah adults and some factors affecting the amount.



## CHAPTER III

## METHODS AND PROCEDURE

NE 113 Family Time Study

The data for this research project were gathered from May 1977 to August 1978, as part of a larger research project titled "An Interstate Comparison of Urban/Rural Families' Time Use." This project was carried out in Utah and 11 additional states, including New York, California, Texas, etc.

Sample

The subjects of the Utah project were 210 two-parent, two-child families, half being urban and half rural. The urban families were selected from Salt Lake County and the rural families from Iron and Washington Counties.

The families were stratified by the age of the youngest child into five levels:

Level 1 - Under 1 year old

Level 2 - 1 year old

Level 3 - 2 to 5 years old

Level 4 - 6 to 11 years old

Level 5 - 12 to 17 years old

Respondents were randomly selected from lists of two-parent, two-child families residing in the three counties being studied. The sample was checked in the phone directory to eliminate families from the list who could not be contacted by telephone or who no longer lived in the county. This is a source of known bias in the sample.

The subjects for the current research were the parents of the households interviewed in the Utah project, a total of 210 men and 210 women.

#### The Data Collection Instrument

No perfect method of collection of time data has yet been devised. Two common methods are time diaries and time estimations. The more common practice has been to ask respondents to estimate the amount of time spent on certain activities over a period of time, such as a week or a year. Robinson (1977b, p. 9) stated, "In each of these instances, our experience has been that the estimates generated appear to exceed significantly the time reported on such activities on a daily basis."

The time diary method used in this study has some advantage over the estimation method. In it the respondents were asked to record all of their activities for the previous day and the times at which the activities began and ended. They were asked to recall only one day, and at a time when it was still fairly fresh in their minds. "Hence recall bias and exaggeration of socially acceptable activities are both likely to be minimized" (Robinson, 1977b, p. 9). The Utah

study also asked respondents to record time use for the following day as they participated in the activities. Statistical tests showed .85 and .88 correlations on two separate tests between the yesterday and tomorrow estimates of time use (Robinson, 1977b, p. 11).

The instruments administered as part of the NE 113 research project were:

- A. A time diary. This was a revised version of the time diary used by Cornell in its 1966-67 family time use study (Walker, 1976). The revisions made included additions and deletions of specific activities, some recategorization of activities, and some clarification of definitions of activities. The instrument was used by all researchers participating in the NE 113 project. The time diary included 18 categories under which all activities could be coded (see Appendix).
- B. An information questionnaire. It included information on types of meals prepared, equipment found in the home, level of education, occupation, and income.

The instruments were pretested by the researchers at Cornell University, who were coordinating the project.

#### Administration of the Instrument

The instruments were administered by professional interviewers hired through Wasatch Opinion Research Corporation. Interviews were conducted over a full calendar year to take seasonal variations into account. Data were gathered from May 1977 to August 1978.

The interviewers contacted the families by telephone who had been drawn from the lists and determined whether or not they fit the sample. They then determined if the families were willing to participate, and made an appointment for the first interview. During the first appointment, the interviewer helped the homemaker recall the activities of all four family members for the previous day. A diary was left with the homemaker for her to record the family's activities the following day. When the interviewers returned for the second appointment, they checked the diaries for completeness, and also the information questionnaires that had been left with each homemaker to complete.

#### Hypotheses

1. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by men and the amount reported by women.
2. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by employed women and the amount reported by non-employed women.
3. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by women with a preschool child and the amount reported by those with only school-age children.
4. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by men with a preschool child and the amount reported by those with only school-age children.

5. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by urban women and the amount reported by rural women.
6. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by urban men and the amount reported by rural men.
7. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by women at different family income levels.
8. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by men at different family income levels.
9. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by women at different educational levels.
10. There will be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by men at different educational levels.

### Definitions

#### Theoretical Definitions

Employed: Participation in the labor market for pay.

Non-employed: No participation in the labor market for pay.

Urban: Residence in a city.

Rural: Residence in a small town or the country.

Income: Amount of money earned or received per year.

Education: Amount of formal schooling completed.

Leisure: An attitude, activity, or time period which connotes pleasure and is free from obligation.

Operational Definitions

Time Diary: An elongated form with 18 categories of time use down the side and 24 hours divided into ten-minute segments across the top, on which families could record their day's activities.

Family Level: Determined by the age of the youngest child:

Level 1 - Under 1

Level 2 - 1

Level 3 - 2 to 5

Level 4 - 6 to 11

Level 5 - 12 to 17

Employed: Working for pay 15 hours or more per week (Walker, 1976).

Non-employed: Working for pay less than 15 hours per week (Walker, 1976).

Preschool Child: A child in Levels 1, 2, or 3.

School-age Children: Children in Levels 4 or 5.

Urban: 105 families from Salt Lake County.

Rural: 105 families from Iron and Washington Counties.

Income: Determined by amount of money earned or received per year:

Low Level: Under \$10,000.

Moderate Level: \$10,000 to \$19,999.

High Level: \$20,000 or above.

Education: Determined by the amount of formal education completed:

Less than high school

High school graduate

Some college

College Graduate

Graduate or professional training

NE 113: North East Regional Research Project, "An Interstate Comparison of Urban/Rural Families' Time Use." The states participating were California, Oregon, Texas, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Louisiana, North Carolina, New York, Connecticut, Virginia, and Utah.

Leisure: Time recorded for all activities in the social and recreational category and the organization participation category.

The tallied time totals in these two categories, social and recreational, and organization participation were used as the data for determining the amount of leisure time adults in Utah have. Data for the factors related to leisure time such as sex, employment, age of children, location of residence, income, and education were taken from the information questionnaire.

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present investigation was concerned with leisure time and how the amount is related to the factors of sex, employment, age of children, place of residence, education, and income.

Description of Sample

Interviews were conducted with 210 two-parent, two-child families in three Utah counties. The adults, half from urban Salt Lake County and half from rural Washington and Iron Counties, were the subjects for this study. Total family income, employment status of the homemaker, occupation, educational level, and age were included in the demographic data collected.

Income of the Household

Total family income was divided into three levels: low (under \$10,000), moderate (10,000 to \$19,999), and high (\$20,000 or above). Slightly more than half of the sample fell into the moderate income level. This is similar to the state as a whole whose average income for a family of four, based on per capita estimates in 1975, was \$17,240 (Population Estimates and Projection, 1979). In the same report, average incomes for the three counties were: Washington - \$13,492, Iron - \$14,000, and Salt Lake - \$19,120. In both the



population estimates and in the sample, the urban county had a higher average income than the rural counties. Table 1 summarizes the income distribution of the total sample.

Table 1  
Income of the Household

Income	Rural	Urban	Percent
Low (less than \$10,000)	26	3	13.8
Moderate (\$10,000 to \$19,999)	49	59	51.4
High (\$20,000 or above)	26	41	31.4
No report	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Totals	105	105	99.5*

\* Percentages are rounded off

#### Employment of the Homemaker

Walker (1976) defined employed wives as those who were gainfully employed 15 or more hours per week. Of the 210 women in the sample, only 62 or 29.5% reported being employed 15 or more hours the previous week (see Table 2). Including all women who were employed any number of hours, 46% of the sample reported being employed. The rural and urban women studied were similar in their employment status. In the state of Utah as a whole, 48.4% of all women are in the labor force (Sargent, 1978). To be considered part of the labor force, a women must either have a job or be looking for a job. The sample in this research included only women with husband present and children,

Table 2  
Employment Status of the Homemaker

Employment Status	Number	Percent
Employed	62	29.5
Non-employed	148	70.5
Totals	210	100.0

while Sargent's (1978) figures included all women in the state 16 years and over. This creates difficulty in making accurate comparisons between employment rates in the sample and in the state.

There are possible explanations of why the sample did not include more employed women. First of all, employed women may have refused to participate because of lack of time. Szalai et al. (1972, p. 81) pointed out that employed women are difficult to interview because "the chances of obtaining an interview are a function of the time-budget of the respondent itself." Another possibility is that because of the hours employed women spend outside the home, they were not successfully contacted by the interviewers. Calls were to be made at different times of the day in order to reach employed women, but there was no way to insure that the interviewers actually did this. The required number of calls could all have been made during hours when the employed homemaker was not at home.

Occupation of the Homemaker

Over 57% of the homemakers were listed as full-time homemakers. Those who were employed reported typical female occupations: service workers, clerical, sales workers, and professional/technical (which included teachers) (see Table 3).

Table 3

## Occupation of the Homemaker

Occupation	Number	Percent
Service workers	20	9.5
Laborers	0	0.0
Operatives	3	1.4
Craftsman/foremen	1	0.5
Clerical	29	13.8
Sales workers	16	7.6
Managers/administrators	2	1.0
Professional/technical	16	7.6
Full-time homemakers	121	57.6
No report	<u>2</u>	<u>1.0</u>
Totals	210	100.0

Occupation of the Spouse

Professional/technical and craftsman/foreman occupations were most heavily represented by the spouses, 25.7% and 23.3% respectively. The rest of the sample reported working in all other listed occupations except full-time homemakers (see Table 4).

Table 4  
Occupation of the Spouse

Occupation	Number	Percent
Service workers	9	4.3
Laborers	10	4.8
Operatives	24	11.4
Craftsman/foreman	50	23.8
Clerical	3	1.4
Sales workers	27	12.9
Managers/administrators	27	12.9
Professional/technical	57	27.1
Full-time homemakers	0	0.0
Student	1	0.5
Disabled/can't work	1	1.0
Totals	210	100.1*

\*Percentages rounded off

#### Educational Level of the Homemaker

The sample was divided into five educational levels, from less than high school to graduate or professional training. Table 5 indicates the number of homemakers in each level.

Table 5  
Educational Level of Homemaker

Education	Number	Percent
Less than high school	11	5.2
High school graduate	85	40.5
Some college	71	33.8
College graduate	38	18.1
Graduate or professional training	5	2.4
Totals	210	100.0

Educational Level of Spouse

Level of educational attainment was also reported for each spouse. The number in each level is reported in Table 6. The average educational level of the spouses was slightly higher than that of the homemakers.

Table 6  
Educational Level of Spouse

Education	Number	Percent
Less than high school	8	3.8
High school graduate	55	26.2
Some college	67	31.9
College graduate	57	27.1
Graduate or professional training	23	11.0
Totals	210	100.0

Age of the Homemaker

Homemakers' ages ranged from 21 to 57, with the most common age being the 26-30 category. Most of the homemakers were concentrated in the younger age groups, with over half of them under the age of 30 (see Table 7).

Age of the Spouse

Age of the spouses ranged from 22 to 57, with the most common age again being the 26-30 category. Few men in the sample were in the 46 and above categories (see Table 8).

Table 7  
Age of Homemaker

Age	Number	Percent
21 to 25	43	20.5
26 to 30	67	31.9
31 to 35	37	17.6
36 to 40	24	11.4
41 to 45	15	7.1
46 to 50	12	5.7
51 to 55	4	1.9
56 to 60	1	0.5
no report	7	3.3
Totals	210	99.9*

\*Percentages are rounded off

Table 8  
Age of Spouse

Age	Number	Percent
21 to 25	26	12.4
26 to 30	54	25.7
31 to 35	47	22.4
36 to 40	26	12.4
41 to 45	24	11.4
46 to 50	15	7.1
51 to 55	6	2.9
56 to 60	8	3.8
no report	8	3.8
Totals	210	100.0

### Amount of Leisure Time Reported

A time diary was kept recording how the respondents had allocated their time over a period of two days. Sanik (1979, p. 210) suggested that while time use on one day might not be consistent with time use on another day, an average of the two days would represent "a more valid measure of the family's time by depicting 2/7 of a week, rather than 1/7 of the week." The research was designed so that all days of the week were equally represented. Week days were not separated from weekend days for data analysis.

Time use was divided into 18 categories. Two of these, organization participation and social and recreational activities, were considered leisure time in this investigation. The time reported for leisure was the sum of these two categories.

Approximately one-sixth of the adults' time was reported as leisure time, the average being 4.6 hours per day. There was a wide variation in the amount of leisure time reported, ranging from 0 to 11-3/4 hours per day.

### Factors Related to Amount of Leisure Time

The focus of this study was to determine how certain factors were related to amount of leisure time. Six factors were considered: (1) sex, (2) employment, (3) age of children, (4) place of residence, (5) income, and (6) education. Reported leisure time was analyzed in relation to these factors.

Hypotheses 1 through 6 were analyzed by use of the t-test to determine if there were any significant differences between means of various groups in the leisure time reported. The analysis of variance test was used to see if there were any differences in leisure time according to the levels of income or education in Hypotheses 7 through 10.

Hypothesis No. 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by men and the amount reported by women.

The hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant difference between the average amount of leisure time for men and for women.

This finding is in harmony with Robinson's (1977b) study which found that when employed and non-employed women were combined, their average leisure time differed little from men. Sex alone does not seem to affect amount of leisure time (see Table 9).

Table 9  
Leisure Time According to Sex

Sex	Average Time per Day	Standard Deviation
Women	4.74 hours	2.14
Men	4.51 hours	2.39

Not significant at the 0.5 level



### Hypothesis No. 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by employed women and the amount reported by non-employed women.

The hypothesis was not accepted. The difference in leisure time reported by employed women and non-employed women was significant at the .006 level. Employed women had nearly an hour less leisure time per day than non-employed women.

Both Robinson (1977b) and Szalai et al. (1972) found that non-employed women had approximately two hours per day more free time than employed women. When a woman goes to work, she usually adds employment time to her housework, rather than giving up one to add the other. In consequence, employment can be a major thief of a woman's free time (Robinson, 1977b).

Table 10

#### Leisure Time of Employed vs. Non-employed Women

Employment Status	Average Time Per Day	Standard Deviation
Non-employed	4.63 hours	2.09
Employed	3.81 hours	1.87

Significant at the .006 level

### Hypothesis No. 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by women with a preschool child and the amount reported by women with only school-age children.

This hypothesis was accepted. At the .05 level there was no significant difference in leisure time between women with preschoolers and those with only school-age children.

These results are in conflict with Robinson's (1977b) study which found that age of children, more than number, decreased the amount of free time available to women.

Table 11

Homemaker's Leisure Time According to Age of Youngest Child

Age of Youngest Child	Average Time per Day	Standard Deviation
Preschooler (age 0 - 5)	4.55 hours	2.06
School-age (age 6-17)	5.02 hours	2.23

Not significant at the .05 level

### Hypothesis No. 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by men with a preschool child and the amount reported by men with only school-age children.

This hypothesis was not accepted. A significant difference in leisure time for men with preschoolers and those with only school-age

children was found at the .029 level. Men with preschoolers had about three-fourths of an hour less leisure time per day than those with only school-age children. These results are also contrary to those reported by other researchers. Robinson (1977b) found that leisure time for men did not vary much with the age of the children. Szalai et al. (1972) reported that the mere presence of children had much more effect on a woman's free time than on a man's.

Table 12

Spouse's Leisure Time According to Age of Youngest Child

Age of Youngest Child	Average Time per Day	Standard Deviation
Preschooler (0 to 5)	4.21 hours	2.23
School-age (6 to 17)	4.97 hours	2.55

Significant at the .029 level

#### Hypothesis No. 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by rural women and the amount reported by urban women.

The hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant difference in leisure time between rural women at the .05 level. No previous studies were found that related urban or rural living to leisure time. However, Szalai et al. (1972, p. 45) suggested that "while time use shifts dramatically from the agrarian life to small towns, change in time allocations from small towns to the large metropolis tends to be rather weak in industrial countries."

Table 13  
Homemaker's Leisure Time According to Residence

Residence	Average Time Per Day	Standard Deviation
Rural	4.92 hours	2.26
Urban	4.55 hours	2.00
Not significant at the .05 level		

Hypothesis No. 6

Hypothesis 6 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by rural men and the amount reported by urban men.

The hypothesis was not accepted. A significant difference was found between rural and urban men at the .012 level. Urban men had less leisure time than rural men. This could be related to greater commuting times in urban areas. Again, no studies were found which discussed how place of residence related to amount of leisure time.

Table 14  
Spouse's Leisure Time According to Residence

Residence	Average Time Per Day	Standard Deviation
Rural	4.93 hours	2.40
Urban	4.10 hours	2.31
Significant at the .012 level		

Hypothesis No. 7

Hypothesis 7 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by women at different family income levels.

The hypothesis was accepted. At the .05 level of significance, there were no differences in leisure time for women at different family income levels.

Little research was found that had attempted to relate income to amount of leisure time. Robinson (1977b) found that the highest income group in his sample, over \$15,000, reported only slightly more free time than the other groups.

Table 15

Homemaker's Leisure Time According to Family Income

Income	Average Time Per Day	Standard Deviation
Less than \$10,000	5.09 hours	2.05
\$10,000 to \$19,999	4.66 hours	2.14
\$20,000 or above	4.71 hours	2.18

Not significant at the .05 level

Hypothesis No. 8

Hypothesis 8 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by men at different family income levels.

The hypothesis was accepted. No differences were found in

leisure time among men of different family income levels at the .05 level of significance. The average hours of leisure time for the three income groups were very similar.

Table 16  
Spouse's Leisure Time According to Family Income

Income	Average Time Per Day	Standard Deviation
Less than \$10,000	4.42 hours	2.17
\$10,000 to \$19,999	4.52 hours	2.50
\$20,000 or above	4.59 hours	2.34
Not significant at the .05 level		

Hypothesis No. 9

Hypothesis 9 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by women at different educational levels.

The hypothesis was not accepted. A significant difference was found at the .009 level in leisure time among women of different educational levels. Those with less than a high school education had the most leisure time, while those with college degrees and above reported the smallest amount of leisure time.

Szalai et al. (1972) found that leisure time increased with advanced educational levels. Robinson (1977b) reported only slightly more free time among the better educated.

This finding could be related to the fact that women with higher levels of education are more apt to be employed than those with less. As previously pointed out, employment tends to decrease a woman's free time.

Homemaker's Leisure Time According to Educational Level

Educational Level	Average Time Per Day	Range
Less than high school	5.64 hours	2.46 to 9.75
High school graduate	4.61 hours	.63 to 9.21
Some college	5.27 hours	1.00 to 11.75
College graduate	3.89 hours	.67 to 9.67
Graduate or professional training	3.94 hours	1.75 to 8.17

Significant at the .009 level

Hypothesis No. 10

Hypothesis 10 stated that there would be no difference in the amount of leisure time reported by men at different educational levels.

The hypothesis was accepted. No differences significant at the .05 level were found among men at different educational levels.

Table 18

Spouse's Leisure Time According to Educational Level

Educational Level	Average Time Per Day	Range
Less than high school	3.78 hours	.50 to 7.75
High school graduate	4.53 hours	.08 to 11.38
Some college	4.75 hours	.00 to 10.29
College graduate	4.31 hours	.00 to 9.67
Graduate or professional training	4.54 hours	.92 to 11.08

Not significant at .05 level

Common Leisure Activities

Although the focus of this study was on the amount of leisure time of Utah adults, the researcher thought it would be interesting to see

what the most common leisure activities were during the respondents' leisure time. When an activity took longer than ten minutes to complete, the respondent was instructed to write above the time line what specific activity was taking place. This general instruction applied to time use in any of the categories. A count was made of the leisure activities listed by the respondents. Not all respondents identified their leisure activities, and others, of course, reported participating in some activities more than once. If an activity was participated in more than once by the same individual, it was only counted once. The tally simply denoted how many respondents indicated participating in an activity at least once. Only primary time was counted, not secondary.

More leisure time was reported in the social and recreational activities than in the organization participation category. Church participation was the only major activity in the latter category. Table 19 summarizes the approximate percentages of participation by men and women in the most common leisure activities.

Table 19

## Participation in the Most Common Leisure Activities

Activity	Percent Women	Percent Men
Television	60	52
Visiting friends/relatives	50	29
Reading/studying	37	30
Church participation	27	12
Talking on the phone	18	2
Sports activities	11	17
Driving/traveling	11	10
Talking	10	8

Percentages are rounded off



## CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The study attempted to determine the amount of leisure time available to adults and how the factors of sex, employment, age of children, residence, education, and income were related to the amount.

The sample consisted of 210 men and 210 women, half from urban Salt Lake County and half from rural Washington and Iron Counties. Time diaries were completed for each respondent which recorded his or her time use for two days. Time use was divided into 18 categories. The sum of time recorded in two of these categories, organization participation and social and recreational activities, was considered leisure time. Average amounts of leisure time were computed for several groups and the means were compared by use of the t-test and analysis of variance to determine any significant differences between or among groups.

The results of the study suggest that different factors were related to amount of leisure time available to women and the amount available to men.

Women

Only two factors had a significant effect on women's leisure time, employment and educational level. Employed women reported nearly one hour less leisure time per day than non-employed women. Women with college degrees and advanced training reported the smallest

amounts of leisure time, while those with less than a high school education reported the largest amounts.

There was no significant relationship between sex, age of children, place of residence, or income and the amount of leisure time reported by women in the sample.

### Men

Two factors were also related to amount of leisure time for men, age of children and place of residence. Fathers of preschool children had approximately three-fourths of an hour less leisure time per day than men with only school-age children. Urban men reported almost an hour less leisure time per day than their rural counterparts. The remaining three factors, sex, income, and education, did not seem to affect the leisure time reported by male respondents in the sample.

In this particular study, non-employed women with less than a high school education and rural men with only school-age children reported the most leisure time. Employed women with a college education or advanced training and urban men with preschool children reported the least leisure time.

The following conclusions may be drawn from this investigation:

1. When all women are lumped together and compared to men, there is very little variation in the amount of leisure time available to either group. Overall, men and women have similar amounts of leisure time.

2. Employment reduces a woman's leisure time more than any other factor studied. Employed women usually take on paid work in addition to household work, rather than substituting one for the other.

#### Limitations

The following limitations are recognized in this study:

1. The housewife did the recording of the family's time use. In some cases she may not have exercised due care. There was also a possibility of inaccuracy in recording data for other family members.
2. Leisure time was operationally defined. The definition used may differ from people's feelings about what leisure is to them.
3. Only primary time was used in this study. Additional leisure time may have been recorded, if secondary time had been considered.
4. The study used only two-parent, two-child families, which are not typical Utah families.
5. In using only adults with two children at home, the age limits were restricted. The aged and the very young were eliminated as part of the sample.
6. As time use was recorded and analyzed in minutes, the results may appear to be more precise than they were in reality.

7. Analysis of data did not separate weekends and week days.  
Time use may be very different on the two types of days.

#### Recommendations

It is recommended that further research be conducted concerning leisure time, considering the following factors:

1. A study including types of leisure activities engaged in as well as amount of leisure time.
2. A study which relates the factors of sex, employment, age of children, residence, education, and income to types of leisure activities participated in.
3. A study including what people consider to be leisure time activities, since all individuals don't consider the same activities as leisure.
4. A study comparing amounts of leisure time in Utah with other states participating in the NE 113 Families' Time Use Project.
5. A study to investigate why men with preschool children report less leisure time than men with only school-age children.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Becker, W. H. & Hunt, J. D. Utah resident recreation travel 1974 and 1975-1976. Institute for Study of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1977.
- Bell, C. S. The value of time. Social Research, 1975, 42(3), 556-563.
- Boulding, K. E. The household as achilles' heel. The Journal of Consumer Affairs, 1972, 6(2), 110-119.
- Brightbill, C. K. Educating for Leisure-Centered Living. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: The Stackpole Company, 1966.
- Carter, R. The myth of increasing non-work vs. work activities. Social Problems, 1970, 18(1), 52-67.
- More spare time--but for what? Changing Times, August, 1958, pp. 7-9.
- What's a housewife worth? Changing Times, April 1973. pp. 11-13.
- Clarke, A. C. The use of leisure and its relation to levels of occupational prestige. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21(3), pp. 301-307
- Cowan, R. S. The "industrial revolution" in the home: Household technology and social changes in the 20th century. Technology and Culture, 1976, 17, 1-23.
- De Grazia, S. Of Time, Work and Leisure. Anchor Books, Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1964.
- Donald, M. N. & Havighurst, R. J. The meanings of Leisure. Social Forces, 1959, 37(4), 355-360
- Faunce, W. A. Automation and leisure. In Smigel, E. O. (ed.). Work and Leisure, A Contemporary Social Problem. New Haven, Conn.: College & University Press, 1963, pp. 85-96.
- Faunce, W. A. Problems of an Industrial Society, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1968.
- Gallogly, S. J. Workers on long hours and premium pay. Monthly Labor Review, 1977, 100(5), 42-45.

- Gittelsohn, N. How women really feel about housework. McCalls, February 1977, pp. 193-194.
- Godbey, G. C. An analysis of the methods for the quantitative measurement of leisure. MS thesis, Pennsylvania State University, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1968.
- Gross, E. A functional approach to leisure analysis. Social Problems, 1961, 9(1): pp 2-8.
- Hall, F. T. & Schroeder, M. P. Effects of family housing on time spent on household tasks. Journal of Home Economics, 1970, 62(1), pp. 23-28.
- Hedges, J. N. A look at the Four-day work week. Monthly Labor Review, October 1971, pp. 33-37.
- Hunt, J. D., Nielson, M. L., Duering, G. E., & Dalton, M. J. Utah resident outdoor recreation participation 1976-77. Vol. I, statewide totals. Institute for the Study of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1978.
- Women Employed: Impact on the family. Journal of Home Economics, November 1977, pp. 14-17.
- Kreps, J. M. Lifetime allocation of work and leisure. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- Kreps, J. M. Time for leisure, time for work. Monthly Labor Review, 1969, 92(4), pp. 60-61
- Kreps, J. M. & Clark, R. Sex, age and work, the changing composition of the labor force. Baltimore, Md.: The John Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- Larrabee, E. & Meyersohn, R. (eds.). Mass leisure. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958.
- Leff, L. Leisure consultants are part Dr. Freud and part Dear Abbey. Wall Street Journal, September 12, 1978, p. 1.
- Linder, S. B. The harried leisure class. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
- Maklan, D. M. How blue-collar workers on four-day work weeks use their time. Monthly Labor Review, August, 1977, p. 18-26.
- May H. L. & Petgen, D. Leisure and its use. New York: A. S. Barnes Co., 1928.

- Mellor, E. F. Working a long week and getting premium pay. Monthly Labor Review, April 1978, pp. 46-48.
- Meyersohn, R. Is there life after work? Saturday Review World, May 4, 1974, 1(17), pp. 14-16.
- Moore, G. & Hedges, J. N. Trends in labor and leisure. Monthly Labor Review, February 1971, pp. 3-11.
- Murphy, J. F. Concepts of leisure, philosophical implications. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Nye, F. I. Sociocultural context. In Hoffman, L. W. & Nye, F. I. (eds.). Working Mothers, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 1-31, 1974.
- Owen, J. D. Work weeks and leisure: An analysis of trends, 1948-75. Monthly Labor Review, August 1976, pp. 3-7.
- Parker, S. The future of work and leisure. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.
- Peterson, J. L. Work and socioeconomic life cycles: An agenda for longitudinal research. Monthly Labor Review, 1979, 102(2), pp. 23-27.
- Pieper, J. Leisure, the basis of culture. New York: Pantheon Books, 1952.
- Population estimates and projection. Bureau of Census, Series P-25, No. 783. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, January 1979.
- Robinson, J. P. Changes in Americans' use of time: 1965-1975, a progress report. Cleveland, Ohio: Communication Research Center, Cleveland State University, 1977a.
- Robinson, J. P. How Americans use time. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977b.
- Sanik, M. M. A two-fold comparison of time spent in household work in two-parent, two-child households: Urban New York State in 1967-68 and 1977; urban-rural, New York-Oregon in 1977. Ithaca, N.Y.: Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1979.
- Sargent, R. L. Report on women in the Utah labor force. Utah Department of Employment Security, 1978.

- Smigel, E. O. (ed.). Work and leisure, a contemporary social problem. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1963.
- Social indicators, 1976. Washington D.C. Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards, U.S. Bureau of the Census, December 1977.
- Swados, H. Less work--less leisure. The Nation, 1958, 186: pp. 153-158.
- Szalai, A., with Converse, P. E., Feldheim, P., Scheuch, E. K., & Stone, P. F. (eds.). The use of time: Daily activities of urban and suburban populations in twelve countries. The Hague: Mouton, 1972.
- Too much leisure a problem. San Francisco Examiner and Chronicle, October 31, 1971.
- Leisure: Where no recession is in sight. U.S. News and World Report, January 15, 1979, pp. 41-44.
- Vanek, J. Time spent in housework. Scientific American, 1974, 231(5), pp. 116-120.
- Walker, K. E. Homemaking still takes time. Journal of Home Economics, October 1969. pp. 621-624.
- Walker, K. & Woods, M. E. Time use: A measure of household production of family goods and services. Washington D.C.: Center for the Family of the American Home Economics Assn., 1976.
- Weiss, R. S. & Riesman, D. Some issues in the future of leisure. Social Problems, 1961, 9(1), pp. 78-86.
- White, C. Social class differences in the use of leisure. American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 4(1), pp. 145-150. Abstract
- Wilensky, H. L. The uneven distribution of leisure: The impact of economic growth on free time. Social Problems, 1961, 9(1), pp. 32-56.
- Wilensky, H. L. Impact of change on work and leisure. Monthly Labor Review, 1967, 90(9), pp. 21-22.
- Willmott, P. Family, work and leisure conflicts among male employees. Human Relations, 1971, 24(6), pp. 575-584.
- Zuzanek, J. Society of leisure or the harried leisure class? Leisure trends in industrial societies. Journal of Leisure Research, 1974, 6(4), pp. 293-304.



## APPENDIX



## VITA

Sherry Ann Swapp  
Candidate for the Degree of  
Master of Science

Thesis: Factors Affecting the Amount of Leisure Time of Utah Adults

Major Field: Home Economics and Consumer Education

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Kanab, Utah, August 7, 1953, of Orson Spencer and Mary Ann Johnson Swapp.

Education: Attended elementary school at Kanab, Utah; attended Kanab High School in Kanab, Utah. Graduated in 1971. Completed requirements for Bachelor of Science degree at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, in 1977, with a major in Family Economics and Home Management and a minor in Child Development and Family Relations. Completed requirements for Master of Science degree in Home Economics and Consumer Education at Utah State University, Logan, Utah, in 1979.

Professional Experience: Graduate teaching assistantship in Household Economics and Management at Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1977-1979. Internship with Utah State University Extension Service, Iron County, Utah, from June to September 1978.