

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1979

Contributions to Household Work by Children in Two-Parent/Two-Child Families in Utah

Lundie Lee Osborne
Utah State University

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



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

Recommended Citation

Osborne, Lundie Lee, "Contributions to Household Work by Children in Two-Parent/Two-Child Families in Utah" (1979). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2307.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2307>

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.



CONTRIBUTIONS TO HOUSEHOLD WORK BY CHILDREN IN

TWO-PARENT/TWO-CHILD FAMILIES IN UTAH

by

Lundie Lee Osborne

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

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Home Economics and Consumer Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to Jane McCullough who has served as my major professor and advisor during the course of this study. Throughout my graduate experience she has remained an example of dedication to academic excellence and individual achievement. Without her encouragement, insightful suggestions, and willing assistance, this project would not have been possible.

Special thanks are also due to Dr. Janice Pearce and Dr. Alison Thorne. Their helpful comments and assistance in the preparation of the final manuscript were sincerely appreciated.

I would also like to express my thanks to Edith Gunnell for her words of encouragement when they were most needed, and to Laura Gaynard for her friendship and continued support throughout the last two years.

Finally, I am very indebted to my family who, though far away, have been an inspiration and encouragement every step along the way toward the completion of this study.

Lundie Lee Osborne

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ABSTRACT	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Statement of Purpose	3
Hypotheses	3
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Management and Family Resources	5
Family Resource Use	6
Family Time Use and Household Activities	6
Children's Contributions to Household Work	8
METHODS AND PROCEDURES	22
Sample	22
Instruments	23
Collection of Data	25
Statistical Analysis	26
Definitions	27
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	29
Description of the Sample	30
Factors Related to Children's Contributions	33
Overview of Children's Contributions	51
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	61
Implications	65
Limitations and Recommendations	68
REFERENCES	71
APPENDICES	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Family Income Levels	31
2. Educational Level of Parents	32
3. Number and Percentage of Children by Age and Sex	33
4. Correlations of Children's Time in Household Work with Time in School, Paid Employment, and Organizational Activities	35
5. Percentage of Children Involved in School, Paid Employment, and Organizational Activities	36
6. Correlations of Children's Time in Household Work with Hours of Parental Employment	38
7. Urban/Rural Comparison of Children's Time Contributions to Household Work	42
8. Comparison of Time Contributions to Household Work by Boys and Girls	44
9. Comparison of Time Spent in Traditionally Feminine Household Tasks by Boys and Girls	46
10. Comparison of Time Spent in Traditionally Masculine Household Tasks by Boys and Girls	49
11. Number and Percentage of Children Participating in Household Work	52
12. Percentage of Children Participating in Selected Household Activities	53
13. Average Number of Minutes Children Spent in Selected Household Activities	55
14. Average Number of Minutes Participants Spent in Selected Household Activities	57
15. Percentage of Children Contributing Various Amounts of Time to Household Work	60
16. Summary of Hypotheses	62

ABSTRACT

Contributions to Household Work by Children in
Two-Parent/Two-Child Families in Utah

by

Lundie Lee Osborne, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1979

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

The purpose of this study was to investigate children's contributions to household work and to determine what factors affected the amount of time children spent in household work activities. Data for the study came from the Utah portion of the "Interstate Comparison of Urban/Rural Families' Time Use" which involved 210 two-parent/two-child families in Utah. Data were collected through interviews with the homemakers in each family using time diaries and an information questionnaire. Time use was recorded for two 24 hour days for all family members over the age of five. For the present study an analysis was made of the time contributions to household work by 200 children (87 girls/113 boys) from 114 families. Ninety-six of the children were from rural families and 104 were from urban families.

Factors considered included sex; place of residence; children's time in school, paid employment, and organizational activities;

children's time in social and recreational activities; hours of parental employment; and parents' time in household work. Statistical analysis was done using either a partial correlation coefficient to control for age or a "t" test of the differences between means.

Findings revealed that the amount of time children contribute to household work activities varies widely. Some children contribute little or no time to household work while others put in several hours per day. Rural children were found to contribute more time to household work than urban children. Girls did not contribute a significantly greater amount of time to household work than boys, but boys and girls did contribute time to different types of household work activities. Girls were more likely to spend time performing traditionally feminine household tasks and boys were more likely to spend time performing traditionally masculine household tasks. Hours of parental employment and parents' time in household work did not make much impact on children's contributions to work in the home, but it does seem clear that children's time in household work does not substitute for that of adult family members.

INTRODUCTION

In the field of home management, the family is viewed as "a corporate unit of interacting and interdependent personalities who have a common theme and goals, have a commitment over time and share resources and living space" (Hook & Paolucci, 1970, p. 316). Ideally, this corporate unit, in sharing resources and living space, functions to provide a positive and nurturing environment for all family members.

In order to maintain the family unit and its support environment, the household, resource decisions are continually being made in an effort to attain individual as well as group goals. Most commonly recognized decisions involve economic and material resources, but decisions are also being made, albeit often unconsciously, about human resources in the home and in particular about the human resource of time. Maintaining a household requires work and that work takes time; and the decision of whose time will be used for what is a resource issue. Time inputs into household work are resources used to facilitate family functioning so that goals can be achieved.

The issue of work in the home has been studied and/or commented on by economists, sociologists, historians, advocates of the women's movement, and by any number of other interested individuals. Most of the attention has focused on the distribution of housework between husbands and wives. Curiosity about the economic value of housework; the opportunity costs of time; the question of leisure and quality of life; and questions of gender roles, role-sharing, and dual careers have all spawned research studies and essays on the time contributions and/or

household task performance of adults in the home. The contributions of children to household work have for the most part been ignored.

Some work has been done in the areas of sociology, history, anthropology, and economics with the focus on the types of work children do rather than on their relative contributions to household work. The question of how much time children contribute to household work is of importance when considering resource management within the home. Are the time inputs of children to household work a viable alternative to the time inputs of adult family members, and in particular to the inputs of mothers? Are there factors which affect how much time children contribute to work in the home? Do working mothers use their children's time in meeting the demands of maintaining a home and family? Are children contributing members of the corporate unit we call the family?

Statement of the Problem

As our world increases in complexity, time as a resource does not change, but the number of alternative uses for time in the lives of people young and old continues to increase. Within the context of the family this time dilemma holds definite implications for the roles of family members in the home. Maintaining a home and family takes time and who takes what roles in household work can be an issue of who has time to do the work required. As more and more women have entered the labor force and as the time demands on all family members have increased, it is possible that the roles of children in household work have changed.

At present, the available research on children's contributions to

household work does not present a very clear picture of children's work in the home. Early studies do not answer questions concerning children's roles today. More recent studies vary in methods and consequently comparative evaluations are difficult. Conclusions, overall, have been contradictory at points and as a result have not provided a sound basis for evaluating children's contributions to household work or the factors influencing the time children do contribute in the home.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate children's contributions to household work as indicated by the amount of time they spent in performing household work activities and to identify factors which influence the time contributions children make to household work.

Hypotheses

Based on the review of the literature the following hypotheses concerning children's contributions to household work were proposed:

1. The amount of time spent in household work activities by children is negatively related to the total amount of time they spend in school, in paid employment, and in organizational activities.
2. The amount of time spent in household work activities by children is negatively related to the amount of time they spend in social and recreational activities.
3. The amount of time spent in household work activities by children is positively related to the hours of parental employment.
4. The amount of time spent in household work activities by boys

is negatively related to the amount of time their fathers spend in household work activities.

5. The amount of time spent in household work activities by girls is negatively related to the amount of time their mothers spend in household work activities.

6. There is no significant difference between the amount of time rural children spend in household work activities and the amount of time spent in household work activities by urban children.

7. Girls spend a greater amount of time in household work activities than do boys.

8. Girls spend more time than boys performing the traditionally feminine household tasks of food preparation, dishwashing, clothing care, housecleaning, and caring for other household members.

9. Boys spend more time than girls performing the traditionally masculine household tasks of maintaining the home, yard, car, and pets.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Management and Family Resources

Management has been defined by Schlater (1967) as "a dynamic, ongoing process which encompasses those human actions directed toward the realization of values and goals" (p. 95). It has also been defined a bit more specifically as "the process of planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating the use of resources to accomplish goals and satisfy wants" (Nickell, Rice, & Tucker, 1976, p. 462). Inherent in both definitions is the concept of management as a process concerned with utilizing resources to attain goals. The goals sought may be of an individual or group nature but in either case, they will determine how, when, where, and by whom available resources will be used.

Resources, themselves, are recognized assets which can be used to achieve goals (Nickell, Rice, & Tucker, 1976). Within the family, these assets are varied and include human resources, nonhuman objects, events, and situations which possess the property of "resourcefulness" and so function as means to some desired outcome (Schlater, 1967). Human resources of any given family include the time, energy, skills, knowledge, abilities, and interests of the individuals who make up that family. The nonhuman or material resources of a family consist of economic resources, such as money, credit and material assets, and environmental resources, such as available community facilities and natural resources. Taken together, these resources are what a family has to work with in their effort to attain individual and group goals.

Family Resource Use

In the context of the family, management and more specifically resource use play a critical role in fostering the growth and development of family members through the handling of family activities and household work in such a way as to build and strengthen the home as a support system. Paolucci (1967), in discussing home management, stated that "decision-making in the family is concerned with the simple everyday resolution of competing values and goals of individual family members and the realization of specific goals through the creation, allocation, and utilization of resources" (p. 2). Broderick (1970), in his discussion of the functional requirements of the family, has similarly stated that the family will not survive "if it cannot manage its resources in such a way as to do the work necessary to support its material needs and keep the group operating" (p. 2). Nichols (1970) has identified "family welfare as the purpose and outcome of resource use" (p. 41); and Rice (1970) has stated that "family welfare . . . depends upon the use made of resources to provide physical necessities, goods, and services" (p. 6).

In reviewing the literature on family resource use, it becomes very apparent that resource use is important to the well-being and effective functioning of the family unit. Working with limited resources, families must make choices, often amidst competing goals, of how to allocate the resources available.

Family Time Use and Household Activities

As a resource common to all families, time is continually being

assigned, allocated, and directed toward the achievement of both family and individual goals. Whose time is used for what purpose is the result of numerous decisions that are made daily, though often unconsciously. How a family uses its time, or rather the time of its various members, affects goal attainment as well as the development and use of other resources. This is particularly evident in the area of household activities.

Many family and individual goals relate to household activities (Deacon & Firebaugh, 1975) and the time, physical capacity, and cognitive resources of family members are vitally important to the accomplishment of those goals. We may not be accustomed to thinking of the time and skills of family members as resources but with the many activities involved in maintaining a household, the participation of various family members in performing those activities is a resource issue. Traditionally women have been or have provided the major human resources in household activities, but as pointed out by Nickell, Rice, and Tucker in 1976:

Home related work can also be shared by other family members, the tasks can be delegated to individual workers, or a number of people can cooperate to complete a task or group of tasks. Resources and goals of the household need to be considered to decide whether to divide responsibilities, to cooperate, or to do the work alone (p. 250).

In terms of time use by family members and their contributions to household work activities, most of the available data have focused on the time contributions of adults (Robinson, 1977a; Szalai, 1972;

Vanek, 1974; Walker and Woods, 1976). Children, however, are also contributing members of most households and their assistance in household work activities may be an important resource alternative in meeting daily household work demands. They may increase overall efficiency or they may simply serve to alleviate part of the work load that would normally be performed by adults; but either way, children's time contributions are worthy of consideration as one of the potential resources available to families in working toward and attaining household goals.

Children's Contributions to Household Work

There are two types of literature available on the contributions of children to household work. The first type includes studies which were aimed at assessing the time spent by homemakers in household work. In these studies, children's contributions were considered along with other workers as the contribution of "helpers." The second type of studies focused specifically on children's contributions to household work, or at least considered children's contributions as important to an overall understanding of who does what around the house. Both types of studies provide an excellent background to approaching the study of children's contributions to household work and the factors that affect the contributions they make within the household unit.

Studies with Children as a Secondary Focus

The earliest available data on the contributions of children to household work come from several studies which were funded by the Federal Bureau of Home Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. These studies took place in the last 1920's and early

1930's and were aimed at ascertaining the time spent in household tasks by homemakers. One of the most extensive of these studies was conducted by Wilson (1929) in Oregon using a sample of over 500 farm and nonfarm households. Wilson found that full-time homemakers spent an average of 51.6 hours per week in performing household tasks. About 90 % of these homemakers received some assistance from family members, with children contributing an average of 4.6 hours per week to household work. Children's contributions accounted for about half the total time contributed by all "helpers." Farm children of grade school age were found to contribute an average of 3.3 hours per week to household work while high school children contributed an average of five hours per week. The average contribution for grade school children living in town was about the same as that of farm children. The children of high school age living in town, however, contributed less than their farm counterparts, averaging 4.1 hours per week. Of the household work performed by helpers, the most frequently performed tasks were those of caring for the fires, purchasing food, cleaning up after meals, and regular house activities.

Another of the early studies sponsored by the USDA was conducted by Arnquist and Roberts (1929) using a sample of 137 Washington farm homemakers. Their research indicated that farm children of all ages were assisting in household work with over 60% of all children contributing an average of almost five hours per week. Children's contributions were found to account for over 45% of all the help given by family members and others combined. Most of this help was in clearing away and washing dishes after meals, meal preparation, wash-

ing and ironing, and care of other family members. Girls were found to contribute more time to household work than boys and this difference increased with age. For children age six to fifteen, boys contributed an average of 1.7 hours per week whereas girls contributed an average of 6.6 hours per week. Arnquist and Roberts also found support in their research for the conclusion that children from farm families contribute more to household work than children from town families.

Wasson (1930), also under the sponsorship of USDA, studied the household time use of homemakers in rural South Dakota. Of the one hundred homemakers included in the sample, 58 reported having received help from other family members. For those receiving help, the time contributed averaged 10 hours and 12 minutes per week or less than one and one-half hours per day. Wasson's examples of help in household tasks focus on the contributions of daughters and tended to be in the areas of meal preparation and dishwashing.

In 1933, Richardson conducted another USDA study in Montana of the time use patterns of 118 rural homemakers. For the 61 women who reported having received help, an average of 10 hours and 40 minutes per week was recorded for all assistance. Of this amount, six hours and 50 minutes were spent in food preparation and dishwashing. Unlike some of the earlier studies, children's contributions were not separated out from the total time contributions of other family members as helpers. But, Richardson did note that those homemakers receiving the greatest amount of help were those having two or more children over the age of 12 or else having some other adult relatives living with the family. Also, in this study, homemakers who received help in household work

were found to actually spend more, rather than less, time performing household tasks. Richardson speculated that when there is help available women may take on additional household tasks thus adding to the total time spent in household work.

In Muse's 1946 study of 183 Vermont homemakers, persons other than the homemaker contributed an average of 17.75 hours per week to household work. As reported by the homemakers, the majority of help was contributed by other female members of the family. Girls age eight to 17 were identified as contributing about six percent of the total time devoted to household work, with the time varying from 10.0 to 34.75 hours per week. The tasks most often performed by girls were found to vary somewhat with age. Girls who were eight to 12 helped most frequently with housecleaning and washing of dishes, although as many as a third to one-half of these girls also helped with food preparation, child care, and care of personal clothing. Of the boys who contributed time to household work, 88 percent spent under five hours per week. The tasks most often done by boys of all ages were different from those of the girls. They most frequently helped with carrying in water, building fires, and filling lamps and stoves.

One of the most comprehensive studies dealing with the participation of various family members in household work was conducted under the direction of Walker (Walker & Woods, 1976). Using a sample of 1296 Syracuse, New York households, Walker used time as a measure of household production and evaluated family composition variables, number of children, and age of the oldest and youngest child, as they affected the amount of time contributed to household work by different members of

the family. The primary unit of analysis was the household, and as a result analysis of children's contributions to household work was not based on the time inputs of individual children but on the time contributions of all children as grouped into two age classifications, six to 11 years and 12 to 17 years. Children age six to 11 were found to contribute an average of 1.1 hours per day to household work in families where the mother was not employed and an average of 1.0 hours per day in families where the mother was employed. For children age 12 to 17 the average daily contribution was 2.0 hours per day in households where the mother was not employed and 2.2 hours in households where the mother was employed. Older children accounted for five percent of the total household work time when the mother was not employed and 10% when the mother was employed. However, the increase in percentage was not due to an increase in the actual time contributions of children whose mothers were employed but to a decrease in their mothers' time inputs into household work.

Like previous studies, Walker also indicated that children most frequently helped with regular house care, marketing, after meal cleanup, and regular meal preparation. Older children were reported as having contributed to some household work on about 90% of the record days and the four activities in which they were most often involved included meal preparation, after meal cleanup, regular house care, and marketing. These activities represented 60% of their total time in household work in families where the mother was not employed and 72% of their total time in families where the mother was employed.

Studies with Children as
Part of Primary Focus

In 1953, Johannis (1965) studied the roles of family members as evidenced by their relative participation in family economic activities, in household work, and in the care of children. The basis of the study was survey data supplied by 1,027 high school sophomores living in Tampa, Florida. In terms of household work, information was gathered on the participation of fathers, mothers, and all teenage sons and daughters in 18 selected household tasks. Johannis' results indicated that the families followed a fairly traditional division of labor with mothers performing the central role in carrying out household tasks. Where teenage children did participate in household work, daughters were found to participate more frequently in traditionally "female" activities whereas sons were found to participate more frequently in traditionally "male" activities. The tasks most often performed by daughters included picking up and putting away clothes, making beds, cleaning and dusting, clearing and setting the table, and doing after meal dishes. For sons the tasks most often performed were caring for the yard and emptying the garbage and trash. For both sons and daughters the contributions to household work were most frequently in performance of tasks which required little skill and which were easily learned, demanding a minimal amount of supervision.

In the same study, Johannis also evaluated the participation of teenage sons and daughters in caring for younger siblings. Their participation was highest in activities of a supervisory nature such as seeing that children got dressed properly and helping them with school work. However, overall, their participation was relatively infrequent.

Teenage daughters were found to contribute more to child care than sons but even their participation in terms of time was of minimal significance.

In a survey of 21 middle class families in upstate New York, Phillips (1957) gathered data on 47 children to determine what household tasks children between the ages of four and 12 were performing. Through interviews with the mothers and 27 of the children, Phillips found that children performed, on the average, 10 different household tasks in the course of a week, and spent nearly eight hours doing so. The tasks most frequently done, as reported by the children, included picking up their rooms, making their own beds, setting the table, clearing the table, running errands away from home, and baby sitting. Generally, the number of household tasks performed by children increased with age but there was little relationship between the age of children and the frequency with which household tasks were performed, or with the amount of time spent in performing tasks in the home. All children performed at least one task in the area of regular house care but in almost all other areas--food preparation, dishwashing, and clothing care--girls performed a greater number of tasks than boys. Girls also spent considerably more time doing household work than did the boys. As estimated by their mothers, girls averaged 11.7 hours in household work per week while boys averaged only 5.1 hours.

Participation in outside activities didn't seem to influence the average number of household tasks performed by children but the maximum number of household jobs done by any one child tended to decrease as the number of outside activities increased. Mothers' employment

outside the home did not seem to affect the average number of household tasks performed by children, but estimates of time spent in household work were higher for children whose mothers were employed outside of the home than for those whose mothers were not employed. Overall, mothers gave their children credit for saving them an average of at least 55 and as much as 65 minutes a day due to the household tasks they performed.

In 1964, Tengel conducted a research project to obtain information about the work experiences and income of middle class teenagers living in South Euclid-Lyndhurst, Ohio. Part of the study included an analysis of the types and amounts of work performed by teenagers at home. Using questionnaires completed by 261 students in the eighth, tenth, and twelfth grades, Tengel found that 94 percent of the girls and approximately 67 percent of the boys performed various kitchen and housecleaning tasks and half of the students reported shopping for groceries and running errands. Girls more often than boys reported tasks involving clothing and care of younger siblings while boys more frequently reported working outside (washing the car, gardening, washing windows, etc.), cleaning the basement, and taking out the trash. In terms of time inputs, as estimated by the students, Tengel concluded that girls assumed more responsibility for household chores than boys. Where relatively few boys reported working over three hours per week, 65 percent of the tenth and twelfth grade girls reported working more than six hours per week.

Taking a somewhat different approach, Parker (1966) studied 100 homemakers in an effort to determine the basis for task distribution

in the family. Participation in household tasks was recorded for all members of the family in order to determine whether tasks were assigned by individualized requirements or according to traditional role concepts. The results of the study indicated that women performed the majority of household tasks but that children did share in a wide variety of household responsibility. However, Parker commented that "the major responsibilities of children tend to be the more menial tasks" (p. 375).

Lynch (1975a, 1975b), in seeking to clarify the patterns of household work participation of children, analyzed the time use data of children six to 17 years of age in one, two, and three child households of the 1967-68 Cornell study (Walker and Woods, 1976). Using the time use records of 387 girls and 419 boys from 455 families, Lynch found that girls age nine to 17 performed a greater number of household activities than boys of the same age and spent more time in household work. The mean times ranged from .3 hours per day for both boys and girls to six to eight years of age to .6 hours for boys and 1.3 hours for girls in the 12 to 17 age group. In comparing boy-girl participation rates for four household work activities, meal preparation, meal cleanup, and regular house care were identified as primarily female tasks and care of yard and car was identified as primarily a male task. Two of these tasks, meal cleanup and regular house care, were found to become more sex differentiated with age. In looking at the amount of time spent on meal preparation, regular house care, and care of the yard and car, the same differentiation took place. Girls spent more time in meal preparation and regular house care than other household tasks and boys spent more time caring for the yard and car than in other household work activities.

In considering factors that might influence children's participation in household work, Lynch found some support for sons modeling the behavior of their fathers in terms of the types of household work activities and the amount of time spent in household work. She did not find strong support for parental employment as a significant variable in determining children's contributions to work in the home. Age was identified as an important factor in increasing the amount of work contributed, but the age relationship was noticeably stronger for girls than for boys. As girls got older they spent more and more time in household work.

Berk (1976), in a study conducted in Evanston, Illinois, used a combination of data techniques (direct observation, telephone interviews, and diary records) to evaluate the division of household labor in various sized suburban households. Unlike many previous studies in the area of household production, Berk did not use time contributions as the basis of analysis but focused instead on relative task performance in terms of who did what proportion of particular household tasks. Although Berk was primarily interested in the relative contributions of all household members, it is significant to note that she assumed that "the productive capabilities of children are potentially important elements in the maximization of household marginal activities" (p. 33). Berk identified children as contributing household members and spent a great deal of time exploring the relationship between children's contributions and the investments of other family members, especially mothers, in household work.

Breaking household tasks into general task areas, Berk identified

many relationships between household members' efforts in household work which she felt were helpful in understanding variations in the division of household labor. Findings from the study indicated that a mother's efforts were affected far more by an increase in children's efforts than by an increase in a father's efforts. It did not appear that there was an equal exchange but children's contributions in the areas of meal preparation and kitchen cleanup did seem to influence a mother's proportionate inputs. In the same task areas, a mother's employment outside the home was also associated with an increase in children's efforts. Regardless of employment, as well as children's ages, children were found to contribute "little or nothing" to child care and outside errands. Like other research, Berk pointed out that "while fathers and children do participate in household work, their roles are viewed as 'helpers'" (p. 280). Primary responsibility for household tasks appeared to remain with the adult females in the household. Consequently, "it is the mothers' proportion of the household work efforts, rather than the fathers', which importantly determines the role of children" (p. 280).

The most recent study of children's contributions to household work was performed by O'Neill in 1978. Comparing time use data from 1967-68 and 1977, O'Neill looked into the patterns of children's household task participation in two-parent, two-child families living in Syracuse, New York. For both the 1967-68 and 1977 studies the data were collected by means of a survey questionnaire and two time record charts completed by the homemaker. The comparison was made on the basis of time use records of 219 children (115 boys/104 girls) between the ages of six and 17 from the 1977 households and records of 333

children (181 boys/152 girls) from the 1967-68 households. O'Neill found time spent in household work by school-age children to be negatively related to time spent in school and in social and recreational activities. Relatively few children in both time periods were involved in paid employment or organizational activities so neither of these activities proved to constrain the amount of time available for household work. Generally, both boys and girls contributed to a variety of household tasks but the average time contributions per day were relatively small, under one-half an hour and often 15 minutes per day in any one task. In both time periods it was found that as children grew older they did a greater number of household tasks and spent more time in household work.

For all age groups, girls were found to engage in a greater variety of household tasks than boys. Also, the average daily time spent in household work tended to be higher for girls than for boys. The one marked exception to such a trend was found among the 15 to 17 year old boys in the 1977 study who contributed six minutes more to household work than girls of the same age.

In comparing the average time contributions over the 10 year period O'Neill found that both boys' and girls' contributions to household work were greater in 1977 than in 1967-68. Interestingly, boys contributions increased by a greater percentage than girls'. Like previous studies, tasks of food preparation, dishwashing, and housecleaning were still more frequently performed by female children and tasks involving maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets were more frequently performed by male children. Along with these findings O'Neill found

support for the theory that sons and daughters model their household efforts after their same-sex parents.

In terms of time contributions relative to parental employment O'Neill found a definite negative relationship. Increases in the hours of employment of both mothers and fathers were not accompanied by increases in children's time in household work. Rather, as hours of parental employment increased time spent by children in household work decreased. Such findings open some interesting questions about management of human resources in the home. O'Neill commented that such findings "suggest that children accomplish more household work if at least one parent is at home to supervise them or, perhaps, that less household work is being attempted in multi-worker households" (p. 100).

Summary of Studies Dealing with Children's
Contributions to Household Work

The studies reviewed here varied widely in focus, methodology used, and in their means of evaluation. As a result, conclusions based on these studies offer only a partial view of children's work efforts in the home. In all the studies reviewed children did contribute to household work, but regarding factors influencing the amount of work and types of work performed, the evidence remains somewhat sketchy. It would seem that as children grow older they contribute more time to household work and that overall, most of their involvement is in simple and routine tasks which require little skill and minimal supervision. There does appear to be a division of household tasks by sex, but there is also evidence of an overlapping of the tasks done by boys and girls. Generally it has been observed that girls contribute more time to household work than boys, especially as children get older. When it comes to

the influence of parental hours of employment, contributions of other family members, outside activities, and place of residence there are conflicting findings. Consequently, conclusions concerning the allocation of time inputs into household work on the part of children remain speculative.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The data for this study were obtained from a research project on urban/rural family time use in Utah, conducted by Jane McCullough and financed by the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station. The Utah study was part of a larger regional project which involved ten other states besides Utah.¹ The research project, "An Interstate Comparison of Urban/Rural Families' Time Use," was initiated by Kathryn Walker at Cornell University. It was designed to update the 1967-68 family time use data (Walker and Woods, 1976) and was expanded to include data from different regions of the United States.

Sample

Controls were established for all state samples. There were to be 210 two-parent/two-child families, 105 of which were from an urban area and 105 from a rural area. The samples were to be randomly drawn and stratified according to the age of the younger child. Five levels of stratification were designated:

Level I: Younger child under one year of age.

Level II: Younger child one year old.

Level III: Younger child between two and five.

Level IV: Younger child between six and eleven.

Level V: Younger child between twelve and seventeen.

For the Utah sample, the urban population consisted of two-parent/

¹NE 113 Family Time Study. Participating states: California, Connecticut, Louisiana, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

two-child families living in Salt Lake County. Salt Lake was chosen because it is located on the Wasatch Front, the most urbanized area of the state. The rural population consisted of two-parent/two-child families living in Iron and Washington counties. These counties were selected because of their population size, their geographic location, and the availability of necessary census data.

After the population lists had been obtained, a systematic random sample was drawn and the families were grouped according to the age of the younger child. There were 42 families in each of the five levels. After being drawn, the family names were checked in the telephone directory to determine whether the family was still residing in the county and to obtain each family's telephone number. This biased the sample by eliminating those families without phones, those with unlisted numbers, and those who had moved into the counties after publication of the telephone directory.

For the purpose of this study a subsample of the Utah study was used. The subsample consisted of all the children over the age of five. Children under the age of six were not included because time data were obtained only for family members age six and over. The subsample consisted of 200 children from 114 of the 210 families in the Utah study. Fifty-four of the families were from Iron and Washington counties and 60 of the families were from Salt Lake County.

Instruments

The instruments for the "Interstate Comparison of Urban/Rural Families' Time Use" consisted of a time diary and an extensive information questionnaire. Both instruments were revised forms of the instruments

used in the 1967-68 family time use study. The instruments were pre-tested at Cornell University and Cornell printed and shipped the instruments to all participating researchers to ensure that data would be collected in the same manner nationwide.

Reliability and validity of the time diary approach to collecting time data has been studied and evaluated by Robinson (1977a, 1977b). Robinson commented that the time diary as a method has the advantage of asking people to report activities of a single 24 hour period while that period is still fresh in their minds. Reliability of the time diary has been substantiated by the congruency found in results from different research projects investigating time use in different parts of the world (Robinson, 1977a; Szalai, 1972; Walker and Woods, 1976). Robinson also cites a multinational study in which "yesterday" estimates and "tomorrow" records were used to determine the degree of correspondence between the two types of time diaries. The overall correlation was found to be .85 (Yule's Y), which indicates that the time diary as a method of gathering time use data is highly reliable. Comparisons of time diary results with "observational" records of time use have offered support to the validity of time diaries as a method of gathering time data (Robinson, 1977b).

The time diaries used in the "Interstate Comparison of Urban/Rural Families' Time Use" listed activity categories on the vertical axis and time periods in ten-minute intervals on the horizontal axis. Each diary recorded a complete 24 hour day. Time recorded was broken down into eighteen categories such as food preparation, paid work, and personal care of self (See Appendix A).

The informational questionnaire used in the study asked for the

types of meals prepared during the days recorded, the types of equipment found in the home, the level of education of adult family members, occupations, income levels, and other demographic and background data (see Appendix B).

Collection of Data

Data were collected through personal interviews with the homemakers of the selected families. The advantages of the personal interview were cited by Walker and Woods (1976) as being (a) its potential for obtaining the desired number of complete diaries, (b) an opportunity to explain the purpose of the study and answer any questions, and (c) a means of giving clear directions concerning the time diary.

Interviews were conducted over a full calendar year and were spaced evenly throughout the year to take into account any seasonal variations. They were also spread evenly over the different days of the week.

The interviewers for the Utah study were hired through a professional public opinion corporation and were brought to Utah State University for training using a video-tape developed at Cornell. After the sample had been drawn, lists of family names were mailed to the interviewers who made the initial contact by telephone. If the family met the criteria of being a two-parent/two-child family and was willing to participate, an appointment was set for the initial interview. Completion rates were calculated for the total urban sample at 46% and for the first segment of the rural sample at 51%.

The first interview involved the completion of a recall time diary

of the day previous to the interview. Time use was recorded for all family members over the age of five, as recalled by the homemaker. However, since Hoppen's research (cited in O'Neill, 1978) had shown that mothers' reports of children's time use is similar but not identical to those of the children themselves, homemakers were asked to have family members check the diaries for accuracy. A second time diary was left with the homemaker on which the time use of family members for the day following the interview was to be recorded. The time diaries were picked up during the final interview and checked with the homemaker for completeness. In addition to the time diaries, an information questionnaire was completed for each family.

Once completed, the interview materials were forwarded to the researcher at Utah State University for checking, coding, and analysis.

For the purposes of the current research project, a tally was made of the amount of time spent in certain activities by children age six and above. Of the 18 categories of activities specified on the time diaries, the following eleven categories were used: food preparation; dishwashing; housecleaning; maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets; clothing care; physical care of household members; nonphysical care of household members; school; paid work; organization participation; and social and recreational activities.

Statistical Analysis

The basic unit of analysis for the study was the individual school-age child within each household. The variables used for data analysis included place of residence; sex of the child; parents time and

children's time in household work activities; children's time in school, paid work, and organizational activities; children's time in social and recreational activities; and hours of parental employment.

As the first five hypotheses dealt with factors which might have related to children's time in household work, a partial correlation coefficient was used to control for age in testing the relationships hypothesized. Hypotheses number six through nine asserted that there was or was not a difference in the time spent in household work based on sex or place of residence. These hypotheses were tested using a "t" test for differences between the mean times.

The level of significance chosen for hypothesis testing was .05. This denotes a situation where in five percent of the cases sampled, it would be possible to make the mistake of rejecting a null hypothesis when, in fact, it was true.

Definitions

For the purposes of this study the following definitions were established:

1. Household work: "The multiplicity of activities performed in individual households that result in goods and services that enable a family to function as a unit" (Walker and Woods, 1976, p. 1).

Operational Definition: Food preparation, dishwashing, clothing care, physical and nonphysical care of the family members, housecleaning and maintenance of home, yard, car, and pets.

2. Traditional Feminine Household Tasks: Those household tasks traditionally assigned to and performed by women.

Operational Definition: Food preparation, dishwashing, clothing care, physical and nonphysical care of family members, and house-cleaning.

3. Traditional Masculine Household Tasks: Those household tasks traditionally assigned to and performed by men.

Operational Definition: Maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets.

4. Time Contribution: The average daily time spent in any given activity.

5. Age Groups: Children were divided, according to age, into four smaller groups for the purpose of analysis: 6-8, 9-11, 12-14, and 15-17+ years of age.

6. Hours of Parental Employment: An average of the combined time spent in paid employment over the two days for which time was recorded.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate children's contributions to household work. In analyzing the amount of time spent in household work by children over the age of five the researcher sought to discover how much time children spent in performing household tasks and what factors influenced the time contributions made by children to household work. The factors considered included place of residence; sex of the child; hours of parental employment; mothers' and fathers' time spent in household work; and children's time spent in school, work, and organizational activities; and children's time spent in social and recreational activities.

Data for the study came from a larger research project on family time use of 210 Utah families. Half of the families were residents of Iron and Washington counties and were considered rural; and half of the families were residents of Salt Lake County and were considered urban. Data were collected through interviews with homemakers using time diaries and survey questionnaires. Time use was recorded for all family members over the age of five, covering two 24 hour periods for each family. Interviews were scattered over different days of the week and over the period of an entire year.² This was done to account for any daily and/or seasonal variations in time use. Time use was recorded in 10-minute intervals for 18 categories of activities. For the purposes of this study, eleven of these categories were used, seven of which were household work activities. All time inputs were averaged

²From May 1977 to August 1978.

over the two days were recorded to the nearest minute. The decision to average time inputs over the two days was consistent with the method used by Sanik (1979) in analyzing the New York time data. The rationale presented by Sanik was that an average of the two days "represented a more valid measure of the family time use by depicting 2/7 of a week rather than 1/7 of a week" (p. 210).

Description of the Sample

The sample for the present study consisted of 200 children from 114 Utah families. All children were from two-parent/two-child families and were at least six years of age. Ninety-six of the children were from rural families and 104 were from urban families.

Family Income

Table 1 presents a general picture of the annual income levels of the 114 families included in the study. The distribution indicates a somewhat higher average income level for urban families which is consistent with census estimates of income levels for the urban and rural counties selected for the study. The 1975 per capita income estimate for Salt Lake County was \$4,780, or an average of \$19,120 for a family of four. The per capita income estimates for Iron and Washington counties were \$3,500 and \$3,373, or approximately \$13,748 for a family of four living in these two counties (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1979).

Education of Parents

It is not clear that the educational level of parents has any influence on the amounts of time children contribute to household work,

Table 1
Family Income Levels

Income	Urban		Rural	
	#	%	#	%
under \$5,000	1	2	1	2
\$5,000 - \$9,999	1	2	7	13
\$10,000 - \$14,999	8	13	13	24
\$15,000 - \$19,999	15	25	9	17
\$20,000 - \$24,999	12	20	12	22
\$25,000 and over	21	35	10	18
no response	2	3	2	4
Totals	60	100%	54	100%

but some researchers have suggested that educated mothers may rely on the help of their husbands and/or children more than mothers with less education (Robinson, 1977a; Szalai, 1972). It has not been attempted in the present research to evaluate such a relationship. But in order to provide a clearer picture of the types of families represented in the sample, the educational levels of the parents are recorded in Table 2.

Age and Sex of Children

The mean age for the sample was 11.8 years, with a mean age for girls of 11.9 years and a mean age for boys of 11.7 years. Table 3 presents a breakdown by sex of the number and percentage of children in

Table 2
Educational Level of Parents

Education	Urban		Rural	
	#	%	#	%
Mothers				
Less than high school	4	7	3	6
High school graduate	27	45	24	44
Some college	21	35	15	28
College graduate	8	13	10	18
Graduate and/or professional training	0	0	2	4
Fathers				
Less than high school	2	3	5	9
High school graduate	19	32	15	28
Some college	14	23	13	24
College graduate	18	30	12	22
Graduate and/or professional training	7	12	9	17

Table 3
 Number and Percentage of Children
 By Age and Sex

Age Group	Boys	% of Total	Girls	% of Total	Total	% of Total
6-8	29	14.5	23	11.5	52	26.0
9-11	26	13.0	16	8.0	42	21.0
12-14	24	12.0	23	11.5	47	23.5
15-17+	34	17.0	25	12.5	59	29.5
Totals	113	56.5%	87	43.5%	200	100.0

each of the four age groupings. These were the same age groupings used by Lynch (1975a, 1975b) and O'Neill (1978) and were used in the present study to facilitate comparison with the New York State studies.

Factors Related to Children's Contributions
 to Household Work

In considering factors which might be related to children's contributions to household work, nine hypotheses were proposed. The first five hypotheses were tested using a partial correlation coefficient in order to control for age. These hypotheses dealt with school, work, and organizational participation; social and recreational involvement; hours of parental employment; mothers' time in household work; and fathers' time in household work.

Hypotheses six through nine examined the influence of place of

residence and sex of the child. These hypotheses were analyzed using a "t" test to determine whether there were significant differences in the mean times spent by children in household work according to where they live or whether they were boys or girls.

Hypothesis Number One - School,
Work and Organizational Participation

Hypothesis number one asserted that the amount of time children spent in household work was negatively related to the total amount of time they spent in school, paid employment, and organizational activities. Holding age constant, the correlation between children's time in household work and their total time in school, paid employment, and organizational activities was found to be $-.2873$ with a significance level of $.000$; which indicates that as children spent more time in school, work, and organizational activities, they spent less time in household work. On the basis of this finding the hypothesis was accepted. However, to clarify the relationship, the times spent in school, in paid employment, and in organizational activities were separately correlated with children's time in household work. These correlations are summarized in Table 4. It should be noted that time records were collected over an entire year, including holidays, weekends, and summer vacation as well as school days. Consequently, the average time in school reported is less than the length of an average school day.

Although the individual correlations between children's time in household work and time in school, paid employment, and organizational activities were all significant, it is important to note the differences in the strengths of the relationships. The correlation between

Table 4
 Correlation of Children's Time in Household Work
 with Time in School, Paid Employment,
 and Organizational Activities

Activity	Mean Minutes Per Day	Correlation	
		4	df
School	173	-.2066*	197
Paid Employment	58	-.1320*	197
Organizational	34	-.0095*	197
Combined	265	-.2873*	197

*Significant at .000

children's time in household work and their time in school is considerably stronger than those between children's time in household work and time in paid employment or time in organizational activities.

This finding is consistent with that of O'Neill (1978) who found school-related activities to be "the most important out-of-home constraint upon the time available to children for potential contributions within the home" (p. 50). However, in O'Neill's study the correlation of school time with children's time in household work was the only one of the three correlations which was significant. In discussing this fact, O'Neill suggested that the results may have been due, in part, to the low percentage of children involved in either paid employment or organizational activities. The percentage of children involved in these activities was higher for the present study, with 27% of the

children having spent some time in paid employment compared to only 10% in the O'Neill study; and 39.5% having spent some time in organizational activities compared to 27% in the O'Neill study. However, looking at the percentage of children involved and the correlations with time in household work does not, on the surface, seem to indicate a relationship between the percentage involved and the degree of correlation (See Table 5).

Table 5
Percentage of Children Involved in School, Paid
Employment, and Organizational Activities

Activity	% Involved	Correlation of time in activity with time in household work
School	69	-.2066
Paid employment	27	-.1320
Organizational	39.5	-.2873

Hypothesis Number Two - Social
and Recreational Activities

Hypothesis number two stated that the amount of time spent by children in household work is negatively related to the amount of time they spent in social and recreational activities. All 200 children reported having spent time in social and recreational activities on one or both of the record days. The mean time for the sample was 358 minutes, or about six hours per day per child. This compares to almost six and a half hours spent in social and recreational activities per

child per day in the New York study by O'Neill (1978).

Holding age constant, the correlation between children's time in household work and their time in social and recreational activities was $-.0496$. The correlation was in the predicted direction and was significant at the $.000$ level, but the relationship appears to be very weak. O'Neill's study found a correlation of $-.12$ at the $.044$ level. In neither study was the correlation even moderately strong.

Hypothesis Number Three - Hours of Parental Employment

On the basis of resource management it would seem plausible that as parents' hours of employment increase, then the time they have available for household work would decrease, and children's time would serve as an alternative resource in meeting the demands of maintaining a home and family. To test for such a relationship hypothesis number three was formulated. It stated that the amount of time spent in household work by children is positively related to the hours of parental employment.

The hypothesis was tested using a partial correlation to control for age. Children's time in household work was correlated with the total hours of parental employment and with mothers' and fathers' separate hours of employment. In all three cases the correlations were significant, but they were negative rather than positive. Consequently the hypothesis was rejected. Table 6 presents the findings.

All three correlations are small and can explain only a minute proportion of the variability. Still, the fact that the correlations are negative rather than positive indicates a relationship between

Table 6
 Correlations of Children's Time in Household Work
 with Hours of Parental Employment

Children's time in household work with:	Correlation	df	Level of Significance
Total hours of parental employment	-.023	197	.000
Fathers' hours of employment	-.018	197	.000
Mothers' hours of employment	-.017	197	.000

children's time in household work and hours of parental employment which would not be expected. O'Neill (1978), in finding similar results, commented on the possibility that such findings may be due to children's need of supervision in accomplishing household tasks or due to a diminished amount of household work being attempted in multiworker households. It is the opinion of the author that the first possibility is the more likely explanation. Children's need of supervision has been noted by other researchers (Berk, 1976; Johannis, 1965) and such an explanation may also explain partially why a smaller amount of time is spent in household work in multiworker families. The general indication is that children's time in household work does not substitute for the time inputs of their parents to household work.

Hypothesis Number Four - Fathers'
Time in Household Work

Based on the assumption that there is a certain amount of work to

be done around the home and that time inputs from one person would replace the inputs of another, hypothesis number four stated that the amount of time spent in household work by boys would be negatively related to the amount of time their fathers spent in household work. Consistent with the findings of both Lynch (1975a) and O'Neill (1978), the correlation between boys' time in household work and that of their fathers' in household work was positive rather than negative. With a correlation of $+0.2164$ at a significance level of $.000$, the hypothesis was rejected. The correlation found in the present study is weaker than those found by Lynch or O'Neill, but, in all three studies the indication is that boys spent more time in household work as their fathers spent more time in household work. This finding, like that in hypothesis three, may suggest that children do more around the house with parental supervision than without it.

Hypothesis Number Five - Mothers'
Time in Household Work

Similar to hypothesis number four, hypothesis number five stated that the amount of time spent in household work by girls would be negatively related to the amount of time their mothers spent in household work. Here again the correlation turned out to be positive and the hypothesis was rejected. Holding age constant, the correlation between daughters' time in household work and mothers' time in household work was $+0.0676$ at $.000$ level of significance. The weakness of the correlation would suggest that there is no clear relationship between daughters' time in household work and that of their mothers, but that the time of daughters is not a substitute for mothers' time.

Hypothesis Number Six - Place
of Residence

Hypothesis number six asserted that there would not be a significant difference between the amount of time spent in household work by rural children and the amount of time spent by urban children. Previous research on urban/rural differences in the time contributions of children to household work is limited to two of the earliest time studies. Wilson (1929) and Arnquist and Roberts (1929) concluded that rural children tended to contribute more time to household work than urban children. Since their studies in 1929, the question of rural/urban differences has not really been considered by researchers of children's time in household work. More often than not, the assumption has been that differences in the time contributions of rural and urban children to household work do not exist. The findings of the present study did not, however, support such an assumption; and the hypothesis that no difference exists between the time contributions of children to household work in rural families and those of children in urban families was rejected.

In comparing the mean time inputs into household work of urban and rural children, a "t" test was used to evaluate any difference between the means. The mean time contribution to household work by rural children was 58 minutes per child per day while the mean time contribution of urban children was 40 minutes per child per day. The standard deviations are very large but this is not unusual for time data because of the wide variation in how people use their time. A difference was found between the two means at a .031 level of significance. This significant difference did not show up in an analysis of time spent in

individual household tasks but was found in comparing total time inputs into household work. Table 7 summarizes the findings on individual tasks as well as on total time spent in household work by urban and rural children.

Hypothesis Number Seven -
Sex of the Child

Hypothesis number seven stated that girls spend a greater amount of time than boys in household work. The hypothesis was rejected. Analyzing the time contributions of children to household work, the present study found no significant difference between the amount of time spent in household work by girls and the amount of time spent by boys. Differences were measured using a "t" test and were analyzed in each of the four age groups. Table 8 summarizes these results.

These findings are interesting in that previous research has tended to support the position that girls contribute more to household work than boys. Lynch (1975a) and O'Neill (1978) are the only researchers who found exception to such a position and their exceptions were within specific age groups. Lynch found significant differences between boys' and girls' time inputs into household work in every age group except the six to eight year olds. O'Neill found a significant difference in the twelve to fourteen year age group.

In looking at the average time spent per day per child in household work, there are observable but not significant differences. The discussion following hypotheses eight and nine should help to explain some of the differences in time inputs to household work by boys and girls in the various age groups.

Table 7
 Urban/Rural Comparison of Children's Time
 Contributions to Household Work

Children	Mean minutes per day	Standard deviation	"t" value	df	Signi- ficance
All household work					
Rural	58.26	67.78			
Urban	40.24	46.50	2.18	165.96	.031
Food preparation					
Rural	7.29	17.17			
Urban	7.55	10.11	-.13	150.54	.899
Dishwashing					
Rural	5.86	14.76			
Urban	3.47	8.07	1.41	143.90	.161
Housecleaning					
Rural	16.61	30.91			
Urban	10.75	22.88	1.52	173.93	.131
Maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets					
Rural	20.05	41.95			
Urban	13.25	31.98	1.28	176.96	.200

Table 7

Continued

Children	Mean minutes per day	Standard deviation	"t" value	df	Signi- ficance
Clothing care					
Rural	.57	2.93			
Urban	.85	5.32	-.46	166.61	.645
Physical care of household members					
Rural	2.03	8.92			
Urban	2.26	8.21	-.19	200	.847
Nonphysical care of household members					
Rural	5.83	18.15			
Urban	2.10	9.76	1.79	142.45	.075

Table 8
 Comparison of Time Contributions to Household
 Work by Boys and Girls

Group	Mean minutes per day	Standard deviation	"t" value	df	Level of Significance*
All ages					
Boys	42.96	51.54	-1.58	161.98	.057
Girls	56.36	65.28			
Six to eight year olds					
Boys	30.58	34.88	.73	50	.235
Girls	23.37	36.72			
Nine to eleven year olds					
Boys	44.81	45.54	-1.12	22.45	.136
Girls	69.41	82.40			
Twelve to fourteen year olds					
Boys	58.54	72.05	-1.05	45	.150
Girls	80.98	74.70			
Fifteen year olds and older					
Boys	41.47	50.16	-1.01	57	.315
Girls	55.20	53.15			

*Based on one-tailed test of probability.

Hypothesis Number Eight -
Traditionally Feminine
Household Tasks

Hypothesis number eight asserted that girls spend more time than boys performing the traditionally feminine household tasks of food preparation, dishwashing, clothing care, house cleaning, and caring for other household members. Although no previous research known to the author had tested such a hypothesis, previous studies had identified the household tasks most frequently performed by girls. From the early studies by Wasson (1930) and Muse (1946) to the most recent study by O'Neill (1978), the household tasks included in hypothesis number eight have at one time or another been identified as tasks more frequently performed and participated in by girls than by boys.

To test the hypothesis a "t" test was used. Analyzing the mean times of boys and girls of all ages, the difference between time inputs of boys and girls was significant at the .000 level, with girls contributing a significantly greater amount of time than boys to the traditionally feminine household tasks of food preparation, dishwashing, clothing care, housecleaning, and caring for other household members. Hypothesis number eight was accepted.

To analyze the hypothesis a bit more critically a "t" test was also performed for each of the age groups as well as for the entire sample of children. In reviewing these findings it is clear that the difference between time inputs by boys and girls in traditionally feminine household tasks becomes larger and increasingly more significant as children get older (See Table 9).

Table 9
 Comparison of Time Spent in Traditionally
 Feminine Household Tasks by
 Boys and Girls

Group	Mean minutes per day	Standard deviationl	"t" value	df	Level of significance*
All ages					
Boys	21.27	27.24			
Girls	46.62	55.80	-3.92	118.86	.000
Six to eight year olds					
Boys z	20.42	26.52			
Girls	17.28	33.03	.38	50	.252
Nine to eleven year olds					
Boys	25.48	27.27			
Girls	52.79	59.21	-1.78	20.49	.045
Twelve to fourteen year olds					
Boys	27.08	35.33			
Girls	71.41	70.45	-2.71	32.10	.006

Table 9
Continued

Fifteen year olds and older

Boys	14.71	20.16			
Girls	46.60	44.28	-3.35	31.34	.002

* Based on one-tailed test of probability.

Hypothesis Number Nine -
Traditionally Masculine
Household Tasks

Similar to hypothesis number eight, hypothesis number nine was based on the findings in the literature that boys, like girls, perform certain household tasks more often than others. The household tasks most frequently identified as being masculine include things like taking out the garbage, doing yard work, looking after pets, washing windows, and maintaining the car. Hypothesis number nine stated that boys spend more time than girls performing these types of tasks. Tested using a "t" test, the difference between the mean time boys spent maintaining the home, car, and yard, and caring for pets, and the mean time spent by girls was found to be significant at the .007 level. Hypothesis number nine was accepted. Boys consistently contributed more time to the traditionally masculine household tasks than girls.

To, again, get a better understanding as to whether such a difference was influenced by age, the hypothesis was tested for each of the four age groups. Table 10 summarizes the results of the analyses. As in the case of traditionally feminine household tasks, it is apparent that as age increases the difference between boys' and girls' time inputs into traditionally masculine household tasks becomes more pronounced.

Considering hypotheses number seven, eight, and nine together, it would appear that although there are not significant differences in the total amounts of time boys and girls contribute to household work, there are definite differences in the types of household tasks performed by male and female children.

Table 10
 Comparison of Time Spent in Traditionally
 Masculine Household Tasks
 by Boys and Girls

Group	Mean minutes per day	Standard deviation	"t" value	df	Level of Significance*
All ages					
Boys	21.69	44.64	2.47	175.66	.007
Girls	9.74	22.67			
Six to eight year olds					
Boys	10.17	24.59	.80	42.89	.213
Girls	6.09	11.30			
Nine to eleven year olds					
Boys	19.33	40.29	.25	39.18	.407
Girls	16.62	30.06			
Twelve to fourteen year olds					
Boys	31.46	59.37	1.65	31.74	.054
Girls	9.57	25.91			

Table 10

Continued

Fifteen year olds and older

Boys	26.76	48.82			
			1.92	48.55	.030
Girls	8.6	21.92			

* Based on one-tailed test of probability.

Overview of Children's Contributions
to Household Work

There are several ways of approaching an evaluation of children's contributions to household work. Contributions can be viewed in terms of the proportion of children who contribute time to household work activities or they can be viewed in terms of children's average time contributions to household work. They can also be viewed in terms of the proportion of children who contribute various amounts of time to household work activities. The author has utilized all three approaches in an effort to present as complete an overview of children's contributions to household work as possible.

Proportion of Children Participating
in Household Work

Looking first at Table 11, we see the proportion of children who contributed any time at all to household work. The highest rate of participation was among girls age 12 to 14, with 100 percent contributing some time to household work. The second and third highest participation rates were also those of girls. Ninety-four percent of the girls age nine to eleven and 88 percent of the girls age 15 and over participated to some extent in household work. It is only in the six to eight year old grouping that more boys participated than girls.

For both boys and girls participation increases until they reach the age of fifteen. Then there is a drop in the proportion of children involved in household work. Lynch (1975a) and O'Neill (1978) both found similar results in their analyses of New York children's contributions to household work. It is plausible that the observed decrease

in participation by children over the age of fourteen is due to their greater involvement in school and outside activities.

Table 11
Number and Percentage of Children Participating
in Household Work

Age in years	Girls			Boys		
	N	#	%	N	#	%
6 - 8	23	14	61	29	21	72
9-11	16	15	94	26	20	77
12-14	23	23	100	24	20	83
15-17+	25	22	88	34	26	76

N = Number in each age group

= Number participating in household work

Table 12 presents a more detailed breakdown of children's participation in specific household activities. Again the highest rates of participation are among the girls. For girls of all ages, food preparation was the activity with the highest percentage of girls participating. Maintenance of the home, car, yard, and pets was the activity in which the highest percentage of boys participated.

Looking at the different age groups, we see that the activities with the highest percentage of children involved are different for boys and girls in each of the age groupings. With the exception of the youngest group, boys participation is highest in maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets; while girls' participation is highest in food

Table 12
 Percentage of Children Participating in
 Selected Household Activities*

Activity	Age in Years				All Ages
	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17+	
Girls	N=23	N=26	N=23	N=25	N=87
Food preparation	17	75	65	52	51
Dishwashing	9	69	48	40	39
Maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets	30	38	30	24	30
Housecleaning	22	63	70	36	46
Clothing care	0	6	13	20	10
Physical care of household members	9	13	9	16	11
Nonphysical care of house- hold members	26	13	13	8	15
Boys	N=29	N=26	N=24	N=34	N=113
Food preparation	31	31	38	32	33
Dishwashing	17	23	21	18	19
Maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets	31	50	54	38	42
Housecleaning	34	50	38	26	36
Clothing care	0	0	4	3	2
Physical care of household m members	21	4	0	3	7
Nonphysical care of house- hold members	21	19	8	12	15

* Percentages are rounded off

preparation and housecleaning. As in the case of combined household work activities there is a noticeable drop in participation on the part of older children in almost all activities.

Average Time Contributions to
Household Work

Another way of considering the contributions that children make to household work is in terms of the amount of time they spend in performing household tasks. Tables 13 and 14 present the average time contributions children of both sexes and of different ages made to selected household activities. Table 13 presents the average time contributions for all children and Table 14 presents the average time contributions of the children who actually participated in the activities. As would be expected, the average time contributions are highest in those activities in which a large proportion of the children participated. For girls of all ages the highest average number of minutes was spent in housecleaning, with an average of 19 minutes for all girls and 42 minutes for all girls who participated. For boys the highest average number of minutes was spent in maintenance of the home, car, yard, and pets. The average number of minutes for all boys was 22 minutes and the average for boys who participated 53 minutes.

It is obvious in looking at the proportion of children involved and the average number of minutes spent that children do not contribute a great deal of time to clothing care and/or care of other household members. Most of the contributions made by children of both sexes are in the activities of food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, and maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets.

Table 13
 Average Number of Minutes Children Spent
 in Selected Household Activities^a

Activity	Age in Years				All Ages
	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17+	
Girls					
Food preparation	3	16	17	8	11
Dishwashing	1	10	13	6	7
Housecleaning	4	22	30	22	19
Maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets	6	17	10	9	10
Clothing care	0	1	2	3	2
Physical care of household members	1	3	2	6	3
Nonphysical care of house- hold members	8	1	7	1	4
Boys					
Food preparation	5	4	5	5	5
Dishwashing	2	4	4	1	3
Housecleaning	6	13	14	6	9
Maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets	10	19	32	27	22
Clothing care	0	0	*	*	*
Physical care of household mem bers	3	1	0	1	1

Table 13

Continued

Nonphysical care of house- hold members	4	3	4	2	3
--	---	---	---	---	---

^a Averages are based on entire sample of children including those children who did not contribute any time to household work activities.

* Indicates time input under one minute.

Table 14
 Average Number of Minutes Participants Spent
 in Selected Household Activities^a

Activity	Age in Years				All Ages
	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17+	
Girls					
Food preparation	19	23	26	16	22
Dishwashing	9	16	28	15	19
Housecleaning	19	37	43	61	42
Maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets	20	47	31	36	33
Clothing care	0	10	12	17	14
Physical care of household members	15	24	26	39	29
Nonphysical care of household members	30	11	55	11	30
Boys					
Food preparation	18	13	13	15	15
Dishwashing	10	16	19	7	13
Housecleaning	17	26	37	21	25
Maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets	34	39	58	70	53
Clothing care	0	0	5	10	8
Physical care of household members	16	35	0	20	19

Table 14

Continued

Nonphysical care of house- hold members	22	17	50	1	23
--	----	----	----	---	----

^a Averages are based on the time inputs of children who did contribute time to household work activities.

There is also a noticeable difference in the times recorded in Table 13 and Table 14. The average times of participants are considerably higher than those of all children together. Even in those activities in which a very small percent of the children participated, the time contribution of the children who participated are far more substantial. Taken together with the information on the proportion of children who participated in household work, the average time contributions indicate that the amount of time children contribute to household work varies widely. Table 15 looks specifically at the percentage of children who contributed various amounts of time to household work.

Eighty percent of the children contributed some time to household work, but individual time inputs ranged from five minutes to a high of 315 minutes, or over five hours contributed in one day. It might be expected that small time inputs would be found in the younger age groups and large inputs in the older age groups, but the average amounts of time varied widely within each of the four age groups. In each group there were some children who contributed very minimal amounts of time and other children who contributed substantial amounts of time. Wide variation was also observed in the time inputs of children of both sexes.

Table 15
 Percentage of Children Contributing Various
 Amounts of Time to Household Work*

Number of minutes	Age in Years			
	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17+
Girls	N=23	N=16	N=23	N=25
no time	39	6	0	12
1- 10	9	6	4	4
11- 30	35	13	30	32
31- 50	4	38	13	12
51- 90	4	19	22	20
91-130	4	0	4	4
131-170	4	6	9	12
171+	0	13	17	4
Boys	N=29	N=26	N=24	N=34
no time	28	23	17	24
1- 10	10	8	4	12
11- 30	28	19	33	29
31- 50	10	15	4	12
51- 90	14	19	21	9
91-130	7	12	8	9
131-170	3	0	4	3
170+	0	4	8	3

* Percentages rounded off

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Household work has been defined by Walker and Woods (1976) as "the multiplicity of activities performed in individual households that result in the goods and services that enable a family to function as a unit" (p. 1). The question of what contributions children make to that "multiplicity of activities" has been the focus of this study. Seeking to provide further insight into possible patterns of children's participation in household work, the author has studied the time use of 200 children from 114 Utah families. Considering the total amount of time spent in selected household activities, an attempt has been made to determine how much time children contribute to household work and what influences the amount of time they contribute.

For the purpose of analysis nine hypotheses were proposed and four were accepted. Table 16 provides a summary of these hypotheses, how they were tested, and the results that were obtained.

Of the 200 children included in the study, 161 children contributed some time to household work. The mean time contributed was slightly over 49 minutes per child per day. Time contributions to household work ranged from three minutes to a little over five hours. Rural children were found to contribute more time to household work than urban children and although it appeared that girls contributed more time to household work than boys, the difference was not significant.

Children's contributions to household work were, for the most part, concentrated in the areas of food preparation, dishwashing, house-cleaning, and maintenance of home, car, yard, and pets. Very few

Table 16
Summary of Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Statistical Treatment	Findings
I. The amount of time children spent in household work activities is negatively related to the total amount of time they spend in school, paid employment, and organizational activities	Partial correlation controlling for age.	Accepted -.2873 sig @ .000
II. The amount of time children spent in household work activities is negatively related to the amount of time they spend in social and recreational activities.	Partial correlation controlling for age.	Accepted -.0496 sig @ .000
III. The amount of time children spent in household work activities is positively related to the hours of parental employment.	Partial correlation controlling for age.	Rejected -.023 sig @ .000
IV. The amount of time boys spent in household work activities is negatively related the amount of time their fathers spend in household work activities.	Partial correlation controlling for age.	Rejected +.2164 sig @ .000
V. The amount of time girls spent in household work activities is negatively related to the amount of time their mothers spend in household work activities	Partial correlation controlling for age.	Rejected +.0676 sig @ .000

Table 16

Continued

Hypothesis	Statistical treatment	Findings
VI. There is no significant difference between the amount of time rural children spend in household work activities and the amount of time spent in household work activities by urban children.	"t" test	Rejected "t" value = 2.18 sig @ .031
VII. Girls spend a greater amount of time in household work activities than do boys.	"t" test with one-tailed test of significance	Rejected "t" value = -2.94 sig @ .002
VII. Girls spend more time than boys performing the traditionally feminine household tasks of food preparation, dishwashing, clothing care, housecleaning, and caring for other household members.	"t" test with one-tailed test of significance	Accepted "t" value = -3.92 sig @ .000
IX. Boys spend more time than girls performing the traditionally masculine household tasks of maintaining the house, car, and yard, and caring for pets.	"t" test with one-tailed test of significance	Accepted "t" value = 2.47 sig @ .007

children contributed time to clothing care or physical and nonphysical care of other household members. Boys' contributions were greatest in maintaining the home, car, yard, and pets; while girls' contributions were greatest in food preparation and housecleaning.

There is some evidence that children's time in household work is influenced by the amount of time children spend in school, paid employment, organizational activities, and social and recreational activities. But, the impact of such constraints does not appear to be very great. The strongest individual correlation with children's time in household work was a correlation of $-.2066$ with children's time in school. The correlation was significant at the $.000$ level, but it can still only account for four percent of the variability.

Looking at children's time in household work relative to hours of parental employment and parents' time in household work, it does not appear that children's time serves as an alternative to that of parents in accomplishing work around the home. Neither mothers' nor fathers' hours of employment had a substantial effect on how much time children spent in household work. Both fathers' and sons', and mothers' and daughters' times in household work were positively correlated. Such a relationship may suggest that supervision of children is an important determinant of how much children contribute to household work.

Overall, there seems to be a great deal of variance in the amounts of time contributed by children to household work activities. Children's participation and average times in household work tend to increase with age until they reach 15. Among 15 to 17 year olds there is an observable drop in the proportion of children involved in household work

activities and in their average time inputs into household work. It is speculated that this may be due to the increased amount of time teenage children spend in school and out-of-home activities. Gesell (1956), in discussing this age group, suggested that teenagers may still help around the house but that they are more reluctant to do so and are usually too busy to do much.

Implications

The present findings on children's contributions to household work are an expression of the existing situation in 114 Utah families. It is the opinion of some (Lynch, 1975a; Walker, 1975) that those in a position of teaching, guiding, and/or directing children, do have a responsibility to evaluate what is in relationship to what might be. Here, in considering the implications of the present research, the author hopes to raise some questions about children's work in the home as it relates to life past childhood.

Sex Role Socialization

One of the long range implications of the present findings is the indication that traditional sex role stereotypes continue to be perpetuated by the way household tasks are divided between boys and girls. Although there were no significant differences in the total amounts of time boys and girls contributed to household work, there was, by age nine, a clear differentiation in the types of tasks performed by boys and girls. Nor is it surprising to find that this differentiation is the same one that exists between adult men and women. Boys tend to perform tasks which involve working outside, like mowing the lawn or

washing the car; while girls tend to perform tasks inside the living unit, such as helping with meals and regular housecleaning.

Also interesting is the fact that in the youngest age grouping of children, six to eight years old, the differentiation of tasks between boys and girls is almost the reverse of that which is observed after the age of nine. This raises the question of whether tasks are really assigned because of some innate ability or because of traditionally accepted ideas about the roles of males and females within the family.

There are numerous researchers and authors (Beuf, 1974; Pleck, 1976; Scanzoni, 1975; Stoll, 1972; and Weitzman, 1974) in the area of sex role socialization who point out that sex role norms and sex-typed behaviors are learned early in life and are as a result very resistant to change. If such is the case, the existence of a traditional division of labor among adult men and women may perhaps be explained by early association with particular household tasks. Also, the present findings of positive relationships between mothers' and daughters', and fathers' and sons' time in household work leave room for speculation as to whether traditional sex roles are also perpetuated in the sharing and role-modeling of household tasks between parents and their like-sexed children.

On the basis of the present findings, it does not seem likely that there will be much change in the roles of men and women within the home environment. In spite of the many changes that have taken place concerning women's roles in the labor market, it is more than likely that the family roles learned in childhood will be assumed throughout adulthood. Once learned and reinforced through participation, such roles

Once learned and reinforced through participation, such roles begin to feel "natural," and although the women's movement may press for equality and women may enter the labor force with greater and greater freedom, there is little evidence that roles in the home have been changing or will change in the near future (Berk, 1976; Nickols, 1976).

Still, it is important to remember that the present research reveals what is, not necessarily what could be or what ought to be.

Nickell, Rice, and Tucker (1975) suggest that if parents are concerned with training their children for independent adult lives, they should perhaps attempt to provide children with experience in a variety of tasks and not just in those traditionally acceptable to one sex or the other. The potential for change is always present.

The Value of Children's Work

One of the more subtle implications of the present research concerns the question of value placed on children's work in the home. In American society children generally aren't valued for the economic contributions they make to the family. This is not surprising as one of the marks of a modern society and a high level of economic and social development is a decline in the importance of children as economic laborers (Population Reference Bureau, 1977).

Still, just because children's work isn't economically valued does not mean that it is unimportant. Work experiences in the home can provide children with an opportunity to be productive members of the family unit. Stern, Smith, and Doolittle (1975), in discussing how children used to work, imply that without "valued" work experiences in the home children will remain the only truly dependent individuals in society.

Whether such is the case and whether it is good or bad can be argued, but the point remains that work experiences in the home can be valuable in helping children to develop a sense of themselves as contributing members of the family and of society as a whole.

The indications of the present study pose some question about whether or not children's contributions to household work are indeed valued. In the present study children's time in household work represents approximately ten percent of the total time spent in household work by all family members. This certainly can't be considered a major contribution. There also is evidence that parents do not consider children's time as an alternative to their own in performing household tasks. This would seem to indicate little value associated with children's work. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the variance in individual time contributions was extreme and while some children contributed no time at all to household work, others contributed several hours. It would be interesting to learn whether differences in time inputs reflect differences in family attitudes toward the value of household work and the value of children's contributions in the home.

Limitations and Recommendations

The present study was limited to the analysis of children's contributions to household work in two-parent/two-child families living in Utah. As such, the findings are not necessarily representative of children's contributions to household work in larger families. Because the average family size in Utah is considerably larger than that of the nation as a whole (Nelson, 1978) there remains a need for further

research into the contributions that children in Utah make to household work.

A second limitation of the present study resulted from the way in which time was recorded. Because broad categories of household work activities were used, no conclusions could be made as to the specific types of household tasks performed by children. A more detailed recording of time use might present a clearer picture of what types of tasks children do in the way of household work. It might also provide further insight into whether tasks are assigned according to the sex of the child.

Another limitation of the present study was brought out in the discussion of the value of household work and children's work in the home. Research on time use cannot in and of itself provide insight into how children or adults "feel" about time spent in household work; nor can it tell how time use is influenced by attitudes or feelings toward household work. It seems possible that a time use study combined with an attitude survey could offer some answers to these questions.

A fourth limitation of the study existed in that time was recorded for individuals and did not provide direct information concerning the interaction of family members in the performance of household work activities. Are there tasks which are shared by parents and children, by siblings, or entire families? It would seem that in considering sex role socialization and the theory of role modeling between parents and like-sexed children, a study which analyzed the joint participation of family members in household work would be advantageous.

Finally, there remains the question of how children's time

contributions to household work vary within the United States. With the completion of the NE #113 Family Time use Project the data will be available for such an analysis. It will be interesting to see if differences exist in task participation and/or in the total time contributions made to household work according to place of residence within the United States. It will, however, be important to pay careful attention to how household work is defined. Differences in definitions will alter the results found. In the present study only seven of the ten household work activities specified on the time diaries were included in analyzing children's contributions to household work. Time in shopping, clothing construction, and management were not included primarily because previous research had indicated that children spent a limited amount of time in these activities and the time they did spend was not clearly a contribution to household work, as in the case of children who accompany their parents when shopping but who really don't do the shopping.

REFERENCES

- Arnquist, I. F., & Roberts, E. H. The present use of work time of farm homemakers. State College of Washington Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 234, 1929.
- Berk, S. F. The division of household labor: patterns and determinants (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37, 6809A-7372A. (University Microfilms No. 77-10; 003, 411).
- Beuf, A. Doctor, lawyer, household drudge. Journal of Communication, 1974, 24(2), 142-145.
- Broderick, C.B. The interrelationships of family functions. In American Home Economics Association, The family: focus on management. Washington, D. C.: Author, 1970.
- Deacon, R. E., & Firebaugh, F. Home management context and concepts. U.S.A.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1975.
- Gesell, A. L., Ilg, F. F., & Ames, L. B. Youth, the years from ten to sixteen. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1956.
- Hook, N. C., & Paolucci, B. The family as an ecosystem. Journal of Home Economics, 62 (5), 315-318.
- Johannis, T. B., Jr. Roles of family members. In Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Economic Development, Family mobility in our dynamic society. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1965.
- Lynch, M. C. Participation in household tasks by children from six to seventeen years of age. Unpublished masters thesis, Cornell University, 1975. (a)
- Lynch, M. C. Sex role stereotypes: household work of children. Human Ecology Forum, 1975, 5(3), 22-26. (b)
- Muse, M. Time expenditures on homemaking activities in 183 Vermont farm homes. University of Vermont Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 530, 1946.
- Nelson, A. Birth rate in Utah reaches high. Salt Lake Tribune, April 1, 1978, p. 1; 2.
- Nichols, A. Research, our knowledge base. In American Home Economics Association, The family: focus on management. Washington, D. C.: Author, 1970.

- Nickell, P., Rice, A. S., & Tucker, S. P. Management in family living (5th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1976.
- Nickols, S. Y. The dynamics of family time allocation to productive activity (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37, 42335B-5450B. (University Microfilms No. 77-5635, 254).
- O'Neill, B. M. Time-use patterns of school-age children in household tasks: a comparison of 1967-68 and 1977 data. Unpublished masters thesis, Cornell University, 1978.
- Paolucci, B. Decision-making in the family. Address to American Home Economics Association 58th Annual Meeting, Dallas, Texas, June 17, 1967.
- Parker, F. Task distribution within the family. Journal of Home Economics, 1966, 58(5), 373-375.
- Phillips, S. S. Participation in household tasks by children from 4-12 years of age. Unpublished masters thesis, Cornell University, 1957.
- Pleck, J. H. The psychology of sex roles: traditional and new views. In L. A. Cater, & A. F. Scott, with W. Martyna (Eds.), Women and men: changing roles, relationships and perceptions. New York: Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, 1976.
- Population Reference Bureau, Inc. The value and cost of children. Population Bulletin, 1977, 32(1), 1-48.
- Rice, A. S. An emerging economic framework for analyzing family managerial behavior. In American Home Economics Association, The family: focus on management. Washington, D. C.: Author, 1970.
- Richardson, J. E. The use of time by rural homemakers in Montana. Montana State Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 271, 1933.
- Robinson, J. P. How Americans use time. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977. (a)
- Robinson, J. P. Changes in Americans' use of time: 1965-1975, a progress report. Cleveland, Ohio: Communication Research Center, Cleveland State University, 1977. (b)
- Sanik, M. M. A twofold comparison of time spent in household work in two-parent, two-child households: urban New York State 1967-68 and 1977; urban-rural New York - Oregon in 1977. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1979.
- Scanzoni, J. H. Sex roles, life styles, and child bearing. New York: The Free Press, 1975.

- Schlater, J. D. The management process and its core components. Journal of Home Economics, 1967, 59(2), 93-98.
- Stern, D., Smith, S., & Doolittle, F. How children used to work. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39(3), 93-117.
- Stoil, C. S. Female & male. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1974.
- Szalai, A. (Ed.). The use of time. Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1972.
- Tengel, M. P. Teenage production -- income, earnings, and work experience in South Euclid-Lyndhurst, Ohio. Unpublished masters thesis, Cornell University, 1964.
- U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Population estimates and projections. Current population reports (Series P-25, no. 783). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Vanek, J. Time spent in housework. Scientific American, 1974. 231(5), 116-120.
- Walker, K. E. Who shares in the family work? American Vocational Journal, February, 1975, pp. 52-56.
- Walker, K. E., & Woods, M. E. Time use: measure of household production of family goods and services. Washington, D. C.: The Center for the Family, American Home Economics Association, 1976.
- Wasson, G. E. The use of time by South Dakota farm homemakers. South Dakota State Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 247, 1930.
- Weitzman, L. J. Sex role socialization. In A. Heyman (Ed.) Growing up female. New York: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston, Inc., 1974.)
- Wilson, M. Use of time by Oregon farm homemakers. Oregon State Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 256, 1929.

APPENDICES

HOUSEHOLD CODE	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE			
	1	2	3	4
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
0				

Would you give me information about the meals prepared at home yesterday, whether they were eaten at home or elsewhere. If the total time for preparing the meal or snack was less than 3 minutes, do not include it. Start with the first meal of the day.

1. Recording Day I Recording Day II
2. What meal was it? : morning : noon : evening : snack : packed lunch : other
3. How many persons were served? : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8

5. Number of items prepared	6. What were the items prepared or eaten at this meal?	7. How much preparation was required for each item? None Very limited Simple Moderate Extensive	8. What kind of cooking was done? No cooking done Top of range Broiler Microwave Charcoal Small Appliance
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			

9. Recording Day I Recording Day II
10. What meal was it? : morning : noon : evening : snack : packed lunch : other
11. How many persons were served? : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : 8

13. Number of items prepared	14. What were the items prepared or eaten at this meal?	15. How much preparation was required for each item? None Very limited Simple Moderate Extensive	16. What kind of cooking was done? No cooking done Top of range Broiler Microwave Charcoal Small Appliance
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			

HOUSEHOLD FOOD	
1	2
3	4
5	6
7	8
9	0
1	2
3	4
5	6
7	8
9	0

1. Yesterday did you or any household member eat a meal away from home that had NOT been prepared at home?

YES NO

2. IF YES, now many times were meals eaten away? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(USE SEPARATE COLUMNS FOR EACH MEAL EATEN, WHETHER BY ONE OR MORE THAN ONE FAMILY MEMBER)

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
3.	Recording Day I Recording Day II	1 2	1 2	1 2	1 2	1 2	1 2	1 2	1 2	1 2
4.	Starting with the first meal eaten away was it?									
	a morning meal (1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	a noon meal (2)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	an evening meal (3)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	a snack (4)	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5.	How many household members ate this meal?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6.	From which of the following was this food obtained?									
	fast food (1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	school cafeteria (2)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	industrial cafeteria (3)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	private cafeteria (4)	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	a restaurant (5)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	private club or resort (6)	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	social gathering (7)	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	friend's or relative's house (8)	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	D.K. (9)	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
7.	What was the approximate cost including the tip, of this meal for all household members who ate it?									

FOR
OFFICE
USE
ONLY

1.	2.	3.	4.
5.	6.	7.	8.
9.			

HOUSEHOLD CODE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

1. Do you own or rent your home? _____
Own or buying Rent Other _____
2. About what year was your home built? _____
3. Is your household responsible for care of the yard? ^{YES NO} _____
IF YES, what is the approximate size of the lot that you take care of? _____
4. How many rooms are in your home? (DO NOT COUNT BATHROOMS OR HALLS) ^{0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9} _____
5. How many full bathrooms do you have? ^{1 2 3 4} _____ 6. How many partial bathrooms do you have? ^{1 2 3 4} _____
7. What is the main source of heat for your home? Electric Gas Oil Coal Wood Other D.K.
8. What is the main source of heat for cooking? Electric Gas Oil Coal Wood Other
9. How many motor vehicles do you have that are used for transportation by members of your household? ^{0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7} _____
10. How many drivers are in your household? ^{1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9} _____ 11. Do you have any household pets? ^{YES NO} _____
12. What is approximate size of your refrigerator(s)?
a. Refrigerator 1 b. Refrigerator 2
 small (less than 7 cu. ft.) small (less than 7, cu. ft.)
 medium (7-12 cu. ft.) medium (7-12 cu. ft.)
 large (12.1-19 cu. ft.) large (12.1-19 cu. ft.)
 extra large (19.1+ cu. ft.) extra large (19.1+ cu. ft.)
 not applicable not applicable
13. Is your refrigerator(s) unit:
a. Refrigerator 1 b. Refrigerator 2
 1 door model? 1 door model?
 2 door model? 2 door model?
 not applicable not applicable
14. Is your refrigerator/freezer a frost free model?
a. Refrigerator 1 b. Refrigerator 2
 Yes, refrigerator only Yes, refrigerator only
 Yes, both freezer/ Yes, both freezer/
 refrigerator refrigerator
 Not applicable Not applicable
 No No
15. Do you have a separate freezer(s) (free-standing)? ^{YES NO} _____
16. IF YES, is your freezer space
 small (less than 12 cu. ft.)?
 medium (12-19 cu. ft.)?
 large (19.1+ cu. ft.)?
 not applicable
17. IF 1 OR MORE FREEZERS, ASK:
 How many of your free-standing
 freezers are frost free? ^{0 1 2 3 4} _____
18. Is your oven continuous cleaning? self cleaning? neither?

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								

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

canning, pickling, making jams, and jellies ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 freezing food ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 preparing food for another day ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 shopping for food ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

2. On how many of the last seven days have the following been consciously used to avoid some dishwashing or laundry?

disposable cooking or serving dishes ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 aluminum foil or disposable baking pans ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 disposable diapers ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 disposable household textiles ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

3. Do you have a _____ 4. IF YES, on how many of the last 7 days has it been used for your household work?

microwave oven?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	N
dishwasher?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	O
garbage disposer?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	T
trash compactor?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	A
washing machine automatic?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	P
washing machine nonautomatic?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	P
clothes dryer?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	L
sewing machine?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	I
vacuum cleaner?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	C
power sander and/or yard equipment?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	A
air conditioner?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	B
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	L
										E

IF YES, identify: Central 1 2 3+ room units

5. How many loads of clothes were washed on Day 1 ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 on Day 2 ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 during last 7 days ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

6. Where was washing done?

Day 1 home someone else's house apartment house laundromat other _____
 Day 2 home someone else's house apartment house laundromat other _____

7. On how many of the last seven days did someone in your household:

take items to commercial laundry or dry cleaner? ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 use coin operated laundry or dry cleaning equipment? ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 do hand washing? ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 iron? ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 do sewing? ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

HOUSEHOLD CODE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0

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

shopping for items or services priced over \$100? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
special housecleaning? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
painting, redecorating? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
washing or waxing motor vehicles? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
repairing appliances? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
working in the yard, garden, including harvesting? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
working on outside areas of the house or property? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

2. On how many of the last seven days was any household member ill? ----- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

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

to and/or from doctor, dentist or barber? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
to and/or from paid work? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
to and/or from school or classes? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
to and/or from a social function? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
to and/or from an organization, including church? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
to and/or from an educational or athletic activity? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
to and/or from a store? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

4. On how many of the last seven days were the following modes of transportation used by one or more household members:

family car? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
company car? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
school bus? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
car pool? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
city bus? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
taxi? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
bicycle? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
other, ? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

5. In the last seven days, did you or any family member have someone from outside the household do any of the following:

YES NO NA

take care of your children -- in your home? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
take care of your children -- in someone else's home? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
take care of your children -- in day care center? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
take care of other household member(s)? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
do housecleaning? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
do lawn or yard work? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
do painting, redecorating? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
service appliances? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
work on your motor vehicles? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
do house maintenance? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
other services? -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

6. How many hours did it take? -----
7. How much did it cost? -----

- 1) How many of your children, 12-17 years of age, worked for pay last week?
If none or NA, go to next page.

	CHILD I	CHILD II	CHILD III
2) What is the age and sex of the child?	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> 12-13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14-15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-17	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> 12-13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14-15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-17	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> 12-13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14-15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-17
3) What kind of work did he/she do?			
4) How many hours did he/she work last week?	_____ hrs	_____ hrs	_____ hrs
5) Approximately how much did he/she earn last week?	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
	CHILD IV	CHILD V	CHILD VI
2a) What is the age and sex of the child?	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> 12-13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14-15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-17	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> 12-13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14-15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-17	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> 12-13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14-15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-17
3a) What kind of work did he/she do?			
4a) How many hours did he/she work last week?	_____ hrs	_____ hrs	_____ hrs
5a) Approximately how much did he/she earn last week?	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE -- FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

WAGES		HOURS		WAGES	
1.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24	1.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24	5.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24
2.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24	2.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24	5.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24
3.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24	3.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24	5.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24
4.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24	4.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24	6.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24
				6.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 <input type="checkbox"/> 14 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/> 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 21 <input type="checkbox"/> 22 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 <input type="checkbox"/> 24

HOUSEHOLD CODE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0

(FOR EACH ADULT ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS)

	HOMEMAKER	ADULT II	ADULT III
1. What was the highest grade in school you completed? (IF DEGREE MENTIONED NOTE)			
2. Last week were you employed? FOR EACH EMPLOYED ASK:	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO
3. Was this for pay? (CODE 1) For pay, but not at work, example, illness or vacation? (CODE 2) Without pay, example, family farm or business? (CODE 3)	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
4. What kind of work did you do? (IF MORE THAN 1 JOB, ASK FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE FIRST OR PRIMARY JOB)			
5. What kind of industry or business were you employed in?			
6. How many hours did you work for pay last week? I II III	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
7. What is the usual number of hours you work for pay a week?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
8. Are you: an hourly wage earner? (CODE 1) salaried? (CODE 2) on commission? (CODE 3) self-employed? (CODE 4) other? (CODE 5) GO TO Q. 9 GO TO Q. 10	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. What is your hourly wage rate?	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
10. If you were salaried, self-employed, or on commission, what amount did you earn last week? (USE INCOME BEFORE DEDUCTIONS)	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

H	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0

II	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0

III	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0

REFERENCE KEYS

	HOUSEMAKER	ADULT II	ADULT III
1. Did you have more than one paid job last week? (IF NO, GO TO C 9)	YES	YES	YES
2. (IF YES) What kind of work was this?			
3. What industry or business was it in?			
4. How many hours did you work for pay last week on this job?
5. What is the usual number of hours you work for pay per week on this job?
6. For this second job are you: an hourly wage earner? (CODE 1) → salaried? (CODE 2) → on commission? (CODE 3) → self-employed? (CODE 4) → other? (CODE 5) → GO TO Q 7 → GO TO Q 8 →
7. What is your hourly wage for your second job?	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
8. If you were salaried, self-employed, or on commission for a second job, what amount did you earn last week? (USE INCOME BEFORE DEDUCTIONS)	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
9. If you worked without pay in family business or farm, how many hours did you work last week?
10. Which category on this card represents the total income before taxes for your household in the past twelve months? This includes wages and salaries, net income from business or farm, pensions, dividends, interest, rent, Social Security payments and any other money received by members of your household? BLOCK OUT ONE LETTER ONLY			

HOUSEHOLD CODE _____

Were there unusual weather conditions that affected household members' time use?

on the 1st day _____

on the 2nd day _____

Were there any unusual physical conditions or situations regarding your residence that affected household members' time use?

on the 1st day _____

on the 2nd day _____

Were there any unusual activities of your family or household members that affected household members' time use?

on the 1st day _____

on the 2nd day _____

Are there any special situations in your home, for example: handicapped or chronically ill family members, that affected household members' time use?

Are there special ways your household members "save" time on household activities?
